Copyright

by

Christian Marie Bell

2013

The Dissertation Committee for Christian Marie Bell Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

The Curious Case of Oklahoma: A Historical Analysis of the Passage of Universal Pre-Kindergarten Legislation in Oklahoma

Committee:

Pedro Reyes, Supervisor

Elizabeth Gershoff, Co-Supervisor

Mark Gooden

Sheri Mycue

Edwin Sharpe

The Curious Case of Oklahoma: A Historical Analysis of the Passage of Universal Pre-Kindergarten Legislation in Oklahoma

by

Christian Marie Bell, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2013

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother, Gale Lee. While you are absent in body, you are always with me in spirit.

Acknowledgements

I oftentimes liken graduate school to the Wizard of Oz movie. It has been strange scary, and alienating at times, but I was blessed with many lions, scarecrows, and tin men along the way who gave given me just what I needed, at just the right time, to complete this journey. This acknowledgements section is by no means exhaustive, so if I overlooked someone, please charge it to my head and not my heart.

I first want to sincerely thank Mr. Joe Eddins for welcoming me (a complete stranger) into his home to discuss Oklahoma's Pre-K story, for periodically sending follow-up e-mails to update me on media coverage of Oklahoma's Pre-K program, and for reading drafts of Chapter Four. I can honestly say that if not for him, I would not have been able to complete my dissertation. I would also be remiss if I did not thank Mr. Bob Harbison for talking to me about the Oklahoma Pre-K story for an hour while he drove from Kansas to Oklahoma and calling me several months later to answer a follow-up question. Many thanks also to Mr. Steven Dow, who did not hesitate to agree to speak with me about the current state of early childhood education in Oklahoma. I am inspired by the devotion and passion these men have for the youngest residents of my home state.

I am eternally grateful to my primary chair, Dr. Elizabeth Gershoff. I was not a student in the Human Development & Family Sciences program, yet you agreed work with me on my proposal and to serve as co-chair, guiding me as I ventured into the uncharted territory to complete this type of dissertation. I am also thankful for the support and guidance from my other committee members.

My friends and colleagues in the EPP program: Amy, Bo La, Brad, Chris, Lorna, and Vanessa, your support and friendship certainly made this journey a lot easier. I count myself lucky to have met each of you.

To my sister friends: Alicia, Kirstyn, and Michelle. It's easy to lose yourself in graduate school, so I'm glad I had these women, who knew me before I began the program, that I could go on trips with, send random text messages to, have lengthy Google Chat sessions with—to just be myself, minus all the school stuff.

Walter, your support and friendship did not go unnoticed or unappreciated.

Dr. Martha Doolittle and Dr. Sheri Mycue have been my managers throughout most of my graduate studies and were patient with all of the schedule changes and needs I had as a student and employee. More importantly, they took the time to tell me I could complete my studies and to just hang in there. It is no small task to work two part time jobs while going to school full time, and I'm blessed to have two managers who supported me throughout the process.

Last, but not least, a huge shout out to the entire Lee family, but especially: my grandmother, Elreatha, my siblings Candace and Xavier, and my aunts and uncles: Erma, Greta, Robert, and Tony. We finally have a doctor in the family!

The Curious Case of Oklahoma: A Historical Analysis of the Passage of Universal Pre-Kindergarten Legislation in Oklahoma

Christian Marie Bell, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2013

Supervisors: Pedro Reyes and Elizabeth Gershoff

State-funded voluntary pre-K programs have grown steadily over the past decade and now enroll 1.3 million children (Barnett, Carolan, Fitzgerald, J., & Squires, 2012). While the overall trend has been to increase participation in state funded Pre-K, access in most states is targeted to select groups of at-risk 4-year-olds. Unfortunately, targeted programs for disadvantaged children tend to underserve their targeted populations with respect to availability and quality (Gelbach & Pritchett, 2002). In light of this, Pre-K advocates have begun pushing for universal Pre-K. However, only six states offer universal-prekindergarten, and with varying degrees of success.

In this environment of modest state funding for Pre-K, the state of Oklahoma has managed to rise to the forefront of the universal Pre-K movement. That a high-quality Pre-K system exists in a conservative state is a very curious case and provides an opportunity for a thorough examination of the political processes. This study seeks not only to explain the development and passage of universal Pre-K in Oklahoma, but to also

understand what lessons can be taken from a historical analysis of this issue for contemporary education policy.

Table of Contents

List of Tables xi

Chapter One: Introduction 1

National Attention 5

The State of Pre-K 8

Pre-K in Oklahoma 10

Problem Statement 15

Research Questions 15

Significance 15

Organization of the Proposal 17

Summary 17

Chapter Two: Review of Literature 19

History of Early Childhood Education 19

The Development of Public Education for Preschoolers 25

Making the Case for Pre-K 28

Policy Makers' Response 30

Support from Philanthropic Foundations 32

Support of the Business Community 33

Opposition 34

Chapter Three: Methodology 36

Theoretical Framework 36

Rationale for Historical Analysis 38

Sources of Data 40

Data Collection and Analysis 43

Ethical Considerations 44

Chapter Four: Findings 46

Setting the Stage 46

Program Creation 58

Garnering House and Senate Support 59
Potential Opposition 61
The Aftermath 65
The Current State of Early Childhood Education in Oklahoma 68
Chapter Five: Discussion 71
Conclusions 71
Research Questions 74
Analysis of Kingdon's Streams Theory 77
Suggestions for Future Research 78
Lessons Learned 81
Appendix A 82
Appendix B 84
Appendix C 85
Appendix D 95
Appendix E 106
Glossary 106
References 108
Vita……......121

List of Tables

Table 1. Pre-K and Kindergarten Enrollment in Oklahoma from 1992-1998 53

Chapter One: Introduction

Education policymakers over the last decade have been deeply impacted by the high stakes accountability measures that were set forth in the federal legislation, No Child Left Behind, enacted in 2002. The main goal of this legislation was to close the academic achievement gap between socioeconomic groups with accountability and flexibility so that no child will be "left behind" (No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2002). More specifically, NCLB was intended to address persistently low reading proficiency rates of fourth graders in the United States. As a result of the increased accountability, districts are working diligently to ensure that all students reach academic proficiency. However, many educators are discovering that recent reform efforts in K-12 education spurred by NCLB have not had the desired impact and are not timely enough to warrant a change. Researchers have found startling gaps in students' achievement by family income that indicate that low income students are performing significantly behind their peers in skills and measures of school readiness by the time students enter school (Cannon & Karoly, 2007; Devarics & O'Brien, 2007). Similarly, Gormley, Gayer, Phillips, and Dawson (2005) indicated that, "Huge numbers of children are not performing at grade level, huge numbers of disadvantaged children lack basic skills, and huge numbers of advantaged children lack motivation" (p. 246). These educational gaps tend to be much more difficult and costly to close as children progress through the K-12 educational system (Devarics & O'Brien, 2007).

Educators and researchers continue to promote high quality pre-kindergarten (which can be defined as non-compulsory, formal, classroom-based learning environment

that a child customarily begins around the age of three or four in order to prepare for the more academically intensive experience of kindergarten) as an important policy to improve our country's educational system (Gayl, Young, & Patterson, 2009). With public schools facing more demands for rigor and responsibility in this high stakes era, pre-kindergarten (Pre-K) has emerged as a vital and sustainable intervention that promotes school readiness and closes the achievement gap in elementary school and beyond (Cannon & Karoly, 2007; Gayl, Young, & Patterson, 2009; Reynolds, 1992).

Both promising and disappointing results have been found in research on the developmental consequences of attending a pre-K program. A series of well-designed and implemented model preschool programs have shown significant short- term and some long-term effects on young children's cognitive growth. Such effects have been reported for small demonstration programs such as the Perry Preschool Project (Schweinhart, Barnes, Weikart, Barnett & Epstein, 1993), carefully controlled early interventions such as the Abecedarian program (Campbell, Ramey, Pungello, Sparling, & Miller-Johnson, 2002) and the Infant Health and Development Project (McCarton, Brooks-Gunn, Wallace, & Bauer, 1997). Evidence on the federal Head Start program remains controversial, although carefully designed studies have documented positive effects on children's early learning (Currie & Thomas, 1995; Garces, Thomas & Currie, 2002; Abbott-Shim, Lambert, & McCarty, 2003), as has a random-assignment evaluation of the Early Head Start program (Love, Kisker, Ross, Brooks-Gunn, et al., 2002).

In a review of the long-term academic impacts of both model and large-scale public Pre-K programs, including Head Start, Barnett (1995, 1998) found that public

programs often had weaker effects than the generally higher-quality and better-implemented model programs. Moreover, research on the developmental implications of more naturally occurring childcare experiences has generated mixed evidence. Links between higher quality childcare environments and children's cognitive and language development have been repeatedly documented (NICHD ECCRN, 2000; Peisner-Feinberg, Burchinal, Clifford, Culkin, Howes & Kagan, 2001). Such cognitive benefits are found most consistently for children who, post- infancy, were enrolled in center-based arrangements (NICHD ECCRN, 2000) and appear to be stronger for children growing up in low-income households, who typically receive less support for cognitive and language development (Loeb, Fuller, Kagan, & Carrol, 2004; Votruba-Drzal, Coley, & Chase-Lansdale, 2004).

It is difficult to locate state pre-K programs along this spectrum of early childhood options from very high-quality model early intervention programs to highly variable community-based child care. Prior research suggests that the typical school-based Pre-K program is of higher quality than the typical child care program serving low-income children (Goodson & Moss, 1992; Phillips, Voran, Kisker, Howes, & Whiteboook, 1994). Nevertheless, emerging descriptive data indicate that pre-K programs, like child care, vary extensively. For example, state-funded Pre-K programs range from as short as two and a half hours per day to as long as ten hours per day (Bryant et al., 2004). A handful of states, including Oklahoma, require that all Pre-K teachers have a college degree and certification in early childhood education, while many others require only a Child Development Associate (CDA) certificate. This variability

makes it difficult to compare findings from evaluations of pre- K programs to prior evidence of either model intervention or more typical early childhood and child care programs. The issue of quality also has important public policy implications, because, for example, pre-K children living in poverty are more likely to be enrolled in a program staffed by teachers with lower qualifications than children with greater resources (Barnett & Ackerman, 2006). That being said, the common thread among these evaluation studies is that high quality Pre-K programs are effective.

Recent studies of the effectiveness of Oklahoma's Pre-K system on academic achievement have shown promise. For example, Gormley et al.'s 2005 study of Oklahoma's universal Pre-K found that children who participated in the program scored significantly higher on the Letter-Word Identification at kindergarten entry than children who did not participate in the program. This subtest of the Woodcock-Johnson Achievement Test is designed to assess pre-reading skills. Significantly higher results were also found in the Spelling and Applied Problems subtests (effect sizes of .64 and .38, respectively), indicating noteworthy differences between the kindergarten readiness of participating and non-participating children. Children from all racial and ethnic groups were found to benefit from participating in the program, with the greatest gains found in Hispanic children. Furthermore, positive outcomes were found for children of all socioeconomic levels, as measured by school lunch eligibility status.

In 2011, Oklahoma spent approximately $7,878 on per-pupil expenditures in the K-12 public school system, ranking 49th in the nation. State Pre-K spending for that same year was $3,461 per child, ranking it 27th in the nation for state Pre-K spending,

according to the National Institute for Early Childhood Education Research (Barnett, Carolan, Fitzgerald, & Squires, 2011). However, it is important to note that Oklahoma's total reported spending (which includes federal and local revenue sources) on Pre-K in 2011 was $7,690, bumping it to 9th in the nation for all reported spending, as reported in NIEER's 2011 State Preschool Yearbook (Barnett et al., 2011). Additionally, Oklahoma's Pre-K system met nine out of ten of NIEER's quality standards (Barnett et al., 2011). State officials clearly place a value on investing in quality early childhood education as demonstrated in large part by the amount of money spent on state Pre-K. Thus, developing an understanding of the processes that led to the development of a high-quality universal Pre-K program could provide a road map for other states.

NATIONAL ATTENTION

At the federal level, there has been a growing financial investment in and commitment to Pre-K funding , changes that have drawn considerable interest from educators, politicians, and parents across the United States. in 2011, preschool education made national headlines when federal officials announced a new competitive grant program, the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC), aimed at building integrated statewide systems of early childhood education and care for children from birth through age five (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). The RTT-ELC grant competition focuses on improving early learning and development programs for young children by supporting States' efforts to:

1. Increase the number and percentage of low-income and disadvantaged children in each age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers who are enrolled in high-quality early learning programs;
2. Design and implement an integrated system of high-quality early learning programs and services; and
3. Ensure that any use of assessments conforms to the recommendations of the National Research Council's reports on early childhood.

Through the competition, 35 states, D.C., and Puerto Rico created plans to increase access to high-quality programs for children from low-income families, providing more children from birth to age five with a strong foundation they need for success in school and beyond. In December 2011, the White House announced that nine states (California, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island and Washington) would receive grant awards from the $500 million Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge fund. The number and list of winners was determined both by the quality of the applications and the funds available. In March 2012, The Obama administration announced that Colorado, Illinois, New Mexico, Oregon, and Wisconsin, states that were finalists in the earlier competition, would be able to compete for a share of $133 million in new Race to the Top funding.

In addition to RTT-ELC funding, the U.S. Department of Education announced in November 2011 a proposal to create an Office of Early Learning that would be tasked with overseeing the RTT-ELC Grants and coordinating early learning programs across

the Department. The proposal named Senior Advisor for Early Learning Jacqueline Jones as head of the new office, which operates within the Department's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE). Regarding this new office, U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan said, "Effective early learning programs are essential to prepare our children for success in school and beyond. A dedicated early learning office will institutionalize, elevate and coordinate federal support for high-quality early learning, while enhancing support for state efforts to build high-performing early education systems" (Office of the Press Secretary, 2011). This suggests that the federal government had an interested in supporting state efforts to provide high quality early learning experiences for children.

Most recently, during his 2013 State of the Union address, President Obama proposed working with states to make high-quality Pre-K available to every child in America (Obama, 2013). Under his proposal (Office of the White House, 2013), the U.S. Department of Education would allocate dollars to states based their share of four-year olds from low- and moderate-income families (those at or below 200% of the poverty line) and funds would be distributed to local school districts and other partner providers to implement the program. In order to access federal funding states would be required to meet quality benchmarks that are linked to better outcomes for children, include:

- State-level standards for early learning
- Qualified teachers for all preschool classrooms
- A plan to implement comprehensive data and assessment systems

Funds under this program may also be used to expand full-day kindergarten once states have provided preschool education to their low- and moderate-income students. The President's proposal will also help expand the availability of Early Head Start, which provides early learning opportunities before kids begin preschool, as well as voluntary home visiting programs. Home visiting programs enable nurses, social workers, and other professionals to connect families to services and educational support that will improve a child's health, development, and ability to learn.

THE STATE OF PRE-K

During the 2008-2009 school year, states spent more than $5 billion on state preschool initiatives, an increase of $446 million (without adjusting for inflation), or 23.4 percent, over the previous year. State Pre-K spending ranges from $3.25 million in Nevada to more than $694 million in Texas, with an average per-child expenditure of $4,142 (Barnett et al., 2008). In the 2009-2010 school year, the effects of the recession became fully apparent despite federal government aid to the states for education. Total spending by the states decreased, and per child spending declined in inflation-adjusted dollars to $4,296 per child. Without the aid from federal economic stimulus, funding per child would have been even lower. And, by the 2010-2011 school year, funding had deceased yet again to $4,151 when adjusted for inflation (Barnett et al., 2011).

Currently, there are Pre-K programs in 39 states, with most targeted to disadvantaged children. Targeted Pre-K programs are offered only to children with particular characteristics, or risk factors, associated with high rates of school failure.

Some states target services to all children in a geographic region where there is a high percentage of children with particular risk factors. Each state has a different list of risk factors for targeting resources, and some states define multiple risk factors but let local governments or school districts determine which ones to prioritize for services.

Six states (Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, West Virginia, New York, and Illinois) have programs that might be described as universal. In practice, a universal program means that the program is universally available (or nearly so) but not compulsory—namely, that parents are free to enroll their children or not as they see fit. The state of Oklahoma has been a leader in the Pre-K movement since 1980. It was the second state to create a universal Pre-K program in 1998. By 2003, Oklahoma ranked first in the nation for the percentage of four year olds enrolled in publicly funded Pre-K and those classes meet stringent quality standards. Through the work of Pre-K supporters in the State Department of Education and throughout the education, child care, and social services communities, Oklahoma has created a high-quality program in which children are served in public schools, Head Start agencies, childcare programs, assisted living centers, Indian Nation centers, YMCAs, hospitals, and faith-based facilities (Barnett, Carolan, Fitzgerald, & Squires, 2011). However, there is little research on the political processes that occurred that led to the development of universal Pre-K in the state of Oklahoma.

PRE-K IN OKLAHOMA

A brief history

The state of Oklahoma is marred with an ugly past: it was the last stop on the Trail of Tears for the Cherokee Nation, nearly 300 people (most of whom were Black) were killed in the 1921 race riots in Tulsa, and the Ku Klux Klan was visible through the mid-twentieth century (Kirp, 2007). In 1968, Oklahoma became the focal point of Richard Nixon's Southern Strategy to recruit the "silent majority," and ever since its politics have leaned to the right. Kirp (2007) also notes that in the 2004 Senate race, Oklahoma Republican candidate Tom Coburn "warned of lesbians lurking in high school bathrooms, supported the public's right to buy and use bazookas, urged the death penalty for abortionists—and won handily" (p. 181). More recently, the Oklahoma Senate passed the Personhood Act, the first bill of the 2012 legislative session, an anti-abortion statement that life begins at the moment of conception, approved by senators after only two hours of debate (Rolland, 2012). Additionally, according to the Children's Defense Fund (2012), the state of Oklahoma ranks poorly in three key areas: it is 49th in per-pupil expenditures, 34th in infant mortality rate and 29th in the percentage of babies born at a low birth weight. In spite of this fiscal and social conservatism, high quality early childhood education has been a state priority for over thirty years.

To understand how Oklahoma's Pre-K movement began, it is necessary to go back to the early 1980s, when Cleta Mitchell, a member of the Oklahoma House, partnered with Ramona Paul, the Early Childhood Coordinator in the state department of

education. Head Start (discussed in greater detail in the next chapter) started in Oklahoma in the 1960s, with federal funds distributed through newly organized community action agencies. At the same time, a few urban school districts began using federal Title I funds to create "model preschools." Later, in 1981, the state school chief asked Ramona Paul what she wanted for early childhood (Fuller, 2007). Mitchell, who represented the Norman area, was also interested in doing something in the child care arena, particularly since her district (home to the University of Oklahoma) revolved around educational institutions. According to Fuller (2007), Paul and Mitchell devised a $120,000 pilot program that would encourage schools and community organizations to create Pre-K programs that served middle class and poor families. The pilot program was added onto another bill "through the back door," (Fuller, 2007, p. 108) and passed. This new program allowed 10 school districts to participate in a competitive grant process, where children were voluntarily enrolled in Pre-K on a first-come, first-served basis. Children attended Pre-K four days a week with a fifth day designated for parental involvement. Thus, the Early Childhood Four-Year-Old Program, a model pre-school program for all children, began.

In 1991, the legislature approved compulsory half-day kindergarten. Under House Bill 1017, each five-year-old enrolled (even for half a day) would generate the same per-pupil state funding as a first-grader. Several school districts, especially those in rural areas with dwindling enrollments, took note of this financial incentive and began working to enroll more children (Fuller, 2007). Oklahoma is one of 34 states that require districts to offer half-day kindergarten; ten states and the District of Columbia have statutes that

require full-day programs, and six states do not require districts to provide kindergarten at all (Children's Defense Fund, 2011).

In 1992, the state legislature passed a more ambitious Pre-K bill, supported by Paul and Tulsa's early childhood activists. This legislation created an early childhood education (ECE) credential for preschool and kindergarten teachers, as required by the state's early childhood education system. The bill provided about $1,100 for each child enrolled in a half-day preschool located in a public school. The funding was focused on low-income children who met the requirements for Head Start, and was financed on a sliding scale fee charged to families who did not meet the Head Start requirements. This provision again demonstrated Paul's desire to have a program for all children.

Then, in 1993, the legislature authorized school districts to fill out kindergarten classrooms with four-year-olds. This legislation was particularly important for rural school districts that had experienced declined enrollments (Fuller, 2007).

Finally, in the spring of 1998, House member Joe Eddins and state senator Penny Williams secured approval to amend the school formula so that four-year-olds would be included in the school funding formula, and school districts could actually weigh four-year-olds more heavily when calculating their share of state funds. Several quality requirements were also included in the law. First, Pre-K teachers were required to have a bachelor's degree in early childhood training. Second, stringent staff to student ratios capped the number of four-year-olds in a class and also required a classroom aide. Third, community-based organizations were eligible for funding if they met quality standards. This last provision was pivotal, as it allowed schools to contract with existing providers,

many of which provided comprehensive services (i.e., health screenings and outreach to parents) that school districts did not typically provide. Though the bill did not require school districts to have Pre-K classrooms, it did provide a major incentive. The small (but significant) change in the funding formula allowed schools to enroll more four-year-olds, which led to an increase in funding, while at the same time providing a high-quality Pre-K program to all students, regardless of income.

Current structure of Oklahoma's Pre-K system

Oklahoma's current Pre-K system is very similar to the program created in 1998. Districts may collaborate with other classroom providers by placing public school teachers in community-based programs, childcare centers, and Head Start program settings. Children receiving services in these collaborative sites are considered public school enrollees and receive the same services as children in public school settings. In the 2010-2011 program year, nearly 4,000 students were served through collaboration programs (Barnett, Carolan, Fitzgerald, & Squires, 2011). Barnett et. al (2011) also reported that a total of over 38,000 children were enrolled in state Pre-K during the 2010-2011 school year in 98 percent of school districts in the state and 75 percent of eligible four-year-olds were enrolled in state funded Pre-K. School districts have the option to offer a half-day program or full day program, and both operate five days per week during the regular academic year.

The state also met nine of ten of the quality standards set forth by NIEER (Barnett, et al., 2011). The state program has comprehensive early learning standards,

requires teachers to have a bachelor's degree, caps class sizes at 20 students, and requires a 1:10 teacher to child ratio. Additionally, students receive vision, hearing, health, and other support services, and at least one meal per day. The program also is monitored via site visits to ensure high quality is maintained.

While the state does not provide specific funding for three-year-olds, some Oklahoma school districts offered classroom programs for these younger students. Through a combination of funding sources, including Title I, Head Start, special education, and general funds, 2,238 3-year-olds were served in Pre-K classrooms during the 2010-2011 school year. In the 2006-2007 school year, the state also launched the Pilot Early Childhood Program (Barnett, et al., 2011). The Oklahoma state Board of Education established rules and regulations for this program, though funding comes from both public and private sources. This program provides education and family support services year-round to at-risk children from birth through age 3. Enrollment is expanded each year and the program served 1,099 3-year-olds in the 2010-2011 school year. The five-year pilot ended in the 2010-2011 school year. A new term began in the 2011-2012 school year using yearly contracts with the Community Action Project of Tulsa County. Another program, the Early Childhood Expansion Project, uses public and private funding to serve children in this age range. As of the 2011-2012 school year, there are 26 classrooms serving 314 children from birth through age four. Oklahoma also supplements the federal Head Start program by providing $2,191,700 in state funds to the program in fiscal year 2011 for extended-day and additional services.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

To date, research on Oklahoma's Pre-K programs has focused on its efficacy. However, there is little explanation of the why: why and how were the political processes that led to the development of universal Pre-K in a socially and fiscally conservative state successful? This study seeks to examine the history of the political development of universal Pre-K legislation in Oklahoma.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To date, research on Oklahoma's Pre-K program has focused on its efficacy. In addition, the development of universal Pre-K legislation is limited to what happened and has not addressed why.

In order to understand how a traditionally conservative state came to be on the forefront of the universal Pre-K movement the study focuses on the following questions:

1. What explains the development and passage of universal Pre-K in Oklahoma?
2. What lessons can be taken from a historical policy analysis of this issue for contemporary educational policy?

SIGNIFICANCE

State-funded voluntary Pre-K programs have grown steadily over the past decade and now enroll 1.2 million children (Barnett et al, 2011). While the overall trend has been to increase participation in state funded Pre-K, access in most states is limited to select groups of at-risk four-year-olds. At first glance, this approach makes sense. The large

research base demonstrating the benefits of high-quality preschool education for disadvantaged children (Barnett, 2001) as well as cost-benefit analyses showing high rates of return on investment (Barnett & Ackerman, 2006) suggest a strategy of first serving families of children who are in greatest need but unable to pay for Pre-K on their own. Furthermore, targeting at-risk children limits government involvement and the cost to the public. Unfortunately, targeted programs for disadvantaged children tend to under-serve their targeted populations with respect to availability and quality (Gelbach & Pritchett, 2002). In light of this, Pre-K advocates have begun pushing for universal Pre-K. However, only six states offer universal-prekindergarten, and with varying degrees of success.

The state of Oklahoma has managed to rise to the forefront of the universal Pre-K movement. That a high-quality Pre-K system exists in a conservative state is a very curious case and provides an opportunity for a thorough examination of the political processes that can lead to passage of a universal Pre-K program. For this project, I seek not only to explain the development and passage of universal Pre-K legislation in Oklahoma, but also to understand what lessons can be taken from a historical analysis of this issue for contemporary educational policy. These lessons are especially important given President Obama's proposal for that federal government to partner with states to expand access to Pre-K for all children in the nation.

Organization of the Proposal

This paper is organized into five chapters. Chapter One served as an introduction to the study. It included the background of the research problem, the problem and purpose of the study, and research questions.

Chapter Two contains the review of related literature to the project. The review will focus on why there is a push for universal Pre-K. This examination is necessary to understand why states, particularly Oklahoma, focused attention on universal Pre-K.

Chapter Three contains a description of the methods and procedures used in the study and the analytical paradigm used for this study.

Chapter Four contains the findings of the study. This chapter will detail the events leading up to the passage of legislation in 1998 that offered full-day pre-kindergarten to all students in the state and also discuss what has happened in the early childhood education community since then.

Chapter Five summarizes the findings and makes recommendations for policy makers.

Summary

High quality early childhood education programs, such as Pre-K, are beneficial for all children, but particularly so for students from economically disadvantaged families (Barnett, 2008; Burger, 2010). To date, research has focused on how effective such programs are in academically preparing students for kindergarten and beyond. While it is important to know what is happening in early childhood education programs, it is equally

important to consider how a policy is developed and what lessons can be learned as other states work to implement universal Pre-K.

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

This chapter contains a review of literature related to the study and will focus on the history of early childhood education, the development of public education for preschoolers, the forces that have contributed to make the case for universal Pre-K, how policy makers have responded to the case, and the groups (i.e. business and philanthropic) communities that supported Pre-K I will conclude with a discussion of the opposition to Pre-K.

History of Early Childhood Education

Historians often trace the origin of early childhood education to Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000; Wolfe, 2000). While Rousseau had little actual experience working with young children (Wolfe, 2000), his essays and books about how to educate them were revolutionary during the 1700s. Rousseau believed that childhood was an important time and that teachers needed to understand children in order to be effective (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000; Wolfe, 2000). He did not believe that children needed to be controlled, but rather observed, studied and understood (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). These ideas were in stark contrast to the actual educational processes used at the time, which were based on rote memorization, obedience to the teacher and harsh discipline. Rousseau believed teachers needed to teach through the environment, rather than through lecture or text, whether that was in nature or in a well-prepared classroom (Wolfe, 2000). He was the first champion of child-centeredness and believed children should live fully while focusing on the present, not simply to prepare for the future

(Wolfe, 2000). Rousseau's ideas impacted many educational theorists after his time. His ideas about the importance of childhood and understanding child development, observing and studying children, teaching through the environment and being child-centered are foundational teachings in early childhood education today.

Rousseau did little to apply his ideas to educational settings, but did influence Johann Heinrich Pesalozzi, who expanded Rousseau's ideas and applied them to Swiss educational settings in 1805 (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000; Wolfe, 2000). Pestalozzi tried to educate his son using Rousseau's writings as a guide. During this educational experiment, Pestalozzi applied the idea of child study, documenting and reflecting on his son's learning. Throughout the process, Pestalozzi was able to refine and expand on Rousseau's ideas (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000; Wolfe, 2000). Pestalozzi was very concerned about poverty and saw education as a way to improve society. Pestalozzi taught in schools that served poor children and while teaching he developed "object lessons" which were manipulatives to be used with children. This built from Rousseau's belief in learning through the senses. Pestalozzi also thought it very important to follow the child's motivation, realizing that real learning happens when children are internally motivated and interested. Pestalozzi introduced the concept of the whole child (i.e., every aspect of the child, including health, nutrition, values, attitudes, beliefs) and believed that education must serve the whole child (Wolfe, 2000).

Robert Owen (1771-1858), a self-made businessman, grew up in England during the peak of the industrial revolution. Owen saw the effects of poverty on children and became concerned with the exploitation of children working in factories. Owen believed

that factory owners could improve the world by providing education for both the children and the adults in their employ while still making a profit. He bought some textile mills in Scotland and built schools and a community center near the factories to provide education and support for the families working in his mill. Owen would not let young children work in his mill, but provided schooling for young children of the families working for him. Owen built his educational ideas around those of Pestalozzi and Rousseau. However, a key difference was that he believed that children as young as two years old should be provided education in a group setting (Beatty, 1995). Some key approaches of Owen's school were that instruction was to be based on children's experiences, that teachers must be kind, and that children must not be punished. Owen also provided education for adults in the evenings. The idea of educating poor people in Great Britain was met with great hostility at the time, but Owen believed that "man was no better than his environment and that if the environment changed, people would change" (Wolfe, 2000, p. 150). His experiment in Scotland was a great success, so he wanted to test his approaches somewhere else.

Owen came to the United States in 1825 to build a village based on his educational ideas for improving the lives of the poor. He built his village in New Harmony, Indiana, with three schools, one for infants, one for children, and one for adults that taught a wide variety of trade skills (Wolfe, 2000). He imported his experiment of educating groups of very young children, both boys and girls equally, to the United States (Wolfe, 2000). His infant schools were created in part to allow mothers to work in his factories while easing their worry of who would care their very young children. Owen's

schools in New Harmony only lasted three years before disagreement within the community led Owen to sell them (Wolfe, 2000). Owen's ideas of building curriculum around children's experiences, forbidding corporal punishment, providing equal education for boys and girls, and seeing education as a way to improve the lives of families in poverty have continued as core values in early childhood education.

The kindergarten movement. Friedrich Froebel, a contemporary of Owen, is known in the early childhood education field as the "father of kindergarten." Froebel, born in Oberweissbach, Germany, spent time working and studying under Pestalozzi in Switzerland, and adhered to Pestalozzi and Rousseau's ideas (Wolfe, 2000). However, Froebel felt that Pestalozzi's curriculum lacked a focus on unity and interdependence. Froebel believed that very young children needed an orderly set of experiences in order to fully develop (Wolfe, 2000). As a result, Froebel opened a school based on Pestalozzi's ideas, with a more orderly curriculum. He called his school a "kindergarten", which means children's garden. Froebel's methods cannot be under estimated in their influence on early childhood education. Prior to the development of kindergartens, broad support of efforts to provide education outside of the home to children prior to entering the primary grades did not exist.

Froebel's kindergarten methods found their way to the United States with German immigrants who had come to the new country to set up kindergartens and to train teachers in Froebelian approaches (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). Margarethe Schurz opened the first kindergarten in the United States in 1856 in Watertown, Wisconsin

(Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000; Seefeldt & Barbour, 1986; Snyder, 1972). Three years later, Schurz met Elizabeth Palmer Peabody (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000; Snyder, 1972) and introduced Peabody to kindergarten and Froebel's methods. Based on conversations with Schurz and Froebel's writings, Peabody opened the first English-speaking kindergarten in Boston in 1860 (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000; Snyder, 1972; Beatty, 2004). However, the effort only lasted a year because the superintendent thought it was too expensive. Nearly 30 years later, the Boston Public Schools incorporated privately funded "charity" kindergartens (Beatty, 2004). But, as with most urban kindergartens, they were seen as programs primarily for the poor.

Kindergartens in the United States were not initially associated with public schools. Rather, free kindergartens were organized by women to address the social and educational needs of poor children in urban areas (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). These kindergartens began to expand their services to include home visits to help families and classes for mothers on childrearing and as a way to address some of the social problems brought about by the Industrial Revolution (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000; Seefeldt & Barbour, 1986). The first kindergarten within a public school system was in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1873 (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000).

Kindergarten was seen as a way to "Americanize" immigrant children as well as a place to address the needs of children in poverty (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). However, as kindergarten became part of the public school, changes occurred and a new bureaucracy evolved (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). Once kindergarten became part of the public school system, concerns about the cost associated with the program became a

factor in determining kindergarten's structure (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). Additionally, a tension arose between teachers following Froebelian kindergarten philosophy about child growth and development and first grade teachers expecting children ready for academic work (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). In an effort to reduce the conflict between kindergarten and first grade, school systems merged the supervision and curriculum of kindergarten into their elementary grades (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). By the middle of the twentieth century, most kindergartens were subsumed by elementary schools and were focused on preparing children for first grade.

Nursery school movement. The nursery school movement began with infant schools introduced by Robert Owen in the early 19th century. Infant schools made it possible for women to work in the factories of the industrial revolution. By the 1850s, infant schools in the United States had virtually disappeared, but they continued to flourish in Europe until the turn of the century (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000; Wolfe, 2000). The nursery school movement recognized that children needed to be in a supportive, home-like environment in order to grow and develop. The nursery school movement in the United States grew from a number of sources: scientific interest in the growth and development of young children, the need for supervision of children stemming from the industrial movement, and the work in nursery education being done in Europe (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). The nursery school movement maintained important ideals from the earlier infant school movement including focusing on the development of the whole child, believing that important learning happens before the age of six, and using methods based on the freedom of the child and sensory experiences.

In the 1960s, as federal money was poured into early childhood education, many developmental psychologists shifted their research agendas to experimental curricula for young children (Goffin & Wilson, 2001). In Project Follow Through, initiated in 1967, the government set up a competitive, outcomes based evaluation of early childhood curricula. Several different approaches to early childhood were tested and evaluated (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). Historically, early childhood education had at its core a primary concern for the development of children, rather than the education of children specifically in academics. However, after Project Follow Through, the focus of early childhood programs shifted to cognitive and academic development, rather than development of the "whole" child (Goffin & Wilson, 2001; Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000).

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION FOR PRESCHOOLERS

America's public education system began in the private sector, and over time, local governments became involved so that, eventually, the K-12 system was an obligation of the states (Zigler, Gilliam, & Jones, 2006). While the federal government mandated rules and polices related to public education, it has (for the most part) taken a laissez-faire approach and deferred control to state officials. However, there have been two notable exceptions to this approach: The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1975, which gives all children with special needs the right to a free and public education in the least restrictive environment, and The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which mandated achievement testing and imposed strict consequences for states that did not demonstrate adequate yearly progress. Though these are federal policies,

states are responsible for paying for most of public school costs and make most decisions (Kenyon, 2007).

Unlike the history of the K-12 system, the impetus for public preschool came from the federal government. During the Great Depression, the federal government sponsored preschool as a way to provide work for unemployed teachers, and to provide child care centers during World War II so mothers could work to produce war materials while men were serving in the military (Zigler, Gilliam, & Jones, 2006). As the crises of the Great Depression and World II ceased, so did preschool efforts.

Then, in the 1960s, interest in preschool was renewed. As part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's War on Poverty, Project Head Start was launched. Head Start, a federally funded national program, promotes school readiness by enhancing the social and cognitive development of children (from birth to age five) through the provision of educational, health, nutritional, social and other services to enrolled children in low income families. While the program is federally funded, individual states and local programs administer Head Start.

Head Start serves as a way to help poor children begin school on an equal footing as children from wealthier homes. Since its inception in 1965, Head Start has served nearly 27 million children (Administration for Children and Families, 2010). Head Start marked the first ongoing commitment by the federal government to fund early childhood education. The program was built around planned variation, meaning that programs would look different in each community, responding to needs and unique circumstances through grass roots efforts (Goffin & Wilson, 2001). The creation of Head Start can be

tied to work done in the 1950s by psychologists researching whether intelligence was inborn or could be influenced by the environment (Goffin & Wilson, 2001; Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000). Their findings that environment mattered for intelligence suggested that direct intervention with young at-risk children could bring about positive changes in their lives (Lascarides & Hinitz, 2000).

It is important to note that Head Start has strong public support (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). The education of pre-school children was once considered a family matter but quickly became an issue that many citizens enthusiastically supported, in spite of the fact that it was geared to children from very poor families and children with special education needs. A 1999 survey by the President's Management Council found that Head Start received the highest customer satisfaction ratings of any government agency or private company, even Mercedes-Benz and BMW (Administration for Children and Families, 1999). Additionally, a national survey by Opinion Research Corporation reported that 80 percent of respondents favored expanding the program to serve more eligible children (PaxWorld/NHSA Survey, 2003).

Support for preschool is not only limited to programs that serve poor children. For example, a poll conducted by the National Institute for Early Education Research found that almost 90 percent of those polled agreed that there should be state-funded pre-school for all children (Barnett, Robin, Hustedt, & Schulman, 2003). A public opinion poll of voters and leaders from the business, government, child care, media, and religious communities in Massachusetts reported that 100 percent believed that education should begin before kindergarten (Blood, 2000).

Agreement that Pre-K is important does not necessarily translate into a willingness to pay for high-quality programs for a small portion of the population, despite its relatively low total cost (Gelbach & Pritchett, 2002). Rather, programs for disadvantaged children tend to under serve their targeted populations with respect to both availability and quality. Most state funded Pre-K programs are small and set educational standards far below those generally considered acceptable for public education (Barnes et al., 2010).

MAKING THE CASE FOR PRE-K

There are several reasons that Americans have shifted from thinking young children should be educated at home by their mothers to overwhelmingly endorsing Pre-K. One important factor is the entry of women into the work force. For women between the ages of 25 and 54, 69.3 percent were employed in the civilian labor force in 2010 (U.S. Department of Labor, 2011). A closer look at the data shows that in 2009, 23.6 percent of all children and 50.4 percent of Black children were living with only their mothers (Kreider & Ellis, 2011). Oftentimes these parents are the sole providers for their children and have no choice but to work. These statistics certainly point to the reason why the need for child care has risen.

Events in the research community also contributed to the acceptance of public Pre-K education. The Consortium for Longitudinal Studies (1983), a group of researchers who had evaluated 11 different early intervention programs during the 1960s and early 1970s, released a landmark report. The researchers tried to find as many program

participants as possible to collect information about their progress since participating in the programs. Data were combined and showed that children who attended quality Pre-K programs gained an initial boost in IQ scores that lasted for a few years, but eventually faded. The researchers also found that the Pre-K participants were somewhat less likely to be held back a grade and were much less likely to be put into special education classes. These findings of immediate and lingering benefits also shifted focus to public Pre-K.

The positive response to the Consortium studies was further fueled by the release of the long-term results of the Perry Preschool Program (Schweinhart, Berrueta-Clement, Barnett, Epstein, & Weikart, 1984). The Perry Preschool Program, a small demonstration program in Ypsilanti, Michigan, was created in 1962 and served low-income Black children, by providing quality preschool for one to two years as well as weekly home visits by staff members to encourage parent participation in the educational process. By the time program graduates were 19 years old they were more likely to be high school graduates and self-supporting (as opposed to being on welfare), less likely to have a history of encounters with the juvenile justice system, less likely to have criminal arrests, and women were more likely to report fewer pregnancies. Additionally, by age 40, the former preschoolers still had higher incomes and committed fewer crimes (Schweinhart, Barnes, Weikart, Barnett, & Epstein, 1993).

The greatest excitement about Pre-K education has actually come from economic analyses. Economists projected savings to society from the lower rates of grade retention, special education, welfare benefits, and criminal justice systems, in addition to the increased earnings and tax contributions of program graduates. They concluded that

every $1 spent on the preschool program returned between $3 and $6 to taxpayers (Schweinhart et al., 2005). A RAND Corporation study (Karoly, Kilburn, & Cannon, 2006) also found that well-designed programs for disadvantaged children age 4 and younger can produce economic benefits ranging from $1.26 to $17 for each $1 spent on the programs.

Lynch (2007) estimated that if states offered high-quality universal Pre-K beginning in 2008, they would expect to pay, on average, almost $6,300 per participant and enroll nearly seven million children when it is fully phased in. Services for children who would attend the universal Pre-K program would require approximately $33.3 billion in additional government costs in 2008. While it would take 17 years for the benefits to offset the costs, Lynch estimated that by the year 2050 (the last year estimated), the annual benefits of universal Pre-K would total $779 billion: $191 billion in government budget benefits, $432 billion in increased compensation of workers, and $156 billion in reduced costs to individuals from less crime and child abuse. These annual benefits in 2050 would exceed the costs of the program in that year by a ratio of 8.2 to 1.

POLICY MAKERS' RESPONSE

As evidence about the effectiveness of preschool programs emerged in the late 1980s/early 1990s, policy makers began to take note. Head Start, which had operated with a small budget and little attention to quality and research and development, was "rediscovered" (Zigler et al., 2006). The first President Bush proposed a massive increase

in Head Start funding, after which half of the nation's senators co-sponsored a bill to make Head Start an entitlement to all eligible children. The Human Services Reauthorization Act (1990) gave Head Start the largest budgetary increase in history and authorized money for expansion until there was room for every eligible child. Although the money to fund this act never materialized, the program grew rapidly during the 1990s and received substantial funds for quality improvements.

In 1990, George H.W. Bush and the governors of 50 states held a summit where they adopted six national educational goals. These goals (as well as two others) became the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which was signed into law by President Clinton in 1994. The act's first objective was that by the year 2000, all children would arrive at school ready to learn. Additionally, all governors agreed that all children had the right to quality preschool education.

Despite these strides by the federal government, the election of President George W. Bush brought in the first administration that was not openly friendly to Head Start, despite his father's previous support. The second President Bush thought the program was not doing a good job teaching literacy and other academic skills (Zigler et al., 2006) and as a result made two proposals that would in essence end Head Start. The first proposal was to move Head Start funds to the Department of Education, where it would be block-granted to states like Title I funds.

This proposal failed to receive adequate support, and Bush attempted to turn Head Start's administration over to eight states, as an experiment. This experiment caused the program's budget to stagnate, stopping quality improvement programs and (for the first

time in decades) reducing the number of children and families served. Instead of focusing on early childhood development, Bush's attention was on reforming the K-12 system through the No Child Left Behind Act. While Bush did launch the Good Start, Grow Smart initiative to strengthen early learning, the emphasis was on fundamental language and literacy skills. While Head Start and other preschool programs focus on academic skills, they also pay close attention to other school readiness factors (e.g., physical and mental health and social factors).

SUPPORT FROM PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATIONS

A strong thrust to achieve universal early childhood education has occurred within the world of private philanthropic foundations. Leading this effort is The Pew Charitable Foundation, which committed approximately $75 million to the effort over five years (Zigler, et al, 2006). In addition to work conducted at the organization, Pew also put two programs into place. The first, the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER), serves as a research arm and is headed by W. Steven Barnett, a noted economist. NIEER has published numerous pivotal reports on preschool education, including its annual State of Preschool Yearbook which has been published since 2004. The other program, Pre-K Now served as an advocacy arm and completed its ten-year campaign to advance high-quality, voluntary Pre-K for all three- and four-year-olds on December 31, 2011. Pre-K Now acted as a catalyst helping states achieve universal Pre-K via policy and grassroots initiatives.

SUPPORT OF THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

Strong support for universal Pre-K has also come from business leaders and economists. While these groups are typically not linked to early childhood advocacy, they undoubtedly have a great deal of influence with policy makers. The arguments made by these professionals center around huge economic returns to the economy as a result of preschool education. For them, funding preschool education is not a cost, but a benefit that will be returned many times over. They view universal Pre-K as a means of ensuring that the United States remains competitive in the world markets and that businesses are more profitable (Zigler et al, 2006).

One of the earliest economists to emphasize the value of preschool programs was Isabel Sawhill (1999) from the Brookings Institution, who wrote a convincing paper making the case for national investment in Pre-K education. Additionally, James Heckman, a Noble laureate and economics professor at the University of Chicago, conducted an evaluation of job training programs, tax policies, school reform efforts, and financial incentives. He found "the best evidence supports the policy prescription: invest in the very young and improve basic learning and socialization skills" (2000, p. 8).

Other economic groups advocate preschool for targeted groups. Lynch (2004) from the Economic Policy Institute reported that high quality programs for low-income children resulted in a $3 return for every $1 invested. While this number is lower than that calculated by economists and child development researchers, the report concluded that the institute's study "demonstrates… that providing all 20 percent of the nation's three-and-four-year-old children who live in poverty with a high-quality (early child

development) program would have a substantial payoff for governments and taxpayers in the future" (Lynch, 2004, p. 1).

OPPOSITION

It would be naïve to assume that the push towards universal Pre-K education has not had its share of opponents. In fact, some critics fear that universal Pre-K will push children too hard and too soon into excelling academically. In addition, many right-wing conservative groups are against the idea because they believe children are best taught by their mothers at home and/or because they fear the government will act outside of its areas of responsibility and usurp traditional family roles (Zigler et. al, 2006).

Conservative think tanks such as the Cato Institute, the Goldwater Institute, and the Heritage Foundation have disagreed with the plethora of findings citing the immense benefits of Pre-K, instead arguing that there is not enough compelling evidence that preschool has a lasting impact on children. Another criticism voiced by conservatives is that children best acquire school readiness skills "by experiencing the first years of their life in a loving home environment where they receive individual attention and nurturing from a parent rather than a preschool classroom with other children and strangers" (Salisbury, 2002, para 2). Finally, other conservative critiques of universal Pre-K argue that it will result in a "nanny state," where the government and other individuals have more control over children than their parents (Olsen, 1999).

Universal Pre-K in the United States has yet to be realized. However, the state of Oklahoma has managed to provide high quality prekindergarten to all students for nearly 15 years. This project explores the development of universal prekindergarten in the state

of Oklahoma, focusing primarily on the political processes. The next chapter details the methodology used to explore the topic.

Chapter Three: Methodology

This chapter contains a description of the theoretical framework as well as the methods and procedures used in the case study.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section examines Kingdon's streams theory (originally published in 1984), which is used in this study. Kingdon (1995) describes policy formation as the result of three kinds of processes, or the flow of three "streams": the problem stream, the policy stream and the politics stream. The problem stream regards public matters requiring attention. Quite naturally, a plethora of problems could be advocated to policy makers. However, decision makers cannot pay attention to each problem brought to their attention. Some situations are not even defined as problems until there is a solution (a policy) available and recognized by the politicians. The policy stream regards proposals for change. Before a problem can reach the decision agenda, decision makers must be given at least one alternative solution, worked out and ready to put in place. Politicians concerned with an array of problems will prioritize to act on the ones where the administration, the scientific community, or somebody else could provide a constructive solution, often worked out in advance. Finally, the politics stream is composed of political issues, e.g. election results, changes of administration, interest group campaigns or changes in public opinions.

These three streams normally operate independently unless an opportunity (or policy window) permits policy entrepreneurs to bring the streams together (Sabatier,

1999). Policy entrepreneurs are individuals who introduce and promote their ideas in many different arenas and invest the time and energy needed to increase the chances for an idea to be placed on the decision agenda (Kingdon, 1995). Policy entrepreneurs are active in the problem stream and the policy stream and could serve in any of a number of capacities inside or outside the organization where an idea is introduced: as politicians, civil servants, lobbyists, researchers, or even laypeople. While decision makers often shift their attention from one problem to another, policy entrepreneurs keep to their issue. It is not enough with a problem, not even a pressing one, to get a subject on the decision agenda. A solution must be available within prompt and easy reach for the decision makers and policy entrepreneurs often prepare such solutions. However, even good proposals may fail to be taken seriously if they are presented before the policy community is ready. Policy entrepreneurs must also work at "softening up processes" (i.e., preparing and educating the public and the specialists) (Guldbrandsson & Fossum, 2006, p. 435). Thus, both the problem recognition and the suggested solutions could be results of policy entrepreneurs' efforts.

I used Kingdon's streams theory to make sense of the policy window that opened and led to the creation of universal Pre-K in Oklahoma. This framework helped elucidate the various streams involved in the process, and (most importantly) shed light on the work of a particular policy entrepreneur in Oklahoma's legislature who was instrumental in the passage of the law that provided Pre-K for all in the state of Oklahoma. Additionally, this framework lends itself to making a hypothesis for what the political processes in Oklahoma mean for other states that wish to implement universal Pre-K.

RATIONALE FOR HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

The topic is explored via a historical analysis using a case study design. I chose historical analysis as my method for this project in order to discover and interpret the values and opinions of the major actors in Oklahoma who contributed to the development of a universal Pre-K system. In addition, the ideal case study is one in which the case is unique, of general public interest, and relevant to national importance in terms of policy (Yin, 2003). This study of Oklahoma's passage of legislation that provided universal Pre-K fits these criteria.

My goal was to gather information and pertinent data to provide a deeper and richer understanding about the development of Pre-K in a socially and fiscally conservative state. As Merriam (1998) notes, qualitative research can be considered "an umbrella concept covering several forms of inquiry that help us understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible" (p. 5). The driving force of this qualitative research was to understand how legislators, state bureaucrats and leaders in the education community worked to make decisions about early childhood education in the state of Oklahoma from 1980 until 1998. For this study, qualitative research was an appropriate method to take "apart a phenomenon to examine component parts (which become the variables of the study), qualitative research can reveal how all the parts work together to form a whole" (Merriam, 1998, p. 6). Therefore, examining the components of Oklahoma's Pre-K story to understand how they came together is my desired outcome for this study. Maxwell (1996) suggests that qualitative research studies are particularly suited for:

"understanding the particular context within which the participants act,… identifying unanticipated phenomena and influences, and generating grounded theories about the latter… it helps to expose the process by which events and actions take place…and, it can be useful in developing causal explanations" (pp. 19-20).

To capture the true essence of what state leaders were thinking as they made decisions regarding Pre-K, I planned to conduct thorough interviews with key informants including current and former legislators, governors, superintendents, and state education bureaucrats. Interviews were critical to the nature of this study in that they provide the needed data to answer the proposed research questions. Furthermore, it is important to note that the critical factor in interviewing is not number of participants, but instead lies in "the potential of each person interviewed to contribute to the development of insight and understanding of the phenomena" (Merriam, 1998, p. 83). I used a protocol (Appendix A) for the interview process and utilized the prepared questions as a guide to conduct interviews that were conversational in tone. As noted by Yin (2003), "the researcher has two jobs: (a) to follow her own line of inquiry, as reflected by the case study protocol, and (b) to ask actual (conversational) questions in an unbiased manner that also serves the needs of the line of inquiry" (p. 89-90).

A careful review of state documents such as legislative bills and session meeting notes was conducted. These documents served as another valuable source of data collection as the researcher attempted to answer the specific research questions posed in this study. As Merriam (1998) notes, "documentary data are particularly good sources for qualitative case studies because they ground an investigation in the context of the

problem to be investigated" (p.126). Since the primary goal of this historical analysis was to examine the process by which leaders made the complex decision of implementing universal Pre-K, this historical analysis of legislative bills was appropriate for this study as the legislative documents are rooted in context.

SOURCES OF DATA

The following data sources were collected over the course of the study:

1. Interviews;
2. Newspaper articles;
3. Secondary histories of the development of universal pre-kindergarten in Oklahoma; and
4. Legislative documents
5. Participants

I first reviewed the work of Kirp (2007) and Fuller (2007), both of whom briefly described Oklahoma's Pre-K history, and from their works developed an initial list of possible participants. I also reviewed various versions of the bill that allowed for universal Pre-K, and created a list of possible participants and cross-referenced those names with the names from Kirp and Fuller's book. I chose three people to initially contact to arrange an in-person interview in mid-October 2012 and sent invitation letters and/or e-mails (see Appendix B) in late September 2012.

I identified Joe Eddins, the House member who originally authored House Bill 1657 the bill in 1997, and Penny Williams, the Senate member who co-authored the bill

that was ultimately passed in spring 1998. Since Eddins and Williams are both retired from the Oklahoma legislature, I located their addresses in the White Pages and sent letters to their homes. Eddins sent me an e-mail, agreeing to an interview. After receiving his e-mail, I called and arranged to interview him at his home in Vinita, Oklahoma. On my drive back to Austin from my Oklahoma visit in mid-October (approximately three weeks after I mailed the invitation letter), I received a voicemail from Williams, indicating that she would be available to speak with me. I called her the next day to arrange an interview, and Ms. Williams indicated that she was travelling between her home in Oklahoma and her son's home in Colorado, but would call me the next day to arrange an interview date and time. Unfortunately, I did not hear from her. I called her again and was not able to speak with her.

I also planned to interview Ramona Coats (formerly Ramona Paul), who was responsible for the creation of the program in 1980 that provided free public preschool to children in 10 counties. Coats is especially important as she has remained active in public education in Oklahoma and is currently employed as Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction for the state. Since Coats is still employed in public office, I sent an e-mail and letter to her work address. Ramona and I arranged to meet at her office in mid-October. However, I was not able to meet with her on the appointed day due to an illness in her family and we were not able to arrange another time to speak with one another.

During my interview with Eddins, Bob Harbison's name was mentioned. Harbison has been a champion of early childhood education since the early to mid-1990s, when he created preschool and after-school programs, using new childcare funding from

the former President Bush's block-grant program. Additionally, he served as CEO of the Tulsa Children's Coalition until 1998 when the Coalition merged with the Community Action Project, consolidating the Coalition's early childhood programs with Head Start. Harbison was a key figure who helped Eddins understand the need for universal Pre-K in Oklahoma. Though he is now retired, Harbison remains deeply connected to the early childhood community and Oklahoma legislators today. Shortly after my interview with Eddins, in mid-October, I called Harbison to arrange an interview. Given his time schedule, we had an impromptu phone conversation that same day, and I took hand written notes during the interview.

Another key participant mentioned by Eddins was Steven Dow, Director of Community Action Project of Tulsa County (CAPTC). In 1998, CAPTC was named the Tulsa area's Head Start and Early Head Start provider. In conjunction with three local school districts (Tulsa, Union, and Sand Springs Public Schools), CAPTC has become a major developer of state-of-the-art early childhood education centers. Since 2001, CAPTC has developed numerous early learning and family mega-facilities built on the grounds of neighboring public elementary schools. Total capital investment in these projects has been in excess of $60 million, generated through a combination of federal, state, and local grants, private donations, low interest loans, and tax exempt bond financing. More recently, in 2007, CAPTC was awarded a grant contract jointly financed through private donations and state funds to serve at risk infants and toddlers and their families. According to Eddins, Dow also supplied him with information about the value

of early childhood education for all children and it is clear that Dow remains heavily involved in early childhood education in Oklahoma.

In late September 2012, I sent an e-mail or letter (see Appendix B), requesting an interview with the aforementioned participants.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The emphasis on a sociohistorical approach requires the employment of historical research methods to trace the development of universal Pre-K in the state of Oklahoma. This will involve the collection of primary and secondary sources. Lugg (2006) has identified historians' main sources of data to be:

> artifacts or *primary sources* such as diaries; personal and professional correspondence; newspaper accounts; government documents, including memos, minutes of meetings, arrest reports and criminal complaints, health and safety data, public health records, and court decisions; church, synagogue, and mosque records; as well as unedited sound and video recordings. (p. 176, emphasis in original)

However, historians also make use of secondary sources produced by other scholars, such as "biographies; political, social, and/or legal histories; film and audio documentaries; but also autobiographies and memoirs" (Lugg, 2006, p. 177).

I used a process of sifting and sorting between both primary and secondary sources. A careful reading and analysis of primary and secondary sources helped me begin to piece together a narrative of how Oklahoma's Pre-K system developed. In order

to form the narrative, I first created a chronological timeline of the key events that precipitated the creation of universal Pre-K in Oklahoma. The newspaper stories, legislative documents, and interviews assisted me in creating this timeline. From there, I planned to situate this timeline in context. This means I need to reference primary and secondary sources to understand public sentiments regarding Pre-K school education from 1980 to 1998.

The interviews with key participants were vital to the study. Once participants agreed to an interview, I arranged a date and location that was convenient for both parties. I conducted an in-person interview with Joe Eddins at his home in Vinita, Oklahoma. I was not able to conduct in-person interviews with Steven Dow and Bob Harbison due to scheduling conflicts, so I conducted phone interviews with both participants. For the interviews with Joe Eddins and Steven Dow, I used software on my laptop to capture the conversation, after both agreed to being recorded. When I called Harbison to see if he was available for an interview, he answered the phone while driving back to Oklahoma from Kansas. He indicated that the best time to talk was at that moment. Therefore, I typed notes during our hour long conversation. At each interview, I obtained oral consent from participants.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Historical research requires a great deal of interpretation, and so it is important for the researcher to keep in mind her own biases. I am a Black female, who was born and raised in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and I am also a first generation college student. I attended

Head Start in the early 1980s, and I credit that early experience with preparing me to succeed academically in subsequent years. I also have taught first and second grades in high-minority, high-poverty schools. My experiences as a teacher have made me a firm believer in the power of high quality Pre-K, particularly for disadvantaged students. These experiences as an Oklahoma native, teacher, and recipient of a targeted Pre-K program provide me with a better understanding of the state and educational contexts. However, I also recognize that these experiences have the potential to limit my understanding of why universal Pre-K came about in Oklahoma. Thus, in order to reduce the risk of my bias influencing my interpretation, I emailed a draft of chapter four to Joe Eddins. He read the draft and provided feedback on the wording of one his quotes.

Chapter Four: Findings

How did Oklahoma, one of the poorest and "reddest" states in the country, move to the forefront of the early childhood movement? This chapter will detail the events leading up to the passage of legislation in 1998 that offered full-day pre-kindergarten to all students in the state and also discuss what has happened in the early childhood education since then.

SETTING THE STAGE

The story begins with Dr. Ramona (Paul) Coats, who is currently employed as Assistant State Superintendent of Federal Programs in Oklahoma's State Department of Education. In 1980, Coats was an early childhood specialist for the state when the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Leslie Fisher, came to her and said, "Ramona, what would you like to have for children under age five?" (Krehbiel, 2010, p. 40). Coats is herself a product of an early childhood program. Her parents were on the faculty of what was then Oklahoma A&M (now Oklahoma State University), and Coats' early years were spent in the university's Child Development Laboratory school. Started in 1924, the lab was the first of its kind in Oklahoma and a precursor to modern early childhood education centers.

Dr. Coats went on to teach preschool (Lerner, 2012) and child development courses at Oklahoma State University and was at Texas Woman's University in 1965 when the federal Head Start program began (Lerner, 2012; Krehbiel, 2010). In the 1970s, she taught undergraduate courses and ran the lab school at Purdue University, where she

completed her Ph.D. After a brief stint as a middle school administrator with Edmond Public Schools in Oklahoma, she began working for the Oklahoma Department of Education in 1977. Dr. Coats' background provides the context needed to explain why Fisher posed his question to her in 1980 as well as to understand her response, namely, that she wanted a program for four year olds that was "just like the five-year-old kindergarten program. All of those children could come to the public school—if they wanted to, on a voluntary basis—and they would have a certified teacher," (Coats, as quoted in Krehbiel, 2010, p. 40).

Coats' background in early childhood education also convinced her of three key components for the four year old program: a) early childhood education should be provided to all children, regardless of socioeconomic status because she believed in the power of children learning from one another, b) high standards were necessary (i.e., teachers should receive the same benefits as public school teachers, with a 1:10 teacher to student ratio), and c) it was important to place the four year old program under the purview of the public school system, facilitating funding and oversight for the program (Bushouse, 2009; Krehbiel, 2010). Fisher agreed and, in 1980, the Oklahoma legislature funded the state's pilot program for four-year-olds. While the measure passed, it is important to note that the pilot program was met with some opposition. Coats (as cited by Bushouse, 2009) stated that some legislators felt "if we provide preschool, women will go to work" (p. 36). While these beliefs did not prevent the pilot program from the being added as a line item, the program was small, with only ten school districts participating in the first year (Krehbiel, 2010), eventually growing to 24 sites (Bushouse, 2009).

Additionally, states had to finance their programs through a competitive grants program each year.

Coats left the Oklahoma Department of Education in 1988 to take a position with Oklahoma City Public Schools, but returned in 1991, at the same time Democrat Sandy Garrett (a former first grade teacher and advocate of early childhood education) began the first of five terms as State Superintendent of Public Instruction (Krehbiel, 2010). When Garrett stepped into this role, she began working with House Education Committee Chairperson Carolyn Thompson and Senate Education Committee Chairperson Bernice Shedrick to shift funding for the four-year-old program into the state funding formula (Bushouse, 2009). Bushouse notes that these three policy entrepreneurs capitalized on a policy window, 1990's HB 1017 (The Education Reform Act), to advance preschool in the state of Oklahoma. HB 1017 was a pivotal moment in Oklahoma's education policy history. Prior to passage of that bill, Bushouse observes, several policy entrepreneurs were pushing for K-12 reform in the state, led by Republican Governor Henry Bellmon. Bellmon was aided by The Oklahoma Academy for State Goals, a nonpartisan public policy organization, which sponsored a 1989 conference on education in Oklahoma. At the conclusion of the conference, the Academy came up with 11 recommendations for education reform, most of which centered on K-12 education reform. However, there were two related to preschool, namely, (1) to establish new quality preschool programs, and (2) to improve the quality of existing programs.

Bushouse (2009) notes that the Academy's inclusion of preschool reforms in its recommendation represents the start of the entwining of two streams of policy

alternatives: education reform and state-funded preschool. The summer of 1989 also saw the calling of a special legislative session during which House Speaker Steve Lewis proposed to reduce class size, expand preschool, and mandate full day kindergarten (Greiner, 1989). Oklahoma City's primary newspaper, *The Oklahoman*, reported that Lewis' proposal was controversial, because there would not be enough teachers for the classrooms, not because of the public provision aspect (Casteel, 1989).

Ultimately, HB 1017 included two provisions related to early childhood education. First, Oklahoma school districts were required to provide half or full day kindergarten. Additionally, a line in the bill specified that the state, through its Department of Education, would provide free preschool to Head Start-eligible families, but would allow school districts to set sliding scale fees for families above Head Start income limits. Specifically, school districts would receive a .5 reimbursement for half-day preschool, but only for the students who were Head Start eligible. Thus, policy entrepreneurs were able to obtain consensus that the state should provide targeted Pre-K, but they were not able to secure support for universal Pre-K. The compromise for targeted Pre-K came about because, according to Sandy Garrett (as cited in Bushouse, 2009), there was still a lingering sentiment that "young children should be at home with their mothers" (p. 38).

Interestingly, I was not able to locate any newspaper or magazine articles following the passage of HB 1017 that noted the new statewide targeted Pre-K that had become part of the state's funding formula. This lack of media coverage of changes in early childhood education appears to be the hallmark of Oklahoma.

In 1993, another small, yet significant legislative change occurred that had significant and unintended consequences for early childhood education in Oklahoma, but was not covered by any news outlets in the state. In 1993, under pressure from rural school districts that were experiencing declining enrollments, HB 1720 (Appendix C) was passed. This bill allowed school districts to enroll four-year-old children in kindergarten, provided they passed a readiness screening and were not already enrolled in an early childhood program approved by the State Board of Education.

Prior to the passage of HB 1720, children had to be five years old by September 1 in order to be admitted to kindergarten. After HB 1720 passed, four-year olds enrolled in kindergarten would be counted in the average daily membership of the school district for state aid funding. This minor change in the state law had significant consequences for school districts, as it now meant school districts were able to enroll four-year-olds in kindergarten and receive the same amount of funding they would receive for five-year-olds.

This incentive was initially limited because the program was expensive since state reimbursements were based on the prior year's enrollment, meaning school districts that enrolled four year olds into kindergarten would have to cover the first year of the program before they received increased state aid (Bushouse, 2009). However, after a few years, the legislature shifted the date for the enrollment count to the current year (70 Oklahoma Statue Annotated §18.201.1 2004), which created an even greater incentive for school districts to increase the number of kindergarten classrooms. Additionally, while school districts were required to offer kindergarten, they had the choice to offer half or

full day kindergarten. Thus, some school districts chose to have two half-day kindergarten classes (one class in the morning and a second in the afternoon), with one teacher for both classes in order to increase the amount of funding they received from the state of Oklahoma. Students enrolled in pre-K were funded at a .5 weight in the school funding formula while kindergarten students had a 1.3 funding weight.

The new law thus created a loophole via which school districts could fill kindergarten classrooms with four year olds. Under the old law, school districts only received state aid for four-year-olds who enrolled in Pre-K who were also Head Start eligible. Now, states could receive state aid for any four-year-old who enrolled in kindergarten, regardless of their Head Start eligibility. Since school districts were not required to provide full day kindergarten, they could still offer half-day kindergarten while receiving more money from the state. Lloyd Snow, a superintendent at the time, stated:

> It was like a no brainer to not only be able to do this, put it in play, and then have money left over for other so desperately needed underfunded educational processes. I mean, it was—it was a good thing, and we haven't had very many good things in public schools in my estimation. So I didn't blink twice (as cited by Glass, 2012).

Joe Eddins further explains that law makers

> really thought that once you got to 20 students you would quit. But if you have 14 students in kindergarten why not put seven of them in each of two classrooms and

> then fill those up? A couple of school districts started this and then the others jumped on (personal communication, October 15, 2012).

Bob Harbison concurs (personal communication, January 7, 2013), noting that this loophole created a "perverse incentive" that was primarily used by rural school districts to make up for their declining enrollments. From 1990-2000, the population in Oklahoma increased by 9.7 percent, but still grew slower than the nation, which increased by 13.2 percent (Oklahoma Institute for Child Advocacy & Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families, 2004). During that same time period, rural areas in Oklahoma grew significantly less than non-rural areas; 35.6 percent of rural counties and only 7.8 percent of non-rural counties in Oklahoma lost population.

Table 1 shows the number of students enrolled in Pre-K and kindergarten from 1992-1998 as reported by the Oklahoma State Department of Education. The decrease in Pre-K and kindergarten enrollment between the 1993-1994 and 1994-1995 school years supports other evidence that Oklahoma's population dwindled. What is particularly interesting is the fact that the number of students enrolled in kindergarten more than doubled between the 1995-1996 and 1996-1997 school years. Since the State of Oklahoma did not disaggregate data by age for kindergartners until the 1996-1997 school year, it is difficult to explain how in the span of just one year the state of Oklahoma gained over 26,000 kindergarten students. However, what is clear is that between the 1996-1997 and 1997-1998 school years, some school districts were aware that allowing four-year-olds to enroll in kindergarten was advantageous.

Table 1

Pre-K and Kindergarten Enrollment in Oklahoma from 1992-1998

School Year	Pre-K Enrollment	Total Kindergarten Enrollment	4 Year Olds Enrolled in Kindergarten [b]	5 Year Olds Enrolled in Kindergarten
1992-1993	4,859	45,010 [a]	n/a	n/a
1993-1994	5,456	44,874	n.d.	n.d.
1994-1995	2,627	23,905	n.d.	n.d.
1995-1996	2,662	23,738	n.d.	n.d.
1996-1997	4,600	50,387	4,268	46,119
1997-1998	2,494	54,203	8,064	46,139

Note. From Oklahoma State Department of Education Data/Research Services (1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998)

[a] Four-year-olds were not allowed to enroll in kindergarten until the 1993-1994 school year.

[b] Oklahoma State Department of Education did not begin reporting data disaggregated by age until the 1996-1997 school year.

Of course, the problem with allowing four-year-olds to enroll in kindergarten is that it is not a developmentally appropriate practice. Pre-K provides a time for children to learn key social, emotional, and academic skills that prepare them to enter kindergarten. Additionally, the fact that school districts did not have to provide full day kindergarten further compounded the problem. Not only were four-year-olds in a setting that was not appropriate, they were also receiving instruction in a condensed time.

In 1995, this problem was brought to the attention of Joe Eddins, who had just been elected to the House of Representatives. As Eddins explains,

> A school superintendent that I had taught school for in the prior years asked me to change the law for him. A lot of some school districts were beginning to enroll four-year-old children in kindergarten. He asked me to stop that or limit it. I said sure… (personal communication, October 15, 2012).

Eddins statement demonstrates the first stage in his development as a policy entrepreneur. At this point, Eddins is still naïve to the political process, and agrees to address the problem simply because he was asked to do so. After the problem was brought to his attention and he did some research about the four-year-olds in kindergarten dilemma, Eddins became even more interested in changing the law because, as he explained, "everybody was equally overcharging the pool," as a result of the additional money generated from four year olds enrolled in kindergarten and school districts were using the extra money to fund everything from football programs to new buildings (Glass, 2012). Eddins stated that only a few school superintendents understood this loophole and made sure to discuss it discreetly as not to "inflame the powers that be." Since only a few rural school districts were taking advantage of the loophole, the general sentiment was "it didn't really hurt other people very much." However, Eddins was concerned that the system was being abused and realized that soon the larger urban districts (e.g., Tulsa and Oklahoma City) would begin to understand how lucrative it would be to enroll four year olds in kindergarten. Thus, a small loophole that was positively impacting a few school districts would actually start to have a negative impact of dilution when the larger districts started to enroll four year olds into Pre-K, thereby decreasing the amount of per-pupil aid for all schools. Eddins' understanding of the budgetary implications associated with allowing four-year-olds to enroll in kindergarten was a crucial factor in his development as a policy entrepreneur because he possessed a true understanding of a complex situation; an understanding that many of his colleagues did not possess.

So, for the next two years Eddins set out trying to change the law—with little success. Eddins stated that he authored a bill changing the four year olds in kindergarten loophole and the bill

> whizzed through the House, whizzed through the Senate with the title off. Which means it has to come back through a conference committee. Okay the title off means you have to amend it, so when you amend it then the other house has to deal with it. In Oklahoma you have these deadlines and the mandatory adjournment. So here we are whipping around and I don't know what's what. I'm not talking to anybody, legislators or staff. I'm just doing it and nobody at the state department talks to me. Everybody I've talked to says, 'Yeah Joe, I'll vote for your bill' right down to the deadline and… it got lost somewhere (personal communication, October 15, 2012).

It turns out that the bill was actually held up by leadership in the legislature because according to Eddins, "some really important legislators had this in their district and later said 'Let's just don't do that right now'" And, so the legislature adjourned and the bill was not passed. While Eddins failed to get his bill passed, it is clear that this experience was invaluable as it helped him to better understand how politics played out in the Oklahoma legislature. Eddins began his tenure in the House of Representatives with no experience about the political process. Yet, his attempts to pass his Pre-K bill proved to be an excellent introduction into the political system.

Eddins persisted and introduced the bill again the following year. By this time, he had become very knowledgeable about early childhood education due in part to his

assembling his own "task force" of children's advocates that spun from a meeting held by the Institute for Child Advocacy. At this meeting, Eddins spoke about his plan to change the law that allowed four year olds to enroll in kindergarten. That meeting led to subsequent meetings with "volunteers and some really smart people that had really good connections that were really interested in children." This task force was mutually beneficial, in that it provided early childhood advocates with the ear of a state legislator while Eddins benefitted from the knowledge and support of key stakeholders.

At one of these meetings, Eddins met Bob Harbison. The president of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce approached Harbison, a former manager at Trans World Airlines and executive in the oil and gas industry, in the early 1990s. In 1990, the Chamber had put together a task force to address workforce development concerns. Tulsa had experienced explosive growth, but also found that not enough people possessed the necessary skill sets to do the work. The Chamber explored a number of reasons for this, and continued to return to the notion that children were not graduating high school adequately prepared to enter the workforce and committed itself to making the city of Tulsa "a world-class center for early childhood education" (Bushouse, 2009, p. 41). The president of Tulsa's Chamber of Commerce then approached Harbison to devise a strategy to address this issue and in the fall of 1991, Harbison was instrumental in starting Tulsa's Children Coalition and became the non-profit's Executive Director.

Harbison explained (personal communication, October 15, 2012) that his work first began with assessing Oklahoma's pre-K program and ascertaining that the voluntary program served four-year-olds from low-income families, but the supply did not keep up

with the demand, as many school districts wanted to expand their programs. Harbison also worked with Senator Ed Long, who introduced several bills (e.g., SB 294 in 1995), which would have raised the income eligibility limit for the four-year-old program thereby allowing access to more children. Each bill did not pass.

In the meantime, Harbison stated the Tulsa Children's Coalition put together a group of early childcare providers who offered high quality before and after school programs in Tulsa (personal communication, October 15, 2012), using funds from George H.W. Bush's block-grant program, along with Title I and public school dollars (Fuller, 2007). The Coalition's decision to provide high quality before and after school care stemmed from a cardboard box filled with research and reports on early childhood education handed to Harbison by the president of Tulsa's Chamber of Commerce (Glass, 2012). Harbison had read studies about the Perry Preschool Program and the Abecedarian Program and became convinced that high quality early childhood education was crucial to improving the city's workforce. Harbison likened children who entered kindergarten already far behind to a plane flying without a pilot. According to Glass (2012), Harbison thought:

> Statistically, that kid might never catch up. He's occupying that seat in first, second, third grade, in middle school and high school, but the seat might as well be empty for all the good it's doing the kid sitting in it. And also he thought, when you look at the statistics of what happens to a lot of at risk kids when they get out of school, they end up costing the government a lot of money. They end up

incarcerated, or on public assistance—bad outcomes for them and for society" (Pre-K O section, para. 18).

PROGRAM CREATION

It turns out that meeting Harbison and hearing about the program in Tulsa was a pivotal turning point for Eddins, who stated "Bob is the genius in this whole thing, he taught me everything I know" (personal communication, October 15, 2012). Eddins and Harbison then began working together to write another bill that would revamp the state's pre-K system completely. In his description of their partnership, Harbison explained, "Joe carried the water and I made sure the bucket was filled" (personal communication, October 15, 2012).

The 1991 House Bill 1017 already had requirements for high quality Pre-K (i.e., teachers had to have a bachelor's degree in early childhood education) for children from low-income families. The efficacy of such programs was supported by the research literature that Harbison had read and shared with Eddins. The fact that quality standards already existed meant that the major hurdle was how to make the program available to all four-year-olds in the state. By now, Eddins had become well versed in school finance, and was fully aware that most of his colleagues in the legislature were not. So, when he introduced House Bill 1657 (see Appendix D) in February 1997, there were a few (seemingly) insignificant tweaks to the state's school funding formula. First, he increased the reimbursement rate for pre-K programs from .5 to .7, but changed the language so that this only applied to half-day pre-K programs. He then added full day pre-K to the

funding formula, at a rate of 1.3, which was the same rate for kindergarten programs. House Bill 1657 also required children to be five years old when they began kindergarten, which addressed the original problem of four-year-olds enrolled in kindergarten. The bill allowed school districts to partner with Head Start centers to provide pre-K to Oklahoma residents but did not require districts to offer Pre-K to all residents. Additionally, parents were not required to send their children to Pre-K. Interestingly, the original bill retained the original stipulation that Head Start eligible children would attend Pre-K for free, while parents of other children would have to pay on a sliding fee scale. However, the final, enrolled version of House Bill 1657 provided Pre-K to all children, regardless of their family's income.

In my interview with Joe Eddins, I asked how and why the bill was changed. Oddly, he seemed to forget about this key detail about the bill's history, stating:

> Yeah… I forgot about that. I remember it now, in education appropriation subcommittee bill somebody, that came up and somebody said, I think it ought to be for everybody. So they amended it to do that and it went right on... just like that" (personal communication, October 15, 2012).

GARNERING HOUSE AND SENATE SUPPORT

Of course, writing such a bill and convincing members of the House and Senate to support the bill are two different matters. Over a year after the bill was introduced, it passed the House 99-0 on May 6, 1998 and then passed the Senate the following day. During my interview with Eddins, he explained how he was able to get support for his

bill, which is described by Glass (2012) as a "political sleight of the hand." He would give his colleagues a carefully crafted summary, explaining that his bill eliminated the problem of four year olds in kindergarten and would allow school districts to form partnerships with private organizations to provide Pre-K. He also made a point of stressing the fact that continuing to allow four-year-olds into kindergarten would be especially costly once larger urban school districts (i.e., Tulsa and Oklahoma City) began to catch on and do what the rural districts had been doing for years. However, he failed to mention that his bill added another grade that the state would be required to fund. Eddins explained how and when he would summarize his bill to his colleagues:

> If you've ever watched the House of Representatives somebody will read a bill and they will vote for it and they'll talk about it and then they'll have fifteen minutes. During these fifteen minutes it's boring. So I just go slip up and I would sit down next to you and I would say my bill is coming up. Here is what's in it. And I would explain to them if my bill doesn't pass they are all going to be in kindergarten...You could contract with private providers. Oh, we loved private providers even if it's Head Start, which they didn't know that's what it was going to be. So, I'm the only one talking to them, I'm the only one talking to them… That doesn't happen on bills that have millions of dollars attached to it (personal communication, October 15, 2012).

At this stage, it appears that Eddins has come full circle as a policy entrepreneur. In just a few years, Eddins had acquired enough political savvy to know when was the best time to approach his colleagues as well as how to frame his bill to maximize the support he

would receive. It is clear that Eddins was no longer a naïve junior legislator who thought a single legislator wrote a bill, the bill was discussed on the floor, and then the House and Senate voted on the bill (J. Eddins, personal communication, October 15, 2012). Rather, Eddins now had a clear understanding of how imperative it was to garner support for a bill before it is even introduced.

It was not clear in my research how HB 1657 made it through the Oklahoma Senate. Since I was not able to speak with Penny Williams, who was the primary Senate author, I had to rely on Eddins to fill in the blanks. He stated that he never spoke with Senator Williams about the bill, but speculated that the reason the bill passed the Senate was because "the leadership said it was alright and the Senate author didn't care and wasn't good at explaining things" but "had really good staff" (personal communication, October 15, 2012).

POTENTIAL OPPOSITION

Eddins also credited the relationships he had built with the early childhood community for contributing to the bill's passage, stating that "Head Start and daycare…they trusted me" and believed that the bill was beneficial. Thus, to his knowledge, no other outside entities (such as lobbyists or interest groups) discussed the bill with other House representatives. Bushouse (2009) supports Eddins' claims, citing three interest groups: Head Start, the Oklahoma Department of Human Services (ODHS), and the Oklahoma Child Care Association as likely sources of opposition to HB 1657 that

did not lobby or create a public relations campaign to oppose the drastic changes to Pre-K.

Bushouse explains that Representative Eddins was able to get the support of the Head Start Collaboration Director, Eva Carter, by convincing her of two major factors. First, he convinced her that expanding the Pre-K program would increase revenues to Head Start. At the time of these discussions, universal Pre-K was not a factor, so Eddins and Harbison envisioned and proposed a targeted pre-K program where public schools would partner with Head Start centers to provide full-day Pre-K to low-income children. Carter was intent on creating partnerships with school districts, making expanded pre-K advantageous to Head Start. Second, Carter and other child care advocates wanted to eliminate the four year olds in kindergarten provision, and HB 1657 would address that problem. Once Eddins was able to convince Head Start officials of these two key factors, they were on board with the bill and according to Bushouse, worked with Eddins and other childcare advocates to educate legislators to ensure HB 1657 was passed.

In her research Bushouse found that officials at ODHS had been engaged in conversations prior to HB 1657's passage and their main concern was the impact on the preschool program on childcare programs. According to Bushouse, Nancy vonBargen, former director of the Division of Child Care (DCC) at ODHS, wanted the bill to require school districts to partner with child care providers. The bill did not require collaboration at all, and school districts could decide if they wanted to collaborate with Head Start, private providers, or both. Additionally, school districts decide how to expend Pre-K funds, which means there is variation in how pre-K affects Head Start and private

providers. Yet, the absence of a requirement for collaboration did not stop vonBargen and ODHS from supporting the bill, for they hoped that the Pre-K expansion would free up child care subsidy funds so that ODHS could in turn raise the reimbursement rate for children from zero to three years old.

The Oklahoma Child Care Association stood to lose a great deal of revenue if HB 1657 passed, but there was not a concerted effort to protest the bill. Bushouse (2009) interviewed several childcare industry representatives and found these conversations "yielded expressions of frustration and fears about losing business but also a degree of fatalism" (p. 44) about the expansion of Pre-K. Until the bill was introduced, public Pre-K was primarily part-day, which allowed private child care providers to supply before and after school care. However, HB 1657 provided a full-day reimbursement, thus creating an incentive for school districts to offer full day Pre-K, which would mean a substantial loss of revenue for private providers. Bushouse speculated that the reason private providers did not mobilize to protest HB 1657 was due to two reasons. First, they lacked the time to do so since most private providers have limited administrative capabilities. Second, some who were interviewed by Bushouse lacked a general knowledge of the legislative process, thus impeding their ability to even get their foot in the door to hold the ear of a legislator. Eddins shared that he was able to convince childcare providers to support the bill because he explained that more four year old children would go into the kindergarten program than into his new Pre-K program (personal communication, March 15, 2013). The reason for this was because school districts were reimbursed at a rate of 1.3 plus .25 for economically disadvantaged

students, for one half day of kindergarten. Under House Bill 1657, school districts were reimbursed for a full day early childhood program at a rate of .7 plus .25 for economically disadvantaged children.

Another possible reason that private childcare providers did not mobilize to oppose the bill was due to changes made by ODHS after 1996's Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act. A work group on childcare came up with the idea of a quality rating system where high-quality centers would receive higher reimbursements rates. The STAR Rating System, developed in 1997 and launched in 1998, was one of the first ratings system of its kind in the nation. Centers that had the highest rating (three stars) received higher reimbursement for meeting all of the state requirements and received accreditation from by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC).

While these changes were occurring locally, national changes were occurring. States were experiencing drastically reduced welfare rolls and were being allowed to use Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds for family support services. ODHS decided to shift its TANF funds to expand childcare subsidies, which then allowed it to raise the eligibility for these subsidies from 130 percent of the poverty line to 185 percent of the poverty line and to alter the copay schedule, making care more affordable for parents (Bushouse, 2009). These changes in the childcare system reduced the opposition because high-quality centers now had an incentive to accept subsidized children. In other words, they would lose four year olds to public preschool, but would gain children from zero to three, as long as they accepted subsidized children.

Eddins also mentioned that there was concern that Governor Frank Keating, who had taken office in 1995, would veto the bill, so he talked with Keating's staff members and convinced them that "my bill was better than not my bill." Eddins described Keating as the type of governor who preferred to stay out of the legislative process until a bill came to his desk for approval, so it is unclear why he would have vetoed the bill, given that it required a firm grasp of the state's school funding formula, something that Harbison and Eddins agreed that few people fully understood. Nevertheless, by April 1998, the "softening of processes" had occurred and a policy window opened. Governor Keating signed House Bill 1657 into law and the state of Oklahoma became the second state in the United States to offer full-day pre-K to all children.

THE AFTERMATH

While conducting research for this project, I was struck by the profound lack of coverage of Bill 1657 in the media. It stood to reason that once the bill was passed, major newspapers in the state would announce that all four-year-olds were eligible to attend pre-K for free. However, that did not prove to be the case. I was only able to find one newspaper article (Appendix E) on page nine of The Oklahoman (the capital region's primary newspaper), in July 1998, that mentioned HB 1657 along with several other "child-friendly" laws.

During my interviews with Eddins and Harbison, I mentioned the lack of media coverage and both stated that they intentionally did not draw attention to the new law (Eddins, J., personal communication, October 15, 2012; B. Harbison, personal communication, October 15, 2012). Both feared that someone in the House or Senate

would understand the financial repercussions of the law and fight to change it. And, it would be remarkably easy to do this as there is just one line in the bill that provides universal Pre-K: "children who are at least four (4) years of age but not more than five (5) years of age on or before September 1 shall be entitled to attend either half-day or full-day early childhood programs in their district free of charge."

During my interview with Eddins, he echoed my thoughts, stating that if he had done anything to take credit for the bill's passage, it had been that

> I didn't mess it up, and there was plenty of opportunity to mess it up, make no mistake… and if I did something it was I kept this bill from ever attracting attention, negative attention, in other words. Or even positive attention that attracts negative attention… there was no need for anybody to understand [the bill], they didn't understand it ... it was just very simply do you want four year olds in kindergarten or do you want them in a developmentally appropriate program? It was cheaper to have them in the developmentally appropriate program. It was better to have them in a program… So if I did something to take credit for it this would be it; that I didn't mess it up… One [person] can go in there and tell a few lines, then you have to read the bill and then you say, 'By the way we can stop this by stopping four year olds from going into kindergarten, you know,' and so that could have happened. But so I say if I did anything it was not messing it up and letting it become a spectacle (personal communication, October 15, 2012).

In spite of the lack of attention drawn to the change in Pre-K and the fact that Pre-K was voluntary, 38 percent of the state's four year olds enrolled in public school programs during the 2008-2009 school year. The number of children enrolled steadily increased and by the 2010-2011 school year (the latest year for which data is available) 74 percent of eligible four year olds were enrolled in public Pre-K in Oklahoma and the state met nine of out of ten quality benchmarks (Barnett et al, 2011).

According to Harbison, Oklahoma's Pre-K program remained under the radar until the National Institute for Early Education Research ranked Oklahoma as number one in the country for access to state-funded Pre-K (Barnett, Hustedt, Robin, & Schulman, 2004). Harbison stated that it was at this point that the program became a point of pride for Oklahomans, even some conservatives. The state received national attention again when Gormley, Phillips, and Dawson (2005) published an external evaluation of Tulsa's Pre-K program, which demonstrated significant cognitive gains for children who participated in the program. The researchers' evaluation, which used a nationally normed tested (the Woodstock Johnson), showed a 52 percent gain in pre-reading skills, a 27 percent gain in prewriting skills, and a 21 percent gain in pre-math skills. While all students in the study benefited from the program, the gains were highest for Hispanic children who experienced a 79 percent gain in pre-reading skills, a 39 percent gain in pre-writing skills, and a 54 percent gain in pre-math skills, gains that were above and beyond what would be expected to occur in a year.

THE CURRENT STATE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN OKLAHOMA

During both of my interviews with Harbison, who remains deeply involved in early childhood education policy, he stated that he felt Pre-K in Oklahoma would continue to grow and soon reach the same enrollment figures as kindergarten. However, he also stated that some areas of the state still lacked the capacity to have additional Pre-K classrooms for two reasons.

First, school districts simply do not have enough physical classrooms and nearly 5,000 four year olds sit on state Pre-K waiting lists (Banchero, 2013). For example, in 2010, approximately 60 percent of Oklahoma City Public Schools students attended prekindergarten, but only about 16 percent attended all day. Compared to other school districts, such as Tulsa Public Schools, where 75 percent of the students were in prekindergarten, with 98 percent attending all day, Oklahoma City's enrollment numbers are strikingly low (Ross, 2010). In 2011, various philanthropic organizations, such as the Inasmuch Foundation, gave Oklahoma City Schools $417,760 to add 120 prekindergarten classrooms over the course of four years, with a goal of offering prekindergarten to 100 percent of the district's four year olds by 2015 (Harbison, B., personal communication, October 15, 2012; Pemberton, 2011). Other school districts have had to be creative in their search for classrooms, with some opening Pre-K classrooms in insurance offices, strip malls, and even nursing homes (Banchero, 2013).

Another reason some school districts have not expanded access to their Pre-K program is due to a lack of qualified teachers. State law requires Pre-K teachers to have a Bachelor's degree with a certification in early childhood education. The law also requires

a 10 to 1 student to teacher ratio; one of the adults must be a degreed teacher and the other can be an instructional aide who is not required to have a Bachelor's degree. Due to the shortage of qualified teachers, some school districts, such as Tulsa Public Schools have had to delay opening a classroom, even though there was a need and demand for a Pre-K classroom (Banchero, 2013). In response, a major philanthropic organization based in Tulsa, The George Kaiser Family Foundation (GKFF) has funded students at Tulsa Community College (TCC) and at University of Oklahoma-Tulsa (OU-Tulsa) to receive child development associate's certifications, associates degrees, and bachelor degrees. From 2004-2011, approximately 167 students graduated from or were enrolled in TCC and 30 students graduated and enrolled from OU-Tulsa (George Kaiser Family Foundation, 2013).

Following the success of the Pre-K program, in 2006 the Oklahoma legislature directed the state board of education to establish a pilot infant and toddler program called the State Pilot Project (SPP). SPP would be jointly financed through public and private partnerships and was intended to serve at-risk children and their families. SPP continues today and is now called the Oklahoma Early Childhood Program, serving approximately 2,000 children from birth through three years old in 18 early learning centers throughout the state (George Kaiser Family Foundation, 2013). GKFF is the primary private supporter and The Community Action Project of Tulsa County (CAPTC) administers the program, which is funded by ten million dollars in public money that is matched by fifteen million in private support.

During my research for this project, I spoke briefly with Steven Dow, who has served as Executive Director of CAPTC since 1992. Dow stated that one of the "unintended consequences" of universal Pre-K in Oklahoma is that the child care industry has changed and as a result the state now needs to be very mindful of the state of children before they even enter the doors of a Pre-K classroom (personal communication, October 17, 2012). Dow also cited a 2011 state law that ends social promotion for third graders, requiring them to be proficient in reading before moving to the fourth grade (Hoberock, 2011) as another reason that it is especially important that the state ensure that early childhood education is of high quality.

Chapter Five: Discussion

Conclusions

The passage of universal Pre-K legislation in Oklahoma fits with Kingdon's 1995 streams theory, which describes policy formation as the result of three kinds of processes, or the flow of three "streams": the problem stream, the policy stream and the politics stream. The problem stream regards public matters requiring attention. A number of problems could be advocated to policy makers. As a result, they cannot attend to each problem brought to their attention and some matters are not defined as problems until there a policy is proposed and recognized by politicians. Thus, the policy stream regards proposals for change. Before a problem can reach the decision agenda, decision makers must be given at least one alternative solution, worked out and ready to put in place. Finally, the politics stream is composed of political issues, e.g. election results, changes of administration, interest group campaigns or changes in public opinions.

When all of these streams come together, Kingdon proposed that a policy window opened that allowed the passage of a particular policy. In the midst of it all are policy entrepreneurs, individuals who introduce and promote their ideas in many different arenas and invest the time and energy needed to increase the chances for an idea to be placed on the decision agenda (Kingdon, 1995) and are active in the problem stream and the policy stream. Policy entrepreneurs also must keep to their issue, while other decision makers shift their attention from one problem to another. Policy entrepreneurs must also work at preparing and educating the public and the specialists (Guldbrandsson & Fossum,

2006) about the problem. Thus, both the problem recognition and the suggested solutions could be results of policy entrepreneurs' efforts.

In the case of Oklahoma, the superintendent of Vinita Public Schools brought the *problem* of four-year-olds allowed to enroll in kindergarten to the attention of his newly elected representative, Joe Eddins. Eddins' self-professed naiveté (personal communication, October 15, 2012) about the political process is what led him to even pay attention when the problem was brought to his attention, tell the superintendent he would fix it, and then begin researching the problem himself. At this point, the problem became readily apparent to him: allowing four-year-olds to attend kindergarten was not developmentally appropriate. Moreover, school districts were taking advantage of the system and once the larger school districts began to catch on, the problem would be exacerbated. Hence, a small loophole that was positively impacting a few rural school districts would actually start to have a negative impact of dilution when the larger districts started to enroll four year olds into Pre-K, thereby decreasing the amount of per-pupil aid for all schools.

In response, Eddins created a *policy* to address the problem. His policy was initially simple: remove the option for school districts to enroll four-year-olds in kindergarten. However, as time passed and his knowledge about early childhood education increased, Eddins added full day Pre-K for low-income children to the state's funding formula. Eventually, the bill was changed so that all children in the state were eligible to attend full day Pre-K.

At first blush, the *politics* involved in this case centered on Eddins' election to office. It is unclear if any other legislators had attempted to address the four-year-olds in kindergarten issue. However, as a junior legislator, Eddins stated that he was the only one willing to take on such a bill (personal communication, October 15, 2012). In addition, Eddins' political naiveté led him to assume that legislators wrote bills and the bills were discussed on the floor and legislators then voted on the bill. He did not understand that legislators typically worked together to author bills and drum up support for them. However, at some point, Eddins must have realized that he had to work the political system, which would explain why he began to talk to other House members individually about his bill, omitting the fact that the state would now be responsible for paying for an entirely new grade level.

My research also uncovered that another aspect of politics was at play: the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (also known as welfare reform). This reform led to drastically reduced welfare rolls and in response, the state was able to shift Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds for family support services, namely the expansion of child care subsidies. This then allowed the state to raise the eligibility for these subsidies from 130 percent of the poverty line to 185 percent of the poverty line and to alter the copay schedule, making care more affordable for parents (Bushouse, 2009). These changes in the child care system reduced the potential opposition from child care centers as they now had an incentive to accept subsidized children. Child care centers risked losing four year olds to public preschool, but could gain children from zero to three, as long as they accepted subsidized children.

In addition, welfare reform may explain why the state experienced a dramatic increase in kindergarten enrollment between the 1995-1996 and 1996-1997 schools years mentioned in Table 1; namely, mothers of four and five year olds needed to find a place for their children to go while they worked.

Finally, it is clear that Joe Eddins was the primary policy entrepreneur who created the policy solution and worked to make the notion of universal Pre-K palatable to his colleagues and other members of the early childhood community. Additionally, Eddins never gave up on his bill, and shepherded its passage for three years.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research question 1: What explains the development and passage of universal Pre-K in Oklahoma?

When I began researching this project, I hypothesized that universal Pre-K in the state of Oklahoma was developed in response to calls from parents, lobbyists, the philanthropic community, and legislators, much like the history of early childhood education detailed in Chapter Two. However, my research shows that universal Pre-K was developed because of a problem of four-year-olds being allowed to enroll in kindergarten, a practice that was not only developmentally inappropriate but also very costly to the state of Oklahoma. Furthermore, universal Pre-K was not originally part of Eddins' plan when he authored House Bill 1657; he sought to address the four-year-olds in kindergarten issue and to create a state-wide targeted, full day Pre-K program. It was only after someone else said the program should be for all children, during an appropriation's committee meeting, that the idea of universal Pre-K was even considered.

In terms of an explanation for the bill's passage, I thought I would see a number of House and Senate debates, accompanied by testimony from various interest groups. This did not prove to be the case. Instead, the passage of House Bill 1657 can best be explained by the tenacity of one junior legislator, Joe Eddins. Eddins researched the problem, created a solution, and (more importantly) convinced fellow legislators to support his bill. More importantly, Eddins built on the groundwork completed by Coats, Harbison, and other child advocates who assisted in the passage of earlier legislation related to early childhood education.

Research question 2: What lessons can be taken from a historical policy analysis of this issue for contemporary educational policy?

During my conversations with Eddins, I asked if he thought Oklahoma (or any other state) could pass a universal pre-K law today. He stated that he felt Oklahoma would never pass such a bill today and that other states "didn't have a prayer" due to the costs associated with providing a high quality program (personal communication, October 15, 2012). I agree that a legislator could not get a bill passed the way that Eddins did in 1998. Yet, it is not totally impossible and states are currently looking into how they can provide pre-K to all children, particularly given President Obama's State of the Union address (Obama, 2013), where he called for universal Pre-K.

One of the first lessons that states can take from the Oklahoma case is that it is critical to have a clear understanding of the literature regarding high quality Pre-K. During my conversations with Eddins and Harbison, I was struck by the degree to which they consumed literature about early childhood education. While Eddins had once been a

high school teacher, Harbison did not have a background in education. Yet, both made it their business to read and understand the benefits of quality early childhood education. Ramona Coats had laid the groundwork by creating a high-quality Pre-K program, so in that sense part of the hard work was done for them. They did not have to create a program from scratch. Thus, other states looking to implement universal Pre-K should look at their current programs and identify appropriate components that they can scale up to their entire state.

After gaining an understanding of what aspects are critical for a high-quality program, states should consider how to ensure school districts adhere to the standards, while also reassuring students and school districts that Pre-K would not be mandatory. In Oklahoma's case this meant embedding high quality components into the state law while making the program voluntary for school districts and parents of four-year-olds. Eddins and Harbison emphasized that these components were critical, given how right leaning the state is. School districts had no choice but to adhere to the standards in order to receive reimbursement from the state. More importantly, requiring that school districts adhere to high quality standards sends a strong message that the state truly values early childhood education and deems it as important as K-12.

At the same time, by making the program voluntary, it meant that legislators did not infringe on the personal lives of families or place financial stress on school districts. Interestingly, while Oklahoma's Pre-K program is completely voluntary, 98 percent of school districts offer a program and 74 percent of four-year-olds in the state are enrolled in state Pre-K programs. This suggests that concerns that Pre-K would contribute to a

"nanny state" are unfounded. Rather, once parents are offered a high quality program, they are likely to try it and like it. In fact, Harbison stated (personal communication, October 15, 2012) that the primary reason legislators had not attempted to remove universal Pre-K is because their constituents liked it so much.

A final lesson is the importance of identifying potential policy entrepreneurs who posses both political savvy and a comprehensive knowledge of Pre-K, and who are willing to do the work of proposing a bill that addresses universal Pre-K as well as seeing the bill through until it is ultimately passed. This is certainly a tall order, and in the case of Oklahoma, Eddins was simply asked to stop school districts from enrolling four-year-olds in kindergarten. I'm sure that when the superintendent asked Eddins to do this, he had no idea that Eddins was eventually create a bill that made Oklahoma the second state to offer universal Pre-K.

ANALYSIS OF KINGDON'S STREAMS THEORY

Does Kingdon's multiple streams theory explain the decision-making process for the passage of universal Pre-K legislation in Oklahoma? Do the patterns in the model match the patterns provided in this study? Finally, does Kingdon's model provide an analytical approach that is not discussed in the literature?

The information presented in this case suggests that all the elements present in multiple streams theory—a problem, a solution, a changed political climate, with a policy entrepreneur to connect it all together—are present in this case. This suggests that Kingdon's model does explain the decision-making process for Oklahoma's Pre-K

policy. And, we would miss all these aspects of the policy process if we fail to utilize Kingdon. Furthermore, the multiple streams model provides a dimension of analysis that is not present in the literature because other accounts of Oklahoma's Pre-K Story do not explore any of the components that make up multiple streams theory. Yet, these components, as the evidence has shown, are present in this case and crucial to the understanding of it.

I fully recognize that the applicability of multiple streams theory to this case is based on the information I was able to collect. I relied primarily on Eddins' recollection of the events that immediately preceded the passage of universal Pre-K legislation in 1998 and was not able to speak directly with others who may have been involved in the policy process. Thus, this study and the subsequent theoretical framework are shaped in large part by Eddins' personal story. Nevertheless, the multiple streams theory contributes to the body of literature regarding Oklahoma's universal Pre-K legislation.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

After conducting research for this project, I had lingering questions about the entire legislative process that led to the passage of House Bill 1654. As state legislators begin to introduce bills that address universal Pre-K, it is critical that they have a clear understanding of how to possible strategies to employ to ensure that the bill makes it through both the House and Senate. This is particularly important in light of President Obama's proposal for a joint federal/state partnership, which hinges on the fact that states will adhere to high quality standards. The case of Oklahoma is similar in that the high

quality standards were already written into the law, so the issue became how to get the House and Senate to agree to the standards for all children.

Since I did not have the opportunity to speak with Senator Penny Williams, it was unclear exactly what role she played in the story. It would have been useful to have her perspective in order to understand how the bill made it through the Senate. I am also interested in understanding why she decided to support the bill. In Eddins' case, he had a keen understanding of the value of high quality Pre-K as well the financial implications of having four-year-olds enrolled in kindergarten. Eddins suggested that few legislators really understand the state's funding formula, but I wonder if Williams understood it and if that impacted her decision to serve as the Senate author, or did she have other information that influenced her? Also, Eddins, elected in 1995, was a junior legislator, while Williams was first elected in 1981. Given her experience with the legislative system, she certainly had a different perspective and strategy for getting bills passed.

I am also unclear as to why there was concern that Governor Keating might veto House Bill 1654 as well as what influenced him so that he ultimately did not veto the bill. Thus, I would like to know exactly how governors make decisions about education, especially early childhood education.

Finally, given reports that Oklahoma is struggling to find enough certified teachers for Pre-K classrooms, another potential area of research is to study how the state is addressing this particular teacher shortage. Nationally, there is a dearth of math and science teachers, and states are utilizing various polices and strategies to address that shortage. Thus, the question is what is being done to ensure that potential teachers are

attracted to the profession of teaching, and specifically teaching young children. Furthermore, the addition of Pre-K into the school system suggests that school principals must possess an understanding of developmentally appropriate practices for early childhood education. As states respond to President Obama's call for universal Pre-K, identifying school leadership qualities that are essential for early childhood leaders will be of the upmost importance.

In summary, the story of how Oklahoma, one of the most conservative states in the nation, came to have a high quality program that also reaches a large number of four-year-olds in the state is very curious. House Bill 1657 was passed in large part due to the work of Joe Eddins, but it would not have been possible if not for the groundwork laid by early childhood advocates who came before him. The case of Oklahoma has several implications for other states that are seeking to legislate universal Pre-K. First, it is imperative to have an advocate in the legislature that is willing to persist until the bill is passed, even if it takes a few years. Second, the program must be of high quality, and those standards need to be embedded in the school formula. Third, working with early childhood advocates is crucial. Finally, other states should also be aware that Oklahoma's story represents a perfect storm, where various factors arose at the same time and opened the window of opportunity that allowed for the passage of universal Pre-K. Thus, it would appear that that it is impossible to replicate Oklahoma's strategy. Rather, other states should consider how to work within their contexts to create their own perfect storms.

LESSONS LEARNED

When I began researching this topic, I hoped that my research would produce a blueprint for other states seeking to have high quality universal Pre-K. However, it is clear that the unique aspects of the Oklahoma story means it would be impossible for other states to replicate Oklahoma's strategies. Nevertheless, my research taught me the importance of policy entrepreneurs, especially in the early childhood education policy arena. President Obama's call for universal Pre-K means that the subject is at the forefront of the policy agenda—for now. Time will only tell how long it will remain at the forefront and it is my sincere hope that the Joe Eddins, Bob Harbisons, and Ramona Coats of today will continue to push for what is best for our country's youngest children.

After conducting my research, I was struck by the amount of research Eddins (with the help of Bob Harbison) conducted to gain a better understanding of research-based best practices for early childhood education. I believe that this knowledge truly helped Eddins to not only craft the bill, but also gave him the energy he needed to work to ensure that the bill was passed; he genuinely understood the implications his bill would have on the lives of children in the state for generations to come.

Appendix A

Interview Protocol

I am interested learning about the period leading up to the creation of the universal Pre-K program in Oklahoma. As you know, the statewide program was created in 1998. Therefore, I am interested in the years leading up to the 1998 passage of the law. I am particularly interested in why Oklahoma became one of the first states to create a universal pre-K program and hearing your perspectives on this topic.

First, can you tell me your full name, current title, and the name of the place where you currently work? And how long have you been at this position?

1. What position(s) did you hold in the mid- to late-1990s, just before the universal Pre-K program was created in Oklahoma?
2. How many years have you been working on issues related to early childhood education?
3. In your opinion, what was the driving force(s) behind the development of universal Pre-K in Oklahoma?
4. What do you remember as the key events that led to the passage of legislation for universal Pre-K?
5. Do you think Oklahomans have "bought into" the notion of universal Pre-K? Why or why not?
6. Why has universal Pre-K endured in Oklahoma?
7. Why did Oklahoma decide on a universal rather than targeted Pre-K program?

8. Many liberal states and states that are similar to Oklahoma do not have universal Pre-K. What makes Oklahoma unique?
9. What are the reasons various groups with different priorities and agendas have been able to come together around this issue?
10. What do you think are the key issues facing Pre-K in Oklahoma today?
11. Finally, do you have anyone else you recommend I speak with about the development of Pre-K in Oklahoma?

Appendix B

Letter to Potential Participants

Dear _____:

My name is Christian Bell and I am currently a doctoral student at the University of Texas at Austin. I am working on my dissertation, which is analyzing 1998's House Bill 1657. I have begun preliminary research but have questions about the context of the bill and as the bill's co-author, you are the perfect person to answer my questions. I met Dr. Steven Barnett this summer and he also suggested that I reach out to you to understand more about the passage of HB 1657.

While I currently reside in Texas, I was born and raised in Tulsa and graduated from Booker T. Washington High School. I attended Head Start as a child and strongly believe in the power of high quality early childhood education. I am proud of many things done in the state of Oklahoma, and the state's commitment to high quality early childhood education for all students is certainly at the top of the list. I strongly believe the story behind the passage of HB 1657 needs to be told and I would appreciate any insight you can offer.

I am planning to come to Oklahoma the week of October 15. Are you available to meet for about an hour at any time that week? I have enclosed my card which contains my contact information. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best,

Christian

Appendix C

Oklahoma House Bill 1720

ENROLLED HOUSE
BILL NO. 1720

By: Larason of the House

and

Long (Ed), Williams (Penny) and Cole of the Senate

An Act relating to schools; amending 70 O.S. 1991, Section 1-114, as amended by Section 4, Chapter 262, O.S.L. 1992 (70 O.S. Supp. 1992, Section 1-114), which relates to school attendance age; requiring certain testing and approval for early kindergarten attendance; including certain children in average daily membership; amending 74 O.S. 1991, Section 840.8, as last amended by Section 72 of Enrolled Senate Bill No. 31 of the 1st Session of the 44th Legislature, which relates to unclassified service positions; modifying enrollment requirement for students employed part-time; providing an effective date; and declaring an emergency.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA:

SECTION 1. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 1991, Section 1-114, as amended by Section 4, Chapter 262, O.S.L. 1992 (70 O.S. Supp. 1992, Section 1-114), is amended to read as follows:

Section 1-114. A. All children between the ages of five (5) years on or before September 1, and twenty-one (21) years on or before September 1, shall be entitled to attend school free of charge in the district in which they reside. Provided that children who have reached the age of five (5) years on or before September 1 of the school year may be admitted to kindergarten classes approved by the State Board of Education. Beginning with the 1990-91 school year, all children who are at least four (4) years of age on or before September 1 and who have not attended a public school kindergarten shall be entitled to attend early childhood programs at any public school in the state where such programs are offered; provided no child shall be required to attend any early childhood education program. Children who meet the qualifications for federally sponsored Head Start programs shall be entitled to attend free of charge and shall be given priority for acceptance into the early childhood programs over children who do not meet the qualifications for the federally sponsored Head Start programs. Those children who do not meet the qualifications for a federally sponsored Head Start program shall be accepted into a program based on the date of receipt of application and upon payment of a sliding scale tuition which shall be set by the local board of education of the district where the child has applied to attend. For purposes of calculation of State Aid, no child in an early childhood education program who does not meet the qualifications

for federally sponsored Head Start programs shall be included in the average daily membership of the district providing the program. For those early childhood program students who qualify to be included in the average daily membership of the school district for State Aid funding, the weight shall be limited to the early childhood grade weight, as provided in Section 18-201 of this title, for purposes of reimbursement for early childhood programs. Except as otherwise provided by law, no child shall be enrolled in the first grade unless he or she will have reached the age of six (6) years on or before September 1 of the school year. Children who have not reached the age of five (5) years on or before September 1 may be admitted to nursery or early childhood education classes approved by the State Board of Education and conducted by the school district in which the child resides. A child accepted for enrollment in an early childhood education program outside of the district of residence shall be eligible for transfer to a district where such program is offered. Provided, however, any receiving district may object to a proposed transfer on the grounds that said district does not have the physical facilities or the teaching personnel to accommodate the kindergarten student, early childhood education student or students proposed to be transferred. Children who are underage not in attendance in a kindergarten or nursery or early childhood education class approved by the State Board of Education may be admitted to the schools of such district if class size of such schools permit and if the child is found to be ready for enrollment in kindergarten through appropriate readiness screening, as provided for in Section 1210.282 of this title, and if the enrollment of the child is approved by a psychometrist. Those underage children who qualify and are admitted in a kindergarten class of a school district shall be included in the average daily membership of the school district for State Aid funding, as provided for in Section 18-201 of this title. No such nonresident and nontransferred pupil shall be allowed to attend school in any school district unless there shall have been paid in advance yearly or by semester as determined by the local board of education, to such district, before such attendance during any period, a tuition fee equal to the per capita cost of education for a similar period in such district during the preceding year. Provided, tuition shall not be required for attendance in the first grade if an underage child was authorized pursuant to this section to attend an accredited kindergarten in the same school district, and such first grade attendance shall be a legal attendance. If the State Board of Education discovers that such attendance has been allowed without prior payment of the tuition fee in advance as herein required, no further payment of any State Aid Funds shall be made to the district until such district has shown to the satisfaction of the State Board of Education that all such tuition fees have been paid or that such tuition pupil will no longer be allowed to attend school until the required tuition fee has been paid.

B. Any parent, guardian, person or institution having care and custody of a child who pays ad valorem tax on real property in any other school district other than that in which he resides may, with the approval of the receiving board, enroll the child in any school district in which ad valorem tax is paid and receive a credit on the nonresident tuition fee equal to the amount of the ad valorem tax paid for school district purposes in the school district in which the child is enrolled. Provided, the credit shall not exceed the total amount required for the tuition payment.

SECTION 2. AMENDATORY 74 O.S. 1991, Section 840.8, as last

amended by Section 72 of Enrolled Senate Bill No. 31 of the 1st Session of the 44th Oklahoma Legislature, is amended to read as follows:

Section 840.8 The following offices, positions, and personnel comprise the exempt unclassified service:

1. Persons chosen by popular vote or appointment to fill an elective office, and their employees, except the employees of the Corporation Commission, the State Department of Education and the Department of Labor;

2. Members of boards and commissions, and heads of agencies; also one principal assistant or deputy and one executive secretary for each state agency;

3. All judges, elected or appointed, and their employees;

4. Federally funded time-limited employees hired for the specific purpose of providing public service employment or one-time special or research project services for a limited period of time and shall not exceed the period of time for which that specific federal funding is provided;

5. All officers and employees of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, State Board of Education and State Department of Vocational and Technical Education;

6. Persons employed in a professional or scientific capacity to make or conduct a temporary and special inquiry, investigation, or examination on behalf of the Legislature or a committee thereof or by authority of the Governor;

7. Election officials and employees;

8. Temporary employees employed to work less than one thousand (1,000) hours in any twelve-month period. This category of employees shall include persons employed on an intermittent, provisional, seasonal, temporary or emergency basis;

9. Temporary lake patrol officers, regardless of the number of hours worked, who are employed by the Department of Public Safety during the period March 16 through October 31 in any calendar year; provided, the hours worked shall be considered in determining the temporary employee's eligibility for subsequent employment in any other unclassified temporary employment category;

10. Professional trainees only during the prescribed length of their course of training or extension study;

11. Students who are employed on a part-time basis, which shall be seventy-five percent (75%) of a normal forty-hour work week or thirty (30) hours per week, or less, or on a full-time basis if the employment is pursuant to a cooperative education program such as that provided for under Title I IV-D of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a-1087c), as amended, and who are regularly enrolled in ~~(a)~~:

a. an institution of higher learning within The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education ~~(b)~~,

b. an institution of higher learning qualified to become coordinated with said State System of Higher Education ~~(c) for~~. For purposes of this act a student shall be considered a regularly enrolled student if he or she is enrolled in a minimum of five (5) hours of accredited graduate courses or a minimum of ten (10) hours of accredited undergraduate courses, provided, however, the student shall only be required to be enrolled in a minimum of six (6) hours of accredited undergraduate courses during the summer, and such student is regularly attending classes during that semester of employment, or

c. Driver Educational Electronics Technician,
d. Media Technical Assistants,
e. Executive Secretaries,
f. Accounting Supervisor,
g. Supervisor of Records,
h. Supervisor of Printing Services,
i. Migrant Records Transfer System Representative,
j. Financial Managers, and
k. in addition to the State Department of Education offices and positions listed in this paragraph, any and all offices and positions within the State Department of Education for which the annual salary is Twenty-one Thousand Nine Hundred Forty-three Dollars ($21,943.00) or more shall also be in the unclassified service of this state.

Nothing in this paragraph is intended to change the status, whether classified or unclassified, of any person employed by the Department of Education prior to May 1, 1989. No position shall become unclassified while it is occupied by a classified employee because of any change in salary or grade. Hereafter, any position paid an annual salary of Twenty-one Thousand Nine Hundred Forty-three Dollars ($21,943.00) or more shall be in the unclassified service upon being vacated;

20. At the option of the employing agency, the Supervisor, Director, or Educational Coordinator in any other state agency having a primary responsibility to coordinate educational programs operated for children in state institutions;

21. Bill Willis Community Mental Health Center personnel occupying the following offices and positions:
a. Director of Facility,
b. Deputy Director for Administration,
c. Clinical Services Director, and
d. Executive Secretary to Director;

22. The State Comptroller, Office of the Director of State Finance;

23. Employees of the Oklahoma Development Finance Authority;

24. Those positions so specified in the annual business plan of the Department of Commerce;

25. Those positions so specified in the annual business plan of the Oklahoma Center for the Advancement of Science and Technology;

26. The following positions and employees of the Oklahoma School of Science and Mathematics:
a. positions for which the annual salary is Twenty-four Thousand One Hundred Ninety-three Dollars ($24,193.00) or more, as determined by the Office of Personnel Management, provided no position shall become unclassified because of any change in salary or grade while it is occupied by a classified employee,
b. positions requiring certification by the State Department of Education, and
c. positions and employees authorized to be in the unclassified service of the state elsewhere in this section or in Section 840.10 of this title;

27. State Insurance Fund personnel occupying the following offices and positions:
a. Commissioner,
b. Deputy Commissioner,
c. Administrative Assistants to the Commissioner,

~~(d)~~

c. high school students regularly enrolled in a high school in Oklahoma and regularly attending classes during such time of enrollment;

12. The spouses of personnel who are employed on a part-time basis to assist or work as a relief for their spouses in the Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Department;

13. Service substitute attendants who are needed to replace museum and site attendants who are unavoidably absent. Service substitutes may work as part-time or full-time relief for absentees for a period of not more than four (4) weeks per year in the Oklahoma Historical Society sites and museums; such substitutes will not count towards the agency's Full-Time-Equivalent Employee Limit;

14. Employees of State Capitol cafeterias;

15. Employees of either the House of Representatives or the State Senate;

16. Grand River Dam Authority personnel occupying the following offices and positions:

a. the general manager, assistant general managers, secretaries to the general manager, and assistant general managers,
b. the chief engineer and the engineers, superintendents, and assistant superintendents,
c. the general counsel and the attorneys on the general counsel's staff,
d. the secretary,
e. the treasurer,
f. rate analysts, and
g. unclassified employees hired prior to May 1, 1989, who hold engineering job titles but who are not registered engineers, provided said persons are reassigned nonengineering job titles. At such time as the positions occupied by said unclassified employees are vacated, the positions shall revert to the classified service;

17. Oklahoma Tax Commission personnel occupying the following offices and positions:

a. all revenue administrators, the budget officer and the comptroller of the Tax Commission,
b. all administrators and unit managers in the Management Information Services Division,
c. all Computer Programming Systems Specialist positions,
d. all Data Processing Programmer Analyst Supervisor and Data Processing Programmer Analyst III positions,
e. all Public Affairs Officer and Assistant Public Affairs Officer positions,
f. Public Information Officer, and
g. all Tax Economist positions;

18. Corporation Commission personnel occupying the following offices and positions:

a. administrative assistant, administrative aides, and executive secretaries to the Commissioners,
b. Directors of all the divisions, and
c. General Counsel;

19. State Department of Education personnel occupying the following offices and positions:

a. Administrative Assistants,
b. Informational Representatives III,

d. Executive Secretaries to the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner,
e. Law Clerks and Legal Assistants,
f. Special Counsel,
g. General Counsel,
h. Medical Analysts Supervisor,
i. Medical Analysts,
j. Field Adjusters,
k. Investment Officer, and
l. Collections Attorneys;

28. The Carl Albert Internship Program Coordinator within the Office of Personnel Management;

29. Department of Corrections personnel occupying the following offices and positions:
a. Associate Director,
b. Executive Secretary,
c. General Counsel,
d. Assistant General Counsel,
e. Deputy Director,
f. Public Information Officer,
g. Personnel Manager,
h. Administrator of Planning and Research,
i. Administrator of Finance and Accounting,
j. Executive Assistant,
k. Administrator of Information Services,
l. Affirmative Action Officer,
m. System Development Manager,
n. Computer Operations Manager,
o. Training Director,
p. Assistant Training Director,
q. Administrator of Construction and Maintenance,
r. Administrative Assistant,
s. Secretary,
t. Administrator of Classification and Programs,
u. Coordinator of Facility Classification,
v. Mediation Coordinator,
w. Inspector General,
x. Medical Director,
y. Psychiatrist,
z. Physician,
aa. Optometrist,
ab. Dental Services Supervisor,
ac. Dentist,
ad. Psychologist,
ae. Administrator of Dietary Services,
af. Warden I,
ag. Warden II,
ah. Warden III,
ai. Deputy Warden I,
aj. Deputy Warden II,
ak. Deputy Warden III,
al. Community Treatment Center Superintendent,
am. Community Treatment Center Assistant Superintendent,
an. Probation and Parole District Supervisor,
ao. Probation and Parole Assistant District Supervisor,
ap. Administrator of Human Resources,
aq. Facility Staffing Pattern Analyst,
ar. Correctional School Superintendent,

as. Regional Director,
at. Assistant Regional Director,
au. Chief of Operations, and
av. Chief Psychologist;

30. Department of Corrections personnel occupying the following offices and positions as representatives of the Oklahoma State Industries:

a. Administrator of Industrial Production,
b. Administrator of Agriculture Production,
c. OSI Sales Representative,
d. OSI Sales Manager, and
e. Marketing Manager.

The positions listed in this paragraph shall be funded from the Department of Corrections Industries' Revolving Fund only. In addition to the regular salary, any unclassified sales representative of the Oklahoma State Industries of the Department of Corrections who is responsible for obtaining a contract for products manufactured or services provided by prison industries may, at the discretion of the Director of the Department of Corrections, be awarded additional compensation of not more than five percent (5%) of the total amount of said contracts but not more than Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000.00) per year. This compensation may be in addition to the salary of the employee and may be paid in one lump sum from any funds available to the Department of Corrections. No such compensation shall be made unless funds are available. Funds for payment of any compensation awards shall be encumbered to the extent of the awards.

Incumbents in positions listed in paragraph 29 of this section and in this paragraph that are classified under the Merit System of Personnel Administration on the effective date of this act shall have the option of remaining in their classified status under the Merit System of Personnel Administration. Incumbents that choose to accept unclassified appointments shall so signify in writing. All future appointees to these positions shall be unclassified. Incumbents that choose to remain in the classified service under the Merit System of Personnel Administration shall be subject to all rules and procedures of the Merit System of Personnel Administration. By the end of the first full work week of each month, the Director of the Department of Corrections shall submit to the Director of State Finance a report listing the total number of part-time employees employed during the preceding month, the positions for which they were employed, and the number of hours worked for each part-time position;

31. Department of Labor personnel occupying the following offices and positions:

a. Deputy Commissioner,
b. Executive Secretary to the Commissioner,
c. Chief of Staff, and
d. Administrative Assistant, Legal;

32. The State Bond Advisor and his employees;

33. The Oklahoma Employment Security Commission employees occupying the following positions:

a. Associate Director,
b. Secretary to the Associate Director, and
c. Assistant to the Executive Director;

34. Oklahoma Human Rights Commission personnel occupying the position of Administrative Assistant; and

35. The officers and employees of the State Banking Department.

SECTION 3. This act shall become effective July 1, 1993.

SECTION 4. It being immediately necessary for the preservation of

the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is hereby declared to exist, by reason whereof this act shall take effect and be in full force from and after its passage and approval.

Passed the House of Representatives the 19th day of May, 1993.

Speaker of the House of Representatives

Passed the Senate the 24th day of May, 1993.

President of the Senate

Appendix D

Oklahoma House Bill 1657

ENROLLED HOUSE
BILL NO. 1657

By: Eddins, Boyd (Laura), Hager and Deutschendorf of the House

and

Williams and Cain of the Senate

An Act relating to schools; amending 70 O.S. 1991, Section 1-114, as last amended by Section 1, Chapter 220, O.S.L. 1994 (70 O.S. Supp. 1997, Section 1-114), which relates to school attendance; allowing for half-day and full-day early childhood education programs; deleting certain eligibility criteria; deleting certain provisions for priority admission; deleting tuition requirement; providing for State Aid; deleting provisions for certain underage children in kindergarten and first grade relating to admittance, class size, tuition, transfer, residence and screening; deleting certain developmental assessments of certain children; specifying age for admission into kindergarten; amending 70 O.S. 1991, Section 11-103.7, as amended by Section 2, Chapter 205, O.S.L. 1994 (70 O.S. Supp. 1997, Section 11-103.7), which relates to early childhood education programs; modifying certain requirements; directing the State Board of Education to promulgate early childhood education standards; modifying relationship requirement to certain Head Start programs; requiring school districts to give certain advance notice; deleting obsolete language; amending 70 O.S. 1991, Section 18-107, as last amended by Section 1, Chapter 215, O.S.L. 1996 (70 O.S. Supp. 1997, Section 18-107), which relates to definitions for State Aid; including early childhood education programs in average daily attendance; amending 70 O.S. 1991, Section 18-111, which relates to school attendance; changing methodology in determining State Aid to average daily membership; lowering age of legal attendance to four years of age; modifying specification of underage pupil; amending Section 6, Chapter 215, O.S.L. 1996, as amended by Section 5, Chapter 343, O.S.L. 1997 (70 O.S. Supp. 1997, Section 18-201.1), which relates to State Aid formula weights; deleting certain conditions for certain pupil grade level weights; deleting certain pupil grade level weights; adding certain pupil grade level weight for full-day early childhood education program; deleting prohibition for State Aid for certain students; repealing 70 O.S. 1991, Sections 1210.101, 1210.102, 1210.103, 1210.103A and 1210.104, which relate to kindergarten; providing an effective

Children who are accepted in a program outside their district of residence as provided in this paragraph ~~and who are Head Start-eligible shall be entitled to attend the early childhood program free of charge and~~ shall be included in the average daily membership of the district providing the program for State Aid funding subject to the State Aid formula weight limitations ~~as~~ set forth in paragraph 1 of this subsection. ~~Children eligible for transfer as provided in this paragraph who are not Head Start-eligible shall pay tuition on a sliding scale set by the district offering the program.~~

C. ~~Underage children, defined as children who have reached the age of four (4) years but have not reached the age of five (5) years on or before September 1 of the school year, may be admitted to kindergarten subject to the provisions of the following paragraphs:~~

~~1. Underage children may be admitted to kindergarten classes in the district of the child's residence if class size of the district permits. An underage child who is a resident of the district shall not be required to pay tuition. Underage resident children who are admitted to kindergarten classes shall be included in the average daily membership of the district for State Aid funding, as provided in Section 18-201 of this title.~~

~~2. Underage children may be admitted to kindergarten classes in a district other than the district of the child's residence if the class size of the district permits and the district of residence and the nonresident district agree to the transfer. If a transfer is agreed upon, the underage child shall be included in the average daily membership of the receiving district for State Aid funding, as provided in Section 18-201 of this title. If the districts do not agree to a transfer, the child shall not be allowed to attend kindergarten classes in the nonresident district unless a tuition fee is paid as set forth in subsection E of this section.~~

~~3. Prior to admittance in kindergarten classes a school district may through appropriate screening determine if the underage child is ready for enrollment in kindergarten classes.~~

~~D. Except as otherwise provided by law, no~~ No child shall be enrolled in kindergarten unless he or she will have reached the age of five (5) years on or before September 1 of the school year. No child shall be enrolled in the first grade unless he or she will have reached the age of six (6) years on or before September 1 of the school year. ~~Children who have not reached the age of six (6) years on or before September 1 of the school year, who were admitted to a kindergarten class as underage children, who have satisfactorily completed kindergarten and who have been recommended for promotion to first grade shall be permitted to enroll in first grade. Underage children who are enrolled in first grade shall be included in the average daily membership of the school district for State Aid funding, as provided in Section 18-201 of this title.~~

~~E.~~ D. No nonresident and nontransferred pupil shall be allowed to attend school in any school district unless a tuition fee equal to the per capita cost of education for a similar period in such district during the preceding year has been paid to the receiving district in advance yearly or by semester as determined by the district board of education of the receiving district. If the State Board of Education discovers that such attendance has been allowed without prior payment of the tuition fee in advance as required, no further payment of any State Aid Funds shall be made to the district until such district has shown to the satisfaction of the State Board of Education that all such tuition fees have been paid or that such tuition pupil will no longer be allowed to attend school until the required tuition fee has

date; and declaring an emergency.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA:

SECTION 1. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 1991, Section 1-114, as last amended by Section 1, Chapter 220, O.S.L. 1994 (70 O.S. Supp. 1997, Section 1-114), is amended to read as follows:

Section 1-114. A. All children between the ages of five (5) years on or before September 1, and twenty-one (21) years on or before September 1, shall be entitled to attend school free of charge in the district in which they reside.

B. All children who are at least four (4) years of age but not more than five (5) years of age on or before September 1 and who have not attended a public school kindergarten shall be entitled to attend half-day or full-day early childhood programs at any public school in the state where such programs are offered; provided no child shall be required to attend any early childhood education program. The following paragraphs shall govern ~~admission to and eligibility for~~ early childhood programs:

1. Children who are at least four (4) years of age but not more than five (5) years of age on or before September 1 ~~who meet the qualifications for federally sponsored Head Start programs~~ shall be entitled to attend either half-day or full-day early childhood programs in their district of residence free of charge ~~and shall be given priority for acceptance into the early childhood programs over children who do not meet the qualifications for the federally sponsored Head Start programs. Children who are at least four (4) years of age but not more than five (5) years of age on or before September 1 who do not meet the qualifications for a federally sponsored Head Start program shall be accepted into an early childhood program in their district of residence~~ as long as the district has the physical facilities and teaching personnel to accommodate the child. ~~Admission of children who are not Head Start-eligible shall be based on the date of receipt of application and upon payment of a sliding scale tuition which shall be set by the district board of education.~~ For purposes of calculation of State Aid, children in an early childhood education program ~~who meet the qualifications for federally sponsored Head Start programs~~ shall be included in the average daily membership of the district providing the program. ~~For those early childhood program students who qualify to be included in the average daily membership of the school district for State Aid funding, the weight shall be limited to the early childhood grade weight, as provided in Section 18-201 of this title, for purposes of reimbursement for early childhood programs.~~

2. A child who has not reached the age of five (5) years on or before September 1 and who resides in a district which does not offer an early childhood program shall be eligible for transfer to a district where an early childhood program is offered if the district that offers the early childhood program agrees to the transfer. A district offering early childhood programs may refuse to accept a nonresident child if the district does not have the physical facilities or teaching personnel to accommodate the child in an early childhood education class. If the child requesting the transfer has not reached the age of four (4) years on or before September 1, the district may refuse to accept the nonresident child if the district determines the child is not ready for an early childhood program.

been paid.

~~F.~~ E. Any parent, guardian, person or institution having care and custody of a child who pays ad valorem tax on real property in any other school district other than that in which ~~he~~ that person resides may, with the approval of the receiving board, enroll the child in any school district in which ad valorem tax is paid and receive a credit on the nonresident tuition fee equal to the amount of the ad valorem tax paid for school district purposes in the school district in which the child is enrolled. Provided, the credit shall not exceed the total amount required for the tuition payment.

SECTION 2. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 1991, Section 11-103.7, as amended by Section 2, Chapter 205, O.S.L. 1994 (70 O.S. Supp. 1997, Section 11-103.7), is amended to read as follows:

Section 11-103.7 A. ~~The State Department of Education shall develop standards for early childhood education programs for children who are at least four (4) years of age on or before September 1 of the ensuing school year.~~ Each school district may offer to four-year-old children the opportunity to participate in an early childhood education program.

B. The State Board of Education shall promulgate standards for early childhood education programs for children who are at least four (4) years of age on or before September 1 of the ensuing school year. The standards shall include both half-day programs consisting of not less than two and one-half (2 1/2) hours per school day, and full-day programs of six (6) hours. The standards for all early childhood programs shall require a certified teacher, as specified in this section, to be present in the classroom for the length of the school day. Such program shall:

1. Be directed toward developmentally appropriate objectives for such children, rather than toward academic objectives suitable for older children;

2. ~~Be offered in addition to, rather than supplant, federally sponsored Head Start classes; and~~

~~3.~~ Accommodate the needs of all children and families regardless of socioeconomic circumstances~~.~~; and

~~C. The program shall require~~ 3. Require that any teacher employed by a public school to teach in such early childhood education program shall be certified in early childhood education.

C. The superintendent of any school district providing classroom space or other school facilities for a federally sponsored Head Start program that is planning to make a material change in the arrangement, shall give notice to the director of the Head Start program at least seven (7) days prior to a school board hearing on the matter.

D. A school district may offer such early childhood education program within the district, in cooperation with other districts, through the use of transfers as specified by law, or by contracting with a private or public provider of early childhood education programs. If the program is provided through contract with a private or public provider other than a school district, the contract may only be continued if each teacher serving the school on and after January 1, 1993, is certified in Early Childhood Education, except that all teachers, without such certification, hired by such provider prior to January 1, 1993, and serving in the school as an early childhood education teacher shall be required to obtain certification on or before the beginning of the 1996-97 school year. Any person who has been employed as an early childhood educator with the Head Start Program, has a child development associate degree (CDA) and has at least five (5) years of experience in such employment shall be

certified in early childhood education for purposes of employment in the public schools of this state to teach in early childhood education for children four (4) years of age and younger; if such person is recertified in child development by the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition within five (5) years prior to the expiration of the person's early childhood certificate that was issued by the State Board of Education, such person shall be granted a renewal certificate in early childhood education by the State Board of Education upon expiration of the early childhood certificate. Provided, private or public providers shall meet such other standards required by law and by the State Board of Education.

E. The State Board of Education shall promulgate rules ~~and regulations~~ to provide for the implementation of such program.

F. ~~On and after the effective date of this section, the~~ The term "pre-kindergarten" shall mean early childhood education for purposes of this title.

SECTION 3. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 1991, Section 18-107, as last amended by Section 1, Chapter 215, O.S.L. 1996 (70 O.S. Supp. 1997, Section 18-107), is amended to read as follows:

Section 18-107. As used in this title:

1. "Average Daily Attendance" (ADA) means the legal average number of pupils, ~~kindergarten~~ early childhood education programs through grade twelve, in a school district during a school year as determined pursuant to the provisions of Section 18-111 of this title. A day of school for early childhood education programs and kindergarten shall be at least two and one-half (2 1/2) hours and, for early childhood education, may be six (6) hours.

2. "Average Daily Membership" (ADM) means the average number of pupils present and absent in a school district during a school year. Average Daily Membership shall be calculated by dividing the sum of the pupil's total days present and total days absent by the number of days taught. Provided, a pupil who has been absent without excuse ten (10) consecutive days shall be taken off the roll beginning the eleventh day and thereafter shall not be considered in a district's average daily membership calculation until the pupil is placed on the roll in the district. For the purpose of this paragraph, consecutive days means days for which enrollment is recorded.

3. "Total Adjusted Assessed Valuation" means the sum of public service property assessed valuation, personal property assessed valuation and real property assessed valuation as adjusted pursuant to the provisions of Section 18-109.1 of this title.

4. "Eighty-five percent (85%) of maximum allowable", for the purpose of assessing class size penalty pursuant to Sections 18-113.1 and 18-113.2 of this title, means eighty-five percent (85%) of ten percent (10%) of the preceding year's net assessed valuation of a school district. The calculation of indebtedness as provided for in paragraph a of subsection G of Section 18-113.1 and subparagraph a of paragraph 4 of subsection A of Section 18-113.2 of this title shall include the outstanding principal amount of bonds issued by the school district plus the principal amount of any bonds authorized by a vote of the people for issuance but not yet issued by the school district.

SECTION 4. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 1991, Section 18-111, is amended to read as follows:

Section 18-111. No pupil shall be counted in the average daily ~~attendance~~ membership of any district for the purpose set out in this article unless said pupil is a legal resident of said district as provided for in Section 1-113 of this title or has been transferred to said district. A pupil moving from a school district during a school

term shall be entitled to attend such school for the remainder of that school term. School districts shall not include out-of-state pupils in their average daily ~~attendance~~ membership for the purpose set out in this article. The following pupils shall not be counted: Those who have attained twenty-one (21) years of age by September 1 of that school year, or who have completed the twelfth grade, except as elsewhere provided for by law for veterans of World War II, the Korean War, or the Vietnam Conflict, and those who have not attained ~~five (5)~~ four (4) years of age by September 1 of that school year. In determining the ages of pupils for State Aid purposes, birth certificates shall be presented, if obtainable, as proof of age. Underage pupils in kindergarten and first grade who have been in legal school attendance in a public or private school in another state or in a Department of Defense School for military dependents may be legally enrolled and attend an Oklahoma school.

SECTION 5. AMENDATORY Section 6, Chapter 215, O.S.L. 1996, as amended by Section 5, Chapter 343, O.S.L. 1997 (70 O.S. Supp. 1997, Section 18-201.1), is amended to read as follows:

Section 18-201.1 A. Beginning with the 1997-98 school year, and each school year thereafter, the weighted membership of a school district for calculation of Foundation Aid purposes pursuant to paragraph 1 of subsection D of Section 18-200.1 of this title shall be the sum of the weighted pupil grade level calculation, the weighted pupil category calculation, the weighted district calculation and the weighted teacher experience and degree calculation. The weighted membership of a school district for calculation of Salary Incentive Aid purposes pursuant to paragraph 3 of subsection D of Section 18-200.1 of this title shall be the sum of the weighted pupil grade level calculation, the weighted pupil category calculation, the weighted district calculation, and the weighted teacher experience and degree calculation.

B. The weighted calculations provided for in subsection A of this section shall be based on the highest weighted average daily membership of the first nine (9) weeks of the current school year, the preceding school year or the second preceding school year of a school district, unless otherwise specified. The highest of the three (3) weighted average daily memberships shall be used consistently in all of the calculations. The average daily membership data used for all calculations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this subsection shall be the same as used in the calculation of the State Aid Formula. The weighted calculations provided for in subsection A of this section shall be determined as follows:

1. The weighted pupil grade level calculation shall be determined by taking the highest average daily membership and assigning weights to the pupils according to grade attended as follows:

	GRADE LEVEL	WEIGHT
a.	~~Early~~ Half-day early childhood programs~~, contingent upon the enactment of Enrolled House Bill No. 1657 of the 1st Session of the 46th Oklahoma Legislature~~	.7
b.	~~Underage students enrolled in kindergarten for the 1997-98 school year, contingent upon the enactment of Enrolled House Bill No. 1657 of the 1st Session of the 46th Oklahoma Legislature~~	~~1.3~~
c.	~~Underage students enrolled in~~	

		~~kindergarten beginning with the 1998-99 school year, contingent upon the enactment of Enrolled House Bill No. 1657 of the 1st Session of the 46th Oklahoma Legislature~~	~~.7~~
		Full-day early childhood programs	1.3
~~d.~~	c.	Kindergarten	1.3
~~e.~~	d.	First and second grade	1.351
~~f.~~	e.	Third grade	1.051
~~g.~~	f.	Fourth through sixth grade	1.0
~~h.~~	g.	Seventh through twelfth grade	1.2
~~i.~~	h.	Out-of-home placement	1.45

Multiply the membership of each subparagraph of this paragraph by the weight assigned to such subparagraph of this paragraph and add the totals together to determine the weighted pupil grade level calculation for a school district. Determination of the pupils eligible for the early childhood program weight shall be pursuant to the provisions of Section 1-114 of this title. ~~No child for whom tuition is paid pursuant to the provisions of Section 1-114 of this title may be included in the membership count of the school district providing the early childhood program.~~ The pupils eligible for the out-of-home placement pupil weight shall be students who are not residents of the school district in which they are receiving education pursuant to the provisions of subsection D of Section 1-113 of this title. Such weight may be claimed by the district providing educational services to such student for the days that student is enrolled in that district. If claimed, the out-of-home placement weight shall be in lieu of the pupil grade level and any pupil category weights for that student. Provided, if a student resides in a juvenile detention center that is restricted to less than twelve (12) beds, the out-of-home placement pupil weight for such students shall be calculated as follows: for a center with six (6) beds - 2.9; for a center with eight (8) beds - 2.2; and for a center with ten (10) beds - 1.74.

2. The weighted pupil category calculation shall be determined by assigning a weight to the pupil category as follows:

	CATEGORY	WEIGHT
a.	Vision Impaired	3.8
b.	Learning Disabilities	.4
c.	Hearing Impaired	2.9
d.	Deaf and Blind	3.8
e.	Educable Mentally Handicapped	1.3
f.	Emotionally Disturbed	2.5
g.	Gifted	.34
h.	Multiple Handicapped	2.4
i.	Physically Handicapped	1.2
j.	Speech Impaired	.05
k.	Trainable Mentally Handicapped	1.3
l.	Bilingual	.25
m.	Special Education Summer Program	1.2
n.	Economically Disadvantaged	.25
o.	Optional Extended School Year Program	As determined by the State Board of Education

Except as otherwise provided, multiply the number of pupils approved in the school year with the highest average daily membership in each

category by the weight assigned to such category and add the totals together to determine the weighted pupil category calculation for a school district. For the 1996-97 school year, the number to be multiplied by the weight assigned to the gifted category in subparagraph g of this paragraph shall be the lesser of (1) the sum of the number of students who scored in the top three percent (3%) on any national standardized test of intellectual ability plus the number of students identified as gifted pursuant to subparagraphs a through d of paragraph 1 of Section 1210.301 of this title or (2) the sum of the number of students who scored in the top three percent (3%) on any national standardized test of intellectual ability plus eight percent (8%) of the total average daily membership of the school district for the preceding school year. For the 1997-98 school year and subsequent school years, the number to be multiplied by the weight assigned to the gifted category in subparagraph g of this paragraph shall be the lesser of (1) the sum of the number of students who scored in the top three percent (3%) on any national standardized test of intellectual ability plus the number of students identified as gifted pursuant to subparagraphs a through d of paragraph 1 of Section 1210.301 of this title, or (2) the sum of the number of students who scored in the top three percent (3%) on any national standardized test of intellectual ability plus eight percent (8%) of the total average daily membership of the school district for the first nine (9) weeks of the school year.

3. The weighted district calculation shall be determined by determining the calculations for each school district for both the small school district formula and the district sparsity - isolation formula, applying whichever is the greater of the calculations of the two formulas and then applying the restrictions pursuant to subparagraph c of this paragraph.

a. Small school district formula: 529 minus the average daily membership divided by 529 times .2 times total average daily membership.

The small school district formula calculation shall apply only to school districts whose highest average daily membership is less than 529 pupils. School districts which are consolidated or annexed after August 19, 1991, pursuant to the Oklahoma School Consolidation and Annexation Act shall have the weighted district size calculation for the two (2) school years following the fiscal year in which such consolidation occurred calculated to be the sum of the individual consolidated districts computed as if the consolidation had not taken place. Thereafter, any such district which is consolidated pursuant to the Oklahoma School Consolidation and Annexation Act shall not qualify for the weighted district calculation unless the district can satisfy the specifications herein. Subject to the provisions of subparagraph c of this paragraph, the resulting number shall be counted as additional students for the purpose of calculating State Aid.

b. District sparsity - isolation formula:

The district sparsity - isolation formula calculation shall apply only to school districts:

(1) whose total area in square miles is greater than the average number of square miles for all school districts in this state; and

(2) whose areal density is less than one-fourth (1/4) of the state average areal density. Areal density

shall be determined by dividing the school district's average daily membership by the school district's total area in square miles.

The district sparsity - isolation formula calculation shall be calculated as follows:

The school district student cost factor multiplied by the school district area factor. The resulting product shall be multiplied by the school district's average daily membership. Subject to the provisions of subparagraph c of this paragraph, the resulting number shall be counted as additional students for the purpose of calculating State Aid.

The school district student cost factor shall be calculated as follows:

The school district's average daily membership shall be categorized into the following grade level groups and applied to the appropriate formulas as computed below:

Grade Level Group	
Grades K-5	Divide 74 by the sum of the Grade Level ADM plus 23, add .85 to the quotient, then multiply the sum by the Grade Level ADM.
Grades 6-8	Divide 122 by the sum of the Grade Level ADM plus 133, add .85 to the quotient, then multiply the sum by the Grade Level ADM.
Grades 9-12	Divide 292 by the sum of the Grade Level ADM plus 128, add .78 to the quotient, then multiply the sum by the Grade Level ADM.

The sum of the grade level group's average daily membership shall be divided by the school district's average daily membership. The number one (1.0) shall be subtracted from the resulting quotient.

The school district area cost factor shall be calculated as follows:

Subtract the state average district area from the district area, then divide the remainder by the state average district area;

however, the district area cost factor shall not exceed one (1.0).

The State Board of Education shall define geographical barriers whose location in a school district would inhibit the district from consolidation or annexation. The Board shall make available an application process, review applications, and for districts the Board deems necessary allow additional square miles to be used for the purposes of calculations used for the weighted district sparsity - isolation formula. Provided, that the additional square miles allowed for geographical barriers shall not exceed thirty percent (30%) of the district's actual size.

c. State Aid funds which a district is calculated to receive as a result of the weighted district calculation shall be restricted as follows:

If, after the weighted district calculation is applied, the district's projected per pupil revenue

exceeds one hundred fifty percent (150%) of the projected state average per pupil revenue, then the district's State Aid shall be reduced by an amount that will restrict the district's projected per pupil revenue to one hundred fifty percent (150%) of the projected state average per pupil revenue. Provided, in applying the restriction provided in this division, the district's State Aid shall not be reduced by an amount greater than by the amount of State Aid which was generated by the weighted district calculation.

The July calculation of the projected per pupil revenue shall be determined by dividing the highest of the district's preceding two years average daily membership (ADM) as weighted by the pupil grade level, the pupil category, the district and the teacher experience degree index calculations for projected State Aid into the district's projected total revenues including projected funds for the State Aid Formula for the preceding year, net assessed valuation for the preceding calendar year times thirty-nine (39) mills, county revenues excluding the county four-mills revenues for the second preceding year, other state appropriations for the preceding year and the collections for the preceding year of state apportionment, motor vehicle revenue, gross production tax and R.E.A. tax.

The December calculation of the projected per pupil revenue shall be determined by dividing the highest of the district's first nine (9) weeks of the current school year or the two preceding school years average daily membership (ADM) as weighted by the pupil grade level, the pupil category, the district and the teacher experience degree index calculations for projected State Aid into the district's projected total revenues including funds for the December calculation of the current year State Aid Formula, net assessed valuation for the current calendar year times thirty-nine (39) mills, county revenues excluding the county four-mills revenue for the preceding year, other state appropriations for the preceding year and the collections for the preceding year of state apportionment, motor vehicle revenue, gross production tax and R.E.A. tax.

The district's projected total revenues for each calculation shall exclude the following collections for the preceding year: federal revenue, insurance loss payments, reimbursements, recovery of overpayments and refunds, unused reserves, prior expenditures recovered, prior year surpluses, and other local miscellaneous revenues.

4. The weighted teacher experience and degree calculation shall be determined in accordance with the teacher experience and degree index. The State Department of Education shall determine an index for each state teacher by using data supplied in the school district's teacher personnel reports of the preceding year and utilizing the index as follows:

	TEACHER EXPERIENCE - DEGREE INDEX		
EXPERIENCE	BACHELOR'S	MASTER'S	DOCTOR'S

	DEGREE	DEGREE	DEGREE
0 - 2	.7	.9	1.1
3 - 5	.8	1.0	1.2
6 - 8	.9	1.1	1.3
9 - 11	1.0	1.2	1.4
12 - 15	1.1	1.3	1.5
Over 15	1.2	1.4	1.6

The school district teacher index for each school district shall be determined by subtracting the weighted average state teacher from the weighted average district teacher. Multiply the school district teacher index if greater than zero by .7 and then multiply that product by the sum of the district's weighted pupil grade level calculation provided in paragraph 1 of this subsection and the weighted pupil category calculation provided in subparagraph n of paragraph 2 of this subsection to determine the weighted teacher experience and degree calculation.

SECTION 6. REPEALER 70 O.S. 1991, Sections 1210.101, 1210.102, 1210.103, 1210.103A and 1210.104, are hereby repealed.

SECTION 7. This act shall become effective July 1, 1998.

SECTION 8. It being immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is hereby declared to exist, by reason whereof this act shall take effect and be in full force from and after its passage and approval.

Passed the House of Representatives the 6th day of May, 1998.

Speaker of the House of Representatives

Passed the Senate the 7th day of May, 1998.

President of the Senate

Appendix E

Article in *The Daily Oklahoman* that lists several bills from the 1998 legislative session that affected Oklahoma's children

Group Lauds Democrats for Backing Child-Friendly Laws

By Penny Owen
Staff Writer

A state child advocacy group called the 1998 legislative session a "mixed bag" for child-related issues but named 42 legislators — all Democrats — as scoring perfectly in favor of bills that affected Oklahoma children.

"It seemed we took two steps forward and one step back," said Anne Roberts, executive director for the Oklahoma Institute for Child Advocacy.

The institute noted that all seven items on its 1998 "Agenda for Children" passed the state House and Senate, but two of the bills were vetoed by Gov. Frank Keating.

Those vetoed bills were: House Bill 3292, which would have used federal funds to raise the age of children eligible for Medicaid from age 14 to 18; and Senate Bill 1018, which would have raised the number of children who could be kept in day-care homes from seven to 12.

Legislation which did become law this session includes:

✔ House Bill 2828, the so-called "Bunk Bed Safety Act," which requires manufacturers to close the space between the guard rail and bed frame to prevent choking or hanging;

✔ House Bill 1657, which gives 4-year-old children the option of attending an early childhood program in schools;

✔ House Bill 2474, which increases reimbursement and provides tax credits for child care providers of babies with special needs;

✔ Senate Bill 923 and House Bill 3065, which appropriated $7.9 million to the Children First program and $700,000 to the Healthy Families program;

✔ House Bill 2965, which requires the state Department of Human Services to adopt a new priority system for investigating child abuse and neglect;

✔ House Bill 2826, which provides foster parents more training and support and more stringent eligibility requirements;

✔ Senate Bill 1224, which brings Oklahoma into compliance with the new federal Adoption and Safe Families Act.

The advocacy group named the following senators, who are all Democrats, as outstanding legislators: Ben Brown, Keith Leftwich and Bernest Cain of Oklahoma City; Gilmer Capps of Snyder; Kevin Easley of Broken Arrow; Ted Fisher of Sapulpa; Berry Harrison of Fairfax; Sam Helton of Lawton; Brad Henry of Shawnee; Rick Littlefield of Grove; Paul Muegge of Tonkawa; and Herb Rozell of Tahlequah.

Democratic representatives were: Jari Askins of Duncan; Gary Bastin of Del City; Loyd Benson of Frederick; Debbie Blackburn, Kevin Cox, Al Lindley and William Paulk of Oklahoma City; Laura Boyd and Wallace Collins of Norman; James Covey of Custer City; Abe Deutschendorf of Lawton; Mary Easley, Darrell Gilbert and Shelby Satterfield of Tulsa; Joe Eddins of Vinita; Lloyd Fields of McAlester; Bobby Frame of Checotah; Jim Glover of Elgin; James Hager of Pawhuska; Joe Hutchison of Jay; Ron Kirby of Lawton; Mike Mass of Hartshorne; Phil Ostrander of Collinsville; Bob Plunk of Ada; Mark Selkel of Harrah; Dale Smith of St. Louis; J.T. Stites of Sallisaw; Gary Taylor of Dewey; Dale Turner of Holdenville and Mike Tyler of Sapulpa.

Glossary

- **Child Care**: regularly scheduled non—parental care for children of diverse ages that usually takes place outside the child's home
- **Head Start/Early Head Start (EHS)**: Federally funded, national programs that promote school readiness by enhancing the social and cognitive development of children (from birth to age five) through the provision of educational, health, nutritional, social and other services to enrolled children and families.
- **Pre-K**: A non-compulsory, formal, classroom-based learning environment that a child customarily begins around the age of three or four in order to prepare for the more academically intensive kindergarten.
- **State-funded pre-school**: Programs that provide early childhood education to 3- and/or 4-year-olds and are largely funded, controlled, and directed at the state level, with some input at the local level
- **Targeted Pre-K**: Programs that offer services only to children with particular characteristics, or risk factors associated with high rates of school failure. Some states target services to all children in a geographic region where there is a high percentage of children with particular risk factors. Each state has a different list of risk factors for targeting resources, and some states define multiple risj factors but let local governments or school districts determine which ones to prioritize for services.

References

70 Oklahoma Statutes Annotated § 1-114, vol. 70. (2004). *Free attendance—admission to early childhood programs—enrollment in kindergarten and first grade—nonresident tuition fee*.

Abbott-Shim, M., Lambert, R., & McCarty, F. (2003). A comparison of school readiness outcomes for children randomly assigned to a Head Start program and the program's wait list. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 8,* 191–214.

Administration for Children and Families (2010). *Head Start program fact sheet: Fiscal year 2010*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ohs/about/fy2010.html.

Administration for Children and Families (1999, December 13). Head Start bests Mercedes-Benz and BMW in customer satisfaction. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Banchero, S. (2013, March 6). Public preschool's test case. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324539404578342514090722542.html.

Barnett, W. S. (2008). *Preschool education and its lasting effects: Research and policy implications*. Boulder and Tempe: Education and Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit.

Barnett, W.S., Carolan, M.E., Fitzgerald, J., & Squires, J.H. (2012). *The state of preschool 2012: State preschool yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.

Barnett, W.S., Robin, K., Hustedt, J., Shulman, K. (2003). *The state of preschool: 2003 state preschool yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.

Barnett, W.S., Hustedt, J.T., Robin, K.B., &Schulman, K.L. (2004). *The state of preschool: 2004 state preschool yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.

Barnett, W. S. (2001). Preschool education for economically disadvantaged children: Effects on reading achievement and related outcomes. In S. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (pp. 421-443). New York: Guilford Press.

Barnett, W.S. (1995). Long-term effects of early childhood programs on cognitive and school outcomes. *The Future of Children*, *5*, 25-47.

Barnett, W.S. & Ackerman, D.J. (2006): Costs, benefits, and long-term effects of early care and education programs: Recommendations and cautions for community developers. *Community Development*, *37*(2), 86-100.

Barnett, W.S., Epstein, D.J., Freidman, A.H., Sansanelli, R.A., Hustedt, & Hustedt, J.T. (2009). *The state of preschool: 2009 state preschool yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.

Barnett, W.S., Carolan, M.E., Fitzgerald, J., & Squires, J.H. (2011). *The state of preschool: 2011 state preschool yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.

Barnett, W.S., Epstein, D.J., Carolan, M.E., Fitzgerald, J., Ackerman, D.J., & Freidman, A.H. (2010). *The state of preschool: 2010 state preschool yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.

Beatty, B. (2004). Past, present, and future: what we can learn from the history of preschool education. *The American Prospect*, *15*(11), A3+. Retrieved from http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA124008036&v=2.1&u=txshracd2598&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w.

Beatty, B. (1995). *Preschool education in America: the culture of young children from the colonial era to the present*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Blood, M. (2000). *Our youngest children: Massachusetts voters and opinion leaders speak out on their care and education*. Boston: Stride Rite Foundation.

Burger, K. (2010). How does early childhood care and education affect cognitive development? An international review of the effects of early interventions for children from different social backgrounds. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *25*(2), 140-165.

Bushouse, B.K. (2009). *Universal preschool: policy change, stability, and the Pew Charitable Trusts*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Campbell, F.A., Ramey, C.T., Pungello, E., Sparlin, J., & Miller-Johnson, S. (2002).

Early childhood education: Young adult outcomes from the Abecedarian Project: *Applied Developmental Science, 6,* 42-57.

Cannon, J. S., & Karoly, L. A. (2007). *Who is ahead and who is behind? Gaps in school readiness and student achievement in the early grades for California children*. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Casteel, C. (1989, August 20). State lacks teachers for Lewis' proposal. *The Oklahoman*, p. 1.

Children's Defense Fund (2011). *The facts about full-day kindergarten*. Retrieved from http://www.childrensdefense.org/child-research-data-publications/data/the-facts-about-full-day.pdf.

Children's Defense Fund (2012). *Children in Oklahoma*. Retrieved from http://www.childrensdefense.org/child-research-data-publications/data/state-data-repository/cits/2012/2012-oklahoma-children-in-the-states.pdf

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *17*, 1-25.

Consortium for Longitudinal Studies (1983). *As the twig is bent: Lasting effects of preschool programs*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Currie, J., & Thomas, D. (1995). Does Head Start make a difference? *American Economic Review, 85,* 341–364.

Fuller, B. (2007). *Standardized childhood: The political and cultural struggle over early education*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Garces, E., Thomas, D., & Currie, J. (2002). Longer-term effects of Head Start. *American*

Economic Review, 92, 999–1012.

Gelbach, J. & Pritchett, L. (2002). Is more for the poor less for the poor? The politics of means-tested targeting. *Topics in Economic Analysis,2,*(1), 1027-1032.

George Kaiser Family Foundation. (2013). Early childhood learning. Retrieved from http://www.gkff.org/areas-of-focus/education/early-childhood-learning.html.

Glass, I. (2012, October 19). *Getting away with it*. [Radio broadcast]. Chicago, IL: Public Radio International. Retrieved from http://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/477/transcript.

Goffin, S. G. & Wilson, C. S. (2001). *Curriculum models and early childhood education: Appraising the relationship*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Goodson, B., & Moss, M. (1992). Analysis report: Predicting quality of early childhood classrooms. *Observational Study of Early Childhood Programs*. Boston: Abt Associates.

Gormley, W. T., Gayer, T., Phillips, D., & Dawson, B. (2005). The effects of universal pre-K on cognitive development. *Developmental Psychology*, *41*, 872-884.

Greiner, J. (1989, February 28). State senators OK education improvement bill. *The Oklahoman*, p. 12.

Guldbrandsson, K. & Fossum, B.2006. An exploration of the theoretical concepts policy windows and policy entrepreneurs at the Swedish public health arena. *Health Promotion International*, *24*(4), 434-444.

Heckman, J. (2000). Policies to foster human capital. *Research in Economics*, 54, 3-56.

Hoberock, B. (2011, May 4). 'Social promotion,' school grades bills signed by Oklahoma governor. Tulsa World. Retrieved from http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/article.aspx?subjectid=11&articleid=20110504_11_0_OKLAHO959915.

Karoly, L.A., Kilburn, M.R., & Cannon, J.S. (2006). Early childhood interventions: Proven results, future promise. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Kenyon, D.A. (2007). The property tax—school funding dilemma. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Kingdon, J. W. (1995) Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies. Longman, London.

Kirp, D. (2007). *The sandbox investment: The preschool movement and kids-first politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kjos, L. (2004). Study: *Preschool woefully lacking*. United Press International. http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2004/02/19/Study-Preschool-woefully-lacking/UPI-84821077166860/.

Krehbiel, R. (2010, January/February). Oklahoman of the year. *Oklahoma Today*, *60*, 38-43.

Kreider, R.M. & Ellis, R. (2011). Living arrangements of children: 2009. Washington, D.C. United States Census Bureau. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/p70-126.pdf.

Lascarides, V. C. & Hinitz, B. F. (2000). *History of early childhood education*. New York: Falmer Press.

Lerner, S. (2012, December 4). Pre-K on the range. *The American Prospect*. Retrieved

from http://prospect.org/article/pre-k-range.

Loeb, S., Fuller, B., Kagan, S. L., & Carrol, B. (2004). Child care in poor communities: Early learning effects of type, quality, and stability. *Child Development, 75*, 47–65.

Love, J. M., Kisker, E. E., Ross, C. M., Brooks-Gunn, J., Schochet, P., & Boller, K. (2002). *Making a difference in the lives of infants and toddlers and their families: The impacts of early Head Start*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

Lugg, C. (2006). On politics and theory: Using an explicitly activist theory to frame educational research. In V. A. J. Anfara & N. Mertz (Eds.), *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lynch, R.G. (December, 2007). *The cost effectiveness of public investment in high-quality prekindergarten: A state level synthesis*. Unpublished paper presented at Human Capital Conference Series on Early Childhood Development, Minneapolis, MN.

Lynch, R.G. (2004). *Exceptional returns: Economic, fiscal, and social benefits of investment in early childhood development*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.

Maxwell, J.A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

McCarton, C. M., Brooks-Gunn, J., Wallace, I. F., & Bauer, C. R. (1997). Results at age

8 years of early intervention for low-birth-weight premature infants: The Infant Health and Development Program. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 277,* 126–132.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education; Revised and expanded from case study research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Institute for Early Education Research (2004). The universal vs. targeted debate: Should the United States have preschool for all? Retrieved from http://nieer.org/resources/policybriefs/6.pdf.

NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1999). Child outcomes when child care center classes meet recommended standards for quality. *American Journal of Public Health, 89,* 1072–1077.

NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2000). The relation of child care to cognitive and language development. *Child Development, 71,* 960–980.

NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2002). Child care structure, process, outcome: Direct and indirect effects of child care quality on young children's development. *Psychological Science, 13,* 199–206.

NICHD Early Child Care Research Network & Duncan, G. Y. (2003). Modeling the impacts of child care quality on children's preschool cognitive development. *Child Development, 74,* 1454–1475.

Obama, B. (2013, February). *Remarks by the president in the state of the union address*.

Speech presented at Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/02/12/remarks-president-state-union-address.

Office of Head Start (2010, February 1). Head Start program fact sheet fiscal year 2009. Retrieved from http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/Head%20Start%20Program/Head%20Start%20Program%20Factsheets/eHeadStartProgr.htm.

Oklahoma Institute for Child Advocacy, & Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families (2004). *Rural kids count! Sharing stories and statistics from Oklahoma and Arkansas*. Retrieved from Oklahoma Department of Libraries website: http://www.odl.state.ok.us/kids/factbook/ruralkidscount2004/index.html.

Oklahoma State Department of Education Data/Research Services. (1994a). 1992-1993 application for accrediting—membership as of October 1, 1992.

Oklahoma State Department of Education Data/Research Services. (1994b). 1993-1994 application for accrediting—membership as of October 1, 1993.

Oklahoma State Department of Education Data/Research Services. (1995). 1994-1995 application for accrediting—membership as of October 3, 1994.

Oklahoma State Department of Education Data/Research Services. (1996). 1995-1996 application for accrediting—membership as of October 2, 1995.

Oklahoma State Department of Education Data/Research Services. (1997). 1996-1997 application for accrediting—membership as of October 1, 1996.

Oklahoma State Department of Education Data/Research Services. (1998). 1997-1998

application for accrediting—membership as of October 1, 1997.

Olsen, D.A. (1999). *Universal preschool is no golden ticket: Why government should not enter the preschool business*. Cato Policy Analysis No. 333. Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute.

Owens, P. (1998). Group lauds Democrats for backing child-friendly laws. *The Oklahoman*, p. 9.

Pax World/NHSA Survey (2003, September 4). *More than 9 out of 10 Americans support existing Head Start program*. Washington, D.C.: Pax World Funds.

Peisner-Feinberg, E. S., Burchinal, M. R., Clifford, R. M., Culkin, M. L., Howes, C., & Kagan, S. L. (2001). The relation of preschool child-care quality to children's cognitive and social developmental trajectories through second grade. *Child Development, 72,* 1534–1553.

Pemberton, T. (2011, May 9). Inasmuch Foundation announces $5.23M in grants. *NewsOk*. Retrieved from http://newsok.com/inasmuch-foundation-announces-5.23m-in-grants/article/3566165.

Phillips, D. A., Voran, M., Kisker, E., Howes, C., & Whitebook, M. (1994). Child care for children in poverty: Opportunity or inequity? *Child Development, 65,* 472–492.

Ramey, C. T., & Ramey, S. L. (2004). Early learning and school readiness: Can early intervention make a difference? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *50*, 471-491.

Rolland, M. (2012, February 16). Oklahoma Senate passes Personhood Act, saying life

begins at conception. *NewsOK*. Retrieved from: http://newsok.com/oklahoma-senate-passes-personhood-act-saying-life-begins-at-conception/article/3649308#ixzz1rqwzg1nj

Ross, B. (2010, July 10). All-day pre-k needed for Oklahoma City Public Schools. *NewsOK*. Retrieved from http://newsok.com/all-day-pre-k-needed-for-oklahoma-city-public-schools/article/3474839.

Sabatier, P. A. (Ed.) (1999). *Theories of the Policy Process: Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Sabatier, P. A. & Jenkins-Smith, H. (Eds). (1988). Special Issue: Policy change and policy-oriented learning: Exploring an advocacy coalition framework. *Policy Sciences*, *21*, 123-278.

Salisbury, D. (2002, January 9). Preschool is no answer. *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/news/comment/2002/01/10/ncoppf.htm.

Sawhill, I.V. (1999). Early education: A national priority. *Brookings Roundtable Report. Policy Brief #1*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Schweinhart, L., Barnes, H., Weikart, D., Barnett, W. S., & Epstein, A. (1993). *Significant benefits: Vol. 10. The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study through age* 27. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Schweinhart, L.J., Berrueta-Clement, J. R., Barnett, W.S., Epstein, A.S., & Weikart, D.P. (1984). *Changed lives: The effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 19*. Monographs of the High/Scope Educational Research

Foundation, Number Eight. Ypsilanti, Michigan: Monograph Series, High/Scope Foundation.

Seefeld, C., & Barbour, N. (1986). Early *childhood education: An introduction*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Snyder, A. (1972). *Dauntless women in childhood education 1856-1931*. Washington, D. C.: Association for Childhood Education International.

The White House, Office of the Press Secretary. (2011). U.S. Department of Education proposes dedicated office for early learning. [Press release]. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-proposes-dedicated-office-early-learning.

The White House, Office of the Press Secretary. (2013). Fact sheet President Obama's plan for early education for all Americans. [Press release]. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/02/13/fact-sheet-president-obama-s-plan-early-education-all-americans.

True, J. L., Jones, B. D., & Baumgartner, F. R. (1999). Punctuated-equilibrium theory. In P.A. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process: Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy* (pp. 97-116). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

United States Department of Education. (n.d.). *Race to the top – early learning challenge executive summary*. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/early-learning/elc-draft-summary.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2006a). *What is Early Head Start:*

Eligibility criteria. Retrieved from http://www.ehsnrc.org/AboutUs/ehs.htm#EligibilityCriteria

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2006b). *About Head Start*. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/hsb/about/index.htm.

U.S. Department of Labor (2011). Women in the labor force: A databook. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/cps/wlf-databook-2011.pdf.

White, K., & Casto, G. (1985). An integrative review of early intervention efficacy studies with at-risk children: Implications for the handicapped. *Analysis and Intervention in Developmental Disabilities*, *5,* 7–31.

Wolfe, J. (2000). *Learning from the past: Historical voices in early childhood education*. Mayerthorpe, Alberta, Canada: Piney Branch Press.

Votruba-Drzal, E., Coley, R. L., & Chase-Lansdale, P. L. (2004). Child care and low-income children's development: Direct and moderated effects. *Child Development, 75,* 296–312.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study and research design methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Zigler, E., Gilliam, W.S., & Jones, S.M. (2006). *A vision for universal preschool education*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Zigler, E. & Muenchow, S. (1992). *Head Start: The inside story of America's most successful educational experiment*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Vita

Christian Marie Bell was born and raised in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and graduated from Booker T. Washington High School. After graduating from high school, she began studies at Spelman College. She graduated from Spelman College in 2004 with a B.A. in psychology. She then entered graduate school at the University of California, Santa Barbara, where she earned her M.A. in Education (with an emphasis in Child and Adolescent Development) in June 2005. Christian had the honor of teaching first grade students at Coop Elementary School in Houston, Texas. In August 2009, immediately after leaving the classroom, Christian began her doctoral program in the department of Educational Administration at the University of Texas at Austin.

Permanent email: cmariebell@utexas.edu

This dissertation was typed by the author.