



Analysis of Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Head Start Performance Standards

August 2015

In June 2015, the Federal Register published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for the Head Start Performance Standards, the federal regulations governing the operation of Head Start programs. This is the first major revision of the Performance Standards since 1998, and the first complete restructuring since their creation, some 40 years ago. The proposed rule seeks to update the Performance Standards to reflect numerous developments that have occurred in the past 17 years, including a reauthorization of the Head Start Act in 2007 and new research findings on how young children learn and on the characteristics of quality early childhood programs.

The proposed changes would significantly improve the Performance Standards by prioritizing outcomes over process; emphasizing quality education in Head Start programs; increasing the amount of time preschoolers spend in Head Start; implementing research-based strategies for parent engagement, professional development, and mental health consultation; and strengthening alignment with other early childhood and education programs. They would also reorganize, streamline, and clarify the Performance Standards, which piecemeal additions and changes over the past 40 years have rendered overly complicated and confusing.

These proposed changes would raise the quality of practice in Head Start and improve child outcomes. But they also have real limitations. The Head Start Act prohibits the Secretary from reducing the number, scope, or type of comprehensive services that Head Start programs must provide. As a result, the proposed rule still requires Head Start programs to do too many things. And, despite efforts to streamline and reduce bureaucratic requirements, it remains prescriptive about how programs provide many required services. The final rule should seek to further streamline the requirements imposed on Head Start programs—and the following analysis offers some suggestions for how to do so. But the limitations imposed by statute underscore the need for a serious and bold conversation about Head Start reauthorization.

Some of the changes in the proposed rule have significant costs, and would require extensive changes in the operation of Head Start programs. While the benefits of improved quality in Head Start justify the costs, how the Office of Head Start supports the implementation of the proposed rule may be as important as the rule itself.

This document provides an overview and analysis of the key changes in the proposed rule and offers recommendations to improve on proposed changes. It consists of six sections. The first provides background information on the Head Start Performance Standards and why they matter. The second gives a high-level overview of key themes and major changes in the proposed rule. The third describes the limitations of the proposed rule, and the fourth section addresses issues related to the cost and implementation of the proposed changes. The fifth

section summarizes the major changes in the structure of the standards, and the sixth section contains a detailed summary and analysis of proposed changes in each section, as well as recommendations for improvements. Finally, an appendix provides examples of areas where the proposed rule would reduce bureaucratic demands on programs, as well as new requirements it would impose.

In keeping with Bellwether's own core competencies and [mission](#) focused on improving educational outcomes for high-need students, this analysis focuses primarily on provisions related to the quality of early childhood education services in Head Start programs. While we recognize the crucial importance of Head Start's health, oral health, and nutrition services for at-risk children, and the interconnection of all domains of young children's development, we also recognize that we are not experts in health and nutrition. Similarly, this analysis does not focus on provisions related to governance, finances, facilities, transportation, or federal administrative procedures for Head Start programs, except insofar as we believe they directly impact programs' ability to provide high-quality early learning and development services to high-need youngsters.

Background

The Head Start Performance Standards define the elements of a high-quality and comprehensive Head Start program and serve as the basis for program monitoring. Because of Head Start's unique federal-to-local grantee structure, they have much more influence over the day-to-day operation of Head Start programs than typical federal education policies do on the operation of schools or other early childhood programs.

The Head Start Performance Standards are best understood not as a standalone document, but in the context of two other documents:

- [The Head Start Act](#): The Head Start Act is the federal legislation that authorizes Head Start and establishes statutory requirements for Head Start programs. In 2007, Congress passed the [Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act](#) (subsequently referred to in this document as the 2007 Head Start Act), which reauthorized the Act and made significant changes in Head Start policies. These include increased education and training requirements for Head Start staff and the creation of the [designation renewal system \(DRS\)](#).¹ The Act authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services to modify the Head Start Performance Standards by regulation, but any such modifications must comply with the provisions of the Head Start Act. Although the Secretary has significant authority to change requirements for *how* programs deliver services to children and families, the Act does not allow the Secretary to reduce or eliminate requirements for *what* health, education, parent involvement, nutrition, social, or other services programs must offer.
- [Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework](#): The Head Start Performance Standards outline expectations for Head Start programs—not for children. The Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework outlines expectations for children's learning and development. In June 2015, in conjunction with the release of the proposed performance standards, the Administration for Children and Families also released a new and expanded version of the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework that includes learning outcomes for the entire birth-to-five continuum and provides additional

information on developmental progressions toward key indicators of children's development and learning.

Summary and Key Themes

Numerous changes in the proposed rule would improve the quality of Head Start programs and support improved outcomes for children:

Prioritizing outcomes over process: The current Performance Standards require programs to make a lot of plans for how they will deliver services or address certain issues—but they don't pay much attention to how programs implement those plans or the results they produce. The revised Performance Standards ditch or deemphasize plans in favor of requiring programs to set goals, measure progress towards goals, and adjust strategies based on progress. This approach pushes Head Start programs to implement cycles of data-informed continuous improvement, rather than focusing on paperwork. A new subsection of the Performance Standards specifically addresses programs' systems for ongoing continuous improvement,² but the focus on using data to improve outcomes is integrated throughout the proposed rule.

Strengthening education in Head Start programs: The proposed rule maintains all the comprehensive services that Head Start currently provides to children and families, as the statute requires. But several proposed changes would increase Head Start's focus on improving children's learning and development outcomes. The current performance standards provide a lot of detail about how programs must provide comprehensive services and much less on the quality of educational services. Curriculum, for example, is mentioned only three times in the current education standards. The proposed rule fundamentally overhauls the education and child development standards to provide a much clearer picture of what high-quality early childhood education looks like in Head Start programs. Where current standards offer a haphazard list of topics that children should learn and programs should provide,³ the proposed rule intentionally focuses on four areas of practice that research shows are associated with improved learning in early childhood programs:

- **teaching and the learning environment,**
- **curriculum,**
- **assessment, and**
- **parent engagement.**⁴

In each of these areas, the proposed rule outlines specific program practices that reflect what research tells us matters to support children's learning. Parent engagement and family services provisions also much more clearly frame the goal of parent engagement activities around building parents' confidence and skills to support their children's learning and development.⁵ By focusing intentionally on the core teacher and program practices that support young children's learning, these standards seek to improve educational outcomes in Head Start.

Research-based strategies to improve child outcomes: The draft Performance Standards are deeply rooted in the research on early childhood, and many proposed changes are informed by recent research on how children learn and the kinds of experiences and interactions that support learning. Key changes—increased dosage requirements, increased focus on curriculum and effective teaching practices, teacher coaching, and emphasis on parents' skills and self-confidence to promote their children's learning—reflect this research:

- **Increasing dosage to support school readiness for high-need kids:** The proposed rule more than doubles the minimum required length of day and year for Head Start preschool programs.⁶ This would significantly increase the amount of time that many children spend in Head Start. Research suggests a direct relationship between the amount of time that children spend in early learning programs and how much they learn.⁷ The children that Head Start serves, who are among the most at-risk, need intensive dosages of early learning opportunities in order to help them narrow the gap with their peers and enter school ready to succeed. Other provisions would also increase the time Head Start children spend learning. For example, provisions that require programs to track individual children's attendance and intervene to address instances of chronic absenteeism would reduce the amount of learning time lost to absence,⁸ as would provisions limiting the use of suspension.⁹
- **Education and development:** As noted above, the proposed education and child development standards emphasize research-based practices in four core areas that research shows are associated with learning in early childhood programs. Standards for teaching and the learning environment,¹⁰ for example, reflect research showing the importance and characteristics of high-quality adult-child interactions in early childhood settings.¹¹ Similarly, curriculum standards¹² reflect growing evidence that a content-rich curriculum, organized in a coherent scope and sequence, can significantly increase young children's learning in early childhood programs.¹³
- **Parent engagement and support:** Parents play a crucial role in enabling young children's learning, but research suggesting that simply engaging parents or providing information may not be sufficient. To change parents' behavior and improve child outcomes, programs must build parental skills and confidence.¹⁴ Reflecting this, the proposed Performance Standards emphasize building parents' confidence and skills to support children's learning as a central goal for parent engagement activities. Unlike the current standards, the proposed rule requires programs to use a research-based parenting curriculum to build parents' skills and confidence.¹⁵
- **Professional development:** Research shows that ongoing, job-embedded professional development can lead to improvements in early childhood teaching and outcomes¹⁶ and is a common feature of the most effective early childhood programs.¹⁷ The Performance Standards seek to shift the focus of professional development for Head Start staff away from the one-shot workshops that are currently the norm in the early childhood field. Instead, they require programs to establish systematic approaches to professional development that focus on key elements of effective educational practice and include ongoing, job-embedded coaching for education staff.¹⁸

The proposed rule requires Head Start programs to implement research-based approaches, but it does not mandate a one-size-fits-all approach. Local programs will still need to choose their own research-based curricula and develop their own strategies for ensuring quality teaching and providing job-embedded professional development. The proposed rule also provides additional flexibility for programs to implement innovative models and alternative approaches. Head Start programs that wish to continue offering partial-day programs, for example, may receive waivers to do so, provided they can show that their proposed approach promotes children's learning and meets community needs.¹⁹ Programs that wish to develop or use new curriculum models may also do so, as long as they partner with a research organization to evaluate the impact of their approaches.²⁰ These options provide flexibility while also maintaining accountability and building knowledge for the broader field.

Strengthening alignment and coordination with other early childhood and education programs: The early childhood education field has evolved dramatically over the past 17 years. State-funded pre-k programs, Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS), and state longitudinal data systems all play a crucial role in early childhood education today—but many didn't exist when the standards were last revised. The proposed rule includes provisions to enhance alignment and coordination between Head Start and state pre-k,²¹ state educational data systems,²² and QRIS.²³ It also includes provisions to improve alignment between Head Start and K-12 public schools,²⁴ including improving coordination around children's transition to kindergarten and aligning services for children with disabilities with the provisions of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.²⁵

What the standards can't do

These individual changes are positive steps to raise the quality of practice in Head Start programs and use evidence-based strategies to improve child outcomes. But they also layer additional requirements on Head Start programs that are already highly regulated and spread too thin by numerous service and compliance requirements.

Over the course of Head Start's history, well-intentioned policymakers have responded to new challenges or sought to improve quality by adding new service, staffing, and documentation requirements for Head Start programs. While most of these requirements reflect valid concerns and needs, the collective impact of so many requirements makes it very difficult for Head Start programs to focus their work on a clear, shared vision for improving children's outcomes, or to prioritize resources for the uses most critical to achieving that vision.

In its education, parent engagement, professional development, and other provisions, the proposed rule seeks to promote a much more intentional focus on strategies and goals most associated with improved outcomes for children and families. It also includes changes that streamline the standards, eliminate excessive bureaucratic requirements and micromanagement, and reduce the amount of documentation and paperwork required of programs. But programs are still required to do too many things, undermining the very intentionality and focus the proposed rule seeks to promote.

To some extent, this is unavoidable, given that the Head Start Act prohibits the Secretary from reducing the range or scope of services that Head Start programs must provide.²⁶ While the proposed performance standards would support significant improvements in the quality of Head Start programs, achieving the true potential of these changes will require further changes that can only be made in legislation—underscoring the need for a serious and bold conversation about Head Start reauthorization.

Further, some proposed changes would impose new requirements on Head Start programs. Some—such as requirements to establish systems of continuous quality improvement²⁷—reflect core features of effective organizations that quality Head Start programs should already have in place. Others, however, add new requirements in response to problems that have arisen in a few programs,²⁸ or “codify best practices”²⁹ in the absence of rigorous evidence. Policymakers should resist the temptation to add such requirements. Even where new requirements are necessary to improve Head Start, they should focus on the outcomes that Head Start programs must produce rather than how they achieve those outcomes. The following detailed analysis identifies places where the proposed rule would impose new requirements on Head Start

programs, as well as opportunities to reduce or change burdensome or prescriptive requirements.

Cost and implementation considerations

Implementing all the requirements in the proposed standards will have significant costs. The regulatory impact analysis estimates a net cost of \$1.05 billion to implement all the proposed changes while maintaining current service and enrollment levels. The major drivers of increased costs are lengthening the Head Start day and year (\$1.05 billion) and requiring coaching for Head Start education staff (\$107 million). Several other provisions, such as flexibility in adult:child ratios for 2-year-olds, elimination of Head Start-created IEPs, and reductions in some bureaucratic and administrative requirements, would reduce costs (estimated total savings \$105 million).

Because Head Start is a discretionary program, any increase in funding is contingent on Congressional appropriations. In its fiscal year 2016 budget proposal, the Obama administration has requested a \$1.5 billion increase in Head Start funding, including \$1 billion to cover the costs of extending the Head Start day and year and \$500 million for Head Start-childcare partnerships. The Labor-HHS-Appropriations bills approved by the House Appropriations Committee and Senate subcommittee provide much smaller spending increases for Head Start, however: \$192 million in the House committee bill and \$100 million in the Senate subcommittee version. In the absence of significant infusions of federal resources, the costs of new requirements will require reducing the number of children served. The regulatory impact analysis estimates a reduction of 126,448 seats in both Head Start and Early Head Start,³⁰ or 14 percent of all Head Start seats.³¹

Ideally, the costs of improving quality in Head Start programs should be paid for through increased appropriations, improved efficiency from reduction in bureaucratic requirements, and redirection of resources from lower-impact to higher-impact services and activities, rather than by reducing in the number of children served. One reason to reduce the number of things that Head Start programs are required to do is to enable them to better focus resources to improve the quality of core services.

Whether the cost of increased quality comes from increased funding or reductions in services, however, the potential benefits justify them. The federal government spends more than \$8.6 billion on Head Start programs. Those investments are producing benefits for children and families, but evidence from high-performing programs and providers—in both Head Start³² and other publicly funded early childhood programs³³—suggests they could yield even greater returns for children and taxpayers. Federal policymakers must ensure that Head Start programs have the resources per-child that they need to provide the quality of teaching and intensity of services necessary to prepare at-risk children for success in school and life. Spreading resources too thin in order to serve more children only sets both programs and the children they serve up for failure.

The strong research base for the improvements in the proposed rule should motivate Congress to provide the resources necessary to implement them without reducing the number of children served. If, as is likely, it does not, federal officials must work with Head Start programs to reduce the number of slots in an orderly and thoughtful way that minimizes disruption for children and families. Federal officials should also work with Head Start programs, state leaders, and

philanthropy to identify opportunities to combine Head Start funds with other federal, state, local, and philanthropic funds to offer a full-day of quality services to children, as already happens in many of the highest-performing Head Start programs.

Beyond their costs, the proposed Performance Standards would require significant changes in the operations of many Head Start programs. This is particularly true for the 43 percent of programs where Head Start preschoolers currently receive less than 6 hours a day of services.³⁴ But changes and new requirements related to curriculum, provision of job-embedded coaching, mental health services, and parent engagement would require nearly all Head Start programs to change their practices in multiple key areas.

Implementing the proposed rule could require programs to simultaneously extend the day and year, adopt new curricula, implement new systems of coaching and professional development, overhaul their approaches to mental health supports, and adopt new parenting curricula—all within a single year. Experience, however, suggests that most organizations can successfully implement only a few major changes or initiatives at one time. Changing so many systems at once could also exacerbate staff burnout and turnover. While there is a clear urgency to improve practice in Head Start, it is important to implement changes strategically and in ways that maximize the chances of success. Programs that need to overhaul multiple aspects of their programs should be given additional time to allow them to focus on implementing a few changes at a time, with clear milestones for changes and progress in each year.

In developing implementation timelines and processes for new structural requirements, ACF should consider input from current programs, particularly from high-performing programs that have already implemented many of the practices that the standards call for and understand the time and resources required to implement them well.

Implementation timelines should also take into account the agency's own internal capacity to provide guidance and review and respond to local requests for waivers in a timely fashion. Programs seeking waivers need to know whether their requests are approved sufficiently in advance of the next school year to inform their budget and staffing plans.

Finally, agency officials will need to develop plans for how the agency will monitor many of the new requirements. Proposed changes in many subparts of the standards call for a shift in focus from paperwork, written plans, and checklists of activities, to focus on programs' outcomes and their systems for continuous improvement. But monitoring whether programs have effective systems is more complicated than monitoring whether they have specific documentation or completed specific activities. Thoughtful planning for oversight will be required to ensure that monitoring for the revised standards does not simply devolve into a new form of box-checking.

Reorganizing the Performance Standards

The Performance Standards were created 40 years ago, and have subsequently been amended or altered in a piecemeal way, creating a confusing structure. Related topics are addressed in different parts of the standards, and some provisions are redundant, unclear, or contradictory. The proposed rule would fundamentally reorganize the Performance Standards, creating a much more logical structure. It would also eliminate excess verbiage and clarify many provisions. This should make it easier for both current and prospective grantees to understand what they are required to do—and where they have flexibility.

Specifically, this reorganization would replace the existing 11 sections of the Head Start Performance Standards with five, several of which include multiple subparts.

New Organization of Performance Standards in Proposed Rule

- Section 1301: Program Governance
- Section 1302: Program Operations
 - Subpart A: Eligibility, Recruitment, Selection, and Enrollment
 - Subpart B: Program Structure
 - Subpart C: Education and Child Development Services
 - Subpart D: Health Program Services
 - Subpart E: Family and Community Partnership Services
 - Subpart F: Additional Services to Children with Disabilities
 - Subpart G: Transition Services
 - Subpart H: Services to Enrolled Pregnant Women
 - Subpart I: Human Resources Management
 - Subpart J: Program Management and Continuous Improvement
- Section 1303: Financial and Administrative Requirements
 - Subpart A: Financial Requirements
 - Subpart B: Administrative Requirements
 - Subpart C: Protection of Privacy of Child Records
 - Subpart D: Delegation of Program Operations
 - Subpart E: Facilities
 - Subpart F: Transportation
- Section 1304: Federal Administrative Procedures
 - Subpart A: Suspension, Termination, Denial of Refunding, Reduction in Funding, and their Appeals
 - Subpart B: Designation Renewal
 - Subpart C: Selection of Grantees through Competition
 - Subpart D: Replacement of American Indian/Alaska Native Grantee
 - Subpart E: Head Start Fellows Program
- Section 1305: Definitions

Analysis of Significant Changes

Section 1301: Program Governance

Parent engagement in program governance is a long-standing principle of Head Start programs and the proposed rule in no way changes that commitment. It does, however, make the following changes:

- **Eliminate requirements for Parent Committees at the center level** (programs are still required to include parents on policy committees at the program level).
- **Increase the length of time a parent may serve on a policy council** from 3 to 5 years (recognizing that Head Start serves children and families across the entire birth-to-five continuum).³⁵
- **Support data-informed continuous improvement** by requiring program governing bodies and policy councils to use ongoing results-monitoring, school readiness goals,

and other data produced by the program's data-informed continuous improvement processes to inform their decision-making.³⁶

Section 1302: Program Operations

This section is the core of the Performance Standards, outlining the education and comprehensive services that programs must provide to children and families, child eligibility criteria and enrollment processes, and the organizational systems and processes (such as human resources management and continuous improvement) that programs must have in place to support quality services. For that reason, this analysis focuses primarily on this section of the standards.

Subpart A: Eligibility, Recruitment, Selection, and Enrollment	
Major Proposed Changes	Commentary and Recommendations
<p>Community Needs Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increase timeline for community needs assessments to once every 5 years, rather than the current 3. This aligns with the new 5-year grant period for Head Start grants and reduces bureaucratic burden on programs.³⁷ ● New requirement for community needs assessment to consider other child development, childcare centers, and family childcare programs that serve eligible children, including home visiting and publicly funded state and local preschools.³⁸ Programs are expected to take into account other early childhood options in the community when developing their services. ● Eliminates requirement that services areas not overlap.³⁹ 	
<p>Eligibility and Selection: The proposed revisions do not change the eligibility criteria for children to participate in Head Start, but do clarify some issues related to how programs implement those criteria.</p> <p>A new provision requires programs in communities with high-quality, full-day, publicly funded pre-k to prioritize younger children for enrollment in Head Start.⁴⁰</p>	<p>Research shows that children in poverty benefit from experiencing multiple years of early childhood education, rather than just one.⁴¹ As state pre-k programs have expanded, Head Start programs are shifting to serve more 3-year-olds and, in some cases, converting slots from Head Start to Early Head Start.</p> <p>As publicly funded preschool and other early childhood services expand, Head Start programs should think strategically about how to work together with these programs to better meet community needs, maximize the combined impact of various early childhood funding streams, and</p>

	<p>increase the number of high-need children receiving quality learning experiences. But the requirement to prioritize younger children, as currently written, could encourage Head Start programs to simply shift slots to younger children. It could even be interpreted to prevent Head Start programs from combining Head Start and other public pre-k funds to better serve 4-year-olds, which should not be the intent.</p> <p>Many publicly funded pre-k programs do not even serve all eligible children, and some have lower quality standards than Head Start.⁴² Where this is the case, prioritizing younger children could result in some Head Start children receiving lower-quality services than they need at age 4—or none at all.</p> <p>It is also unclear whether the intent of this provision is that grantees prioritize serving 3-year-olds over 4-year-olds in existing Head Start slots, or that they seek approval to convert those slots to Early Head Start slots.</p> <p>The final rule should clarify that the intent is to encourage Head Start programs to take into account the existence of other public preschool programs in designing their services, and to identify opportunities to partner with or access funds from those programs so that more Head Start-eligible children receive two years of quality preschool. It should also clarify that Head Start programs are encouraged, and not prohibited, from combining pre-k and Head Start funds to better serve 4-year-olds in communities with widespread pre-k.</p>
<p>Attendance, Suspension, and Expulsion: 1302.16 establishes a new requirement that Head Start programs track attendance for each child, identify children who are chronically absent, and conduct outreach and provide support to their parents to improve attendance.</p> <p>Section 1302.17 encourages programs to limit use of exclusionary discipline, clarifies the circumstances under which a program may</p>	<p>Both the attendance and suspension provisions seek to increase the dosage of early learning services that Head Start children receive by minimizing time lost to absence or suspension. They also reflect research on the prevalence and negative impacts of chronic absence⁴³ and exclusionary discipline⁴⁴ in early childhood settings.</p>

<p>temporarily suspend a child, requires programs to provide mental health supports to suspended children and their parents, and prohibits use of expulsion.</p>	<p>The prohibition on expulsion does not prevent Head Start programs from removing a child to another placement if the child exhibits persistent and serious behavior challenges that pose a threat to safety of other children and cannot be effectively served in the Head Start setting.⁴⁵</p> <p>Requiring programs to track child-level attendance and respond to chronic absenteeism is a positive step, but the requirements to contact parents when a child has not arrived within 1 hour of program start time (1302.16(a)(1)) and to conduct home visits for frequently absent children (1302.16(a)(2)) seem overly prescriptive and would impose additional costs on programs.</p> <p>It would be preferable to modify 1302.16(b), which requires programs to manage systematic program attendance issues, to also require programs to track information on the number and percentage of children who are chronically absent. Programs whose rate of chronic absenteeism rises above a certain level should be required to take the same actions as programs whose average daily attendance rate falls below 85 percent. (Such a requirement could include an exemption for very small programs where a few children’s chronic absence could cause a program to exceed the threshold.) If programs are held accountable for their rates of chronic absenteeism, as suggested above, the agency should not need to mandate the specific steps they take to address it.</p> <p>The current language used to describe chronic absence, “if a child has four or more consecutive unexcused absences or is frequently absent,” is confusing: It is unclear if “consecutive” means four days in a row, that the four absences are not broken by an excused absence, or something else. This language is also subject to variation in how programs define “unexcused.” It would be preferable to</p>
--	---

	establish a clear definition of chronic absenteeism as a set number of days within a particular time period, whether or not they are “excused.”
<p>Encouraging socio-economic integration: Two new provisions in this subpart encourage delivery of Head Start services in socio-economically integrated classrooms that include children from non-poor backgrounds who are funded with non-Head Start funding sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1302.11(b)(viii)(3) requires programs to consider, in the community needs assessment, whether the characteristics of the community allow it to offer socio-economically diverse classes. • 1302.18(b)(1) clarifies that programs may charge fees to families who are not part of the Head Start-funded enrollment, in order to offer socio-economically-diverse classes. 	
<p>Subpart B: Program Structure: This subpart outlines the delivery models (known as “program options”) that Head Start programs can offer (e.g. home-based, center-based, family child care) as well as the structural requirements for each model, including the dosage of services, class or group sizes, ratio of educators to children or families served, and licensing requirements. (Teacher qualifications, which are often considered a component of structural quality, are addressed in Subpart H: Human Resources Management.)</p>	
<p>Major Proposed Changes</p>	<p>Commentary and Recommendations</p>
<p>This subpart makes significant changes to the dosage and other requirements for Head Start preschool programs. Specifically it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases the minimum length of day for preschoolers from 3.5 to 6 hours⁴⁶ • Increases the minimum school year for preschoolers from 128 to 180 days⁴⁷ • Eliminates the home-based option for preschoolers⁴⁸ • Maintains existing adult:child ratios and class sizes for center-based preschool programs, but simplifies and provides more flexibility around how programs determine which adult:child ratio and class size requirements apply for classrooms with children of different ages⁴⁹ • Maintains adult:child ratios and class 	<p>The proposed rule would significantly increase the amount of time that many Head Start children spend in early learning settings, more than doubling the minimum required length of day and year for Head Start preschool programs.⁵⁶ Research suggests a direct relationship between the amount of time that children spend in early learning programs and the amount that they learn.⁵⁷ The children that Head Start serves, who are among the most at-risk, need intensive dosages of early learning opportunities in order to narrow the gap with their peers and enter school ready to succeed. These requirements would ensure that more Head Start children receive this intensive dosage, while providing flexibility for programs to offer other models where there is a strong</p>

<p>sizes for center-based infant and toddler programs,⁵⁰ but allows programs to apply for a waiver to increase adult:child ratios for 2-year-olds from 1:4 to 1:6⁵¹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Maintains existing dosage requirements and delivery options for infant and toddler programs <p>The “locally designed program option variation” allows local programs to seek waivers to implement a program that does not meet these minimum standards, if they can demonstrate that the locally designed variation effectively supports appropriate skill development and progress for children, provides continuity of care, and meets the needs of the community better than the standard options.⁵² Waivers must be renewed every two years. The regulatory impact analysis anticipates that programs holding 20 percent of slots will receive such waivers.⁵³</p> <p>Other provisions of note include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Requires family home care providers to be state licensed and to be employed by the Head Start program or have a legally binding agreement with it⁵⁴ ● Requires all settings in which children receive early learning services in groups to hold appropriate state licenses ● Codifies existing guidance that programs may request to convert Head Start slots to Early Head Start slots either during the re-funding process (at the end of a 5-year grant) or in a separate grant agreement at another time.⁵⁵ 	<p>community rationale to provide less than a full-day program.</p> <p>Allowing programs to apply for waivers to increase adult:child ratios for 2-year-olds would increase flexibility in how programs allocate resources, while maintaining ratios at a level that ensures quality and safety for all age groups.</p> <p>The adult:child ratios included in the proposed rule reflect research and expert consensus. Experience in early childhood programs suggests, however, that ratio requirements can create barriers to providing the kind of high-quality, job-embedded professional development that the rule seeks to promote in Subpart J. To reduce these barriers, the final rule should amend 1302.21(b) to allow programs to count less-qualified staff towards ratio requirements for limited periods of time as necessary to enable teachers to participate in coaching, team planning, or professional development activities, or attend to biological necessities.</p> <p>The proposed rule would require programs to demonstrate that their locally designed program variations support “appropriate skill development and progress in the goals described in the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework.” It is not clear, however, how programs will demonstrate or how HHS officials will assess this.</p> <p>Programs that receive a waiver should be required to show that children are actually making progress, using data collected in accordance with 641A(g)(2) of the Head Start Act and other sources as appropriate. To this end, the final rule should include an additional provision at 1302.24(c)(iii) that reads: “Children’s actual progress in skill acquisition and the goals described in the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework during the previous two-year period.”</p> <p>Once the rule is finalized, ACF will need to</p>
---	---

	<p>establish a waiver application process and guidance that provide greater clarity around the information that programs must provide when applying for a waiver and how HHS officials will review that information, but that does not need to be included in the rule itself.</p>
<p>Subpart C: Education and Child Development Services</p>	
<p>Major Proposed Changes</p>	<p>Commentary and Recommendations</p>
<p>The proposed rule fundamentally reorganizes the educational standards for Head Start programs.</p> <p>The current educational requirements offer a haphazard listing of topics that children should learn and experiences that programs should provide. They also separate educational expectations for infant/toddler and preschool programs and for children’s learning in different developmental domains.</p> <p>The proposed rule focuses much more intentionally on the core practices that research shows are connected to improved learning in early childhood programs. Rather than listing specific topics children should learn, it relies on references to the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework, which articulates what children should know and do in much greater clarity, comprehensiveness, and detail. This enables the performance standards to focus on what high-quality early childhood education programs need to do to enable children to meet those learning goals, with a particular emphasis in four key areas highlighted by the research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teaching and the learning environment, ● Curriculum, ● Assessment, and ● Parent engagement. <p>Rather than separating expectations for preschoolers and infant and toddler programs, the provisions addressing each of these four sets of practices explicitly address what effective practice looks like in both preschool and infant/toddler programs and across developmental domains. A fifth set of provisions focuses on education and</p>	<p>The proposed rule significantly improves on the current education and child development standards and more clearly defines what high-quality early childhood education looks like in Head Start programs.</p> <p>On net, the proposed changes will push Head Start programs to intentionally focus on improving the quality of education they offer and to use teaching, curriculum, and other practices that research indicates are associated with improved learning in early childhood programs.</p>

<p>development in home-based programs, which utilize a slightly different theory of action than center-based programs do. The following analysis addresses each of these areas in succession.</p>	
<p>Teaching and the learning environment: The proposed rule elevates the importance of effective teaching in early childhood programs, focusing on practices and behaviors that research shows promote young children’s learning. This includes practices that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Promote children’s skill development, ● Integrate curricula to plan and implement high-quality learning experiences that build on each child’s development and learning, ● Emphasize nurturing interactions, ● Integrate child assessment data, and ● Include developmentally appropriate learning experiences across all key developmental domains.⁵⁸ <p>It also emphasizes that ensuring effective teaching requires regular and ongoing supervision and professional development to enable, monitor, and support teachers in implementing effective teaching practices.⁵⁹</p> <p>New provisions address effective teaching practices for dual language learners. Programs for infants and toddlers must focus on promoting children’s development in their home language while also exposing them to English. Programs for preschoolers must focus on promoting children’s language development in both English and their home language.⁶⁰</p> <p>1302.31(c) and (d) describe expectations for learning environment, space, and materials. These provisions maintain, reorganize, and in some cases streamline many requirements in the existing standards.</p> <p>1302.31(e) addresses program practices related to rest, meals, and routines. It eliminates several prescriptive provisions around meals and food in Head Start programs (such as a requirement that meals be served family-style), and instead emphasizes that programs should use mealtimes and routines</p>	<p>The emphasis on effective teaching practices represents a significant improvement over the current performance standards and a model for other early childhood programs. Equally important is the recognition that effective teaching must be rooted in organization-level systems of supervision and professional development that support teachers. The elimination of some prescriptive requirements related to food and meals is also a positive change.</p> <p>While the practices described in 1302.31(b) reflect research on effective teaching in early childhood programs, the language in some of these provisions may make it difficult for monitors, programs, or teachers themselves to evaluate teacher and program practice against these standards. The agency should consider whether any of these standards can be further distilled to a smaller number of core ideas that reflect and describe effective practice. This may result in deleting, rewording, or reorganizing some proposed language.</p>

<p>as opportunities to promote children’s learning.</p>	
<p>Curriculum: The proposed rule requires both preschool and infant/toddler programs to use research-based, developmentally appropriate curricula. This is a new requirement for infant and toddler programs, as the current standards require only preschool programs to have a curriculum.</p> <p>The proposed rule also requires curricula to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Be based on scientifically valid research, ● Have standardized training procedures and materials to support implementation, ● Be aligned with the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework and state early learning and development standards, ● Include an organized developmental scope and sequence, and ● Be sufficiently content-rich within the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework to promote children’s measurable progress.⁶¹ <p>A program’s curriculum may meet these requirements through use of additional curricular enhancements.</p> <p>The proposed rule also makes clear that the expectation is not simply that programs have a curriculum, but that they implement it effectively to support children’s learning, by providing support, training, and professional development to staff to implement the curriculum, and by monitoring curriculum implementation.⁶²</p> <p>Finally, it allows programs to select, develop, or adopt their own curricula that do not meet all the requirements in this section, but requires those that do so to partner with a research organization to evaluate the effectiveness of this variation.⁶³</p>	<p>These proposed changes significantly strengthen the curriculum requirements for Head Start programs, reflecting a growing body of research demonstrating the impact of effective curriculum in early childhood programs.⁶⁴</p> <p>The proposed rule focuses on both the <i>content</i> of Head Start curricula (in new references to scope and sequence and being “content-rich”), and its <i>implementation</i> (requiring programs to provide professional development, aligned supports for teachers, and monitor curriculum implementation).</p> <p>The reference to additional curricular enhancements also recognizes that most high-performing Head Start programs supplement their main curriculum with additional supplemental curricula to support children’s learning across all domains.</p> <p>Crucially, these requirements do not impose a national curriculum or mandate a one-size-fits all approach to curriculum in Head Start. Multiple existing curriculum options can meet these requirements, either alone or in combination with supplemental curricula. The policy also gives programs the flexibility to select a curriculum that does not meet these requirements if it works with an independent research entity to evaluate the curriculum.</p> <p>It is likely, however, that many programs will need support and guidance to select curricula that meet these standards, particularly if doing so requires them to supplement a primary curricular approach with additional curricula, as the rule contemplates. ACF will likely need to provide additional clarification to help programs determine whether or not their curricula meet these requirements and to help them make changes or adopt supplements as needed.</p>

	<p>In addition, the proposed rule is somewhat unclear about the circumstances in which a program’s curriculum would be considered a “variation” under 1302.32(b). The references to “paragraphs (a)(1)(iii) and (a)(3) of this section” are particularly confusing. It is unclear whether these are the only provisions within (a) from which a program may have flexibility to implement a variation, or if a program may have flexibility from all the other provisions under (a) and need only consider its program a variation if it does not meet these two requirements. Further adding to the confusion, the narrative accompanying the proposed rule offers two examples of circumstances in which a program may seek to use the flexibility (when standardized training materials are still in development, or when the research base is being built), neither of which relate to the requirements of paragraphs (a)(1)(iii) and (a)(3) 1302.31.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity, this language should be revised to read: “In order to meet the needs of one or more specific populations, a program may choose to develop or significantly adapt a curriculum, such that it does not meet the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section.” This would make clear that a program is implementing a variation if its curricula do not meet any of the requirements listed under 1302.32(a). Programs will likely still need further guidance to determine whether their curriculum meets these requirements.</p> <p>It is reasonable to require programs that want to develop or adapt their own curricula to partner with researchers to evaluate the effectiveness of those curricula. This provides space for innovation while helping build the knowledge base of the field and enabling experimental curricula to eventually develop the research base necessary to meet the requirements of 1302.31(a). ACF will need to provide additional guidance, however, on the expectations for the quality and rigor of evaluations conducted by external partners.</p>
--	--

	<p>These evaluations should not be required to meet the highest What Works Clearinghouse standards for causal evidence,⁶⁵ as meeting those requirements is costly and may not be possible for smaller programs. But given the prevalence of low-quality research in education, there should be some standard for acceptable evaluation. If not carefully implemented, this provision could result in significant waste of Head Start funds on contracts with low-quality independent evaluation consultants who do not actually provide useful information about the impact of curricula on children's learning.</p>
<p>Assessment: 1302.33 consolidates provisions related to screening and assessment, which were previously located in multiple sections of the performance standards, together in one location. It also includes several changes to bring the performance standards into alignment with the 2007 reauthorization of the Head Start Act, and with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Specific changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Screening: 1302.22(a) significantly revises provisions related to developmental screening to align with the requirements of the Head Start Act and reference IDEA. It also adds a new requirement that, if a child with a delay in development is found not to be eligible for IDEA services under his/her state's definition, the program is still responsible for providing services to meet the child's needs. Programs may pay for these services with Head Start funds, but only after first seeking other funding sources. ● Assessment: 1302.22(b) and (c) update the Performance Standards to reflect Section 641A(b) of the Head Start Act, which required the Secretary to provide guidance to Head Start programs in the use of assessments. 1302.22(b) requires programs to conduct regular standardized and structured assessments of children's development and progress that provide 	<p>Use of regular child assessments to inform instruction and continuous improvement is a key feature of effective early childhood educational practices. Most of the changes in this section reflect things already required by the 2007 Head Start reauthorization.</p>

<p>usable information for teachers, home visitors, and parents to individualize services for children. 1302.22(c) prescribes characteristics of child assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Valid and reliable for the purpose and population, o Conducted by qualified personnel, and o Age, developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate, and appropriate for children with disabilities. <p>These provisions directly reflect the requirements of the Head Start Act.</p> <p>This section also includes new requirements for assessment of dual language learners.</p> <p>1302.22(d) forbids using assessment to sanction or reward individual children or teachers; to use screening or assessment results to exclude children; or to use assessment results to rank, compare, or evaluate children except for research and training purposes. These provisions again directly reflect requirements in the Head Start Act.</p>	
<p>Parental involvement: Education services in Head Start programs must encourage parents to engage in their children’s education. 1302.34 retains current requirements for two parent conferences and two home visits annually, as well as opportunities for parents to volunteer. Changes in 1302.34(b)(3) and the curriculum requirements recast the role of parents in curriculum decisions: Rather than requiring parents to be involved in developing the curriculum, as the current standards do, the proposed standards require that parents have opportunities to learn about and provide feedback on curriculum and instructional materials. Additional requirements for how programs support parents in promoting their children’s learning are included in Subsection E: Family and Community Partnership</p>	<p>The distinction between the parent engagement activities outlined in 1302.34 and the parent activities to promote child learning and development in 1302.51 is unclear, and the division of parent engagement activities between these two sections is confusing.</p> <p>The final rule should consolidate all parent activities designed to promote children’s learning and development into 1302.34. This would improve clarity and underscore that the primary purpose of parent engagement activities is to increase parents’ capacity to support their children’s learning. Consolidating parent engagement provisions in this section would also emphasize the linkage between what</p>

Services.	teachers do in the classroom and what parents do at home to support children's learning and development.
<p>Education in home-based programs: The revised education and child development standards include a new set of provisions (1302.35) that recognize the unique nature and theory of action of education in home-based programs. These provisions include a new requirement that home-based programs use an evidence-based curriculum. As with curricula in center-based programs, these provisions allow a program to develop or adapt a curriculum variation and establish a relationship with a research partner to evaluate the effectiveness of the variation. These provisions also reiterate that home-based programs must meet the same screening and assessment requirements as center-based programs.</p>	
Subpart D: Health Program Services	
Major Proposed Changes	Commentary and Recommendations
<p>This subsection describes the health services that Head Start programs are required to provide, including ensuring that children have a regular source of health care and are up-to-date on age appropriate preventative care, oral health, nutrition, and mental health, as well as supporting families to promote their children's health, nutrition, and mental health.</p>	<p>Head Start programs are currently required to provide children and families a range of health, nutrition, and mental health services.</p> <p>Health is a crucial domain of young children's development, and undiagnosed or untreated health problems can negatively impact children's development and school readiness. It is not clear, however, that Head Start's health and other comprehensive services are significantly improving children's health or that all Head Start children need all of the services the Head Start performance standards mandate. While the Head Start Impact Study did find that Head Start has a positive impact on children's receipt of dental care, evidence of impact on other child health outcomes is weak.⁶⁶ Moreover, a recent, comprehensive meta-analysis of impacts across multiple early childhood education programs found a negative relationship between provision of health and other comprehensive services and children's cognitive outcomes in early childhood programs.⁶⁷</p> <p>Head Start programs have limited</p>

	<p>resources—both of money and staff capacity. Providing the range of services mandated by the current Performance Standards may require programs to spread those resources too thin. In addition, the prescriptive nature of many health and safety requirements contributes to a culture of compliance in Head Start that runs counter to the culture of continuous improvement the proposed rule seeks to cultivate.</p> <p>Because of the limitations in the Head Start Act, this rule cannot reduce or eliminate requirements for health, nutrition, and other comprehensive services that are included in the current rule.⁶⁸ Where possible, however, the final rule should seek to streamline, rather than add to, current mandates. The rule should also seek to reduce the focus on prescribing how programs deliver health and other comprehensive services (including timelines by which such services must be provided) and instead focus on outcomes. Future reauthorization should also include a serious re-evaluation of the specific health and other services that Head Start programs are required to provide.</p>
<p>Child health status and care: These provisions require programs to determine whether a child has a regular source of health care within 30 days of enrollment (reduced from 90 in current standards),⁶⁹ and clarifies that this source of care may not be an emergency room or urgent care facility. It also clarifies that programs must directly facilitate services to bring a child up-to-date on age-appropriate preventative and primary care, if necessary.⁷⁰</p>	
<p>Oral health: Maintains requirement that children brush their teeth once daily in Head Start programs, but provides greater flexibility in when tooth brushing may occur.⁷¹</p>	<p>This is a positive example of reducing prescription in health and safety standards.</p>
<p>Mental health: 1302.45 significantly revises mental health service requirements to more clearly align with the mental health consultation model, an evidence-based approach to promoting children’s social and emotional development and mental health and preventing</p>	<p>These provisions much more clearly focus the goals and purpose of mental health staff and services on an evidence-based model of support.</p> <p>They also emphasize that effective support</p>

<p>and addressing behavioral challenges in early childhood programs.⁷² It replaces references to “mental health professionals” in the current rule with references to “mental health consultants” and specifically outlines the responsibilities of consultants as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Implementing program-wide behavioral practices and supports including effective classroom management and supportive teacher practices, ● Helping teachers develop and implement strategies for supporting children with challenging behaviors and mental health issues, and ● Implementing community partnerships to facilitate access to mental health services and resources. <p>The proposed rule also eliminates references to the frequency of provision of mental health professional services. Instead, it requires mental health consultants to work with other program staff in a “timely and effective manner” to address children’s mental health needs.⁷³</p> <p>The rule requires that programs’ staffing include mental health consultants, but does not specify a frequency of services or ratio of consultants to children or teachers.</p>	<p>for mental health is not just about providing services to struggling children and families, but includes program-wide conditions and supports for teachers to promote children’s mental health and social-emotional development and respond effectively to behavior challenges.</p> <p>These are positive developments, given the increased awareness of the impact of toxic stress and trauma on young children’s development. They also complement provisions in 1302.17 that seek to minimize use of exclusionary discipline in Head Start programs, by requiring program-wide practices and support for teachers to prevent and address challenging behavior.</p> <p>That said, mental health consultation is a specific, resource-intensive model, and implementing it effectively in Head Start programs may require both increased resources and changes in the type of staff employed in mental health roles. In implementing this requirement, the agency and programs will need to carefully consider the resources, staffing, and intentionality necessary to implement mental health consultation in ways that improve outcomes for children, rather than simply complying with new requirements.</p> <p>The agency must also consider the supply of mental health professionals with training and experience to provide effective mental health consultation services. Some of these activities require different skill sets than traditional mental health services roles, and the supply of individuals with training to provide mental health consultation may not be sufficient to meet the needs of all Head Start programs, particularly in remote areas. Implementing this requirement successfully will likely require investments in training for mental health professionals to effectively deliver mental health consultation services.</p>
<p>Family support services for health, nutrition, and mental health: 1302.46 consolidates requirements for parent-focused</p>	<p>These provisions continue to require Head Start programs to provide families with “opportunities” to learn about a variety of</p>

<p>activities that are currently included in the health, nutrition, and mental health provisions of the performance standards into one section, along with provisions addressing parent collaboration in services provided to children.⁷⁴</p> <p>It also moves a requirement from the transportation standards that programs provide parents with education in pedestrian and vehicular safety (and eliminates a requirement to do this within 30 days).⁷⁵</p> <p>It adds new requirements for programs to provide parent learning opportunities in two areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Healthy pregnancy and postpartum care⁷⁶ and ● Accessing health insurance.⁷⁷ 	<p>topics, including first aid, home safety practices, and vehicle and pedestrian safety. Rather than requiring all programs to provide learning opportunities in all these areas, the final rule should allow programs to focus the health-, safety-, and nutrition-related learning opportunities they provide to parents on a few selected topics or goals each year, based on the interests and needs they identify within their parent community. While healthy pregnancy and access to health care are worthy topics, their inclusion here further increases the already extensive list of areas in which programs are expected to provide family support services.</p>
<p>Safety practices: The proposed rule eliminates or streamlines a number of health and safety requirements in the current rule and instead references <i>Caring for Our Children Basics</i>, a voluntary set of minimum health and safety standards for early care and education programs that the Administration for Children and Families proposed in December of 2015.⁷⁸ This shift from prescribing specific requirements to referencing a common external document is intended to reduce the burden of complying with multiple, different sets of requirements in the Head Start Performance Standards, state childcare licensure, and other state early childhood programs.</p> <p>The proposed rule also all Head Start centers and family childcare homes to be licensed by the state.⁷⁹ It also requires programs to develop “a system of management, training, oversight, correction, and improvement” to ensure health and safety in Head Start programs.⁸⁰</p>	<p>Current Head Start health and safety requirements, and their overlap with other state licensure and early care and education program standards, create significant compliance burdens for Head Start programs. While the proposed rule makes significant efforts to clarify and streamline the health and safety requirements, it remains highly prescriptive and detailed. This is particularly true for this list of topics in which Head Start agencies are expected to ensure that staff receive safety-related training.⁸¹</p> <p>Moreover, the proposed rule already requires Head Start centers, family care homes, and facilities where children participate in group socialization to hold appropriate state licenses. Given this, and given the work that the Department of Health and Human Services is already doing to improve state licensure policies, it is unclear why the Performance Standards need to independently address hygiene and safety issues that are commonly covered in state licensure.</p> <p>Given the limitations of federal capacity and the need to oversee more than 1,600 grantees nationally, it would be reasonable for the federal government to rely on state</p>

	<p>licensure to evaluate the safety and hygiene practices of Head Start grantees, and to instead focus federal requirements and oversight on ensuring that programs are appropriately licensed and provide quality services described elsewhere in this section.</p> <p>The requirement for programs to track and report safety incidents in accordance with 1302.102(d)(1)(ii) should be retained.⁸²</p> <p>In some states, licensure requirements do not apply to public school facilities. In implementing the rule, the agency will need to address how the licensure requirements in the rule apply to Head Start programs located in public school buildings in these states.</p>
--	--

Subpart E: Family and Community Partnership Services: This subpart describes the family engagement and support services that Head Start programs must provide to parents and families, as well as the partnerships they must establish with other community programs serving Head Start-eligible children and their families.

Major Proposed Changes	Commentary and Recommendations
<p>Purposes: The proposed rule clarifies three primary purposes of parent engagement activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Enhanced parenting skills and confidence to support their children’s learning 2) Increased parent engagement in children’s learning and development 3) Improved family well-being to support children’s learning.⁸³ <p>Current standards require Head Start programs create written partnership agreements with all families but do not require them to track information on the outcomes of family services. The proposed rule eliminates this focus on written family partnership agreements. Instead, it requires programs to track information progress to meeting family needs and goals, and to adjust services as needed in response to this information.⁸⁴ The proposed rule also clarifies that programs can prioritize families for services based on urgency and intensity of their needs, as well as available program resources.⁸⁵</p>	<p>The proposed rule improves on existing family services standards in several ways, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focusing Head Start’s family services requirements around the goals of building parents’ skills, confidence, and engagement to support their children’s learning; • Shifting the focus of parent support services away from written plans and laundry lists of activities; • Increasing focus on the outcomes of family engagement; and • Reflecting research showing that changing parents’ behavior and improving outcomes for children requires focused activities that build parents’ skills and confidence, not just general engagement or information sharing. <p>Although it imposes some new requirements on programs, they are not unreasonable, particularly to the extent that</p>

<p>The proposed rule includes several new requirements for family services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer a research-based parenting curriculum that fosters parent confidence and skills to promote children’s learning⁸⁶ • Partner with parents to promote attendance (this is consistent with and supports the requirements in 1302.16)⁸⁷ • Promote father engagement⁸⁸ • Offer families a choice of where they share personal information; allow this to occur during home visits; and implement procedures for teachers, home visitors, and family support staff to share information as appropriate⁸⁹ 	<p>other provisions in this section allow programs better focus resources for parent engagement and support on the most-needy families, and to reduce the time and resources spent on creating written family service plans.</p> <p>The requirement to use a research-based parenting curriculum to improve parents’ confidence and skills is a positive addition that reflects research. The final rule should provide programs the same flexibility to develop or adapt a local variation for their parenting curriculum as the proposed rule provides for education and child development curricula.⁹⁰ This would allow programs to innovate with alternative approaches to building parents’ engagement, skills, and confidence, and would help to build the knowledge base on effective approaches to parent engagement, which is less developed than the knowledge base on effective strategies for supporting children’s learning.</p> <p>The distinction between this section and the parent engagement activities outlined in 1302.34 is unclear, and the division of parent engagement activities between these two sections is confusing. The final rule should consolidate all parent activities designed to promote children’s learning and development into 1302.34, including provisions related to use of an evidence-based parenting curriculum.</p> <p>Subpart E should focus exclusively on the family support services that Head Start programs provide to address family well-being and needs. Reorganizing the family partnership services provisions in this way would help to clarify the distinction between services that Head Start programs should offer all families to help them support their children’s learning and development, and those that should be targeted to families with urgent or unmet needs that impact their children’s learning and development.</p>
<p>Community partnerships provisions eliminate some documentation requirements for</p>	<p>The proposed rule would impose additional requirements on Head Start programs.</p>

<p>community partnerships, but expand the list of community partners with whom Head Start programs should have partnerships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Providers of prenatal and postnatal support⁹¹ ● Substance abuse treatment providers⁹² ● TANF agencies⁹³ ● Agencies and institutions that provide workforce development and training, adult and family literacy, adult education, and post-secondary education institutions⁹⁴ ● Programs that support homeless children and families⁹⁵ ● Programs that provide domestic violence prevention and support⁹⁶ <p>Two of these new community partnership requirements specifically focus on Head Start programs' relationships with other state early childhood and education programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1302.53(b)(2)(vii) requires Head Start programs to work with the agencies that develop, design, or administer statewide data systems for early childhood education. This provision is designed to support inclusion of Head Start programs in statewide early childhood data systems. ● 1302.53(e) says that Head Start programs "should" participate in their state or local Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) if it meets certain quality standards and enables Head Start programs to participate in the same way as other early childhood programs in the state. Because this provision says "should" instead of "must," it does not require all Head Start programs to participate in QRIS. <p>In addition, the proposed revisions incorporate a requirement that all programs enter into memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with districts or other local entities that manage publicly funded pre-k in their communities. This provision is mandated by the 2007</p>	<p>While none of these requirements are objectionable in and of themselves, collectively they add to the numerous activities and partnerships that Head Start programs are already required to undertake. Simply establishing all the additional partnerships listed in the proposed rule would require significant staff time that may be better used on other activities. The final rule should seek to reduce the number and types of community entities with whom Head Start programs are expected to establish partnerships.</p> <p>The provisions related to participation in state longitudinal data systems, QRIS, and MOUs with publicly funded preschool seem oddly placed in this section. While the other partnerships listed in this section are designed to help families access additional services they may need, these partnerships are intended to better integrate Head Start into the statewide system of early care and education. The final rule should remove these provisions from this subpart and create a new subpart explicitly focused on Head Start programs' relationship with other state and local systems of early care and education. This new subpart could be located following 1302 Subpart A or within Section 1303.</p> <p>The reference to state longitudinal data systems in this subsection is both duplicative of and uses slightly different language than proposed 1302.101(4), which requires programs to share data with the state's K-12 longitudinal data system. All provisions related to participation in the state longitudinal data system should be grouped in one place, either in the new subpart referenced above, or in Section 1303.</p> <p>Head Start programs should be encouraged to participate in state QRIS systems where they are high quality and seek to include all providers in a state. But it is not appropriate to mandate that they do so at this point in time. Very few existing</p>
---	--

<p>reauthorization of the Head Start Act and has been in effect since 2008, but was not previously included in the Performance Standards.</p>	<p>QRIS systems meet the validation criteria referenced in the proposed rule. Some were designed primarily for licensed childcare and may not provide pathways for participation by all Head Start programs. In other states, capacity and funding limit the number of providers that can participate in QRIS. It would not be fair to penalize Head Start programs in these states for being unable to participate in QRIS. Further, states with limited QRIS resources may wish to focus on other providers, such as licensed childcare centers, that are not subject to Head Start's extensive federal oversight and monitoring. Given these factors, federal policies should encourage, rather than mandate, Head Start participation in QRIS.</p>
---	--

Subpart F: Additional Services for Children with Disabilities

Major Proposed Changes	Commentary and Recommendations
<p>This subsection proposes significant changes to provisions addressing how Head Start programs service children with disabilities, in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Align Head Start programs' approaches to serving children with disabilities with the requirements of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2) Align the performance standards with provisions of the 2007 Head Start Act. The Act eliminated Head Start programs' authority to develop their own Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for children with disabilities. Instead, Head Start programs are now expected to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • work with the local agency responsible for implementing IDEA to identify and serve children who are eligible for services⁹⁷ • participate in IEP or individual family services plan (IFSP) meetings with the local agency responsible for implementing IDEA⁹⁸ 3) Cover all Head Start children, not just preschoolers aged 3-5 4) Ensure that Head Start and Early Head 	<p>The proposed rule would bring Head Start into alignment with provisions of the 2007 Head Start Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.</p> <p>Although the Act requires Head Start programs to work with the local agency responsible for implementing IDEA to identify and serve children who are eligible for services under IDEA, some children may have disabilities or developmental delays that do not meet state eligibility criteria for IDEA services. The proposed rule would require Head Start programs to continue to provide services to these children. Early intervention is crucial for children experiencing developmental delays or other learning challenges, and could help prevent them from needing IDEA services later in their education. But this requirement also imposes additional demands and costs on Head Start programs without providing additional resources for them to do so. The Secretaries of Education and Health and Human Services should work together to provide Head Start programs with information on funding sources they can access to help cover the costs of these services, and seek to eliminate barriers that</p>

<p>Start programs provide appropriate services to children who have disabilities or developmental delays but do not meet state eligibility standards for IDEA⁹⁹</p> <p>5) Clarify expectations for the support that Head Start programs provide to parents of children with disabilities, including helping parents understand the IEP process and their children’s rights to IDEA services¹⁰⁰</p>	<p>may prevent Head Start grantees from accessing such funds. The Secretaries of Health and Human Services and Education should jointly fund research and data collection to understand the number of children with developmental delays served under these provisions, to inform future reauthorizations of both the Head Start Act and IDEA.</p> <p>The Head Start Act requires Head Start programs to collaborate with these agencies to serve children with disabilities. Anecdotal reports suggest that some Head Start programs have experienced challenges in working with school districts and other local agencies to secure necessary services for IDEA-eligible children. States, the Secretaries of Health and Human Services and Education, and independent researchers should support research and data collection to better understand how effectively this approach is serving Head Start children with disabilities, the challenges that local agencies and Head Start programs face in working together, and opportunities to improve collaboration and services for Head Start children with disabilities in future reauthorizations of both Head Start and IDEA.</p>
--	--

Subpart G: Transition Services

Major Proposed Changes	Commentary and Recommendations
<p>This subpart organizes all provisions related to children’s transitions—including transitions from Early Head Start, transitions from Head Start to kindergarten, and transitions from Early Head Start or Head Start to another early childhood program—in one place. It also updates those provisions to reflect requirements of the 2007 reauthorization of the Head Start Act.</p> <p>In doing so, it imposes several new requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help parents understand and use parenting practices that will support their children academically and socially during transition to kindergarten¹⁰¹ • Prepare parents—particularly parents of 	<p>Many of the proposed changes in this subpart reflect provisions of the 2007 reauthorization of the Head Start Act.</p> <p>As publically funded pre-k programs grow and Head Start programs shift to serving younger children, addressing expectations for transitions between Head Start and other early childhood programs, as well as between Head Start and kindergarten, makes sense.</p>

<p>dual language learner students—to exercise their rights and responsibilities related to the education of their children¹⁰²</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Implement strategies in the learning environment that help children get ready for kindergarten¹⁰³ ● Collaborate with school districts to determine the availability of summer programming for children, if the Head Start program does not offer it¹⁰⁴ <p>A new set of provisions in 1302.72 address expectations for collaboration and transition support when children transition from Head Start or Early Head Start to publically funded pre-k or another early childhood program, or move out of the community.</p>	
---	--

Subpart H: Services to Enrolled Pregnant Women

Major Proposed Changes	Commentary and Recommendations
<p>The proposed rule includes a new subpart that describes services for pregnant women, who are eligible for services in Early Head Start programs, distinct from services for infants/toddlers and services for all Head Start parents.</p>	<p>Much of this subpart reorganizes existing provisions of the Performance Standards, but it also includes several new requirements that codify “best practices” that “many programs already have in place.”¹⁰⁵</p>

Subpart I: Human Resources Management: This subpart addresses Head Start programs’ personnel policies, required staff qualifications, and staff professional development.

Major Proposed Changes	Commentary and Recommendations
<p>Personnel Policies (1302.90): The proposed rule eliminates detailed requirements for specific personnel policies, which are included in the current performance standards.</p> <p>It raises background check requirements for Head Start programs to align with those established for childcare in the 2014 Child Care and Block Grant Act reauthorization.</p> <p>It also clarifies provisions related to hiring parents of Head Start children. Where the previous language stated that Head Start parents should “receive preference” for positions for which they are qualified, the revised language says that programs must “consider” current and former program parents for positions for which they are qualified.¹⁰⁶</p>	<p>Aligning background check requirements across multiple early childhood programs makes sense, but these requirements do impose additional requirements and costs on Head Start programs. Because 1302.90(b) focuses primarily on background checks, rather than recruitment and selection, the heading of that paragraph should be revised to reflect that, and provisions related parent hiring re-designated as 1302.90(c).</p> <p>The changes in provisions on hiring parents would enable programs to hire the person they believe is best suited for the position, even if that means selecting another candidate over a Head Start parent.</p>

Staff qualifications (1302.91): This paragraph outlines qualifications required for various Head Start staff positions, including Early Head Start center-based teachers, Head Start center-based teachers, Head Start assistant teachers, education coordinators, home visitors, family child care providers, Head Start or Early Head Start directors, family service workers, nutritionists, mental health professionals, and fiscal officers:

- Family service, health, and disabilities staff: The proposed rule eliminates current requirements that these workers have “knowledge of” a variety of topics, and instead states that they must have “sufficient knowledge, training, and experience to fulfill the responsibilities of their position and ensure high-quality service delivery.”¹⁰⁷
- Early Head Start teachers in center-based settings must have a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential, as mandated by the Head Start Act. Early Head Start center-based teachers must demonstrate competency to provide effective and nurturing teacher-child interactions, plan and implement high-quality learning experiences that ensure effective curriculum implementation, and promote children’s progress across the standards described in the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework.¹⁰⁸
- Head Start teachers: No less than 50 percent of all Head Start teachers must have a bachelor’s degree in child development, early childhood education, or equivalent coursework. All center-based teachers must have at least at least an associate’s degree.¹⁰⁹ Head Start teachers must demonstrate competency to provide effective and nurturing teacher-child interactions, plan and implement learning experiences that ensure effective curriculum implementation, and promote children’s progress across the

These requirements reflect the provisions of the 2007 Head Start reauthorization, which required half of all Head Start preschool lead teachers to have a bachelor’s degree by 2013. The Act also required the Secretary to ensure that Head Start teachers have “demonstrated competency.”¹¹⁹ This proposed rule addresses this requirement by defining competencies for Head Start lead teachers, Early Head Start teachers, and home visitors.

Given the new coaching requirements in 1302.92, the final rule should add “coaches” to the list of program staff in 1302.91(a) who programs must ensure have “sufficient knowledge, training, and experience to fulfill the roles and responsibilities of their positions.”

The competencies for Early Head Start center-based teachers, Head Start teachers, and home visitors are reasonable and focus on the core skills that teachers and home visitors need to support children’s learning. The decision to keep the list of competencies limited, rather than including every possible skill that might be desirable for teachers to have, is the right approach. Given the prominence of assessment within the education and child development standards, and the centrality of assessment to good early childhood teaching, the final rule should add assessment to the list of teacher and home visitor competencies.

The NPRM requests comment on whether the revised standards should raise requirements for Head Start lead teachers to require a bachelor’s degree for all teachers. Research on the relationship between teachers’ degrees and children’s learning is complicated.¹²⁰ But the high-quality pre-k programs that have produced evidence of lasting gains in children’s learning employ teachers with bachelor’s degrees and training in early childhood education,¹²¹ and most high-quality

<p>standards described in the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework and applicable State early learning and development standards.¹¹⁰</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Head Start assistant teachers: All Head Start assistant teachers must have a CDA credential or be enrolled in a program leading to an associate’s degree, bachelor’s degree, or CDA credential.¹¹¹ This reflects the requirements of the 2007 reauthorization of the Head Start Act. ● Education coordinators: Staff who serve as education coordinators or curriculum specialists must have a bachelor’s or advanced degree in early childhood education.¹¹² This reflects the requirements of the 2007 reauthorization of the Head Start Act. ● Home visitors: The proposed rule would establish new minimum standards for education staff in home-based Head Start programs. Home visitors must have a minimum of a home-based CDA credential or equivalent coursework as part of an associate’s or bachelor’s degree and training and experience in early childhood education, prenatal and child development, strength-based parent education, family support, and knowledge of community resources. Home visitors must demonstrate competency to plan and implement home-based learning experiences that ensure effective implementation of the home visiting curriculum and promote children’s progress across the standards described in the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework. These requirements are not mandated by the Head Start Act.¹¹³ ● Family Child Care Providers must have previous early child care experience and be enrolled in a CDA or state equivalent program or an associate’s or bachelor’s degree program in child development or early childhood 	<p>providers seek to hire teachers with similar credentials. Given this, the aspiration for the field should be that all pre-k teachers, including lead preschool teachers in Head Start centers, have bachelor’s degrees and training in early childhood education. But in light of the ongoing debate in the field over bachelor’s degree requirements for preschool teachers, the potential cost of this change, and its impact on current Head Start teachers, any mandate raising the credential requirements for Head Start teachers should come from action by Congress, rather than regulation. Teacher qualifications should be a high priority for the next reauthorization of the Head Start Act.</p> <p>Raising the qualifications of Head Start teachers requires a range of high-quality pathways through which they can earn credentials. Current requirements for Head Start teachers to hold a bachelor’s degree in specific subject areas may create a barrier to Head Start teachers prepared through alternative teacher certification pathways. To address this, the final rule should mirror language in the Department of Education’s Preschool Development Grants program that includes teachers certified through alternative pathways.¹²²</p> <p>If the final rule retains the focus on mental health consultation in 1302.45, the requirements for mental health consultants should include training, experience, or competency to support teachers and program leaders in implementing effective strategies to support children’s behavior and social-emotional development. Providing effective mental health consultation requires coaching, adult learning, and classroom management expertise different from the skills required to become a licensed or certified mental health provider.</p> <p>This subpart, as currently written, does not recognize the role of instructional leadership in Head Start programs. The</p>
--	--

<p>education. Family Child Care providers must complete a CDA within 18 months of beginning to provide Head Start services (this has been lowered from 2 years in the current rule).¹¹⁴</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Child Development Specialist must have a minimum of an associate’s degree in child development or early childhood education at the time of hire.¹¹⁵ • Nutritionists: A program must use staff or consultants who are registered dietitians or nutritionists to support nutrition services.¹¹⁶ • Mental health consultants: A program must use staff or consultants who are licensed or certified mental health professionals to support mental health services.¹¹⁷ • Early Head Start or Head Start Director: A director hired after the effective date of the regulation must have either a bachelor’s or advanced degree and experience in staff and fiscal management.¹¹⁸ 	<p>rule includes requirements for Head Start and Early Head Start Directors, but these requirements focus primarily on general management, rather than early childhood expertise, and do not address the role of center-level leaders who supervise teachers. Center directors and other instructional leaders are crucial to provide effective staff supervision and support and implement cycles of continuous improvement. The rule should not establish new qualification requirements for center director roles. Doing so would be overly prescriptive and might not match the varying needs of Head Start programs operating in different communities. But, in implementing and monitoring provisions related to staff supervision, professional development, curriculum, and continuous improvement HHS officials and policies must recognize the critical role that center-level leaders must play in these efforts. To the extent that the final rule reduces existing compliance and paperwork burdens on programs, this will also help to reorient the role of center-level leaders away from compliance and towards instructional leadership.</p>
<p>Training and professional development (1302.92): The proposed rule makes two significant changes in professional development requirements for Head Start programs.</p> <p>First, it calls for research-based professional development for Head Start education staff that is more intentionally focused on seven key topics for effectively promoting children’s development and learning in early childhood programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective curriculum implementation • Knowledge of content in Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework • Teacher-child interactions • Supporting dual language learners • Addressing challenging behaviors • Preparing children for transitions • Improving child outcomes for all children 	<p>Professional development is crucial for improving the skills and knowledge of Head Start educators, but research and experience suggest that much of the professional development that educators currently receive is not effective or focused on the skills and knowledge most related to improving children’s learning.</p> <p>Intentionally focusing professional development on the topics outlined in 1302.92(a)(3) would be a positive step. But 1302.47(b)(4) also requires Head Start programs to train their staff in a wide range of safety-related topics. If all staff received training annually in all of these topics, this would consume a significant portion of the 15 hours. To ensure that training and professional development for education staff focus on their skills to promote children’s learning, the final rule should clarify that all education staff do not need to complete all safety trainings on an annual</p>

<p>It also clarifies that the education program staff who should receive such professional development include teachers, assistant teachers, home visitors, and family child care workers.¹²³</p> <p>Second, a new provision requires programs to establish coordinated coaching strategies to provide coaching and job-embedded professional development to staff.¹²⁴ This would require programs to create dedicated coaching roles on their staffs.¹²⁵ Programs are not required to provide coaching for all education staff—they may focus coaching on the staff who have the greatest need—but they are required to assess all program staff to determine their needs.¹²⁶ Staff who do not receive dedicated coaching would still be required to receive 15 clock hours of professional development annually, as mandated by the Head Start Act,¹²⁷ in the areas described above.¹²⁸</p> <p>Programs that wish to adopt a different approach to staff training and support may do so, but must notify the responsible HHS official and establish a partnership with a research organization to evaluate the effectiveness of their approaches.¹²⁹ (This is similar to the local variation allowed for curriculum in 1302.32).</p>	<p>basis.</p> <p>Research suggests that job-embedded coaching is a much more effective approach for driving improvements in teacher practice than more traditional professional development.¹³⁰ The most effective early childhood programs include job-embedded professional development to improve the quality of teaching.¹³¹</p> <p>Simply adding new staff roles for coaches does not necessarily ensure provision of effective professional development, however. And adding a new staff position for a coach may not be the best approach for all programs. There are a variety of staffing models through which programs can provide this kind of coaching or supervision.¹³² Some programs, for example, may find it more effective or cost-effective to reorient the center director's role to focus on instructional leadership and staff coaching.</p> <p>The proposed rule provides some flexibility for programs to implement alternative models. But the requirement for research partnerships to evaluate these models may not be appropriate. Coaching is less a specific model or intervention than an organizational structure of effective programs. The ultimate goal of these requirements should be to encourage programs to cultivate organization-wide approaches that support educational staff to improve their practice, not to implement specific coaching models or staffing roles.</p> <p>The final rule should maintain job-embedded coaching for education staff as an expectation of best practices for programs, but provide flexibility in how programs meet this expectation, by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Clarifying that a coach may also be a center director (in the case of center-based teachers) or supervisor (in the case of home-visiting programs), provided that that individual has appropriate
--	--

	<p>instructional and adult leadership skills to provide effective coaching.</p> <p>2) Adding “coaches” to the list of staff and consultants in 1302.91(a) who programs must ensure have sufficient knowledge, training, and experience to fulfill the roles and responsibilities of their positions.</p> <p>3) Eliminating research partnership requirements for programs implementing different approaches to job-embedded professional development. Provisions in 1302.93(b)(5)(ii) and 1302.102(c)(2)(iii) already require programs to track data on education staff assessments, set goals for education staff progress, evaluate whether education staff are making expected progress, and adjust their models accordingly. This analysis should be sufficient to inform program decisions about coaching approaches.</p> <p>If programs are required to hire new staff in coaching roles at the same time as they are laying off teachers due to extended day requirements, some may simply re-assign teachers as coaches, even if they lack appropriate instructional and adult learning skills for these roles. Initial monitoring of programs’ implementation of these provisions should seek to ensure this does not occur.</p>
--	---

Subpart J: Program Management and Continuous Improvement: This subpart focuses on the process of ongoing monitoring and self-improvement in Head Start programs, and seeks to create a cycle of ongoing, data-informed continuous improvement.

Major Proposed Changes	Commentary and Recommendations
<p>Management system: 1302.101 requires programs to implement a management system that includes program directors and management staff, provides supervision to support staff professional development, includes adequate record keeping, and ensures that budgeting and staffing promote continuity of care and sufficient time for staff to participate in training and professional</p>	<p>Management and organizational capacity are crucial to ensuring the delivery of high-quality early childhood education. Shifting the focus of the standards from checklists of management roles to creation of systems is a positive change. But monitoring whether programs have effective systems is complicated. Throughout this subpart, the agency will</p>

<p>development.¹³³ It eliminates a detailed list of management roles included in 1304.52(a) of the current rule.</p> <p>New provisions require programs to develop program-wide coordinated approaches for three areas in which the proposed rule requires significant changes or improvements in program practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Training and professional development¹³⁴ ● Ensuring full and effective participation of dual language learners¹³⁵ ● Ensuring full and effective participation of children with disabilities¹³⁶ <p>Another new set of provisions address data systems and data governance in Head Start programs. These new provisions require Head Start programs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify a data governance body responsible for decision-making and procedures for data management¹³⁷ ● Share relevant data with the state’s K-12 statewide longitudinal data system and other early childhood data systems¹³⁸ ● Consult with the Head Start State Collaboration Office, State Early Childhood Advisory Council, and State Education Agency in developing data procedures¹³⁹ ● Align Head Start data collection and definitions, where possible, with Common Education Data Standards¹⁴⁰ 	<p>need to be very thoughtful in developing its approach to monitoring programs’ implementation of these standards, to ensure that monitoring actually focuses on systems for ongoing assessment of program goals, rather than becoming another checklist of specific activities.</p> <p>Head Start programs should be included in statewide early childhood and education longitudinal data systems. New provisions related to participation in these systems align with the goals of other federal policies, such as the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grants. These provisions seem oddly placed in this section, however. It would be more appropriate to incorporate them within or adjacent to the proposed 1303 subpart C, grouping content related to privacy, data governance, and data sharing in one location. Provision 1302.53(b)(2)(vii) should also be moved to the same section. Differences between the proposed language in 1302.53(b)(2)(vii) and 1302.101(b) should be addressed to clarify that Head Start programs should share data with both the state’s K-12 statewide longitudinal data system and its statewide data system for early childhood programs, if one exists. In implementing these provisions, the agency must consider that some state systems create barriers to Head Start programs’ participation that cannot be addressed by the Head Start programs alone.</p> <p>For clarity, the final rule should eliminate the phrase “adequate record keeping” in 1302.101(a) and create a new 1302.101(a)(4) to address record keeping. The phrase “promote continuity of care enrolled that provides sufficient time for staff to participate in appropriate training and professional development,” should be deleted from 1302.101(a)(3) because it is already covered by the reference to the full range of services described in subparts C-H.</p>
<p>Achieving program performance goals</p>	<p>The proposed rule incorporates provisions</p>

<p>1302.102 requires programs to set performance goals,¹⁴¹ monitor performance against those goals,¹⁴² and use data for continuous improvement.¹⁴³</p> <p>Programs must establish goals and measurable objectives for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and safety practices¹⁴⁴ • School readiness goals (required under Section 641A(f)(2)(A) of the Head Start Act)¹⁴⁵ • Goals for the provision of educational, health, nutritional, and family and community engagement services¹⁴⁶ • Strategic long-term goals for ensuring programs are and remain responsive to community needs¹⁴⁷ 	<p>on program planning included in 1304.51 of the current performance standards, but does so in a very different way. The current standards require programs to develop written plans for how they will implement services and to communicate those plans to certain stakeholders, but do not address the implementation or outcomes of the plans.¹⁴⁸ The revised standards place less emphasis on process and “planning” and more emphasis on data and outcomes.</p> <p>The shift in focus from writing plans to setting goals and measuring progress towards them is a positive development. A few changes would further strengthen these provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1302.102(a)(3) should require programs to set goals for the outcomes of educational and other services, rather than for their provision. • Given the emphasis on staff professional development in Subpart H, programs should also be required to set goals for the recruitment, retention, and development of qualified staff.
<p>Monitoring program performance: 1302.102(b) requires programs to establish an ongoing oversight process to monitor and correct compliance and quality issues.¹⁴⁹</p> <p>Programs must monitor progress toward performance goals and conduct an annual self-assessment of the program’s progress towards goals, using data that includes aggregated child assessment data; compliance with program standards; and classroom, professional development, and parent and family engagement data.¹⁵⁰</p> <p>Programs must engage the governing body, policy council, staff, and parents when conducting the assessment, and submit the findings to the responsible HHS official.¹⁵¹</p>	<p>The language of 1302.102(b)(2)(i) is confusing because it includes a mixture of outcomes and data sources. This language should be reorganized to list outcomes to be addressed in the self-assessment before the word “using” and data sources following. Adding goals related to staff development in 1302.102(a) will also help here.</p>
<p>Using data for continuous improvement: 1302.102(c) Establishes new requirements for programs to establish a process or cycle for</p>	<p>The provisions in this section are strong, but the key question is how programs implement them and how the agency</p>

<p>using data to continuously evaluate and improve performance. This cycle must include lessons from ongoing monitoring and annual self-assessment and program data on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● standardized teacher observations, ● staffing and professional development, ● child assessments, ● family needs assessments, and ● comprehensive services. <p>Programs must ensure that child assessment data is aggregated and analyzed at least three times a year.</p>	<p>monitors them in a way that actually supports continuous improvement rather than simply compliance-oriented box-checking.</p>
<p>Reporting: 1302.102(d) lists the reports that programs must make on oversight data to the governing body and policy council, the relevant HHS official, and the general public. Programs that have deficiencies identified must still develop and implement quality improvement plans. These provisions do not establish any new requirements for programs.</p>	
<p>Implementation of the performance standards: 1302.103 is a new section requiring programs to implement a program-wide approach for the effective and timely implementation of changes required by the final performance standards. Programs must ensure that children are not displaced during a program year and plan for successful transitions for children displaced at the end of a year due to slot reductions. Programs may request a one-year extension of the new structural requirements related to length of day and year.</p>	<p>See comments on implementation timelines below.</p>

Section 1303: Financial and Administrative Requirements:

This section addresses financial and administrative requirements for Head Start programs, requirements related to facilities and transportation, and the relationship between grantees and their delegate agencies.

The most significant change is the creation of a new subsection, Protection of Privacy of Child Records (Subpart C), that seeks to protect the privacy of Head Start children’s personally identifiable information, as the Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act does for students in K-12 public schools. These provisions also outline the conditions under which children’s data may be shared, including with K-12 schools and other state and federal government agencies.¹⁵² As noted above, provisions related to Head Start programs’ participation in state data systems would be more appropriately moved to this section of the proposed rule.

Other changes of note include:

- Consolidation of provisions related to **delegate agencies**. Proposed changes in these provisions align them with the 2007 Head Start Act and streamline the process through which grantees may defund a delegate
- Clarification of current policies that require grantees to conduct **cost comparisons** of options to purchase, construct, or renovate facilities. This should reduce the cost and burden of cost comparisons for grantees
- New provisions to facilitate **refinancing** of debt on Head Start facilities
- **New** requirement for grantees located in high-risk areas to obtain **flood insurance**

Section 1304: Federal Administrative Procedures

This section focuses on how the Administration for Children and Families deals with grantees, including processes for awarding, suspending, and terminating grants. It also includes regulations governing the designation renewal system (DRS). The proposed revisions do not include any substantive changes to the DRS, and the Administration for Children and Families is not seeking, and will not consider, comments on DRS as part of this process.

Section 1305: Definitions

This section consolidates all definitions of key terms into one place. The current rule includes separate sets of definitions in each section, making it difficult to know where key terms are defined. In addition, the proposed rule eliminates definitions for many terms where the plain language definition is obvious and sufficient. It also moves requirements that were previously included in the definition of some terms (such as curriculum) into the text of the standards themselves. Overall, these are positive developments, but adding definitions for a few terms may help to provide greater clarity and reduce confusion for some users:

- High-quality preschool (referenced in 1302.14(a)(3)): High-quality preschool programs should be defined as those that meet at least the same structural, education and child development, and teacher qualifications requirements as those in the Head Start performance standards.
- Chronic absence or chronic absenteeism (1302.16): Chronic absence or chronic absenteeism should be defined as a set number of days absent in a certain time period, whether or not the absences were excused.
- Scientifically valid research (1302.33): Definition should clarify whether this is the same definition used in other federal legislation, including the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002: “The term “scientifically valid research” includes applied research, basic research, and field-initiated research in which the rationale, design, and interpretation are soundly developed in accordance with scientifically based research standards.”¹⁵³

Conclusion

The proposed changes to the Performance Standards reflect the lessons of rigorous academic research, as well as the experience and results of high-performing early childhood programs, both within and apart from Head Start. As the Department of Health and Human Services moves to finalize and implement these standards, it should continue to listen to the voices and input of both researchers and high-quality providers, and to facilitate opportunities for others to learn from them as well.

Appendix

Examples of bureaucratic requirements and excessive prescription that standards would eliminate:

- Lengthen timeline for community needs assessment (1302.11(b))
- Clarify cost comparison requirements to reduce time and burden on grantees (1304)
- Requirements for family-style meals, prescriptions around children's inclusion in food-related activities (1302.31(e))
- Provide greater flexibility around when daily tooth brushing occurs (1302.43)
- Eliminate requirement that pedestrian and vehicle safety training occur within first 30 days (1302.46)

Examples of new requirements the proposed standards would impose on programs:

1302.16 establishes a new requirement that Head Start programs track attendance for each child, identify children who are chronically absent, and conduct outreach and provide support to their parents to improve attendance.

1302.31 addresses effective teaching practices for dual language learners: programs for infants and toddlers must focus on promoting children's development in their home language while also exposing them to English, and programs for preschoolers must focus on promoting children's language development in both English and their home language.¹⁵⁴

1302.32 establishes a new requirement for infant and toddler programs, as the current standards require only preschool programs to have a curriculum.

1302.22(a) significantly revises provisions related to developmental screening to align with the requirements of the Head Start Act and reference IDEA. It also adds a new requirement that, if a child with a delay in development is found not to be eligible for IDEA services under his/her state's definition, the program is still responsible for providing services to meet the child's needs, and may use Head Start funds to do so, but only after first seeking other funding sources.

1302.46(b) adds new requirements for programs to provide parent learning opportunities in two areas: healthy pregnancy and postpartum care¹⁵⁵ and accessing health insurance.¹⁵⁶

1302 Subpart E includes several new requirements for family services:

- Offer a research-based parenting curriculum that fosters parent confidence and skills to promote children's learning¹⁵⁷
- Partner with parents to promote attendance (this is consistent with and supports the requirements in 1302.16)¹⁵⁸
- Promote father engagement¹⁵⁹
- Offer families a choice of where they share personal information, and allow this to occur during home visits, and implement procedures for teachers, home visitors, and family support staff to share information¹⁶⁰

1302.53 requires partnerships with additional, new community partners not included in current standards:

- Providers of prenatal and postnatal support¹⁶¹
- Substance abuse treatment providers¹⁶²
- TANF agencies¹⁶³
- Agencies and institutions that provide workforce development and training, adult and family literacy, adult education, and post-secondary education institutions¹⁶⁴
- Programs that support homeless children and families¹⁶⁵
- Programs that provide domestic violence prevention and support¹⁶⁶

1302.53 also establishes new requirements related to Head Start programs' relationships with other state early childhood and education programs:

- 1302.53(b)(2)(vii) Requires Head Start programs to work with the agencies that develop, design, or administer statewide data systems for early childhood education. This provision is designed to support inclusion of Head Start programs in statewide early childhood data systems.
- 1302.53(e) says that Head Start programs “should” participate in their state or local Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) if it meets certain quality standards and enables Head Start programs to participate in the same way as other early childhood programs in the state. Because this provision says “should” instead of “must” it does not require all Head Start programs to participate in QRIS.

1302 Subpart G establishes several new requirements for transition services to comply with the Head Start Act:

- Help parents understand and use parenting practices that will support their children academically and socially during transition to kindergarten¹⁶⁷
- Prepare parents—particularly parents of dual language learner students—to exercise their rights and responsibilities related to their education of their children¹⁶⁸
- Implement strategies in the learning environment that help children get ready for kindergarten¹⁶⁹
- Collaborate with school districts to determine the availability of summer programming for children, if the Head Start program does not offer it¹⁷⁰

1302.72 addresses expectations for collaboration and transition support when children transition from Head Start or Early Head Start to publically funded pre-k or another early childhood program, or move out of the community.

New Subpart H describes services for pregnant women, who are eligible for services in Early Head Start programs, distinct from services for infants/toddlers and services for all Head Start parents, and includes several new requirements that codify best practice.

1302.91(f) establishes new minimum standards for home visitors to have a home-based CDA.

1302.92 requires Head Start programs to provide job-embedded coaching to education staff.

1302.101(b) requires programs to develop program-wide coordinated approaches for three areas in which the proposed rule requires significant changes or improvements in program practices:

- Training and professional development¹⁷¹
- Ensuring full and effective participation of dual language learners¹⁷²
- Ensuring full and effective participation of children with disabilities¹⁷³

1302.101(b)(4) establishes new requirements for data systems and data governance in Head Start programs, these new provisions require Head Start programs to:

- Identify a data governance body responsible for decision-making and procedures for data management.¹⁷⁴
- Share relevant data with the state's K-12 statewide longitudinal data system and other early childhood data systems.¹⁷⁵
- Consult with the Head Start State Collaboration Office, State Early Childhood Advisory Council, and State Education Agency in developing data procedures¹⁷⁶
- Align Head Start data collection and definitions, where possible, with Common Education Data Standards.¹⁷⁷

1302 Subpart J Establishes new requirements for programs to establish a process or cycle for using data to continuously evaluate and improve performance.

¹In 2011 the Administration for Children and Families, ACF, [adopted regulations](#) that amended the Performance Standards to establish the designation renewal system.

² 1302, Subpart J—Program Management and Quality Improvement

³ See 1304.21 of the current Performance Standards

⁴ 1302 Subpart C

⁵ 1302.52(a)

⁶ 1302.21(c)(1) and (3)

⁷ Kenneth B. Robin, Ellen Frede, and W. Steven Barnett, "Is More Better? The Effects of Full-Day vs. Half-Day Preschool on Early School Achievement." NIEER Working Paper (May 2006) <http://nieer.org/publications/nieer-working-papers/more-better-effects-full-day-vs-half-day-preschool-early-school>; Arthur J. Reynolds, et al., "Association of a full-day vs part-day preschool intervention with school readiness, attendance, and parent involvement." *JAMA*, 312(20), (2014) 2126–2134. doi: 10.1001/jama.2014.15376

⁸ 1302.16

⁹ 1302.17

¹⁰ 1302.31

¹¹ Andrew Mashburn, et al. "Measures of Classroom Quality in Prekindergarten and children's development of academic, language, and social skills," *Child Development* 79:3 (2008), p 732-749; Rowe, "Child-directed speech: relation to socioeconomic status, knowledge of child development and child vocabulary skill." *Journal of Child Language* 35:1 (2008), p 185; Zimmerman et al. "Teaching by listening: the importance of adult-child conversations to language development" *Pediatrics* 124:1 (2009), pp 342-349

¹² 1302.32

-
- ¹³ *Advisory Committee on Head Start Research and Evaluation: Final Report. Submitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Service.* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012) https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/eval_final.pdf; Doug Clement and Julie Sarama, "Experimental Evaluation of the Effects of a Research-Based Preschool Mathematics Curriculum." *American Educational Research Journal*. 45:2 (2008), pp 443-494; [Karen L. Bierman, Robert L. Nix, Brenda S. Heinrichs, Celene E. Domitrovich, Scott D. Gest, Janet A. Welsh, and Sukhdeep Gill "Effects of Head Start REDI on Children's Outcomes One Year Later in Different Kindergarten Contexts," *Child Development*. 85:1 \(2014\), pp 140-159](#)
- ¹⁴ Hirokazu Yoshikawa, Testimony before the Senate HELP Committee, Full Committee Hearing on Supporting Children and Families through Investments in High-Quality Early Education, February 6, 2014. Jack Shonkoff, *Minds (Still) Wide Open: Sharpening Our Theory of Change and Advancing the Frontiers of Innovation*. Presentation to Frontiers of Innovation Community Workshop, Boston, Massachusetts (2013).
- ¹⁵ 1302.52(a)
- ¹⁶ Robert C. Piana, Andrew Mashburn, Jason Downer, Bridget Hamre, and Laura Justice, "Effects of web-mediated professional development resources on teacher-child interactions in pre-kindergarten classrooms." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 23(4), (2008), pp 431-451; Bridget Hamre, Robert Pianta, Andrew Mashburn, and Jason Downer "Promoting young children's social competence through the preschool PATHS curriculum and MyTeachingPartner professional development resources." *Early Education and Development*, 23(6), (2012), pp 809-832.
- ¹⁷ Jim Minervino, "Lessons from the Classroom: Implementing High-Quality Pre-K that Makes a Difference For Young Children." *Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation* (2014) https://docs.gatesfoundation.org/documents/Lessons%20from%20Research%20and%20the%20Classroom_September%202014.pdf
- ¹⁸ 1302.92(b)(4)
- ¹⁹ 1302.24
- ²⁰ 1302.32(b)
- ²¹ 1302.11(b)(iv), 1302.14(a)(3), 1302.52(d)
- ²² 1302.52(b)(2)(vii) and 1302.100(b)(4)(iii)
- ²³ 1302.53 (e)
- ²⁴ This is the focus of 1302 Subpart G
- ²⁵ This is the focus of 1302 Subpart F
- ²⁶ Head Start Act, 641A(a)(2)(C)(ii)
- ²⁷ 1302, Subpart J, Program Management and Quality Improvement
- ²⁸ See 1303.72(a)(3)
- ²⁹ See 1302.81(a) and (c)
- ³⁰ Page 226
- ³¹ There were 927,275 funded Head Start slots in FY 2015. <http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/data/factsheets/docs/hs-program-fact-sheet-2014.pdf>
- ³² Howard S. Bloom and Christina Weiland, "Quantifying Variation in Head Start Effects on Young Children's Cognitive and Socio-Emotional Skills Using Data from the National Head Start Impact Study," *MDRC*, March 2015, http://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/quantifying_variation_in_head_start.pdf; Christopher Walters, "Inputs in the Production of Early Childhood Human Capital: Evidence from Head Start," *NBER Working Paper Number 20639*, October 2014, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w20639.pdf>, Steve Barnett and Kwanghee Jung, "Acelero Learning 2011-12 Program Evaluation," *National Institute for Early Education Research*, June 2013, <http://nieer.org/sites/nieer/files/Acelero%20report%20June%202013.pdf>.
- ³³ Jim Minervino, "Lessons from the Classroom: Implementing High-Quality Pre-K that Makes a Difference For Young Children." *Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation* (2014)
- ³⁴ See Administration for Children and Families webinar presentation on Head Start Performance Standards Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (June 2015) <http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/standards/hspss/nprm/docs/ohs-nprm-webinar.pdf>
- ³⁵ 1301.4(d)(3)
- ³⁶ 1301.3(b)(2), 1301.4(c)(2)
- ³⁷ 1302.11(b)
- ³⁸ *Ibid.* (iv)
- ³⁹ 1302.11(a)
- ⁴⁰ (1302.14(a)(3))
- ⁴¹ W. Steven Barnett, Kwanghee Jung, Min-Jong Youn, and Ellen C. Frede, "Abbott Preschool Program Longitudinal Effects Study: Fifth Grade Follow-Up." *National Institute for Early Education Research* (March 2013) <http://nieer.org/sites/nieer/files/APPLES%205th%20Grade.pdf>
- ⁴² See: W. Steven Barnett et. al. *The State of Preschool 2014*. (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, 2015) <http://www.nieer.org/yearbook>
- ⁴³ Stacy B. Ehrlich, Julia A. Gwynne, Amber Stitzel Pareja, and Elaine M. Allensworth with Paul Moore, Sanja Jagesic, and Elizabeth Sorice, "Preschool Attendance in Chicago Public Schools." *University of Chicago Consortium*

on Chicago School Research. (September 2013)

http://images.politico.com/global/2013/09/02/ccsr_earlychild_summary-final.html; Mariajose Romero and Young-Sun Lee, "A National Portrait of Chronic Absenteeism in the Early Grades," (New York: National Center for Children in Poverty, October 2007) http://www.nccp.org/publications/pdf/text_771.pdf

⁴⁴ Walter S. Gilliam, "Prekindergarteners left behind: Expulsion rates in state prekindergarten systems." (New York, NY: Foundation for Child Development, 2005)

⁴⁵ 13012.17(b)(3)

⁴⁶ 1302.21(c)(3)

⁴⁷ 1302.21(c)(1)

⁴⁸ 1302.22(a)

⁴⁹ 1302.21(b)

⁵⁰ 1302.21(b)

⁵¹ 1302.24(b)

⁵² Some provisions cannot be waived, including licensing requirements, square footage requirements, and child:adult ratios for children under two years old.

⁵³ 1302.24

⁵⁴ 1302.23

⁵⁵ 1302.20(c)(4)

⁵⁶ 1302.21(c)(1) and (3)

⁵⁷ Kenneth B. Robin, Ellen Frede, and W. Steven Barnett, "Is More Better? The Effects of Full-Day vs. Half-Day Preschool on Early School Achievement." *NIEER Working Paper* (May 2006) <http://nieer.org/publications/nieer-working-papers/more-better-effects-full-day-vs-half-day-preschool-early-school>; Arthur J. Reynolds, et. al. "Association of a full-day vs part-day preschool intervention with school readiness, attendance, and parent involvement." *JAMA*, 312(20), (2014) 2126–2134. doi: 10.1001/jama.2014.15376

⁵⁸ Section 1302.31(b)

⁵⁹ 1302.31(a)

⁶⁰ Section 1302.31(b)(2)

⁶¹ 1302.32(a)(1)

⁶² 1302.32(a)(2) and (3)

⁶³ 1302.32(b)

⁶⁴ Advisory Committee on Head Start Research and Evaluation, *Final Report. Submitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Service*. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012)

https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/eval_final.pdf; Doug Clement and Julie Sarama, "Experimental Evaluation of the Effects of a Research-Based Preschool Mathematics Curriculum." *American Educational Research Journal*. 45:2 (2008), pp 443-494; Karen L. Bierman, Robert L. Nix, Brenda S. Heinrichs, Celene E.

Domitrovich, Scott D. Gest, Janet A. Welsh, and Sukhdeep Gill "Effects of Head Start REDI on Children's Outcomes One Year Later in Different Kindergarten Contexts," *Child Development*. 85:1 (2014), pp 140-159

⁶⁵ See "Procedures and Standards Handbook," *What Works Clearinghouse*, accessed July 31, 2015

http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_procedures_v2_1_standards_handbook.pdf

⁶⁶ Mike Puma, Stephen Bell, Ronna Cook, Camilla Heid, Pam Broene, Frank Jenkins, Andrew Mashburn, and Jason Downer, *Third Grade Follow-up to the Head Start Impact Study Final Report*, OPRE Report # 2012-45 (Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012).

⁶⁷ Gregory Camilli, Sadako Vargas, Sharon Ryan, and W. Steven Barnett, "Meta-analysis of the effects of early education interventions on cognitive and social development," *Teachers College Record*, 2010;112(3):579-620, <http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=15440>.

⁶⁸ Head Start Act. 641A(a)(2)(C)(ii)

⁶⁹ 1302.42(a)

⁷⁰ 1302.42(b)(iii)

⁷¹ 1302.43

⁷² For a summary of the model and synthesis of relevant research, see: Frances B. Duran, Kathy S. Hepburn, Roxanne K. Kaufman, Lan T. Le, Mary Dallas Allen, Eileen M. Brennan, and Beth L. Green, Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation: Research Synthesis. *The Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning*. (retrieved July 31, 2015) http://csefel.vanderbilt.edu/documents/rs_ecmhc.pdf

⁷³ 1302.45(b)

⁷⁴ 1302.46

⁷⁵ 1302.46(b)(1)(v)

⁷⁶ 1302.46(b)(1)(ii)

⁷⁷ 1302.46(b)(2)(i)

⁷⁸ 1302.47(a). The proposed rule for *Caring for Our Children Basics* can be found at:
<https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2014/12/18/2014-29649/caring-for-our-children-basics-comment-request#h-22>

⁷⁹ 1302.47(b)(1)(i)

⁸⁰ 1302.47(b)

⁸¹ 1302.47(b)(4)

⁸² See 1302.47(c)

⁸³ 1302.52(a)

⁸⁴ 1302.52(c)(2)

⁸⁵ 1302.52(c)

⁸⁶ 1302.51(b)

⁸⁷ 1302.50(b)(1)

⁸⁸ 1302.50(b)(3)

⁸⁹ 1302.50(b)(5 and 6)

⁹⁰ 1302.32(b)

⁹¹ 1302.52(b)(2)(i)

⁹² 1302.52(b)(2)(i)

⁹³ 1302.52(b)(2)(v)

⁹⁴ 1302.52(b)(2)(v)

⁹⁵ 1302.52(b)(2)(vi)

⁹⁶ 1302.52(b)(2)(vii)

⁹⁷ 1302.63(a) and (b)

⁹⁸ 1302.63(c)

⁹⁹ See 1302.32(a)(5) and 1302.61(a)

¹⁰⁰ 1302.62

¹⁰¹ 1302.71(b)(2)(ii)

¹⁰² 1302.71(b)(2)(iii)

¹⁰³ 1302.71(d)

¹⁰⁴ 1302.71(c)(3)

¹⁰⁵ See 1302.81(a) and (b) and 1302.82(c)

¹⁰⁶ 1302.90(b)(5)

¹⁰⁷ 1302.91(a)

¹⁰⁸ 1302.91(b)

¹⁰⁹ Although the Head Start Act requires all Head Start center-based teachers to have at least an associate's degree, the regulatory impact analysis notes that a small percentage of Head Start teachers do not have at least an associate's degree (about 2,345 nationally) and estimates the cost to bring all these teachers into compliance at \$4,167,135. Nationally, Head Start already exceeds the requirement that at least half of teachers have a bachelor's degree.

¹¹⁰ 1302.91(c)

¹¹¹ 1302.91(d)

¹¹² 1302.91(d)

¹¹³ 1302.91(f)

¹¹⁴ 1302.91(g)

¹¹⁵ 1302.91(g)(3) Note: it is not clear why this provision is included under the requirements for family child care providers.

¹¹⁶ 1302.91(h)(1)

¹¹⁷ 1302.91(h)(2)

¹¹⁸ 1302.91(i)

¹¹⁹ 648A(a)(1)

¹²⁰ See: Diane M. Early, et. al. "Teachers' education, classroom quality, and young children's academic skills: results from seven studies of preschool programs." *Child Development*. (2007) Mar-Apr;78(2):558-80.

¹²¹ Jim Minervino, "Lessons from the Classroom: Implementing High-Quality Pre-K that Makes a Difference For Young Children." *Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation* (2014)

¹²² The language reads "High staff qualifications, including a teacher with a bachelor's degree in early childhood education or a bachelor's degree in any field with a State-approved alternate pathway, which may include coursework, clinical practice, and evidence of knowledge of content and pedagogy relating to early childhood." See U.S. Department of Education, "Preschool Development Grants—Development Grants Executive Summary. Program Definitions." (August 2014) P 20 <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/preschooldevelopmentgrants/executivesummary-419a.pdf>

¹²³ 1302.92(b)(3)

¹²⁴ 1302.92(b)(4)

125 1302.92(b)(4)
126 1302.92(b)(5)(iii and ii)
127 648A(a)(5)
128 1302.92(c)
129 1302.92(d)
130 Robert C. Piana, Andrew Mashburn, Jason Downer, Bridget Hamre, and Laura Justice, "Effects of web-mediated professional development resources on teacher-child interactions in pre-kindergarten classrooms." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 23(4), (2008), pp 431-451; Bridget Hamre, Robert Pianta, Andrew Mashburn, and Jason Downer "Promoting young children's social competence through the preschool PATHS curriculum and MyTeachingPartner professional development resources." *Early Education and Development*, 23(6), (2012), pp 809-832.
131 Jim Minervino, "Lessons from the Classroom: Implementing High-Quality Pre-K that Makes a Difference For Young Children." *Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation* (2014)
https://docs.gatesfoundation.org/documents/Lessons%20from%20Research%20and%20the%20Classroom_September%202014.pdf
132 Given the definition of education staff in this section, the requirement to provide coaching would appear to apply to both teachers and home visiting staff. Some home visiting models and research, however, may refer to provision of job-embedded support and professional development as supervision, rather than coaching. See:
http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/~media/publications/PDFs/earlychildhood/EBHV_brief4.pdf
133 1302.101(a)
134 1302.100(b)(1)
135 1302.100(b)(2)
136 1302.100(b)(3)
137 1302.101(b)(4)(i)
138 1302.101(b)(4)(iii)
139 1302.101(b)(4)(ii)
140 1302.101(b)(4)(iv)
141 1302.102(a)
142 1302.102(b)
143 1302.102(c)
144 1302.102(a)(1)
145 1302.102(a)(2)
146 1302.102(a)(3)
147 1302.102(a)(4)
148 1304.51 (a, b, c)
149 1302.102(b)(1)
150 1302.102(b)(2)(i)
151 1302.102(b)(2)(ii and iii)
152 1303.22
153 Education Sciences Reform Act of. Sec. 102 (20) <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/rschstat/leg/PL107-279.pdf>
154 Section 1302.31(b)(2)
155 1302.46(b)(1)(ii)
156 1302.46(b)(2)(i)
157 1302.51(b)
158 1302.50(b)(1)
159 1302.50(b)(3)
160 1302.50(b)(5 and 6)
161 1302.52(b)(2)(i)
162 1302.52(b)(2)(i)
163 1302.52(b)(2)(v)
164 1302.52(b)(2)(v)
165 1302.52(b)(2)(vi)
166 1302.52(b)(2)(vii)
167 1302.71(b)(2)(ii)
168 1302.71(b)(2)(iii)
169 1302.71(d)
170 1302.71(c)(3)
171 1302.100(b)(1)
172 1302.100(b)(2)
173 1302.100(b)(3)
174 1302.101(b)(4)(i)
175 1302.101(b)(4)(iii)

¹⁷⁶ 1302.101(b)(4)(ii)
¹⁷⁷ 1302.101(b)(4)(iv)