

**HEAD START'S FUTURE:
Perspectives from the Bush Administration,
Congress, States, Advocates and Researchers**



**The Brookings Institution
Falk Auditorium
May 7, 2003**

PANEL THREE: What Does the Research Tell Us?

JAMES J. GALLAGHER

Kenan Professor of Education, University of North Carolina -Chapel Hill

LYNN KAROLY

Director of Labor and Population Program and Professor of Economics, RAND

CRAIG T. RAMEY

Distinguished Professor in Health Studies and Director, Georgetown Center on Health and Education, Georgetown University

PANEL THREE: What Does the Research Tell Us?



MR. HASKINS: As everybody who comes to Brookings events knows, policymakers and advocates and so forth have opinions but researchers know the answers because they have data. [Laughter] So we thought it would be fitting to see what research would imply for both the general issue of reauthorization as well as the specific proposal that the President has put on the table.

So we've invited three very distinguished researchers to join us today. Jim Gallagher who is the Kenan Professor from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. And I think it only behooves me to point out that Jim has been doing research longer than the rest of us because he's the oldest. [Laughter]

But Crag is not far behind. Craig Ramey who used to be Jim Gallagher's colleague at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill is now at Georgetown University where he's a Distinguished Professor of health issues, and he also runs a center for children.

Third, Lynn Karoly from the RAND Corporation. Lynn has just completed a masterful review of the research on the effects of the 1996 Welfare Reform legislation, and earlier she wrote a wonderful review of pre-school programs.

So we're delighted to have all three of you here. Each of the speakers has ten minutes and then we'll have plenty of time for audience participation. We're going to start with age before beauty, Jim Gallagher.



MR. JAMES GALLAGHER: Thank you, Ron. I think. [Laughter]

One of the things that struck me as I was looking at strengthening Head Start and other planning devices is that they're really asking for some very dramatic changes here and the question is, is there data behind those changes, or what kinds of issues are we going to have to face if in fact we buy into this.

One of the persistent observations that I think we can make about programs that are started with high ideals and important goals is that if they don't work the chances are it's because of the implementation, not because of the central idea. So that's what I would like to talk about.

Let's suppose we wanted to implement some of these ideas that we have been talking about today and what the issues would be.

I believe in a comprehensive and integrated state program to serve children of pre-school. It's hard for me to project 20 years down the road and say there will be a separate Head Start program or even 10 years down the road and to think about a separate Head Start program. So the question is how do you bring together these various elements in the pre-school area on an effective basis? Because I think the bringing together of all these programs will happen sooner or later, and I think sooner is probably what we're facing.

But in such a complex operation we need to follow the physician's dictum, first do no harm. There are valuable contributions that have been made by Head Start in work with families, in nutrition, in health, in technical assistance. These contributions should not be lost in such a move toward collaboration. The proposed changes create many challenges in implementation so let me just comment on a couple of the implementation -- Think about now, and we're going to bring together all of these pre-school efforts that are now available.

There are many players in the pre-school field. Head Start, Children with Disabilities, Title I, Child Care, and these players can be counted upon to be protective of their hard-won gains in the past. So when there are inevitable disputes, who is the umpire? Who is the referee?

Second, assuming that all of these existing major pre-school program components will be maintained in some form, there needs to be organizational mechanisms established for interagency and interprogram cooperation. Just how is that going to be done and how is it going to be operated?

Third, despite some savings to be achieved from program integration there is likely to be a shortage of funds for pre-school programs that will tempt program managers and decisionmakers to shortcut these program support elements necessary for quality.

The plan for implementation of a comprehensive pre-school system should try to cope with these problems at the every beginning, not down the road when things have gone bad.

We use a definition of social policy at the Frank Porter Graham Institute, and it goes like this. "Social policies are the rules and standards by which scarce public resources are allocated to almost unlimited social needs."

Written social policy should provide the answer to four major questions. Who shall receive the resources? That's the eligibility issue. Who shall deliver the services? That's the professional issue. What is the nature of the services to be delivered? That's the curriculum issue. And what are the conditions under which these services will be delivered?

It is a struggle for these scarce resources that trigger most of the agency battles. We are aware of the complexities caused by the various and separate histories of Head Start, Children with Disabilities, Child Care, and Title I, and each of these interest groups are justifiably suspicious of any action that would cause them to lose turf that has been obtained through blood, toil, sweat and tears over the years. It would be very good if when we're thinking about such a major change we could provide some answers to those four questions and not merely pass them off to the states to answer.

It might be helpful to step back for a moment and suppose that we are not captives of the past and various interest groups. How would we try from scratch to organize the delivery of quality services for pre-school children?

Let us compare our delivery of educational services for a moment to health services, and think about the physician and what the support system of the physician is. With laboratories, researchers, pharmaceuticals research, support personnel all over the place. They become an impressive part of these services.

Education has tried to get by with much less help for the primary service deliverer, the teacher. And Ed Zigler is exactly right. We need personnel preparation at a very high level, but we need more than that. If we aspire to the goal of No Child Left Behind, then we need a support system that stands behind the service deliverer just as a physician has that support system.

A couple of years ago Dick Clifford and I wrote an article on the needed infrastructure for early childhood. I'm still inclined to believe that this infrastructure may hold the key to bringing these programs together in some efficient and economical way, and so what we're talking about is personnel preparation, technical assistance, applied research and program evaluation, communication, data systems, often neglected, comprehensive planning, and coordination.

So such a support system should provide the answers to questions such as who will prepare the professional and paraprofessional staff? How will staff access new knowledge and skills? How can we assess the effectiveness of our own work? And how can we manage our limited funds?

The predictable shortage of money for pre-school programs will result in inevitable delay or absence of these support elements unless we make policy decisions now to create a support system for early childhood.

The existing programs already have major commitments to support system elements. Head Start has committed \$166 million to personnel preparation. Child Care has \$20 million for early learning opportunities. Children with Disabilities has technical assistance, regional resource

centers, and personnel preparation. Title I is struggling with academic standards. But the elements of a pre-school support system is there.

So you would support Ed Zigler's notion of a task force, but not just a task force to look at Head Start. A task force to look at pre-school and all of the various services of pre-school.

How can we get the proposed comprehensive program for pre-school and avoid the pitfalls that experience tells us lies right down the road? We would propose an incentive for states willing to take on the new pre-school responsibilities. A three year grant up to five percent of the amount the state would receive from the four federal sources -- Child Care, Head Start, Children with Disabilities, Title I. This is five percent on top of these. This is not extracted from these funds.

The sum of money would be earmarked so the state could build the remainder of an integrated support system necessary for a quality pre-school program. Qualified personnel are probably the most critical need, developing an integrated personnel preparation program is a major implementation target.

The range of information and skills needed to conduct a first-rate pre-school program extend far beyond the capabilities of an individual staff. So there's a need for them to have some place to access needed information or skills on a regular basis and that's the technical assistance issue.

There is also a need for information on numbers of children, qualifications of staff and financial information or program managers will never be able to plan. And there is a need for a plan for accountability for all of the elements of the comprehensive program. This is probably the most difficult of technical issues and will require sustained professional attention.

If all that is provided by the state or federal government are funds for direct services to children, this program will fail. These key support elements must be planned for, financially supported, and a special allocation is designed to help do some of that.

There is part of this proposal that asks the state to produce a maintenance of effort statement for all of these things. It would be well to be more specific about the federal role in this effort. There should be a maintenance of effort for the federal role during a multi-year transition period which means investing the same or increased levels of support for Head Start to the states as is being given to the local providers. In addition the cost of the research and evaluation effort aimed at accountability should be carried by the federal government, including the developmental costs of measuring instruments and protocol.

A coordinated effort at the federal level would be required to develop appropriate accountability measures. I cannot in my life see 50 separate evaluation plans for pre-school coming out of the 50 different states.

All of these suggestions have been made on the assumption that this is a major governmental priority.

The term unfunded mandate has been a rallying cry for those opposing past federal initiatives. There should be no doubt that what we are proposing does not fall under that category. We recognize many of the implementation problems and we should plan for them now.

Thank you.

MR. HASKINS: Thank you, Jim.

Craig Ramey.



MR. CRAIG T. RAMEY: I'd like to exercise my professorial prerogative and go to the podium. [Laughter] And to show you my Power Point.

I really want to begin by sharing with you my affirmation of the broad goals of Head Start. I think that none of us, at least none of the people I know here today, are here to quarrel with that in any way. We're talking about producing children who are healthy, who grow cognitively and socially and other ways to be ready for school, to strengthen families, to provide high quality comprehensive services, and to link children and families to needed community services, and to ensure that well-managed programs involve parents in what occurs inside those programs.

I have a few premises I want to share with you before I get to some recommendations. We may or may not agree on these, but these are ones that I begin with.

First, that Head Start needs more systematic data. Regularly analyzed and publicly reported to manage its continuous development and its current and expanding commitment to the 908,000 children, families and communities that it now serves.

It's clear, and I think that Jim and I are in agreement on this, and I think Ed, I think there's a broad agreement that we need an integrated data system that combines information about child progress, program features, and community context to clearly understand what is a quite complex process that Head Start is engaged in.

I also believe that Head Start and K-12 public education needs stronger programmatic linkages at the local, state and federal levels. That Head Start and K-12 need to jointly affirm and support children's physical well being and motor development, social and emotional development, approaches to learning, language development, and emerging literacy, and cognition and general knowledge.

The various domains of development, and we'll come to this in another way in a moment, but these various domains of development need to be explicitly recognized as being closely interrelated and not independent. We know that at a neurobiological level as well as at a behavioral level. Local pre-K programs including Head Start and subsidized child care and programs for children with disabilities, clearly need a greater degree of coordination to maximize programmatic effectiveness and efficiency. Having run programs myself, having been involved in program delivery for almost all of my life, it is sometimes almost overwhelmingly complex to understand the various funding streams and to make things effective and efficient. And I believe that assessments of children's progress during Head Start and into pre-K constitutes a kind of bottom line against which we can begin to judge the effectiveness and efficiency of how the system is operating, and that those assessments when properly analyzed and conceptualized could trigger systematic training and technical assistance as a part of program accountability.

There's some debates that are more than just inside-the-Beltway debates that are currently I think corrosive and badly framed and they run the risk of splitting the child development community in ways that I think will do irreparable harm.

One is that the social and emotional development are more important to the mission of Head Start than language, [tugs] of development and preparation for literacy. There's some political currency in that, but that won't lead to serving children better if we operate from that premise.

There's also a position that routinely assessing the development of young Head Start children is too difficult, stressful for the children, and too expensive. I think that is just not true.

That the mission of Head Start was never about school readiness and there is no need to align Head Start and K-12 education. Head Start was about something other than school readiness. I wasn't quite as old as Jim and Ed when Head Start began, but I was aware that we were talking about school readiness when that program was launched.

It also I think is a myth that Head Start has fully adequate funding and a properly prepared and compensated workforce to accomplish its mission. Clearly major effort has to be done to bring about improvements there.

Let me tell you what I think some of the real problems facing Head Start are that we're not talking about in sufficient depth. One is that there is almost mind-bogglingly increasing

linguistic diversity of Head Start families and children, and the lack of culturally and linguistically competent teachers and program administrators is, I believe, a huge problem.

There is also a paucity of empirically validated curricula to promote school readiness and social and emotional competence. I know there is now a jointly funded government effort underway to pursue that, but we need that soon and we need to be clear about it.

That there's a lack of validated, non-pathologizing assessment instruments to measure children's social and emotional growth. I believe that Head Start ought to ask NIH to step up to the plate and help us assess children in ways that can capitalize on their pro-social, emotional development and not just talk about whether the children are free from pathologies.

We know a lot about what makes programs successful when dealing with young children, in Head Start and other programs that were funded to complement Head Start in a research sense. We know that programs that begin early tend to produce bigger and better and longer-lasting results than programs that begin later.

We know that more intensive programs with higher educational quality that provide for direct learning experiences, that have greater breadth and flexibility in service delivery, that recognize individual differences not only in children but in families and programs. By the way, in the transition program we were able to identify seven different types of Head Start families, and those types were not a marker for ethnicity or linguistic diversity, but it's information like that that might allow us to tailor our services more effectively.

We have to understand that when children leave Head Start the kinds of schools that they go into play a huge role in whether the gains are maintained or not. And clearly we must do more and better efforts to deal with the cultural congruence issues that will only become more complex as we go forward.

So here's where I am. What's Head Start really need? Right now in this moment it does not need to fracture itself along partisan lines. It needs desperately to figure out how to do things in a bipartisan way, in a way that has always characterized Head Start, and for that we need vigorous bipartisan leadership. Not just merely go along, get along, but never before in my life has there been a time when the stakes were so high, when progress could be made, and it may slip through our hands like sand if we don't do the right thing.

We need to debate about specific proposals to strengthen our country's premier commitment to the full development of our most vulnerable children. These specific proposals should be subject to prospective cost benefit analyses, and highly promising proposals should be enacted and rigorously evaluated.

By doing so, I believe we can make better use of Head Start as the laboratory of innovation that Ed Zigler envisioned when he and others created this wonderful program, and I believe that rather than rest on laurels this is the time for all of us in the early childhood community to challenge one another to step up to the plate and do it better, faster, with higher standards than we've ever done it before. And I believe we can do that. But I think we cannot do it if we fight some really poorly framed battles inside the child development community and if we approach this in a partisan fashion. We will serve fewer children and less well I believe if we do that. I, I believe, like you, would not like to be part of this effort slipping through our fingers.

MR. HASKINS: Lynn?



MS. LYNN KAROLY: [...Tape Skip...] improvements that can be made in components, if there's a literacy component of the program, and in terms of the quality of the teachers and providers who provide the Head Start services.

It was mentioned earlier that Head Start has met the goal of achieving 50 percent of the teachers having associates degrees, but as we've also heard the current recommendation by the National Research Council report is that Head Start teachers or equivalent pre-school teachers should have at least a BA degree with specific training in early childhood development. So there's clearly room to make improvements in that domain as well.

The goal of improving integration is also one where I think there is widespread agreement on, although how one achieves that I think there is more debate. Here we know that the states are doing considerably more than at the time Head Start was founded, but whether or not there are ways in which we can improve the Head Start investment and the coordination with state-level investment in order to achieve a maximum return from that investment I think is something that the debate needs to consider more fully as we look at the reauthorization of this particular program.

I'll stop there.

MR. HASKINS: Let me begin by asking this panel a very basic question that I think would be one of the first issues that we should satisfy Congress about. We've talked about the programs that you mentioned especially, and thank you for that very nice summary in literature, that from [Abecedarian, Perry] and several other programs, maybe even the Reynolds program in Chicago which is a much broader program, something like 1200 kids, that you can have major impacts on their school preparation and their school performance. Yet we know from the recent early childhood longitudinal study that the average low income minority kid comes to school about 27 standard deviations below in both literacy and mathematics. So some of you may

remember the spirited speech that President Johnson gave at Howard University in 1965 about coming to the starting gate equal, and that Head Start and other programs, not just pre-school as Ron Herndon pointed out, but that we were really going to make progress at the beginning, at age five, that kids were going to come to public schools ready to achieve.

The question before this panel of researchers is, could we do that on a broad scale? Could we actually five years from now or ten years from now come back here and look at that early childhood longitudinal study and find that those kids on average throughout the country are within .2 or .1 standard devices, that made up half or more of the difference? Could we do that?

MS. KAROLY: I think the evidence suggests that yes we could, with the right types of programs, with programs that provided a well designed curriculum, a well tested and proven curriculum with investments in terms of the quality of the providers, the intensity of the services, and so on. I think there is evidence that those gaps can be made up. They may not be fully made up, but certainly the range of improvement that you're talking about.

MR. RAMEY: I have no doubt about it. I'm convinced. If we did two things really well, if we were really tough-minded, if we did the kind of accountability systems that's practically useful that puts into the hands of teachers, directors, program administrators useable information in real time to guide the creation of quality programs and target technical assistance where you need it, if you did that and at the same time combined that with a tender-hearted assurance that this is not about trying to get people, this is about trying to help people fulfill what they have been trying to do as part of their life's work.

Is it tough? Yes. But we can build the management systems, we can build the technical assistance systems.

Will it cost more? Of course it will cost more. How much more? We have to try it. We have to try to build it. I think that's where Ed hit the nail on the head in talking about Head Start as being the nation's laboratory in early childhood education. But we can't do it by half measure.

MR. GALLAGHER: I agree in part. I think that what we can do if we build the systems of support of these quality personnel preparation programs, a leadership training program, we can make a big dent in that gap.

Do I believe that we could even it out? No. I don't. And the reason why is because achievement just doesn't depend upon education. It depends upon an entire cultural background. If you're not going to deal with the heart of poverty in the society than I don't think you're going to get an even playing field.

You can certainly improve the services that are being given now, but I think you've got to look at the larger society if you want to even the playing field and not just focus on those pre-school kids.

MR. HASKINS: So let's assume, Jim is the most dubious about this, which I think is quite admirable. I'd put myself in your camp. [Laughter] You might change your mind! [Laughter]

MR. GALLAGHER: Let me rethink that. [Laughter]

MR. HASKINS: Even Jim says that substantial improvement is possible and I think that's not really a far way from what Lynn said. We make up the entire difference but we could make up --

MR. GALLAGHER: Sure.

MR. HASKINS: It doesn't have to be .7 standard deviation on both reading and math.

MR. GALLAGHER: Exactly.

MR. HASKINS: So the question now is, based on your experience and research and knowledge of literature, would the Administration proposal to give states more control, or some variant. I don't think we ought to focus on just, but the idea that the states are going to play a quarterback role here, is that progress? Is that a step in the right direction? Will that lead to the kind of things, the technical assistance, the accountability, and so forth that you think are necessary? And this infrastructure, Jim, that you talked about so eloquently in your presentation, is it a step in the right direction?

MS. KAROLY: My concern is that simply changing the funding streams and the responsibility without additional resources will not necessarily get you to that goal. In fact in part it may actually with a more diffuse and decentralized system, take more resources and administration and functioning accountability and so on, in this disbursed system than you would have in a more centralized system.

I think to get to the kind of progress that you're talking about we have to talk about what's the resource commitment that we're willing to make at this stage of childhood for a targeted group of children and how are we going to get those level of resources invested into this particular area? I don't think we're making that level of resource investment today.

MR. RAMEY: I guess I would say I'm an incrementalist about this. I'm very optimistic. I think if we can find some places that were really willing to give this a full bore go, where there are Governors that are just committed to understanding the connection between pre-K through

college, we would see the kind of innovation that we've seen in Georgia under Zell Miller and then Roy Barnes; in North Carolina under Jim Hunt; that we've seen in a number of states.

Is the country ready as a whole to do this? I'm quite skeptical that that would occur.

Could the country swallow and efficiently use an extra \$4 billion next year? I have doubts about that. I think we need some really careful thought-out planning, but done quickly to decide what are the most crucial pieces of information that we need that could then help to ratchet up program quality quickly? I think that that is not a decade long, it's not a half decade long. I think it's an 18 month long process.

MR. GALLAGHER: What I'd like to see I think is five to eight states that are eager and ready to try out something like this. Give them the resources and the support that they would need to bring together these various components. Because we have a lot to learn from everybody. Children with Disabilities have something to teach us all. Head Start has something to teach us all. Child Care has something to teach us all. And the research community has something to teach us all. But we need to bring these forces together and to work in some kind of coordination and harmony.

If this can be done through the states, fine. If it can be done through other mechanisms, fine. But it has to be done. And I would think that making a pilot study of five or six states who are willing to take this on, given a federal commitment to provide them with the resources that you need in order to get it done, that would be something that we could look at and see. Because we're going to run into problems that we never even dreamed of when we start doing this kind of thing and we need to see what they are and to deal with them before we go on a 50-state adventure here.

MR. HASKINS: Questions from the audience?

QUESTION: Joan Lombardi. I think on behalf of many people in the audience I think it's been heartening to hear Ed's call, Craig's call and Ron's call for a bipartisan discussion which has been lacking, which we had in 1994 and '98. I don't know why we can't have it now.

My question is, to follow up on what you mentioned, Ron, about the research that shows kids are behind when they walk into school. We actually know that kids are behind when they walk into Head Start. So one of the things that many of us have been wondering is why the discussion has not centered more on what we need to do about infants and toddlers. We've got 600,000 infants and toddlers in the child care development block grant system with little more than health and safety protection. We could do so much more in this area. It would be a way to promote collaboration and coordination if the Head Start programs could serve younger kids and have that flexibility.

So from a research perspective, what's research telling us about the importance of focusing on infants and toddlers, Craig Ramey?

MR. RAMEY: I think this in tennis is called a lob, right? [Laughter]

You notice that one of the principles I put up was timing.

I think the question is what is the country willing to bite off as its adequate challenge? We know that by the time kids are two they come from very low resource families. Even though they were perfectly normal during the first years of life as far as we can tell, there are measurable developmental delays. And they run a spectrum of delays, and the delays appear to correspond with some indicators that we can pretty easily ascertain.

So when I say Head Start, I mean all of Head Start. Early Head Start, Head Start, the transition into school. I think that's the great insight that's grown over 38 years of Head Start. That it's not just one particular time in development and if we get it just right then, that sort of takes care of it. Because you don't do that with your kids, we don't do that with our kids. We know there is a developmental continuity.

So the question is what are we willing to settle for as the floor? I think the floor can be much higher than it is now. I believe it's affordable, but I do believe that both the early childhood group, and I count myself as one of those, and the research community, and I count myself as one of those, we have to do things better, differently, and faster. And we can't just study these problems to death. We have to be in the mix with the policymakers and providing feedback in real time. Because it is a two-year cycle and if we don't have something to offer within those couple of years each and every time, then we're not much of a player.

MR. GALLAGHER: Let me just comment on the infant and toddlers aspect of this. Every one of the 50 states now have taken on the responsibility of providing services for children with disabilities from birth on, and there's a raft of experience out there in the infant/toddler area from a whole bunch of people who've been working on this for a long time. Wouldn't it be nice to bring those people together with the people in Head Start and share experiences? Of course this is the other area in which families play a very significant role in the program.

MR. HASKINS: I'm from Washington, and I know that what you guys are talking about and what Joan Lombardi's talking about starts at \$10 billion a year or more. So the question is this based on the research. Could we get significant progress and help these kids come to school closer to equal, make up half the difference or some such thing, with a universal federal and state program for four year olds who are poor? Or meet other criteria of disadvantage. Could we do it with that?

MR. GALLAGHER: Do it with just that?

MR. HASKINS: Yeah.

MR. GALLAGHER: I don't think so. I think we can make a big dent, doing it even better with all the things you've talked about -- better teachers, better curricula, better information. But will that by itself -- If we did that perfectly, I do not believe we would reach the goal of closing the gap. We would narrow it, and no one knows how much because the piece of research that's critically missing is what do you get --

(END SIDE)

MR. GALLAGHER: -- at high quality. We should never be doing research that is on programs of lesser than high quality, but there simply has never been a study done that has adequately manipulated the duration, the age of entry and the duration of participation that's experimentally adequate to write the equation to say you get this much for that much.

QUESTION: I'm Cheryl Wetzstein with the Washington Times. I've been waiting all morning for this panel. [Laughter]

I'd like to know, ladies and gentlemen, is Head Start, in the President's proposal, is Head Start going to be block granted and dismantled? If you see the President's proposal as block granting Head Start and dismantling it, how do you see that? If you don't see that, how do you see that? [Laughter]

MR. HASKINS: Jim, you're the oldest. [Laughter]

MR. GALLAGHER: I'm getting older all the time. [Laughter]

MR. HASKINS: Craig and I both used to work for Jim and we're getting a little payback here today. [Laughter]

MR. GALLAGHER: I don't see it as block granting. I see those streams of funds coming down as separate streams of funds, at least in the beginning, until we know a lot more about how we can put them together than we do now.

There also are very special things in each of these areas of child care, disabilities, Head Start, that deserves separate support.

But I think that what this does is almost force a coming together and a discussion of the various elements in each of the programs which I think would be very productive.

Assuming that at least the money is there to allow for the coordination and allow for some support forces behind this. Otherwise, you're whirling around but you're not really getting anywhere.

MR. RAMEY: I'm new enough to being inside the Beltway that I still believe some of the things that some of the people tell me. I heard Margaret Spellings say this is not block granting in the way that it's been done before, and that it is an attempt to find some good alternatives. If it's not what the President has on the table, then what's the alternative way to do it? I believe that's a constructive thing to put as a challenge to all of us.

Somebody in the third row or the fifth row or the ninth row who has the way to cut this Gordian Knot, for God's sakes stand up and say, we'll meet out in the hall and have a conversation. Because I think we're all just trying to make this up and we can see that certain ways of going have very high risks associated with them, but there are risks associated with standing still. Although you don't hear anyone arguing for standing still, I think we really have to clearly articulate an agenda that lays out the alternatives and then have good, principled, hard-hitting, rational debate about whether plan A, B, C, or D or some other plan is the thing for us to get behind.

But I do believe that if we don't most all of us get behind it that what will come out will be a very pale imitation of what it could have been. So if a lot of blood's left on the floor after reauthorization, we can just expect that Head Start is going to lie dormant and it's not going to be connected to subsidized child care and it's not going to be connected to children with disabilities.

So I see this as an opportunity that is time-limited. I think we can rise to that occasion. And I didn't hear Margaret say it's their way or the highway.

MR. HASKINS: I think that's a good thing to end on. I'm sorry for all those people who want to ask questions. If nothing else, I think the discussion this morning demonstrates that there is serious attention being devoted in Washington up on the Hill and in the intellectual community to Head Start and I hope this reauthorization will really lead to some serious change.

Thank you all very much.

#####