

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
REFORMING EARLY EDUCATION

Washington, D.C.
Monday, August 22, 2011

PARTICIPANTS:

Welcome:

RON HASKINS
Senior Fellow and Co-Director, Center on
Children and Families
The Brookings Institution

Keynote Address:

W. STEVEN BARNETT
Professor and Co-Director, National Institute
for Early Education (NIEER)
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

YVETTE SANCHEZ FUENTES
Director, Office of Head Start
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Moderator:

RON HASKINS,
Senior Fellow and Co-Director, Center on
Children and Families
The Brookings Institution

Panelists:

JERLEAN DANIEL
Executive Director
National Association for the Education of
Young Children

JENS LUDWIG
Professor of Social Service Administration,
Law and Public Policy
University of Chicago
Nonresident Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

YASMINA VINCI
Executive Director
National Head Start Association

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. HASKINS: Welcome to Brookings. My name is Ron Haskins. I'm a senior fellow here, and along with my colleague, Isabel Sawhill, I run a group here called the Center on Children and Families.

So I'm amazed to see so many people here. We publicized this event for the first time 5 days ago, not to mention that it's August in Washington and yet we had, I think, 150 people sign up for the event. We publicized it so late because part of the feature of the program today is Steve Barnett, who published a very nice article in *Science* magazine. And when you publish something in *Science*, they have a communications department. Many members used to be in the Gestapo. And they completely control you. And of course, I didn't realize this so we planned this event. We invited Jens to come and so forth.

So we had arrangements underway and they told us we could not tell anybody that there was even an article in *Science* that was in any way involved in this event until Wednesday at two o'clock. And then -- I'm sorry, Thursday at two o'clock. And then they wouldn't even let us give the members of the panel a copy of the article until Friday morning. So it was amazing. And then I spent part of this weekend writing a letter to the CIA highly recommending that they immediately send someone over to Science -- American Association for Advancement of Science -- so they can learn how to truly guard their secrets because these guys are amazing. So they did help us in some ways but, boy, it really was a struggle.

Let me start by apologizing to the panelists and especially to Steve. Unfortunately, I know exactly how to make sure that this event gets zero coverage. And the way to do it is to emphasize that this is a very positive story about a \$7 billion program that enrolls 900,000 preschoolers. And in Washington, good stories just don't

sell. So this is a great story.

It's a story of scholarly research that showed that Head Start should be able to produce bigger and more lasting impacts on the development of children than it was typically doing. It's a story of a committee of professionals called, somewhat strangely, the Committee on Redesignation of Head Start that was appointed by a republican administration under requirements passed by a Democratically controlled Congress. And they produced a report offering clear and compelling recommendations about how to improve Head Start. It's a story of a democratic administration that decided to touch the third rail of American preschool programs and developed a creative regulation to implement and actually improve the committee's recommendations for reforming Head Start. And it's a story of a Head Start program that has responded positively to the criticism and to the reforms that are proposed by the Obama administration and appears to fully support the administration plan for improvement even though the plan will likely result in the closing of some Head Start centers.

So here's how we're going to tell this story. First, Steve Barnett, who is the head of the National Institute for Early Education Research and a wonderful colleague of mine, and last year, if you want some background about the evidence on Head Start, we -- Steve and I did a little thing called "Invest in Young Children." There are some copies available out there. We're just about out of copies but it's available on Center for Children and Families website if you would like to have a copy. None of the papers in there exceed 3,000 words, which is pretty good when it's all scholars, to get them to confine themselves to 3,000 words. I was pretty pleased about that.

So he's going to give an overview of his article with special attention to Head Start. And like many reviewers before him, including the ones in the volume I just mentioned, he concludes that Head Start is underperforming. And then rather than adopt

the defensive crouch, the Obama administration has proposed a provocative and well thought out reform plan based in large part on the recommendations of the Committee on Redesignation that will harness market forces to improve existing programs and replace ineffective ones.

And Yvette Sanchez Fuentes is here. She's the director of the Head Start program and she will describe for us the Head Start reforms.

And then after these two stellar presentations, we're going to have reactions from a panel of people who have long history of involvement with Head Start, either as researchers or as practitioners. First, Jerlean Daniel, who is the head of the National Association for Education of Young Children, the largest organization of its type in the country, and who is also a member of the Redesignation Committee.

Then, Jens Ludwig, who is here from the University of Chicago, and who is one of the most accomplished and wise of the people who have actually defended Head Start over the years on the basis of scientific evidence that it does, in fact, produce some long-term impacts.

And then Yasmina Vinci, who is executive director of the National Head Start Association, a representative of all the people in Head Start, and I want to recognize her for what I think is remarkable, a very positive response to this criticism and to the administration proposal. And as I understand it, they're working with the administration and working hard.

I was recently in Las Vegas and decided I'd take advantage of it and go to see the head of the service center and they knew all about what the administration was doing. They were already preparing for it. They were using CLASS, which some of you may know about but you'll hear more about it I think in a few minutes. So it was really quite an impressive thing.

And then we're going to have a discussion that I'm going to moderate, see if I can cause a little trouble among the panelists. And then we're going to turn it over to questions from the audience.

So with that, Steve Barnett.

MR. BARNETT: Thank you, Ron. Good morning. It's a pleasure to see you all here.

So knowing that Ron and his gang are ruthless timekeepers, I'm going to start with my conclusions. So, and I think the first one, and you'll hear this over and over, is that the administration's proposed reforms for Head Start are vital and they should be fully supported by the early childhood field and that we ought to recognize that early Head Start is part of this and needs to be fully included in the reforms.

Second, that the Early Learning Challenge Fund and the state councils that each state has on early childhood now should focus on raising quality and effectiveness, not on increasing coverage. I think increasing coverage ought to come after we raise quality and effectiveness.

And third, that there's a serious need for deregulation of Head Start and that deregulation ought to take place in the context of a new experiment, a new program of experimental research that will provide better information about what, in fact, is the most effective approach to providing early education for young children and working at the zero to three range with their families. Not that that's not important from three to five but I think it's even more important from birth to three.

Now, how did I get to these conclusions? I got here by asking a question. This is really the central question of my paper in Science, which is can large scale public programs produce long-term gains for children in poverty? If so, how and under what conditions?

Part of the evidence for this is in this chart, which is from a meta-analysis. So people often talk about what the research says about this or that and then they pick studies that they like to illustrate their point of view. An alternative is to statistically summarize what all of the research says and often that gives a different picture. So Greg Kennelly and his colleagues published in 2010 a meta-analysis of the literature from 1960 up through 2002 that summarizes the effects of any program that served a three- to five-year-old. And this could be a birth to five program. It's not just preschool programs but it could also have been a program that was only nine months.

This chart summarizes the effects on the cognitive domain. It's not the only domain that was looked at. It also looked at social-emotional development and school progress, but because studies have focused on that to a lesser extent, you can't really break those effects out in the same way and look at the influences on them in the same way that you can analyze the data on cognitive impacts because there are just so many more studies that measure this.

One of the things that makes a difference is the quality of the research design. Effect sizes turned out to actually be bigger in studies that used more rigorous research designs. And so the immediate impact or the impact at the end of treatment, which was typically age 5, was about 0.7; seven-tenths of the standard deviation to put that into perspective. Head Start children start about a standard deviation behind. So if you want to think about what's the achievement gap for kids served by Head Start or other programs for children in poverty, what's the gap when they enter kindergarten, it's about a standard deviation.

This is showing that on average in the literature, 70 percent of that was closed on cognitive abilities. Does that persist? That's my key question. The answer is yes, but not at that magnitude. So if you look at effects from ages 5 to 10 and beyond

age 10 in high-quality designs, they're about 0.3, 0.35, so that about half the impact at kindergarten entry persists later on. And this isn't just an average. I think if you look across studies you find a kind of consistent picture of that, so I think it's a good rule of thumb that our long-term impacts are likely to be about half what our impacts are at kindergarten entry.

Now, because there were so many studies of cognitive impacts, the researchers could actually look at -- so what was associated with bigger effects or smaller effects, well, time of follow-up, research design quality I've already mentioned those. But three other things stood out. One, if direct instruction was used in a major way in the program, effect sizes were larger. If there was individualization; that is, an emphasis on one-on-one working with kids and working in small groups, there were larger effect sizes. And third, if there were comprehensive services, there were smaller effect sizes.

Now, in the paper I look at randomized trials, a number of them separately. By far, the largest randomized trials we have are the randomized trials of Head Start and Early Head Start. And it's interesting to look at where do they fit in this evidence. Now, it's also important to understand that these are -- for Head Start it's the impact of one year. For Early Head Start it's the impact of about two and a half years. And in the meta-analysis that could have been anything from six months or nine months up to five years. Right? So it's not a one-year program estimate.

So across both the Head Start and Early Head Start studies we see modest initial gains across multiple domains. One year of Head Start produces an effect of just under 0.2 on about 13 measures but no significant effects on 9 others. Two and a half-plus years of Early Head Start produces effects of about 0.1 to 0.15 across a bunch of measures, but again, not across all of them. These are substantive, if small, gains.

They do not persist to kindergarten. They don't persist in first grade. There is a follow-up of Early Head Start through grade 5, 45 measures. No significant effects on any of them.

I think this is what you, again, going back to the meta-analysis, if you think about what the initial effects are, divide those in half, it's not surprising we wouldn't see those. They would be undetectable, essentially, later on.

Now, I think it's fortunate that we don't just have research on Head Start; we have research on other programs. And I talk about a bunch of that in the paper. Only some of it is summarized in this chart but this includes the Chicago Child-Parent Centers, which I think are important because they're relatively high quality but not -- but a feasible program model delivered by the public schools in Chicago for which we have very long-term follow-up and a benefit cost analysis that shows payoff of 10 to 1. Universal Pre-K in Tulsa, Oklahoma, in a study done by Bill Gormley and his colleagues; studies by the National Institute and others in Oklahoma and New Jersey using regression discontinuity designs which are relatively a rigorous way of estimating program impact and then for comparison I've put the Head Start impacts on same measures on the chart. And the numbers in parentheses are adjusted for noncompliance.

That's important because in a randomized trial, as in most randomized trials, people don't necessarily do what they're told to do. That's actually a good thing about people but it makes it hard to do a perfect randomized trial. But you can adjust for that. The adjusted figures are in parentheses. And you can see they're smaller. Right? So these are impacts of one year of the program at kindergarten entry. I think it's pretty clear Chicago Child-Parent Centers, Tulsa UPK, Oklahoma, New Jersey. The effects are very similar.

Now, when you get to literacy they bounce around a bit more because some literacy measures are way easier than others. There's only 26 letters. They're

easy to teach. And depending on what is exactly in your literacy measure, you can produce very large effects very quickly or not quite so large but still pretty big.

There is additional research that Science wouldn't let me put in the paper because it's not been peer reviewed or it's not been in a peer reviewed journal yet. I shouldn't say it's not been peer reviewed because it has been peer reviewed for conference presentations. There's a randomized trial of Tennessee's Pre-K Program Regression Discontinuity study and the institute has actually -- our institute has actually done regression discontinuity studies in eight states. These summarize the impact.

So I just wanted to show if you look at the broader literature and not just what I was able to present in Science, the picture looks the same, again, in terms of larger impacts from the state preschool programs, mostly in the public schools or at least under the auspices of public education. So, for example, in New Jersey that program includes Head Start, private preschool programs, operated though through the public schools. Not necessarily in a public school; in fact, typically not.

I think it's important to look beyond the kindergarten data, to look at -- if we follow them a little bit longer, so what would we see at grade two where we're not seeing detectable effects in Head Start or Early Head Start? Chicago Child-Parent Centers, 1 year of the program has an effect size of 0.2 to 0.3; 0.4 to 0.5 for 2 years. And New Jersey's Abbott Preschool program, which is a relatively intensive and expensive model, and I would say in many ways comparable to the Chicago Child-Parent Centers, producing effects at second grade that are very, very similar in size to those from the Chicago Child-Parent Centers.

So if you want to know can today's programs do this, my answer is yes. We can replicate pretty much what was produced by the Chicago Child-Parent Centers, which again had a benefit-cost ratio of 10 to 1. I think this raises some questions about

so why might this be? How do Head Start and Early Head Start differ from what appear to be more effective programs?

Some of these are somewhat speculative and so my thinking about this is that there is less explicit teaching and academic emphasis in Head Start on average. There are lower teacher qualifications, lower teacher compensation, about half what it is in the public schools. There's a lack of connection to the public schools. And obviously, more provision of comprehensive services.

Now, we have a couple of things that I regard as demonstration proofs of my speculation. In Tulsa, you have universal preschool that provides a public school teacher in all of the preschool programs, including Head Start. So you can look at Tulsa Public Schools -- TPS -- Tulsa Head Start -- THS -- and National Head Start and the Impact Study, and compare estimates again at kindergarten entry. The difference between Tulsa Head Start and Head Start nationally is the Tulsa Head Start has public school teachers paid public school salaries.

We see larger effects. Effects about the same size as in these other studies. Somewhat smaller on literacy. And I don't know if this is because of this connection to the public schools and greater academic focus. That's certainly possible. It's also possible that it has to do with peer learning because in Tulsa Public Schools you're with the general population and not just other kids in poverty.

New Jersey's Abbott Preschool program was the result of a court order. So we took the system we had of child care basically and some programs in the public schools, and in 5 years we had to have every teacher with a 4-year degree in Early Childhood Ed certification, research-based curricula, coaches for master teachers, maximum class size of 15, high standards and accountability, and a continuous improvement system.

The periwinkle color is what our quality in those programs looked like before we did this. The maroon color is what it looked like afterwards. You can see a dramatic shift in the quality of the preschool program after these reforms.

A very important part of this is, of course, the standards that I talked about but it's also this continuous improvement cycle. It operates at the classroom level, at the district level, at the state level. You develop standards. You measure and assess progress. Analyze and plan. You implement a response to that. I think this same concept needs to be taken into the Head Start and state pre-K world and implemented from the top down. And I see that happening as part of the state councils, as part of the Early Learning Challenge Fund, and as part of the administration's proposed reforms.

So in conclusion, early education can be a strong public investment. Head Start, Early Head Start, and state programs though need improvement. All state preschool programs are not like the ones that I presented data for. Right? That's the top of the distribution in terms of program quality. We need richer educational experiences, more resources in the classroom, parenting education needs to use more specific models that have evidence of effectiveness. We need to develop and test new models beyond that. I've made a bunch of recommendations but the research base frankly isn't that strong. We need a program of research to inform this.

Thank you. (Applause)

MS. FUENTES: So good morning, everyone.

So at Head Start and in this administration we know that too many children start kindergarten already behind. So today I want to take some time to share with you all what this administration is doing to ensure that Head Start programs are doing the very best that they can for the million children that we serve every day.

We also know that quality early education can help get kids ready for

school and success, and that means that our ability to ensure that all children have the opportunity to reach their full potential depends on us investing early on and providing the high-quality early education that can make a difference for a child's life. Head Start is a critical part of that investment. Nearly the one million children -- nearly 1 million children attend Head Start programs across this country every day. Many of these programs are strong. They're setting an example in the field for evidence-based, high-quality, early education programs. But we do know that some programs aren't strong and there is substantial room for improvement in many of those programs.

Over the last three years, under the leadership of Deputy Assistant Secretary Dr. Joan Lombardi, we have taken an aggressive reform agenda that will bring the best evidence-based practice into Head Start classrooms, will hold programs accountable for the quality of instruction that they provide. We will establish outcomes to ensure family engagement and we're going to require low-performing programs to compete for funding.

Evidence indicates that Head Start helps get our most vulnerable children ready for kindergarten but we can and we must deepen these impacts. The children who attend Head Start -- you all know this -- come from families and communities facing enormous economic and social challenges. Head Start serves the most at-risk children, including children in the welfare system, homeless children, English language learners, and children with disabilities. That's why this administration is committed to ensuring that every Head Start program provides high-quality care and education services. Our reform agenda is bold, it's innovative, and it's built upon the best evidence available. Our agenda is designed to ensure that all Head Start children are ready for success in kindergarten and that all Head Start programs are high quality and well managed.

So the reforms that have garnered the most public attention are those related to requiring low-performing programs to compete for continued funding. Last fall, the Department of Health and Human Services released a proposed rule to implement what the Head Start law calls a designation renewal system or what the community most often refers to as recompetition.

We will issue a final rule this year allowing us to begin the competitive process in 2012. For the first time in the history of Head Start, these proposed regulations will require grantees that are not providing quality Head Start service to compete for continued funding. The proposed rule lays out seven specific performance conditions that would require programs to compete and requires that at least 25 percent of all programs stand for competition. These seven specific program conditions fall under the categories of quality, licensing and operation, and fiscal and internal controls.

Many have argued that the proposed rule is too tough, but this administration believes that no rule is too tough or standard of excellence too high when it comes to the children that we are serving every day. Under the proposed rule, one way that low-performing programs would be identified would be based on the validated evidence-based classroom assessment tool known as CLASS. The proposed rule would take this science-based tool and put it to good use, identifying programs that aren't making the grade and requiring them to compete for funding. While there will be modifications in the final rule, I can assure you that it will feature a robust approach to competition. We are committed to the principle that if a program is not delivering high-quality educational experience that our children deserve, we will, through competition, shift funding to a more capable organization and we will hold those organizations accountable for providing a quality Head Start experience.

So while our plans for competition have garnered the most public

attention, we received over 16,000 comments. And I can tell you that that takes a little bit of time to get through. Other pieces include creating a school readiness framework that Head Start programs must use to inform their curriculum, their approach to professional development, and mechanisms for evaluating teacher and child performance that produce the data needed to engage in continuous quality improvement.

We're taking concrete steps to improve on-the-ground classroom practice. We're developing better linkages between Head Start and the public schools that children enter after they leave Head Start, and we're improving our monitoring system to ensure program integrity, target quality improvement efforts, and to identify poor performing programs.

I want to talk a little bit about each of these. As we laid out in the roadmap to excellence in Head Start, we've designed quality improvement initiatives that use the latest evidence on promoting positive, sustained child outcomes. School readiness means that children are ready to succeed in school because they have the cognitive knowledge necessary to understand literacy in math, they have the critical thinking skills to solve problems and ask probing questions, and they have the ability to self-regulate and demonstrate self-control so that they can sit, listen, and focus. And it also means that parents are involved in order to ensure the long-term, lifelong success of their child.

One of the strengths of Head Start is its focus on ensuring that families are receiving the necessary health, mental health, education, and other social services they need to achieve these school readiness goals. The Head Start school readiness framework is not just words on a piece of paper. The framework lays out in clear terms what every Head Start program needs to do to be effective and provides a way to measure a Head Start program's performance against this framework. Under the

framework, all Head Start programs will have to implement an integrated curriculum that addresses the essential domains of school readiness. They will have to collect data, analyze it, and review it regularly to track children's progress. They'll have to make early learning available to children and to professional development strategies in order to improve services to children, and they'll have to have an individualized wellness plan that promotes healthy development for each child.

In addition, a parent partnership process that promotes an understanding of their child's progress, ongoing communication with local schools to exchange information about kids and families, and a learning community among staff to promote innovation, continuous improvement, and integrated services across education, family services, and health.

Head Start programs will be expected to adopt and align established goals from the child outcomes framework. They will be expected to create and implement a plan of action for achieving these goals. They will assess child progress on an ongoing basis and aggregate and analyze data three times a year. And they will examine data for patterns of progress for groups of children in order to develop and implement a plan for program improvement. The framework sets the stage for the rest of the agenda that is focused on improving classroom practice so that readiness and child development goals are met.

We've made significant investments in improving classroom practice, with a focus on providing quality instruction and social-emotional supports. This includes the launch of a mentor-coach initiative for teaching staff, a revamped training and technical system, and the use of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System -- CLASS -- to inform program improvement and professional development.

There is much that we already know. For example, research indicates

that better child outcomes are associated with high-quality, adult-child interactions. More specifically, children need teachers who can provide rich, stimulating environments and opportunities. We know that the connection between the quality of the implementation and the outcomes are obtained through the professional development.

One example of how we're doing this is CLASS, which most of you, I believe, are very familiar with. So you know that the CLASS measures how teachers promote children's thinking and problem-solving and develops more complex language skills. Since teacher-child interactions are such an important measure of quality, the Department of Health and Human Services has provided CLASS training to every Head Start program across the country. More than 2,000 education specialist and other coordinators have been trained and are utilizing CLASS in their classrooms every day. Many programs are following our lead and using CLASS on an ongoing basis and as noted earlier, CLASS is one of the seven indicators in recompetition.

One example of this is the City of Chicago. They've teamed up with the developers of CLASS at UVA and they'll be implementing CLASS throughout their program. The City of Chicago is one of our biggest programs. They're using the information that they get from CLASS in order to develop professional development that meets the needs of their kids and their teachers every day.

But we're also improving linkages between Head Start programs and the public schools. Strong linkages can accomplish several goals. They can ensure that Head Start educational goals are matched up to what the schools think are important. They can ease the transition for children by making sure that schools have good information and are prepared for children coming from Head Start, and they can improve parent engagement at the critical point when the child is transitioning from Head Start to public school.

At the Office of Head Start, we're focusing on fostering strong collaboration between local programs and public schools to promote continuity of early education experiences and ensure that the gains started in Head Start are built upon in elementary school. Head Start programs are required to work with their local education agency partners to ensure the appropriate alignment of school readiness goals.

And finally, let me talk a little bit about our ongoing monitoring. It is a huge part of what we do every day in Head Start. Beginning in Fiscal Year 2012, just around the corner, the Office of Head Start will begin implementing Monitoring 360 to ensure that every grantee is doing what it must do to prepare children for school. Monitoring 360 connects existing key oversight activities, multiple sources of data, and risk mitigation into an integrated approach to gathering, analyzing, and acting upon information about grantee performance on a continuous basis. Monitoring 360 will increase our understanding of grantees ongoing efforts to ensure children are making progress and that parents are fully engaged in ways that are meaningful and effective.

In addition to more rigorous reviews of grantees' internal, ongoing monitoring, data collection and analysis and self-assessment, federal onsite reviews will include the use of CLASS in randomly selected classrooms. This will allow us to intervene early and to provide oversight when grantees are failing to provide quality services. Just as importantly, the information gathered through this more expansive monitoring process will form the basis for decisions about recompetition.

And in conclusion, you know, Ed Zigler always described Head Start not just as a program but as an evolving concept. Two years since we released the Head Start Roadmap to Excellence, we continue on that roadmap. We're working every day to intensify our impacts, to foster innovation, and to ensure accountability so that every child in a Head Start program has the best opportunity to reach his full potential. Head Start

children need and deserve the most effective early education program possible, and every day we, at the administration, are taking aggressive steps to meet our commitments to them.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. HASKINS: All right. So now let's hear some -- all right. So now let's hear some reactions from people who actually know something about Head Start. Let's start with Jerlean Daniel, who is not only the head of the National Association for Education of Young Children and has a long and distinguished background at all aspects of preschool education, but she was also on the Resignation Committee that made the initial set of recommendations that the administration has picked up on. So Jerlean.

MS. DANIEL: Okay. And thank you for the mike. I was wondering how I was going to do this.

MR. HASKINS: Having had a lot of experience with you, you don't need a mike. (Laughter)

MS. DANIEL: Ah, all right. Don't tell all my secrets, Ron.

Well, thank you for this opportunity to talk about early education reform and to -- while we seem to be talking -- focusing on Head Start, I think one of the things that's important to note is that for a number of years Head Start really has been the most together model of early childhood, if you will, trying to build a system, looking at professional development, looking at parent involvement. And it really is, you know, Steve talked about the Chicago study. There's the Perry (phonetic) study and Abbott-Sedarian (phonetic). And in its own way, Head Start really is that model trying to take it to scale. Trying to take it to scale.

And taking something to scale is really difficult, as Steve has pointed out. It is -- particularly trying to take it to scale in a shifting terrain. You know? The children

who are served by Head Start are some of our most vulnerable children and even our definition of vulnerable children has shifted over time. You know, at one time we were talking about primarily low-income, white and African-American children. The demographics of our country have changed quite a bit and now we're talking about low-income children for whom English is not the first language. And so the tides of change are happening at all times.

And so when you talk about taking something to scale, you always have to think about what modifications need to take place for these particular children that are being served at this particular time. And so when we talk about early care and education, and Head Start specifically, being robust programs, part of being robust is really knowing whom we're serving, why we're doing it, what the ultimate goal is. And I thank you, Yvette, for really pointing out to us what's the bottom line. You know, we want -- we want all the children in this country, irrespective of their backgrounds, to thrive and reach their full potential. And that is not a simple task.

I was honored to be part of the Redesignation Committee and to serve currently on the Head Start Research and Evaluation Committee. And what I would tell you about the Redesignation work is that it was a vibrant group of professionals who sat down together, both, you know -- they were researchers, they were practitioners, there was a nice mix of individuals -- asking each other all the hard questions; asking the Office of Head Start all the hard questions. Trying to make sure that whatever -- wherever we landed we had research evidence to support it. And whenever the research evidence was a little thin, what we said was, okay, this is important. As soon as you've got some research that will help us move in this direction. So we try to give the office leeway to move even beyond the life of the committee.

And I'm really pleased with the roadmap and the direction that the office

is taking this program because I think it scoops up all of the pieces necessary. Looking at classroom interactions, looking at the professional development of teachers, looking at who the children are who are being served and not losing that really important thread of each individual child's homegrown advocate. And that is their family, their parents. That has got to be part of what we're doing here. No child exists and floats around the world without being connected to a family. And far beyond the preschool years a child needs the family to be an advocate for them. Who is going to make the schools better if the parents aren't pressing for that to happen?

So yes, there's a lot of work to get done. But I feel like the field and Head Start are on the way to getting that work done. We've got some serious economic times right now. We've got -- I believe it's one in five children are food insecure. We've got -- we don't yet have universal health care, although we're, you know, we're trying to get there but we don't yet have it. And so we still have children and families who are vulnerable.

States are having to do all kinds of -- make all kinds of cuts. But what I'd like to suggest is that even though we're on hard economic times we should not lose sight of the lessons we've learned about how critical the high-quality early care and education frame is. And I believe Steve pointed out in the NEAR Report (phonetic), I believe the preschool, pre-K report, that some states are lowering their standards in terms of pre-K. This is not the time to do that. I frankly would say it's never the time to lower the standard lower than what we know to be good for young children and their families, to be good for a high-quality early childhood program.

We've learned so many lessons. Neurons to Neighborhoods has told us the importance of starting really young. We knew that all along from some research that happened but Neurons to Neighborhoods kind of set it up for us to see more clearly.

Eager to Learn has told us that it's important that the teaching of young children be highly intentional. That means, and Steve talked about indirect instruction -- I mean, direct instruction, rather. And in the field we talk -- are we talking about capital DI or small DI? And I would support what we call lower case DI, which all that means is that a teacher is highly intentional. She's put together what she knows about a child's social and emotional development. She knows that social and emotional development are connected inextricably to cognitive development. She knows that there are developmental progressions to the learning of -- to becoming literate, to becoming proficient in math and in science.

And so what we're looking for here in high-quality programs across the spectrum, whether you're talking about child care or Head Start or pre-K, what we're looking for is a highly skilled, intentional teacher. And you have to have professional development opportunities for that to happen. You notice Steve mentioned Oklahoma. Well, those were highly trained teachers. One of the things that happen when you try to take something to scale is sometimes you don't have all those people that you need. And so you have to grow them. And Head Start is one of the main telling fields, if you will, for growing teachers. I'm delighted that at this point, 53 percent of the teachers in Head Start have -- now have bachelor's degrees, and another 12 percent are enrolled in school. Yes, we've got a lot to do, but the kids are worth it.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. HASKINS: And now for a perspective from long-time Head Start researcher and one of the most respected researchers working in Head Start, Jens Ludwig.

MR. LUDWIG: Thanks so much, Ron, for having me.

There's a lot I agree with Steve about in his Science paper but we also

have some points of disagreement which I think makes this panel interesting.

What I wanted to do is I wanted to make four points that I think will put the discussions that will come up in the Q&A about the administration's Head Start reform proposals into some larger context that we can refer back to during the open Q&A.

So the first thing that I wanted to say is that every educational institution that I know has room for improvement. I'd like to say that my wife is a recovering preschool special ed teacher. She worked in Fairfax County, Virginia Public Schools, one of the finest public school systems in the country. I work at the University of Chicago, one of the country's great universities. And on a daily basis we compared notes about all of the things that we saw that could be improved.

So I want to start off by saying that I think it's great that HHS and the administration is thinking about ways of strengthening the Head Start program. Given that, though, there has been a lot of what I think of as very overheated rhetoric about the Head Start program. Not Steve's paper, which I think was quite measured, but most of the people in this room are probably familiar with, say, Joe Klein's recent essay in *Time* magazine, for instance, saying things like there's indisputable evidence that Head Start doesn't work; there's nothing good that can be said about the program; it is criminal to fund Head Start in its current incarnation; and so on and so on.

And so the second thing that I wanted to talk about for a minute is to consider the question of how much change actually is needed in Head Start and how much better we think we can actually do with a program like this. Now, the Head Start advocacy organizations are going to say that the problem that people are focused on right now is when the federal government sponsored this randomized experimental study of Head Start that randomizes kids to get a Head Start treatment group versus a Head Start control group that doesn't get offered the chance to be in Head Start. The problem

that people are focused on in that experiment is that when you look at kids at the end of first grade you don't see any difference between the randomized treatment and the randomized control group. What the Head Start advocacy groups are going to say is but when you look at the kids the day they're leaving Head Start, the Head Start program actually looks pretty good.

Now, that is a very self-serving argument. But just because it's self-serving doesn't mean that it's wrong. And if you look at the graph up on the screen, I've plotted -- the gray lines there show the treatment control difference in achievement test scores for the four-year-old kids who were in the Head Start experiment. So the Y-axis is the impact in standard deviation units and then on the X-axis we have outcomes measured at different ages. So the first data point there is kids the year they're leaving Head Start. And you can see that the impact for kids, for 4-year-olds when they're leaving Head Start is about 0.2 standard deviation. So that's about a quarter of the black-white test score gap or about 20 points in the SATs.

The other dark point up there is the short-term impact of Head Start on kids who were in the program in the 1980s according to a very nice quasi-experimental study of Head Start done by David Deming. Now, the nice thing about looking about Head Start kids who were in the program in the 1980s is that we can follow them out into adulthood to see what the program did over the long term given these short-term impacts. And what David Deming finds is that these initial impacts about the size of what we see in the Head Start experiment translate into long-term benefits in terms of things like earnings and high school graduation rates that generate lasting improvements and life outcomes that produce dollar benefits to society that are large enough to justify the program's cost. That is, it generates benefits in excess of costs. All right?

What is new in the Head Start experiment is not that the program is

getting less effective the day the kids are leaving Head Start, but rather than the rate at which the benefits of Head Start fade out is accelerating. And you can see that in the graph. So the dark gray bars, the recent experiment, the test score brush, the test score difference between treatment and controls fades out quite quickly, seem to fade out more slowly for previous cohorts of Head Start. So that's sort of the key puzzle.

The third thing that I want to consider for a moment is how concerned we should be that the difference in the Head Start experiment between the treatment and the control kids and test score impacts is fading out so quickly. Now, I've just told you that for previous cohorts of Head Start kids, an initial impact of something in the neighborhood of 0.2 standard deviations is consistent with long-term benefits. I've also told you that the rate of fade out is accelerating over time.

And so what should we think about what's going to happen for recent cohorts of Head Start kids? Let me see if I'm smart enough to actually do this. Okay. Oh, boy. That looks just tiny up on the screen. We'll see if this works.

So I wanted to show you some additional data that many of you might be less familiar with because this comes from a recent paper that Raj Chetty in the Harvard Economics Department did where he looks at data from the Tennessee STAR class size experiment and he looks at kids who were randomly assigned into high-quality and lower-quality kindergarten classroom environments. And what you can see in that graph -- so again, the Y-axis is test score gains and the X-axis is grade. So the first data point is kindergarten, then first grade, then second grade, then third grade. And what you can sort of see in this tiny graph is that there are sizeable initial impacts of being in a higher quality kindergarten, about the same size of what you see in the recent Head Start experiment, that fade out almost immediately, like what we see in the Head Start experiment.

Now, what Raj Chetty and his colleagues did is he took kids in this experiment and linked their data to IRS earnings records when the kids had reached adulthood. And what you can see in the Tennessee STAR data -- what you can see in the Tennessee STAR data is if you try to predict the effect of being in a high-quality kindergarten on adult earnings using the test scores for the kids when they're leaving kindergarten, those test score benefits translate into increased earnings of \$600 more per year over their entire adult time period despite the fact that the test score gains fade out immediately, like we do in the -- now, this doesn't guarantee that we will see the same sort of benefit in the Head Start experiment, but it does make you realize that very rapid fadeout of test score impact is not necessarily inconsistent with long-term improvements in life changes.

Okay. The final thing that I want to consider is suppose that you were concerned -- we don't know what this rapid test score fadeout means in the Head Start experiment. So suppose that you're risk-adverse and you're concerned about this and you want to do something about it. What should we be focusing on to try and lock in the gains that Head Start makes the day kids leave the program?

What a lot of people focus on is the possibility that low quality elementary schools might essentially squander the benefits that Head Start generates. I'm actually skeptical of that hypothesis for the following reasons. So Doug Miller, an economist at UC-Davis, and I wrote a paper published several years ago where we look at the long-term impacts of Head Start on kids who were living in the 300 poorest public schools in the United States in the 1960s. So these are like African-American kids in the Mississippi Delta attending the lowest quality public schools that you can imagine. And we see evidence of long-term Head Start benefits for those kids despite the fact that they're going to such low-quality elementary schools.

I think more plausible in my view is the hypothesis that Steve mentioned in his Science paper but he didn't talk about so much during his presentation, is the possibility that elementary schools over time might be getting better at remediating skill deficits among kids who are not getting high-quality preschool experiences. That is, the kids who are not in Head Start, the teacher then redirects time towards remediating the skill gaps of the non-Head Start kids. Some evidence that elementary schools might be getting over time, particularly for the lowest achieving kids, comes from scores from the National Assessment of Educational Progress that are in this picture where you can see from 1971 through 2008, test scores are going up for ninth graders in both reading and math and they're going up more for African-American kids than for white kids. If this is what's going on, it raises the hypothesis that one of the best ways to lock in Head Start benefits is to actually expand access to the Head Start program.

Let me stop there.

MR. HASKINS: Excellent. Thank you very much.

So I'll get myself in a little trouble here. I think it's very important to know that the Bush administration was intent on reforming Head Start as well, and it resulted in what I would delicately describe as warfare between the Head Start series of programs and the National Head Start Association and the Bush administration.

Now, the Obama administration is doing reforms that are equally as pervasive and important as the ones that Bush tried to do, and the National Head Start Association appears to be fully cooperating. This is an amazing story that the administration and Head Start are working hand-in-glove to try and improve the program. And I think at least part of it must be due to the next speaker, who is Yasmina Vinci. Thank you for coming.

MS. VINCI: Thank you, Ron. And thank you for including me and for

having us all here for this conversation.

And I also have one more thanks, and that's to Steve. Earlier this year when Head Start was in danger of having quite a number of children cut out of it, Steve and 300 prominent researchers signed this great letter to Congress urging Congress to maintain the current levels of Early Head Start and Head Start. And you were in sync then with Dr. Heckman, the Nobel Laureate, who wrote to the Simpson-Bowles Commission earlier. Early Head Start and Head Start are programs on which to build and improve, not to cut.

So I came to NHSA two years ago and every day I'm with some of the brightest people in early childhood education. And I'm in classrooms where I see Head Start's power and the possibilities. And I hear from Head Start alumni all the time who are teachers, doctors, lawyers, Olympic hockey team trainers -- a Latina from San Benito, Texas, is training for the U.S. Olympic Team, Ice Hockey Team -- prize-winning poets, public servants. Can you believe the Treasurer of the United States is a Head Start alumna? And this year's Grammy winner, jazz artist Esperanza Spalding, she was there yesterday at the front of the *Style* magazine.

So instead of sharing all their stories, which I would love to do, I'm going to focus on three key points about reforming early childhood education, which is today's topic.

First of all, research really matters. It matters because it shows over and over again ways that Head Start works, plus ways that Head Start can work even better. Whether it's the 2002 Impact Study, flaws and all, or any of this stack of studies -- I don't know if you can see it in the back -- research matters to Head Start. In fact, let me just cite to you some of the things -- among the things that those 300 researchers wrote to Congress. Head Start raises test scores, makes it less likely children will repeat a grade,

decreases the need for special education services in elementary schools. For those of you who live in Montgomery County, I want to point out one of their studies where they found that the Maryland Public School saved \$10,100 per child per year in special education costs for children who had been in full-day Head Start. That's awesome.

Head Start graduates are more likely to graduate from high school and attend college. Plus, a Head Start child is as much as 25 percent less likely to smoke as an adult. So in here, many more benefits of Head Start.

My second point is that really Head Start in 2011 is not your father's or, for that matter, your mother's Head Start. Much change has taken place. The 2007 reauthorization, the administration's roadmap to excellence and all the reform efforts which we support strongly, and natural progress that's happening, the natural shift already in the field. So what I see, and this is totally my experience, is I see Head Start collaborates and coordinates like never before with schools in the communities. Just last weekend I was in Montana, and 30 Head Start programs told me about 1,300 community partners they work with.

Head Start programs are getting degreed teachers, and you know that in rural areas, in migrant Head Start, in American Indian and Alaska Native, that's not an easy task. They're using Pianta's CLASS to improve teacher-child interaction. They're using data to individualize instruction. They're transforming parent engagement, and I see enormous creativity and innovation on the ground.

But most of these high impact Head Start reforms had not even begun when the impact study was underway. And remember, the Early Head Start study was done when the program was brand new. Yet, sometimes it seems that this study, begun at a very different time, this study with all the concerns about the crossovers and the no-shows, this study is all that is being used to make sweeping generalizations and

recommendations or even budget decisions.

Which brings me to my third point. This is a very tricky time for Head Start. And actually, for all of early childhood education. We are all -- most of us are really working toward once in a generation reform. This administration, educators, researchers, soft leaders, we're all aligned now around a reform agenda. And because our shared agenda is really about improving outcomes for the most vulnerable youth, Head Start is really a cornerstone of that agenda. To be more effective, we do need bachelor's degrees-level teachers. We need smaller classroom sizes. We need better support for our ESL and special ed families. We need better connections with school. We need quite a bit.

But here's the tricky part. We must work very carefully together to get to that reform. Otherwise, we won't have the resources. We must honor our differences but we must set some of them aside to get to larger reforms like better system coordination, efforts to cut red tape, and inspire innovation. We want to get resources for better research also as Steve and all of us are calling for.

But reforms require investments -- time, people, money -- no matter what the delivery system is. And yet, at the moment, we are staring down the barrel of a cannon loaded to cripple or even end our programs.

So what to do? My proposal is very modest. One is I'd like to invite everybody to come and visit the new Head Start. See it for yourself. Fund and research the innovative practices that help programs improve and reform. And then keep these important conversations going so our collective wisdom can help us all through this tricky time. And finally, let us be aware of what headlines we might prompt or what cannon fodder we might inadvertently supply in this "shoot first, aim later" political environment.

We all want the window of opportunity open for future jazz greats like

Esperanza, and future prize-winning poets like Matthew Dickman -- you probably have picked up a thing about him -- who grew up in a very violent neighborhood in Portland, Oregon, and who recently wrote this: "My experience in Head Start allowed me and gave me tools to say no to the violent contract the neighborhood offered to its young boys and at that early age helped to guide me into the adult I have become. I believe there is a direct line between my creative life, sense of self-worth, and my early success as a poet and my experience in Head Start. I cannot imagine my young life and so my adult life without the dynamic experience of Head Start."

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. HASKINS: All right. So I'm going to pose a couple of questions to the panel and then it'll be your opportunity to do the same.

I want to emphasize something that Yvette mentioned in her presentation. I'll make sure everybody got this. The way this review is going to work is in the next three years, a third of the Head Start programs will be reviewed every year. And that review will result in a minimum of 25 percent of the review programs failing. Now, that is not something that came from the Redesignation Commission. We could never have gotten agreement, I'm sure, on the Redesignation Commission with something like that. But to me that sent an enormous signal to the country and to Head Start centers that this is real. And 25 percent of you are going to have to compete for your money.

So I want you to talk about this first, you and the kind of internal discussion in the administration. And then I'd like to hear you respond to how the Head Start centers in the country feel about this.

MS. FUENTES: Well, I guess just to clarify that, that 25 percent though currently is part of a proposal. So as most of you know, we're moving now into writing and releasing a final proposal by the end of the year.

As Ron mentioned, there is a three-year transition period. And based on the proposal, within that three-year transition period, we will be looking at data coming after June 9, 2009. Thank you. After June of 2009, we collect data on all of our programs. With that, most of you probably know we monitor about 525 programs a year. So we'll take those 525 programs in the first year, all of them based on the proposal, will be compared to the 7 conditions. From there, within those 7 conditions, if you don't get to the 25 percent that's in the proposal, we then would have to kick in an eighth condition.

In the proposal it talks a little bit about putting -- we suggested two things, which we got some comments on. The two things would be using non-compliances. So for those of you who don't know, when we go out on monitoring reviews we make decisions around whether programs are in compliance or not with the performance standards.

The second possible option would be kicking in another instrument. One example we put in the proposal is the Eckers (phonetic). So that is sort of still -- to be very honest, the 16,000 comments that we received, we probably saved the majority of those comments were on the 25 percent. Some of them were very much -- this is not the right thing to do but believe it or not, the Head Start community also realizes that it's time to hold our programs more accountable. And so, many of the comments that we did receive were in a positive light.

Clearly programs though would like to have more information about how does this really work? And what I just really want to clarify is that that NPRM, that's just a proposal. It's some -- proposal is some mechanisms to get to that but those are the pieces that you'll see in the final regulation.

MR. HASKINS: So what do the programs think about this Yasmina?

MS. VINCI: And we've talked to programs so many, I mean, we had

consultation practically daily to get to really the sense of the field. So that informed our national response. And the sense of the arbitrariness of 25 percent, people were saying take 40, take 50, however many you find that don't work. Twenty-five felt like, okay, we have, you know, a quota to, like for traffic tickets, if somebody has to go and give you a traffic ticket and you're going 30-1/2 miles and they say, okay. So that was the major objection, was the arbitrariness of that. The sense in the field is that we are as good as our programs are and people were judged by the lowest usually. So the field was very, you know, aware that recompetition was going to be a fact of life. And it was just the number was -- they did not ask -- they did not say, oh, why it's not 10 percent? Why it's not less? It was just like why is there a percentage? Just get them all and let's move forward.

MR. HASKINS: Okay, good. Thank you for that.

Now, one other thing that I think is real important to emphasize here is that -- and it leads to a logical question -- the difference between this system that you've invented and I've seen this in operation so I think this is an important point. It's going to be based in part on actual observation in the classroom with this instrument that enjoys a very good reputation from Pianta Noscali (phonetic). He's at the University of Virginia. Actually going into the classroom and seeing what happens in a classroom. I mean, logically --

SPEAKER: Randomly selected classrooms.

MR. HASKINS: But, okay, but the point is that the judgment is based on what actually transpires between teachers and students in the classroom. And I think it's -- everybody could recognize it. Without that, any evaluation is flawed. You've got to know what actually happens in the classroom.

So are you really -- how did you select a class? Are you confident that

that's a good instrument? Are you satisfied with -- I know there are a lot of Head Start programs already using it so they can in effect, you know, practice and make sure they're doing the right things. Are you confident in the class?

MS. FUENTES: We absolutely are. I mean, just to step back a little, class was actually part of the last reauthorization of Head Start with regards to monitoring. With as we've continued to get a lot of feedback and talk with the developers and other researchers, we absolutely feel confident in the data that we'll get out of class because it is -- it's research based, it's validated.

We also like it because you can give programs their scores and the information right away and then they can make decisions about how they're going to use that information in order to design professional development or change what's happening in the classroom or make decisions about your curriculum. How are you doing with the implementation of your curriculum?

MR. HASKINS: So what do the Head Start programs think about it?

MS. VINCI: It's a great supervision tool. And I just want to remind us that the Eckers in the impact study, showed the Head Start environment, classroom environment, to be already higher than the environment in other settings. So this is like a compliment. This is now the feature child interaction added to that just showing, you know, more improvement in the overall experience for the child.

MR. HASKINS: Jens.

MR. LUDWIG: The one thought I had in reading over the administration's monitoring and accountability proposal stems from this fundamental challenge that we have right now that we have no idea what the kids' skills are that are carrying these long-term benefits that we see for Head Start for kids in the 1960s, '70s, and '80s, and in this Tennessee class size experiment and so on and so on. So for the

studies form whom we now have data on the kids as they are adults, we have reading and math scores when the kids are young and we have data on their adult outcomes. And we see the reading and math scores fade out and we see the adult outcomes persist.

I think most people assume that the thing that is generating these long-term benefits is some sort of early childhood impact on some sort of socio-emotional-behavioral skills, but we don't have any direct measures of what those things are in those studies. And so right now we assume they matter through a process of elimination, so it's sort of like social policy dark matter. It's got to be that because it's not the other stuff that we can see. And this seems to me --

MR. HASKINS: There's a lot of that, by the way. (Laughter)

MR. LUDWIG: There is a lot of that.

So this, to me, I'm sympathetic to the administration. I don't know how to solve this problem but what it means is that we don't know exactly what the target is that we should be focusing on. It's hard to see what a good Head Start program is if you don't know what the key kid skill set is that generates these long-term benefits.

MR. HASKINS: If Bob Pianta were here, who developed the CLASS, what would he say, Steve?

MR. BARNETT: Well, I don't know what Bob would say but I know what I would say because I think we do know. These studies that Jens talks about, to me they're a little -- it's a little like magic. And there's an old --

MR. HASKINS: So that dark matter, it's magic, you know.

MR. BARNETT: There's an old saying that the skilled wood carver finds a beautiful Madonna in every log. And these are very skilled wood carvers working on these studies. So I don't necessarily think that these are anything but false positives.

However, I think we know a lot from other studies about the things that do carry long-term benefits and part of it is the cognitive effects, language effects, and part of it is self-regulation, and part of it are other social-emotional skills, especially you don't have to just look at the U.S. literature. There's literature worldwide on this that establishes the links between early impacts and later impacts on things like crime, for example.

So I think we have a pretty good idea what it is. It's not just one of these domains; it's all of these domains. I do think the field needs measures of those. Right? So we have okay cognitive measures, okay measures on the things that are on achievement tests. But I think there's a need for the federal government to support the development of, you know, to go back to the drawing board on measures. Right now each state in these councils is sort of faced with the job of trying to create measures. Each program is faced with coming up with measures. I don't think that's a great way for that to happen. I think that's an opportunity for a lot of people to fail. Everybody would be happy using more or less the same measures, and some federal effort to help develop those for the whole field I think would be hugely productive to measure not just the cognitive stuff which we're pretty good at but social skills, self-regulation, these other things, so that programs can adopt these with some confidence that they really measure what they're supposed to.

MR. HASKINS: Yasmina.

MS. VINCI: Well, you know, James Heckman says that the focus on the so-called drop-off in elementary years is based solely on cognitive achievement which data shows is less than half of the equation for success. You know, and I am a consumer of research, not a producer, so you guys probably know what he's referring to when he says the data shows that cognitive achievement is less than half of the equation

of success. There must be something he's referring to.

MS. DANIEL: (inaudible)

MR. HASKINS: Well -- and go ahead, Jerlean.

MS. DANIEL: Well, I'd just like to point to I think that indeed we do need more research around the social and emotional piece. You know, if you're going to measure a child's progress on those, you know, we need something that we can use. And I think it's -- I'm not surprised that we don't have those assessments, if you will, because at the heart of much of that are cultural issues. And, you know, so what does a particular social behavior mean in which context? And so it's quite a thicket to get through. But generally speaking, I'm sitting here thinking, well, so what does a child use literacy for? What is the language for? They use it to maneuver their way through the world. They use it to negotiate. They use it to try to intercede with their peers. They use it to try to get what they need out of adults in a school environment and another environment.

And so while it is this kind of hazy box between because we don't have the measures, we do see the results of a child who had good self-regulatory skills, who mastered some of that literacy area and, you know, put it all together down the road and on the way to get there as well. So we do need some more measures. We need something here but my caution would be that just as it really matters when you're talking about assessments on whom the assessment was validated. And so, you know, you can't just pick up anything out of the box and put it out here. This is very careful work that has to be done in a systematic way. In a systematic way.

But I would hope that as we pursue this work we don't go back to a mentality that we've had for a number of years, particularly as it relates to Head Start. It's either, you know, it's kind of this up or down; it's good or it's bad. We shouldn't do it; we

should do it. It shouldn't be this either/or kind of dichotomy. What is it that we need to be doing to make all of early childhood meet the needs of children and families in a high-quality way? How do we keep progressing? That's what this conversation ought to be about.

MR. HASKINS: In its immense wisdom, the Congress of the United States and the president have focused their attention on one of the smallest parts of the federal budget to get all the savings so far, appropriated money. And that's where Head Start is. And it appears that they're about to do it again, especially if the committee is not successful. There will be automatic cuts. So the question arises, what are you all doing to make sure Head Start doesn't get a big cut of the type that Steve and others organized that letter about?

MS. VINCI: Everybody's looking at me.

MS. FUENTES: Turn it over to the advocate.

MS. VINCI: Well, we -- certainly part of what our assessment is is that if people just knew enough about it. And so there is a very big grass roots campaign to let people know about the impact in the community, which last week we were in Montana, where Chairman Rehberg of the subcommittee was visiting an Early Head Start and it was impressive. I mean, if he was not impressed with that I don't know, you know. And those are the kinds of things that might, I mean that's part of the strategy is really allow members of Congress to see not only, you know, pieces of research that come across their desk which we hope are, you know, the pieces that don't get Head Start in trouble but also to see in reality. I mean, he talked to the parents, he held the kids, he played in the sandbox, and he listened to the community people. There was an elementary school principal who said, "I see the difference in kids who are in Head Start." You know, she attested to that. So those are the kinds of people the community board members were

saying, talking about the accountability of Head Start and so on. So we're trying to change minds one at a time.

MR. HASKINS: I think many people would say that it remains one of the flaws of members of Congress and other elected officials that they are about 5 times more impressed by one experience like that than they are by 10 random assignment studies. So you're on the right path, I believe.

Audience, raise your hand, tell us your name, ask a question that does not last longer than 45 seconds or so, and sit down. Thank you.

MS. VINCI: And has a question mark at the end.

MR. HASKINS: Right here in the back on your right.

SPEAKER: A couple of direct questions. I've worked for many years for UNICEF trying to promote --

MR. HASKINS: Tell us your name, will you please?

MR. DAHL: My name is Frank Dahl (phonetic), and I'm an educational consultant. I've worked in the field of preschool education and early childhood education for many years with UNICEF, actually promoting all of this in the Middle East to some success.

What always amazes me is it's still a struggle here when most of the rest of the world has accepted the linkage between healthy productivity, healthy education, and achievement in early childhood education. But I have two very precise questions to ask. First of all, we're talking about numbers here. Somebody mentioned a million beneficiaries. What does that represent in terms of real need and why are we only getting to a million when, in fact, actually collapsing families and collapsing economies would suggest that there are many millions of children that need this? So where are we on this? And maybe by increasing the numbers somehow or making a case for larger

numbers we might win the political case of bringing this to the attention of the people who make decisions about budgets. One.

Two, you talk about 360 assessments. I'm a researcher as well. A 360 assessment, if it really is a 360 assessment, involves everybody. To what extent are parents involved in 360 assessments? Because that brings us directly to a number of issues raised about measurable or difficult to measure indicators, like cultural indicators, behavioral indicators, and so on and so forth. If we don't get to the families and we don't get to that bit that reinforces anything that might be going on in that small gap that we call education in school or in an environment where children are getting special attention, nothing really will stick. And perhaps one of the reasons why it's not sticking is that we're not involving parents sufficiently in all of this.

MR. HASKINS: All right, so let us answer the question here. Let's do the first one. About 900,000 kids in Head Start every year.

MS. FUENTES: Yeah. So currently there are approximately a little over 960,000 children served in Head Start. So we have Head Start and we have Early Head Start. What we know based on census data is for our Head Start kids, which is our preschoolers, we're only serving about approximately 40 percent of the eligible population. In Early Head Start, which is birth to 3 years old, we're serving less than 5 percent of the eligible population. And that really a lot of that is based on money. On average, our Head Start kids are about \$7,000 to \$8,000 a year; Early Head Start is about \$10,000 to \$11,000.

MR. HASKINS: Steve, in addition to that we have state pre-K programs, so there are other --

MR. BARNETT: There are other programs but I think we also have to be careful. I think the eligible population is defined in terms of population characteristics at a

moment in time. So, for example, children below the poverty level. Fortunately, children don't stay below the poverty level many times, so people are moving in and out of poverty. It's very hard to target. At any given time the characteristics of the kids in Head Start change. The characteristics of the target population changes. So I actually think the number of kids that we have to serve to get the target population is much larger. So we're not serving half the target population in Head Start, maybe a quarter. The given changes --

MR. HASKINS: And if you had state preschool you're up to --

MR. BARNETT: So then maybe you're up to half. But that leaves a lot of kids who are not getting services.

MR. HASKINS: And roughly speaking, half of kids who are either poor at that time or at-risk and will be poor later or have been poor before?

MR. BARNETT: Right.

MR. HASKINS: Jens.

MR. LUDWIG: The one thing that I wanted to add to the discussion around the issue of access is I go around talking about Head Start and I hear a lot of people saying things like we should be focused on improving teacher pay and reducing class size in Head Start and increasing the fraction of Head Start teachers with BAs, all of which will cost money. But it is also true the thing that you just asked and Steve just said -- is that we only have a subset of the kids we would like to serve enrolled in the program.

And so in a world in which the administration came and said we're going to spend \$50 billion more on Head Start per year, this panel would have no panel agreeing on how to -- we would all like that and we would have no trouble agreeing how to allocate the extra \$50 billion. But in a world of very constrained resources, I think there become very difficult questions about whether the marginal billion dollars should focus on

increasing program quality for a given number of kids or expanding access. And Deborah Phillips and I wrote a paper for a volume that Ron --

MR. HASKINS: It's the one we mentioned earlier.

MR. LUDWIG: Steve. That's right. Where we argue that there is a fair amount of evidence to suggest that there is diminishing marginal returns to program quality and that in a world of very constrained resources, the highest bang for the buck right now is to push on the access dimension rather than improve the program quality dimension, recognizing that I think both would generate benefits in excess of -- both would be great things to do if we had the money, but if we only had the money to do one I would probably prioritize access over strength in program quality.

MR. HASKINS: Yvette, in the 360 assessment, parents are involved?

MS. FUENTES: So, I guess, let me be very clear that the 360 monitoring is really sort of an internal piece within the federal government, so it's really our efforts in order to manage all the information that we collect. But what I do want to add is that the law does require for parent involvement in local programs. And so parents have a lot of leverage in terms of what kind of curriculums are being used, who are the people that are being hired, and how is the money being spent. So at the local level, parents have to be very involved in the whole design of the program.

MR. DAHL: But how do you measure that?

MS. FUENTES: We do that -- so there are -- so we have performance standards in Head Start. There are very specific performance standards about the participation of parents on policy councils, on policy committees, as well as how do programs form relationships between -- with parents in order to help parents achieve individual goals. So it's at the individual level but it's also at the program level where parents can get involved.

MR. HASKINS: Next question. All the way in the back there.

MR. SCHULTZ: Hi. Tom Schultz with the Chief State School Officers. I have two questions for Steve.

The core of your presentation is comparing effect sizes from the impact study of Head Start with several other types of studies. What I'm interested in is whether those studies are capturing information on disadvantaged kids that are similar in their background characteristics to the kids served in Head Start. Are we comparing apples to apples?

Second question would be what's your point of view on the reform strategy that the administration is following for Head Start? Would you recommend anything different other than our call for more research on effective practice?

MR. BARNETT: So thank you, Tom.

So, yes, we are comparing apples to apples. To the extent that there are differences in the population, they're biased against studies that serve broader populations because effects are bigger the more disadvantaged kids are. All right? But people have adjusted. Bill Gormley and his colleagues have said, well, let's only look at the kids who could get into Head Start. Effects differences are bigger if you do that.

To the second and I think more important question, while I applaud what the administration is doing, I think there is a classic management problem here. And I think there is a natural reaction at any administration of any program when there's bad news to increase regulation. And I think Head Start needs exactly the opposite. I think Head Start and Early Head Start have philosophical models that are not the most effective. And what I don't see is a reconsideration of that and a willingness to basically take off a lot of the constraints to move in the other direction of deregulating, allowing innovation, and moving away from this model. It's not just the programs I talked about.

The Infant Health and Development Program, a very different model, birth to three, has impacts that for English language learners, for example, are in order of magnitude larger than Early Head Start, at multiple sites around the country. When you have that kind of evidence, I think you have to allow fundamental reconsideration of the basic model and allow people to use different approaches constrained by producing results in a classroom for kids.

MR. HASKINS: Jens.

MR. LUDWIG: I just want to say one thing. So I think an important part of Steve's Science paper is that we have a bunch of large scale, state sponsored pre-K programs that are doing much better than Head Start. And that's part of the argument to suggest that Head Start is way underperforming right now. And I don't want to open the door to a big research food fight. I'm sure it would be great TV to talk about sample selection and a regression continuity design. But I did just want to go on record as saying I am not convinced myself yet that the state pre-K programs really are that much better than Head Start.

MS. FUENTES: Can I just --

MS. HASKINS: Yeah, go ahead.

MS. FUENTES: So I guess I just want to add one piece in terms of saying that this administration is absolutely in favor of innovation, but I think that one of the things that we have to keep in mind is that Head Start is a local program. It's federal to local. We haven't, I think, added any additional regulations except for what's coming through on recompetition. But what I also want to be very clear about is that the pieces that are in recompetition are things that programs should have been doing for many, many years. And so now we're just revamping and increasing our efforts through T&TA (phonetic), through monitoring, through increased professional development, to ensure

that these things really are happening so that we do see progress for kids and families in the programs.

MR. HASKINS: Let me take two questions. Let's go over here on this side. Right up here. Quick.

MS. TAKAS: Yes. I'm Marianne Takas. I'm the director of the nonprofit education and advocacy group, Strengthening Young Families. I have a research-related question related to the use of the randomized control groups. And it's really two very closely related questions.

As I understand, and I'm not a researcher, as I understand it, to have a randomized control group used effectively you have to, multiplying this by, you know, thousands of times, your basic set up is that you have two similarly situated children and you give one child the services -- in this case, Head Start -- and the other give the child no services. And then you compare which child does better and by how much over a period of time.

So the two closely related questions I have is first of all, especially given the fact that families tend to be -- families in need may be involved with many different service agencies and also you have at some point a gatekeeper who has concerns about both families. Do you really have a situation where one kid gets Head Start and the other gets nothing? Or do you have the other child sent into other services which may not be, you know, as clearly set out? And, or do you have somebody saying we better put the neediest kid into the Head Start program, either of which I think dilutes your comparison. And if not, if really you have one kid who gets the Head Start services and one who gets none, then don't we have an ethical problem?

MR. HASKINS: Okay. Next question. In the back there. We're going to answer both of them. Right there on the aisle. Yes.

MS. CLINE: Hi. Andrea Cline (phonetic) with the Family Voices of D.C., Inc. I have a question with regard to Head Start and special needs.

Does DHS see itself doing more stringent analysis of the programs? Because we're finding some of the programs not meeting even the basic requirements.

MR. HASKINS: Steve, where do the control kids come from?

MR. BARNETT: So the relevant question is what happens to these kids without Head Start without nothing? And so the fact that they get childcare, various sorts of other things, is a good thing for the control group. But that's the comparison you want, not the comparison of nothing. Nothing is not the real world. The real world is getting these other things.

There's also some crossovers. Kids manage their way into Head Start anyway. There are ways of adjusting for that. Those are state of the art, close to state of the art in the report. So that's taken care of. The ethical issue was dealt with by enrolling kids in programs where the capacity wasn't there to take all these kids. So they couldn't take all of them if they wanted to. So then what's the fairest way of deciding? Well, make it a lottery is one option.

MR. HASKINS: Special needs kids.

MS. FUENTES: So what we know is that the majority of our programs, the law requires that at least 10 percent of children enrolled in Head Start programs be children with identified disabilities. The dilemma comes in, the last reauthorization of Head Start requires that a child actually be identified by the local education agency. And so one of the things that we're working with with our programs is really helping to build that relationship so that this can happen on a much quicker basis. But we also know that LEAs are strapped.

MR. HASKINS: So what you're saying is that the local education

agencies do not do the evaluations and so you can't get the kids.

MS. FUENTES: They do. It depends where you're at. Some of them are very good. Some of them are strapped for funds. Some of them take much longer than others. Summers are really tough months particularly for our migrant programs because many are shut down. So it can vary from community to community. But what I can tell you is that the majority of programs enroll those kids and then they figure out ways in order to provide services. But we cannot actually count them.

MR. BARNETT: Figuring out this how to have a stronger, better relationship between Head Start and the public schools is really important. Public schools, you know, don't always refer these -- they identify them. They don't always refer them to Head Start. They may not want them there. That's a real problem.

MR. HASKINS: Interesting. Okay. Two more questions. All the way over there. Let's start with the lady right by you. No, no. Right by you. Here. Right there.

SPEAKER: Me?

MR. HASKINS: Yes, you. Thank you.

MS. WALKER: Thanks. Good morning. My name is Shakira Walker (phonetic) and I'm a kindergarten teacher for the past 11 years in Boston Public Schools.

So I'm just wondering if you could talk a little bit about the administration's efforts in terms of strengthening and/or enhancing the relationship between public schools and our local Head Starts.

MR. HASKINS: And all the way over on the outside.

MS. PASACHOFF: I'm Eloise Pasachoff at the Georgetown University Law Center.

In the K-12 world we hear a lot about socioeconomic integration in the

schools, both because it produces substantively better outcomes and because it's politically powerful to link the fates of wealthier children and poor children. It's not something that we've really talked about at all today. I know Head Start is just a totally different model. So I guess the question is is this something that's discussed in the academic literature? Is this something that's in early education? Is this something that the advocacy groups talk about? And if not, why not?

MR. HASKINS: Okay. Panel?

MS. DANIEL: Which question are you talking about?

MR. HASKINS: I'll take the first one.

MS. FUENTES: So the first one, let me just say that through our revised T&TA system we're establishing six national centers. These are, you know, with huge universities and other research groups. We're going to focus more on working hand-in-hand with local programs in order to help them better establish relationships with the public schools. We have some really good examples right now that we're working through, one of them is DCPS Institute at a different model around Head Start inside the public schools last year. We also had the City of Chicago and a couple of other models that we'll be looking at in order to disseminate information.

MS. HASKINS: And the second question?

MS. DANIEL: May I make sure that I understood? You were talking about are we having conversations about mixing populations, you know, low income, middle income, and so forth. Okay, all right. That's what I thought I heard you say.

I think one of the dilemmas we face as a country, because we've been talking about do we expand the service or do we increase the quality? On the one hand Steve is saying, well, don't put more rules, and yet if you don't have rules, how do people know what quality is and how to move in that direction? Things like universal pre-K, there

was some trepidation that this would -- I'm trying to think of the word I want to use -- but would mean less money was available for low-income children.

I think that somehow we've got to find the balance between making sure we meet the needs of the most vulnerable children but also doing what we know is good practice for all the children. I would point out that -- this is going back a ways -- when we were looking at segregated schools, you know, many, many years ago, one of -- a very important decision was that when you have the schools segregated, that the more disadvantaged population wasn't getting the quality of education that they needed and that, you know, so the law said put folks together.

And so how do we make sure when we put people together that everybody's really getting what they need? And I would suggest that it's a combination of these strategies we've got sitting out here with us. You know, a framework such as the monitoring system that Head Start has put into place in trying to get programs to adhere to. You need some frame for people to work with, to reach for, if you will.

And then, also, the collaboration among schools and community-based programs. It's the point at which we all realize we're in this together and that it's not the race that I'm going to beat you or, you know, she's going to beat me and so forth but rather when we have this sense that we are a community that's got to scoop everybody up, I think we'll be at the best advantage. But we haven't quite figured out how to do that without an either/or kind of mentality.

MR. HASKINS: It's worth pointing out that in the current Head Start program, up to 10 percent of the kids in any given program can be above the income requirements. So there already is a provision for at least some integration. I don't know the extent to which that actually happens but it is allowed by the current rules.

Okay. Last question. Right there on the -- behind you. Behind you.

Yes.

MS. CANDELARIA: Hi. My name is Margo Candelaria. I'm a psychologist in pediatrics and psychiatry at the University of Maryland in Baltimore. And I've had the fortunate experience before getting my Ph.D. to be an educational consultant in Head Start and a mental health consultant in Head Start. So I've had some experience in the Head Start.

So the clinic that I'm working with now is helping to train the Baltimore City Head Start using SEFL to increase the social-emotional sort of skills that the teachers, you know, providing a social-emotional foundation. And I know that one of the things talked about today is how do we access and measure the social-emotional impacts. And so I know it's happening pretty heavily throughout the state in Maryland but I was just wondering if someone wanted to comment on those efforts and those kinds of programs nationwide.

MS. VINCI: So I'll just say quickly that SEFL actually is -- it's a national program. Right now it's funded jointly through the Office of Head Start and the Office of Child Care. And so you hear that the SEFL folks really are out and about around the country. They've worked with several states to actually develop state SEFL models. So we see that moving forward and it will continue to be a huge part of our revamp T&TA system.

MR. HASKINS: Well, please join me in thanking the members of the panel for an excellent discussion. (Applause)

We gave you a very short notice for this event, so I want to announce right now that three years from this day we will have an event on how this worked out, and if Yasmina still stayed in a good mood and was willing to sit next to the national Head Start director and so forth. And then on September 13th, in this very room, we will --

that's the day the Census Bureau will release its poverty numbers and income numbers for 2010, and we will have an interesting event in this room. I hope as many of you as possible can come. Thank you for coming this morning. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012