

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH REPORT

JANUARY 4, 2006



REPORT NUMBER 06.026

THE VALUE OF PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS

PREPARED FOR REPRESENTATIVE LES GARA

BY ROGER WITHINGTON, LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

SUMMARY.....	2
<i>The Effects of Universal Pre-K on Cognitive Development</i>	3
<i>The Effects of State Prekindergarten Programs on Young Children's School Readiness in Five States</i>	4
<i>The 2004 State Preschool Yearbook</i>	4
<i>The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project</i>	6
<i>Abecedarian Early Childhood Intervention Project</i>	8
<i>Early Childhood Development: Economic Development with a High Public Return</i>	9
<i>Early Education in the States: A Year in Review—2004</i>	9
Other Informative Sources.....	10
Table 1: Sources of Early Childhood Education Information.....	10
ALASKA'S TWO-YEAR KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM.....	11
ALASKA COMMUNITY PRESCHOOL PROJECT - ALASKA'S PRESCHOOL PILOT PROGRAM.....	12
READY TO READ, READY TO LEARN TASK FORCE.....	12
LIST OF ATTACHMENTS.....	14

You asked for information on the value of prekindergarten programs. Specifically, you asked for a brief summary of current reports or studies that analyze the value of prekindergarten programs. In addition, you asked for a summary of Alaska's prekindergarten program that was discontinued in fiscal year 2003.

As you may know, prekindergarten programs (Pre-K) are generally defined as direct educational services to children who are not yet eligible for kindergarten. Usually, this refers to children ages 3 and 4, but occasionally may apply to younger children. Please keep in mind that there are a number of terms that are used interchangeably with prekindergarten including early education, preschool, early learning, school readiness, and child development. Although more than one-third of states provide state funding supplements to Head Start programs, these generally are not considered state-funded prekindergarten programs.

SUMMARY

According to the National Education Association (NEA), children who attend high quality prekindergarten programs are better prepared for kindergarten, have better language and math skills, better cognitive and social skills, and better relationships with classmates.¹ In addition, they note that children who attend prekindergarten are less likely to drop out of school, repeat grades, need special education, or get in trouble with the law when they are older. They also note that children with disadvantaged backgrounds, such as low-income or a single parent household, generally benefit more from quality prekindergarten programs than do children who are not disadvantaged. The NEA advocates for universal high quality prekindergarten programs because it "represents one of the best investments our country can make."

According to the Education Commission of the States (ECS), forty-three states currently fund early learning programs for young children, up from about ten states in 1980.² Generally, the goal of these programs is to promote school readiness so children have a better chance of future success, both in school and in life. The ECS notes that implementation of state-funded prekindergarten programs varies widely. As examples, some programs are half day, others full day; some programs are for only four-year-olds, others include three-year-olds, while others offer services to infants and toddlers; some prekindergarten programs are operated through local school districts, while others offer services through public and private centers. The ECS also notes that most states target programs for children with an identified risk factor such as poverty, low parental education, teen parents, and English as a second language. Some states and cities, however, are working towards making quality prekindergarten programs universally available.

¹ The National Education Association (NEA) works to advance the cause of public education in the United States. The NEA is the nation's largest professional employee organization, with 2.7 million members who work at every level of education, from pre-school to university graduate programs. The NEA has affiliate organizations in every state, as well as in more than 14,000 local communities across the United States. The NEA's URL is <http://www.nea.org/index.html>.

² The Education Commission of the States (ECS) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan interstate compact created in 1965 to improve public education by facilitating the exchange of information, ideas, and experiences among state policymakers and education leaders. The URL for the ECS is <http://www.ecs.org/>.

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), Georgia and Oklahoma were the first states to expand preschool to all four-year-olds.³ Florida, Maryland, New York and West Virginia are in the process of phasing in their universal programs. The NCSL also notes that 36 states considered early education bills in 2005, and at least 28 states considered expanding preschool programs. According to the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER), approximately 738,000 children, or about 10 percent of all three- and four-year-olds in the nation, participate in state-funded prekindergarten programs.⁴ The NIEER estimates that state spending on prekindergarten programs totals \$2.54 billion.

We identified numerous reports or studies that articulate the benefits of high quality prekindergarten programs. We chose to summarize the following reports because they are generally more recent than others, often cited as a bellwether study or report, discuss a program that has been evaluated with some scientific rigor, or offer a thorough summary of the status of prekindergarten activities in the United States.

THE EFFECTS OF UNIVERSAL PRE-K ON COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

In 2005, the journal *Developmental Psychology* published the results of new research that confirms that Oklahoma's universal prekindergarten program helps four-year-olds prepare for school by improving their cognitive and language functioning. The children who participated in the state-funded universal prekindergarten program performed better on cognitive tests that measured pre-reading and reading skills, prewriting and spelling skills, and math reasoning and problem-solving skills, than those children who did not participate in the program. The research results also showed that the prekindergarten program improved performances for children from all races and income brackets (as measured by eligibility for a reduced-price lunch). According to the study, low-income children and Hispanic children benefited the most from the program.

Although the report provided very little information about the program, the researchers noted that Oklahoma's high prekindergarten teacher education requirements, and the state's willingness to compensate prekindergarten teachers at the same level as elementary and secondary school teachers in the public schools, distinguishes this program from others.

We include the report, entitled "The Effects of Universal Pre-K on Cognitive Development," as Attachment A.

³ The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), founded in 1975, is a bipartisan organization that serves the legislators and staffs of the nation's 50 states, commonwealths, and territories. The NCSL provides research, technical assistance and opportunities for policymakers to exchange ideas on most state issues. The URL for the NCSL is <http://www.ncsl.org/index.htm#>

⁴ The National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) supports early childhood education initiatives by providing objective, nonpartisan information based on research. The NIEER was established at Rutgers University's Graduate School of Education with a grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts. The URL for the NIEER is <http://nieer.org/>

THE EFFECTS OF STATE PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS ON YOUNG CHILDREN'S SCHOOL READINESS IN FIVE STATES

In 2004, the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER), examined a sample of more than 5,000 four-year-olds enrolled in high-quality, state-funded prekindergarten programs in the states of Michigan, New Jersey, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and West Virginia. The Institute compared achievement scores of children who just completed the preschool program with the scores of a sample of children who did not participate in a program. The results of the examination found significant improvement in children's early language, literacy, and mathematical development, regardless of the child's racial or economic background.

Among other things, the study found that the children who attended state-funded prekindergarten programs showed gains in vocabulary scores about 31 percent greater than the gains of those children who did not participate in a program. The researchers note that these higher scores translate into an additional four months of progress in vocabulary growth. In mathematics, including basic number concepts and such tasks as simple addition and subtraction, telling time, and counting money, the children who participated in the state-funded preschool improved their math skills by 44 percent compared to children who did not participate in a program.

As we noted above, this study examined programs in five states—Michigan, New Jersey, Oklahoma, South Carolina and West Virginia. The programs in Michigan, New Jersey and South Carolina target at-risk children (usually low-income children), while the programs in Oklahoma and West Virginia are universal. Although each state program is unique, all required licensed teachers with four-year college degrees and certification in early childhood. These programs also maintain low teacher to child ratios (the highest ratio being one teacher to ten children), and low maximum class sizes (the highest being 20 students). Unfortunately the report did not provide any additional information regarding the studied programs.

We include "The Effects of State Prekindergarten Programs on Young Children's School Readiness in Five States" as Attachment B.

THE 2004 STATE PRESCHOOL YEARBOOK

In 2004, the National Institute for Early Education Research produced the *2004 State Preschool Yearbook* that summarizes state-funded prekindergarten programs in the United States during the 2002-2003 school year. This document is parsed into three sections, the first of which provides background information on preschool education in the United States, a description of the methods used by the NIERR to collect and analyze the data, a national summary of NIEER's findings, and NIEER's national policy recommendations. The second section provides detailed profiles of each state's policies regarding preschool access, quality standards, and resources. The last section of the report includes tables that provide the complete survey data obtained from every state, Head Start and child care data. A few of the findings from the NIEER's study are as follows.

- ♦ In 2002-2003, 38 states funded one or more prekindergarten initiatives serving a total of nearly 740,000 children (this represents an increase of 45,000 students from the previous school year). Access was uneven across states, however, with 10 states accounting for over three-quarters of enrollment.

- ♦ State prekindergarten initiatives served more than six times as many four-year-olds as three-year-olds in 2002-2003. Twenty states enrolled at least 10 percent of their four-year-olds in state preschool programs, but only three states served at least 10 percent of their three-year-olds.
- ♦ Georgia and Oklahoma continued to be the only states that made prekindergarten universally available to children. Across the United States, only one out of ten children ages three and four were participating in state preschool programs, as most states targeted programs that only serve economically or otherwise disadvantaged children.
- ♦ In 2002-2003, twelve states did not have a state-funded prekindergarten program.
- ♦ States need to initiate or improve policies that establish stronger quality standards. Only one state, Arkansas, met all ten of NIEER's quality benchmarks, whereas 20 state initiatives met five or fewer benchmarks.⁵
- ♦ State policies regarding quality standards were inconsistent. For example, one state may emphasize comprehensive services while another stresses teacher qualifications.
- ♦ Only 13 state prekindergarten initiatives required teachers to have both a bachelor's degree and specialized training in early childhood education. In addition, only 13 programs required teachers to be paid on a public school salary scale.
- ♦ State funding for prekindergarten initiatives totaled \$2.54 billion in 2002-2003. Over three-fifths of this funding was from five states—California, Georgia, New Jersey, New York, and Texas. Inadequate funding severely limited access and quality in most states.
- ♦ State spending per child enrolled in state-funded preschool ranged from less than \$1,000 in Maryland to more than \$8,700 in New Jersey. State spending per child averaged about \$3,500, less than half of the total funding provided per child in federal Head Start or public K-12 education.
- ♦ Between the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 school years, total state spending (adjusted for inflation) rose by \$90 million, or four percent. However, state funding per child enrolled decreased by \$90, and 21 states decreased total spending.

We include *The State of Preschool: 2004 State Preschool Yearbook* as Attachment C.

⁵ The NIEER uses a quality standards checklist of ten items to compare standards of quality across different state prekindergarten programs.

THE HIGH/SCOPE PERRY PRESCHOOL PROJECT

According to *Education Week*, "The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project is perhaps the best-known study of the long-term effects of a high-quality prekindergarten education." During the mid-1960s, the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation selected and tracked a group of 123 African-Americans, age 3 or 4, who were born in poverty and at high risk of failing in school.⁶ The children were randomly divided into a program group who received a high-quality preschool program based on High/Scope's participatory learning approach, and a comparison group who received no preschool program. This study provides a comprehensive evaluation of the long-term effect of quality prekindergarten on the lives of the participating students.

In their most recent evaluation of this group of students, the age of which was about 40, the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation was able to interview 97 percent of the study participants still living. Some of this study's major findings are as follows.

- ◆ A greater percentage of the group who received high-quality early education graduated from high school than did the non-program group (65% vs. 45%). This proved to be particularly true for the female participants (84% vs. 32%).
- ◆ A smaller percentage of females who received high-quality early education required treatment for mental impairment than did the non-program females (8% vs. 36%).
- ◆ A smaller percentage of females who received high-quality early education had to repeat a grade than did the non-program females (21% vs. 41%).
- ◆ The group who received high-quality early education on average outperformed the non-program group on various intellectual and language tests during their early childhood years, on school achievement tests between ages 9 and 14, and on literacy tests at ages 19 and 27.
- ◆ A greater percentage of the group who received high-quality early education was employed at age 40 than was the non-program group (76% vs. 62%).
- ◆ The group who received high-quality early education had median annual earnings more than \$5,000 higher than the non-program group (\$20,800 vs. \$15,300).
- ◆ A greater percentage of the group who received high-quality early education owned their own homes (37% vs. 28%).
- ◆ A greater percentage of the group who received high-quality early education had a savings account than did the non-program group (76% vs. 50%).

⁶ The High/Scope Educational Research Foundation is an independent nonprofit research, development, training, and public advocacy organization. High/Scope's mission is "to lift lives through education." Among other things, the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation provides training to preschool and elementary teachers and administrators, conducts research on the effectiveness of educational programs, and develops curricula for infant, toddler, preschool, elementary, and adolescent programs. The URL for the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation is <http://www.highscope.org/index.asp>.

- ♦ The group who received high-quality early education had significantly fewer arrests than did the non-program group (36% vs. 55% arrested five times or more).
- ♦ Significantly fewer members of the group who received high-quality early care than the non-program group were ever arrested for violent crimes (32% vs. 48%), property crimes (36% vs. 58%), or drug crimes (14% vs. 34%).

According to the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, in constant dollars adjusted to 2000, the economic return to society of the Perry Preschool program was \$258,888 per participant, on an investment of \$15,166 per participant, or a \$17.07 return for every dollar invested.

Researchers with the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation identified the following attributes that contribute to the success of their prekindergarten program.

- ♦ The teachers in the Perry Preschool program had bachelor's degrees and were certified to teach in elementary, early childhood, and special education. Teachers also received training, supervision, and assessments that support the Perry Preschool program educational model, and were paid 10 percent above the local public school district's standard pay scale.
- ♦ The Perry Preschool program had four teachers for 20 to 25 children.
- ♦ The Perry Preschool program was a two school year program, starting at age three.
- ♦ The Perry Preschool program consisted of daily classes (five days a week) of two-and-a-half hours or more.
- ♦ The teachers in the Perry Preschool program helped children plan, perform, and review their own work. The classroom was arranged and the day was scheduled to support children's self-initiated learning activities.
- ♦ Perry Preschool program teachers visited with families at home, at least once every two weeks.

We include *The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 40, Summary, Conclusions, and Frequently Asked Questions* as Attachment D.⁷

⁷ Additional information on the High/Scope Perry Preschool Project can be found at <http://www.highscope.org/Research/PerryProject/perrymain.htm>.

ABECEDARIAN EARLY CHILDHOOD INTERVENTION PROJECT

The Abecedarian Early Childhood Intervention Project began in the 1970s by the FPG Child Development Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.⁸ The Abecedarian Project scientifically studied the potential benefits of early childhood education for children from low-income families. Children who were selected to participate in the program received full-time, high-quality instruction in a childcare setting from infancy through age five. Each child had an individualized plan of educational activities. These activities focused on social, emotional, and cognitive areas of development, and gave particular emphasis to language development. The children's progress was monitored over time with follow-up studies conducted at ages 12, 15, and 21.

So far, the findings demonstrate that important, long-lasting benefits are associated with the high-quality early childhood program. A sample of the benefits experienced by the program participants gleaned from the young-adult assessment (age 21) are as follows.

- ◆ The children who received early childhood education in the Abecedarian program are projected to make roughly \$143,000 more over their lifetimes than those who did not take part in the program.
- ◆ The mothers of children who were enrolled in the program also expect earnings of about \$133,000 more over their lifetimes than the mothers of the children who did not take part in the program.
- ◆ School districts saved more than \$11,000 per child because participants are less likely to require special or remedial education.
- ◆ The children who received early childhood education in the Abecedarian project had higher cognitive test scores from the toddler years to age 21.
- ◆ Academic achievement in both reading and math was higher from the primary grades through young adulthood for the children who received early childhood education in the Abecedarian project.
- ◆ The children who participated in the program completed more years of education and were more likely to attend a four-year college.
- ◆ The mothers of the children who participated in the program achieved higher educational and employment status than did the mothers of the children who were not in the program. These results were especially pronounced for teen mothers.
- ◆ Taxpayers received four dollars in benefits for every dollar spent on high-quality early education programs.

⁸ FPG Child Development Institute is a multidisciplinary institute at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The institute's mission is to cultivate and share the knowledge necessary to enhance child development and family wellbeing. The institute, through grants and contracts, conducts research and provides outreach services. The URL for the FPG Child Development Institute is <http://www.fpg.unc.edu/index.cfm>.

We include the FPG Child Development Institute's summary of the Abecedarian Project as Attachment E.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WITH A HIGH PUBLIC RETURN

In 2003, economists with the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis calculated that the potential annual return from a focused, high-quality early childhood education program is as high as 16 percent.⁹ Most of the return benefits the economy as a whole because individuals who participate in high-quality early childhood education programs developed greater skills than they otherwise would have, which in turn contributes to the local economies (approximately 12% return). A smaller portion (approximately 4%) of the return benefits the children who received early childhood education in the form of higher wages later in life. The researchers used data from the High/Scope Perry Preschool Project to conduct their analysis.

In June 2005, as an expansion to their 2003 research, the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis researchers proposed expanding the scope of early childhood education programming to meet the needs of all impoverished children ages five and younger, including newborns. In making this proposal, the researchers cited advances in brain research that indicate the most critical neurological development occurs between birth and age three.

In summary, the authors maintain that economic development schemes based on attracting specific companies or industries often waste taxpayer dollars, whereas investment in early childhood development yields high and dependable returns, in turn aiding long-term economic growth.

We include *Early Childhood Development: Economic Development with a High Public Return* as Attachment F.

EARLY EDUCATION IN THE STATES: A YEAR IN REVIEW—2004

In March 2005, the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) produced, *Early Education in the States: A Year in Review—2004*, to provide detailed information about actions of state legislatures on early education issues. Among other things, this report contains a brief review of the research on early education, NCSL's comments on the role of state legislatures in early education, and a state-by-state summary of state bills, acts, executive orders, and proposals made in 2004 that pertain to early education.

In addition to summarizing many of the reports or studies we discussed above, the NCSL notes that incorporated into recent child development initiatives are three new components: enhancing

⁹ The Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis is one of 12 regional Reserve Banks that, together with the Board of Governors in Washington, D.C., make up the Federal Reserve System—the United States' central bank. The URL for the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis' early childhood education website is <http://minneapolisfed.org/research/studies/earlychild/>.

the role of parents; promoting innovation at the local level; and establishing state-level planning councils.

The NCSL notes that generally, state legislators should approach early education from a number of different perspectives. In some cases, early education has been one part of a larger education reform effort. Lately, legislators have made connections between early education and a state's ability to meet requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. State legislators also view early education as part of the solution to reducing the achievement gap for children before they enter the early elementary grades. In addition, the positive results demonstrated in long-term economic research have prompted policymakers to consider early education as a long-term investment.

We include *Early Education in the States: A Year in Review—2004* as Attachment G.

OTHER INFORMATIVE SOURCES

During the course of our research, we identified additional sources of early childhood education information that you may find useful. We identify these sources and their website address in Table 1.

Table 1: Sources of Early Childhood Education Information	
Organization	URL
Child Development Center, Wilder Foundation	www.wilder.org/programs.0.html
Education and Early Learning, Committee for Economic Development	www.ced.org/projects/educ.shtml
Education Commission of the States	www.ecs.org/ecsmain.asp?page=/html/issue.asp?issueID=184
Foundation for Child Development	www.ffcd.org/
National Child Care Information Center Online Library	nccic.org/
National Education Association	www.nea.org/index.html
National Scientific Council on the Developing Child	www.developingchild.net/
The RAND Corporation	www.rand.org/pubs/online/education/index.html
Ready4K, Minnesota's School Readiness Program	www.ready4k.org/
Strategies for Children: Early Education for All Campaign	www.strategiesforchildren.org/eea/eea_home.htm
The Trust for Early Education	www.trustforearlyed.org/
U.S. Department of Education	www.ed.gov/teachers/how/early/edpicks.jhtml?src=qc

ALASKA'S TWO-YEAR KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

As you know, Chapter 50, SLA 2003 (House Bill 154) amended Alaska Statute 14.03.080(c) to restrict education foundation formula funding of four-year olds attending kindergarten. At the time, approximately 30 of the 53 school districts in Alaska offered some form of a two-year kindergarten program, allowing both four- and five-year olds to attend (some school districts allowed all four-year olds to attend while others did not). Chapter 50, SLA 2003 restricts foundation formula funding to four-year olds for whom there is a realistic expectation that the child will successfully progress through the kindergarten curriculum and advance to the first grade the following school year. According to the Department of Education and Early Development's (DEED) fiscal note attached to HB 154, this amendment resulted in a savings of approximately \$3.9 million.

Although the letter of intent Governor Murkowski included with HB 154 noted the \$3.9 million saving that would result from the enactment of HB 154, the saving does not appear to be the primary motivation for the bill. Eddy Jeans, Manager of the School Finance and Facilities Section of the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, testified during a House Education committee meeting, as well as numerous other committee meetings that discussed HB 154, that the intent of this bill was to address the policy question of whether the legislature wanted to fund four-year-olds in the kindergarten-through-12th-grade program.¹⁰ He also pointed to an equity issue as not every school district in Alaska took advantage of the "loop-hole" in the law. According to Mr. Jeans, it would cost the state approximately \$60 to \$62 million annually to provide kindergarten for all four-year olds. Mr. Jeans noted that this estimate does not include any improvements to the capacity of districts' facilities, such as providing adequate classroom space.

Also during a House Education committee meeting, Kevin Sweeny, then Special Assistant to the Office of the Commissioner of the Department of Education and Early Development, testified, "the commissioner [of DEED] would agree that education would be better if the legislature funded all four-year-olds. In some districts it has shown that bringing kids in at four years old has helped them progress."¹¹ He also noted that the fundamental issue represented by HB 154 is whether the policy makers want to fund a statewide two-year kindergarten program through the foundation formula.

¹⁰ Eddy Jeans, now the Director of School Finance with the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, can be contacted at 907-465-2891

¹¹ In addition, in November 2001, the Alaska State Board of Education and Early Development adopted a resolution calling for voluntary preschool for all three- and four-year-old children. The resolution also expresses support for the development of pilot preschool programs in communities with low achievement scores on state exams, high poverty, and lack of Head Start or other early development programs.

ALASKA COMMUNITY PRESCHOOL PROJECT - ALASKA'S PRESCHOOL PILOT PROGRAM

During each of the last two state fiscal years, the DEED received federally earmarked money to help fund the Alaska Community Preschool Project. During FY2005, the DEED distributed \$800,000, through a competitive process, to seven school districts (serving eight communities), to offer high-quality preschool.¹² During FY2006, the program received \$496,000 and funded services in seven communities in six districts (Juneau, Hoonah, King Cove, Sand Point, Bethel, Unalakleet and Minto). Federal funding for FY2007 has not been determined.

The purpose of this project is to augment existing preschool programs, that often operate in partnership with other entities such as Head Start, to bring them up to the teaching standards prescribed by the Feuerstein Instrumental Enrichment—Basic education model. So far the project has served roughly 200 children.¹³

READY TO READ, READY TO LEARN TASK FORCE

In May 2005, Governor Murkowski called for the establishment of the Ready to Read, Ready to Learn Task Force. The governor charged this task force with identifying the following:

- ◆ Ways Alaskans can improve the readiness of preschoolers to read and learn,
- ◆ Ways families can become better at teaching children to listen, speak, read and write,
- ◆ Ways preschools and childcare centers can provide the best possible start for children,
- ◆ Ways the business community can participate in this effort, and
- ◆ Ways state and local governments can support the effort.

¹² In FY2005, the DEED received a total \$1.2 million, and spent the money not directed to district programs on training and materials. Paul S. Sugar, Education Specialist II with the Department of Education and Early Development, can be reached at 907-465-4862.

¹³ The International Center for the Enhancement of Learning Potential (ICELP), the Feuerstein Instrumental Enrichment—Basic program is directed toward the younger child, from approximately three to seven years of age, and the very low functioning older individual. The program is designed for use in a classroom group setting, for smaller groups of targeted learners, and as a one-to-one therapeutic intervention. The program also provides an "early intervention" to enable students who are developmentally at risk, or those individuals who have not acquired basic foundational knowledge and skills, to respond to direct stimuli and develop cognitive functions.

First Lady Nancy Murkowski is the Chair of Task Force while the Alaska Humanities Forum has the lead in establishing and administering the task force.¹⁴

According to the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services, Governor Murkowski will ask the Alaska Legislature to provide \$750,000 in fiscal year 2007 to improve childhood literacy and learning. This was announced by Nancy Murkowski at the Ready to Read, Ready to Learn Task Force held in Anchorage on November 10, 2005. The Department of Health and Social Services and the Department of Education and Early Development will use the funds to carry out recommendations currently being developed by the task force.

We include the Ready to Read, Ready to Learn Task Force's most recent newsletter "Task Force News" as Attachment H.

I hope you find this information to be useful. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions or need additional information.

¹⁴ The Alaska Humanities Forum was founded in 1972 by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), the Forum is one of 56 state and territorial groups also supported by the NEH. The Forum is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization with a mission to "use the wisdom and methods of the humanities to enrich the civic, intellectual and cultural life of all Alaskans." The Ready to Read, Ready to Learn Task Force URL is <http://www.akhf.org/ReadytoRead/ECL-Summit.html>.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A

William T. Gormley, Jr., Ph.D., Ted Gayer, Ph.D., Deborah Phillips, Ph.D., and Brittany Dawson, M.A., "The Effects of Universal Pre-K on Cognitive Development," *Developmental Psychology*, American Psychological Association, Volume 41, No. 6,
<http://www.apa.org/journals/releases/dev416872.pdf>

Attachment B

W. Steven Barnett, Ph.D., Cynthia Lamy, Ed.D., Kwanghee Jung, Ph.D., "*The Effects of State Prekindergarten Programs on Young Children's School Readiness in Five States*," The National Institute for Early Education Research, Rutgers University, December 2005

Attachment C

W. Steven Barnett, Ph.D., Jason T. Hustedt, Ph.D., Kenneth B. Robin, Psy.M., and Karen L. Schulman, M.P.P., *The State of Preschool: 2004 State Preschool Yearbook*, The National Institute for Early Education Research, 2004,
<http://nieer.org/yearbook/>

Attachment D

Lawrence J. Schweinhart, *The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study through Age 40, Summary, Conclusions, and Frequently Asked Questions*, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, High/Scope Press, 2005,
<http://www.highscope.org/Research/PerryProject/perrymain.htm>

Attachment E

"Early Learning, Later Success: The Abecedarian Study, Early Childhood Educational Intervention for Poor Children, Executive Summary," The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, FPG Child Development Inst., Chapel Hill, NC,
<http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~abc/summary.cfm>

Attachment F

Art Rolnick, Rob Grunewald, *Early Childhood Development: Economic Development with a High Public Return*, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, December 2003,
<http://minneapolisfed.org/research/studies/earlychild/abc-part2.pdf>

Attachment G

Steffanie Clothier, *Early Education in the States A Year in Review—2004*, The National Conference of State Legislatures, March 2005,
<http://www.ncsl.org/programs/cyf/prekreport.htm>

Attachment H

"Task Force News," Ready to Read, Ready to Learn Task Force, Vol. 1, No. 1, December 2005,
<http://www.akhf.org/ReadytoRead/R2Rnewsletter1.pdf>

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH REPORT

FEBRUARY 7, 2006



REPORT NUMBER 06.115

STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDING FOR HEAD START

PREPARED FOR REPRESENTATIVE LES GARA

BY BECKY TAYLOR, LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

You asked for the level of state and federal funding for the Head Start program for FY04 through FY06, and the Governor's proposal for FY07. You were also interested in the number of children enrolled for each of those years, and an estimate of the number of children that could be enrolled under the Governor's FY07 proposal.

Although state funding for the Head Start program remains fairly consistent under the Governor's proposed budget for fiscal year 2007, an anticipated one percent decrease in federal funds could reduce the program's overall funding level. Table 1 shows state and federal funding for FY04-FY06, as well as proposed funding for FY07. A one percent reduction in federal funds would result in a \$272,394 decrease in total federal and state funding for the Head Start program from FY06 to FY07. Based on the average amount of state and federal funding per child served during FY04 and FY05, we estimate that a one percent decrease in federal funding could result in 29 fewer children served.¹

Table 2 shows the number of children served by the Head Start program for FY04 and FY05, as well as estimates for the end of FY06 and FY07. Table 3 provides a more detailed description of the number of children served by the Head Start program so far this year, and the number of children on the waitlist by grantee.

¹ Paul Sugar, Education Specialist for the Department of Education and Early Development, points out that this method, which assumes a consistent cost per child served, may not accurately reflect how the Head Start program operates. Ultimately, local grantees decide how to handle budget cuts, and determine whether slots are lost. He notes that some sites may be able to maintain the number of children they serve for a few years by shuffling resources. Mr. Sugar can be reached at (907) 465-4862.

Table 1: State and Federal Funding for Head Start, FY04-FY07				
Funding Source	FY04 (authorized)	FY05 (authorized)	FY06 (authorized)	FY07 (proposed)
Total Federal	27,809,200	28,023,489	28,029,389	27,749,095
Direct Funding to Grantees	27,500,000	27,779,289	27,779,289	undetermined
Funding to the State	309,200	244,200	250,100	
State	6,385,200	6,320,700	6,330,400	6,338,300
Total Federal and State	34,194,400	34,344,189	34,359,789	34,087,395
<p>Notes: The federal figure for FY07 reflects a projected 1% cut in federal Head Start funds. The vast majority of federal funds go directly from the federal government to organizations that are Head Start grantees; however, a small amount of funding goes to the state to facilitate collaboration at the state, regional, and local levels around early childhood education issues. In addition to the federal Head Start funds, grantees also receive federal Child and Adult Food Care Program reimbursements totaling \$860,000 to \$980,000.</p> <p>Source: Paul Sugar, Education Specialist, Department of Education and Early Development.</p>				

Table 2: Estimated Number of Children Served, FY04-FY07				
	FY04 (authorized)	FY05 (authorized)	FY06 (authorized)	FY07 (proposed)
Total Federal and State Funding	34,194,400	34,344,189	34,359,789	34,087,395
Per child	\$9,734	\$9,356	Undetermined	
Average per child	\$9,545			
Children Served ^a	3,513	3,671	3,600	3,571
<p>Note: The total FY07 funding reflects a projected 1% cut in federal Head Start funds.</p> <p>a) The number of children served for FY04 and FY05 are as of year end. In order to estimate the number of children served at the end of the year for FY06 and FY07, we divided the total amount of state and federal funding for those years by the average amount of federal and state funding per child for FY04 and FY05. This method assumes a consistent cost per child served, which may not accurately reflect how the program operates. Local grantees determine the most cost-effective way to handle budget cuts, and may or may not actually reduce the number of children they serve. As of the end of January 2006, 3,150 children have been served by the Head Start program during the 2005-2006 academic year.</p> <p>Source: Paul Sugar, Education Specialist, Department of Education and Early Development.</p>				

I hope you find this information to be useful. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions or need additional information.

Table 1: State and Federal Funding for Head Start, FY04-FY07

Funding Source	FY04 (authorized)	FY05 (authorized)	FY06 (authorized)	FY07 (proposed)
Total Federal	27,809,200	28,023,489	28,029,389	27,749,095
Direct Funding to Grantees	27,500,000	27,779,289	27,779,289	undetermined
Funding to the State	309,200	244,200	250,100	
State	6,385,200	6,320,700	6,330,400	6,338,300
Total Federal and State	34,194,400	34,344,189	34,359,789	34,087,395

Notes: The federal figure for FY07 reflects a projected 1% cut in federal Head Start funds. The vast majority of federal funds go directly from the federal government to organizations that are Head Start grantees; however, a small amount of funding goes to the state to facilitate collaboration at the state, regional, and local levels around early childhood education issues. In addition to the federal Head Start funds, grantees also receive federal Child and Adult Food Care Program reimbursements totaling \$860,000 to \$980,000.

Source: Paul Sugar, Education Specialist, Department of Education and Early Development.

Table 2: Estimated Number of Children Served, FY04-FY07

Estimated Number of Children Served, FY04-FY07				
	FY04 (authorized)	FY05 (authorized)	FY06 (authorized)	FY07 (proposed)
Total Federal and State Funding	34,194,400	34,344,189	34,359,789	34,087,395
Per child	\$9,734	\$9,356	Undetermined	
Average per child	\$9,545			
Children Served*	3,513	3,671	3,600	3,571

Note: The total FY07 funding reflects a projected 1% cut in federal Head Start funds.
a) The number of children served for FY04 and FY05 are as of year end. In order to estimate the number of children served at the end of the year for FY06 and FY07, we divided the total amount of state and federal funding for those years by the average amount of federal and state funding per child for FY04 and FY05. This method assumes a consistent cost per child served, which may not accurately reflect how the program operates. Local grantees determine the most cost-effective way to handle budget cuts, and may or may not actually reduce the number of children they serve. As of the end of January 2006, 3,150 children have been served by the Head Start program during the 2005-2006 academic year.

Source: Paul Sugar, Education Specialist, Department of Education and Early Development.

I hope you find this information to be useful. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions or need additional information.

Table 3: Children Served and on the Waitlist for the Head Start Program as of January 31, 2006, by Grantee and Community

Community	Number of Children Served	Number of Children on Wait List
Association of Village Council Presidents		
Akiachak	20	3
Bethel A.M.	18	
Bethel P.M.	19	4
Chefornak	17	6
Kalskag	15	
Kasigluk	22	4
Kotlik	25	
Nightmute	12	
Quinhagak	29	
Russian Mission	14	
Scammon Bay	32	
Tuluksak	20	5
Bristol Bay Native Association		
Togiak	17	
Dillingham	35	16
New Stuyahok	18	4
Naknek	17	3
Manokotak	11	2
Council of Athabascan Tribal Governments		
Fort Yukon/Canyon Village	7	10
Venetie	0	12
Arctic Village	5	
Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska		
Angoon	20	
Craig	28	2
Hoonah	16	1
Juneau	122	48
Klawock	17	3
Petersburg	30	3
Saxman	17	5
Sitka	21	11
Wrangell	20	4
Yakutat	14	
Kenaitze Cuya Qyut Anen		
Common Center for Kenai, Soldotna, Nikiski, Kalifornski Beach	57	46
CCS Early Learning		
Chugiak	50	16
Meadow Lakes	60	29
Palmer	55	13
Wasilla	87	42
Chugachmiut		
Nanwalek	10	
Seldovia	9	
Port Graham	4	

Fairbanks Native Association		
Fairbanks/North Pole	213	126
Play N' Learn Community Head Start		
Fairbanks/North Pole	108	5
Metlakatla Indian Community		
Metlakatla	40	
Kawerak Head Start		
Nome	37	13
Brevig Mission	20	
Diomedes	5	
Elim	12	
Gambell	27	
Golovin	4	
Koyuk	18	
Shaktolik	12	
Shishmaref	26	
St. Michael	28	
Teller	9	
Wales	6	
White Mountain	12	
Kid's Corps Inc.		
Anchorage	321	100
Southcentral Foundation		
Anchorage	227	192
RurAL CAP Head Start & Early Head Start		
Selawik	12	1
Savoonga	30	
Stebbins	20	7
Haines	17	5
Kake	12	
Ketchikan	56	12
Kwethluk	63	7
Nunapitchuk	51	12
Napaskiak	20	4
Tooksok Bay	36	1
Alakanuk	38	1
Chevak	32	12
Emmonak	20	15
Hooper Bay	88	9
Homer	19	8
Kluti-Kaah	19	2
Kodiak	52	7
Sterling	39	3
Akiak	43	13
Mt. Village	20	8
Pilot Station	47	1
St. Mary's	26	1
Marshall	15	

Aleutian/Pribilof Island Association		
King Cove	16	1
Sand Point	17	1
St. Paul	20	1
Unalaska	27	2
Tanana Chiefs Conference		
Allakaket	11	
Fort Yukon	19	
Holy Cross	9	
Huslia	8	
Kaltag	9	
McGrath	9	
Nulato	6	
Ruby	7	
Tanana	16	
Nenana	14	
Upper Tanana (UTDC)		
Mentasta/Northway	12	
Tok/Tanacross	54	4
Native Village of Tyonek		
Tyonek	6	
Total Number of Children Served (Reported by Grantees' Sites)	3,150	
Total Number of Children on Waiting Lists (Reported by Grantees' Sites)		862
Total Communities Served	100	
Note: Both Anchorage and Fairbanks are served by two different Head Start grantees. In Anchorage, the total number of children served is 548, with 292 children on the waitlist. In Fairbanks, the total number of children served is 321, with 131 children on the waitlist. Source: Paul Sugar, Education Specialist, Department of Education and Early Development.		

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH REPORT

JANUARY 18, 2008



REPORT NUMBER 08.087

HEAD START PARTICIPATION AND DECLINING SERVICES

PREPARED FOR REPRESENTATIVE LES GARA

BY TIM SPENGLER, LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

You asked for information on the Head Start program. Specifically, you wished to know how many Alaskan children have participated in the program in the last five years and how many communities have lost funding or closed their programs in that time period.

As you know, Head Start is a comprehensive child development program that serves children aged three to five who come from low income homes. The program's goals include increasing the child's social competence, such as the ability to deal with the everyday, present environment, and later responsibilities in life and school. Head Start also works with the families of these children to help educate and strengthen them by offering training and support to help facilitate growth and change.

According to Paul Sugar, Education Specialist II, with the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (DEED), Head Start anticipates serving 3,504 children in fiscal year (FY) 2008.¹ This is a decrease of 167 children served since FY05. Mr. Sugar provided the figures for Table 1, which tracks the number of children served by Head Start in the last five fiscal years. As you will see, the number has dropped from a high of 3,671 in FY05, to its lowest point in five fiscal years.

Table 1: Children Served by Head Start in Alaska, FY04 - FY08

Children Served	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08 (projected)
	3,513	3,671	3,656	3,606	3,504
Difference per Year		158	-15	-50	-102

Notes: Data include children from birth to five years of age.

Source: Paul Sugar, Education Specialist, Department of Education and Early Development. Mr. Sugar can be reached at (907) 465-4862.

¹ This number includes children from birth to five years. Mr. Sugar can be reached at (907) 465-4862

Mr. Sugar points out that in the last five years, while state and federal funding for the Head Start program has remained relatively flat, costs have risen. Not only goods and services—such as heating fuel and transportation—but personnel costs have risen as well. As more teaching staff complete degree programs to meet increased federal requirements, their costs are rising. Insurance costs have also risen over the last five years.

Since fiscal year 2004, 19 communities have closed their Head Start programs.² Table 2 enumerates the closures over the last five fiscal years.

Table 2: Closures of Head Start Programs in Alaska, FY04 - FY08						
Program Closures	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Total
	1	6	6	5	1	19
Source: Paul Sugar, Education Specialist, Department of Education and Early Development. Mr. Sugar can be reached at (907) 465-4862.						

Aside from closures, budgetary concerns have also caused some grantees to go from a center based model to a home visiting model. Others now use a central building site and transport children from nearby communities, while some urban programs have shortened their transportation area. Still others have had to lower the number of children that they serve.

With the current level of funding, Head Start serves just under half (48 percent) of the children in Alaska who are *three to five* year olds and live below the poverty line. Roughly 72 percent of the nearly 13,000 children between *birth and five* who the DEED estimates live below the poverty line are without Head Start early childhood education opportunities.

I hope you find this information to be useful. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions or need additional information.

² One of these communities reopened services with a different grantee; a second will reopen in February 2008.