Research shows that early childhood education has a strong rate of return on investment. How do economists quantify the rate of return? Research shows that disadvantaged children who attend high-quality early childhood programs are less likely to start kindergarten behind, need special education, repeat a grade and are more likely to graduate from high school. They also tend to have higher earnings, pay more in taxes, and commit less crime.
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§ Overview of the Federal Reserve System and Community Development

§ Economic case for investing in young children, focus on fiscal effects

§ Placing “fade out” into context and sustaining early childhood gains

§ Costs and benefits of child care as workforce infrastructure
Federal Reserve System
Community Development

- Promote the economic resilience and mobility of low- to moderate-income (LMI) individuals and communities.

@MplsFedCMD

FedCommunities.org
Economic case for investing in young children: Key concepts

§ Conducting cost-benefit analysis requires rigorous research studies that include a non-treatment comparison group, ideally through a Randomized Control Trial.

§ Research on early childhood programs is conducted in the context of developmental science, which shows the early years are a sensitive period for growth.

§ Benefits to early childhood programs occur both near-term and long-term and are spread across various government jurisdictions and agencies.

§ Investments achieve a high return when they are high-quality, engage parents, start early, effectively scaled, and match the risk profile of children served.
Barriers to **Social Mobility** Emerge at a **Very Young Age**

Average reading scores of U.S. children by socio-economic status group (parent education)

Source: Bradbury, Corak, Waldfogel, and Washbrook (2015)
Early childhood development investments

- Home visiting HV
- Health & nutrition HN
- Early learning programs ELP
- Quality Rating and Improvement System
- Parent education
- Child welfare system
Fiscal-related benefits prenatal to age 5

- Better maternal and child health HV, HN
- Fewer low-weight births HV, HN
- Fewer emergency room visits HV
- Reduced costs to Medicaid, TANF, and food stamps HV
- Reduced child abuse and neglect HV, ELP
- Higher maternal earnings and tax revenue HV, ELP
- Lower cash assistance HV
- Lower maternal crime HV

Sources: Bartick & Reinhold (2010); Devaney, Billheimer, & Schore (2008); Green, et al. (2014); Karoly, et al. (1998); Olds, et al. (1997); Miller (2015); Reynolds, Temple, White, Ou, & Robertson (2011)
Fiscal-related benefits ages 5 to 17

- Improved school readiness  
  - HV, ELP

- Reduced need for special education  
  - ELP

- Less grade repetition  
  - ELP

- Higher high school graduation rates  
  - ELP

- Reduced juvenile crime  
  - HV, ELP

Sources: Garcia, Heckman, Leaf, & Prados (2016); Heckman, Moon, Pinto, Savelyez, & Yavitz (2010); Muschkin, Ladd, & Dodge (2015); Olds, et al. (2004); Reynolds, Temple, White, Ou, & Robertson (2011); Schweinhart, et al. (2005)
Fiscal-related benefits ages 18+

- Higher educational attainment
- Higher earnings and tax revenue
- Lower cash assistance
- Improved health
- Lower crime
- Higher homeownership rates

Sources: Garcia, Heckman, Leaf, & Prados (2016); Heckman, Moon, Pinto, Savelyez, & Yavitz (2010); Reynolds, Temple, White, Ou, & Robertson (2011); Schweinhart, et al. (2005)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home visiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early learning programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Rating and Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education (group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Government cost savings or increased revenue associated with early childhood investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid and unpaid medical care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased tax revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Return on Investment
Evidence from longitudinal early childhood studies

- Perry Preschool
  - Schweinhart: $16 to $1
  - Heckman: $7–$12 to $1

- Abecedarian Educational Child Care
  - Barnett: $4 to $1
  - Heckman: $7 to $1

- Chicago Child-Parent Center
  - Reynolds: $10 to $1

- Elmira Prenatal/Early Infancy Project
  - Karoly: $5 to $1

Sources: Garcia, Heckman, Leaf, & Prados (2016); Heckman, Moon, Pinto, Savelyez, & Yavitz (2010); Karoly, et al. (1998); Masse & Barnett (2002); White, Ou, & Robertson (2011); Schweinhart, et al. (2005)
## Perry Preschool: Intergenerational Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Children of nonparticipants</th>
<th>Children of Perry participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete high school without suspension</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never be suspended, addicted or arrested</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be employed full-time or self-employed</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Heckman & Karapakula
Early Childhood Development
Investment Opportunities

- Access to high-quality early learning programs
  - Address both access and quality for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers

- Home visiting programs for families with pregnant women and young children

- Intersection between child protection system and early childhood services, including mental health services

- Health and dental care
High return principles

- Invest in quality
- Engage parents
- Start early
- Bring to scale
- Match services to risk profile
  - Intensive and free services that start early for high-risk children
  - Less-intensive services with partial subsidy for moderate-risk children
  - No subsidy for low-risk, higher-income children
Language and culture as protective factors

Lakota Immersion Childcare
Pine Ridge Reservation
South Dakota
Minnesota Early Learning Scholarships
Incorporate high-return principles

- $70 million annually
- Attend QRIS-rated providers

Eligibility
- Children ages 3 and 4 below 185% poverty and younger siblings
- Children ages 0 to 2 who have a teen parent, homeless, child welfare services, or foster care
Head Start Randomized Control Trial

“Head Start improved children’s preschool outcomes across developmental domains, but had few impacts on children in kindergarten through 3rd grade.”

Measures Intent-to-Treat
- Includes Head Start enrollees who don’t show up
- 60 percent of the control group children participated in child care or early education programs

Source: Puma, Bell, Cook, Heid, Broene, Jenkins, Mashburn, and Downer (2012)
Positive small and medium effects after 1 year, few effects after entering school

### Exhibit 2a. Summary of ITT Cognitive Impacts for 4-Year-Olds by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Age 4 (Head Start Year)</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1st Grade</th>
<th>3rd Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language, Literacy, and Pre-Writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Identification</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Writing (McCarthy Draw a Design)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Literacy Scale (parent report)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter Naming</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPPP Elision)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive Vocabulary (PPVT)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter-Word Identification (WJIII)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling (WJIII)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Comprehension (WJIII)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Academic Skills (WJIII)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLS-K Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Puma, Bell, Cook, Heid, Broene, Jenkins, Mashburn, and Downer (2012)
Placing “fade out” into context

- Measures that indicate fade out may not fully capture effects.

- Even when fade out is detected, benefits can be found later in childhood and early adulthood.

- Several long-term evaluations show sustained early childhood education program impacts into adulthood.

- “Catch up” may be a better descriptor than fade out.
Head Start children continue to improve, but control children catch up

Source: Presentation by Steve Barnett, Rutgers University
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