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W. Steven Barnett, Ph.D. is a Board of Governors Professor and Director of the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) at Rutgers University. His research includes studies of the economics of early care and education including costs and benefits, the long term effects of preschool programs on children's learning and development, and the distribution of educational opportunities. Dr. Barnett earned his Ph.D. in economics at the University of Michigan. He has authored or co-authored over 160 publications including 16 books. His research interests include the economics of human development and practical policies for translating research findings into effective public investments. His best known works include: reviews of the research on long-term effects; benefit-cost analyses of the Perry Preschool and Abecedarian programs; randomized trials comparing alternative approaches to educating children including length of day, mono-lingual versus dual-language immersion, and the Tools of the Mind curriculum; and, the series of State Preschool Yearbooks providing annual state-by-state analyses of progress in state-funded pre-K.
What do we know from research about program quality and effectiveness?

• Good quality preschool is rare

• Initial effects often are quite small
  • Program designs too weak to produce large gains
  • Implementation is too weak--no system to ensure continuous improvement and results

• Some *fade-out* is really *convergence* as schools help those behind catch up

• Effects do not entirely disappear in most studies
Good Preschool is Rare for All (ECLS-B)
WSIPP Meta-Analysis: 49 Rigorous Studies

Exhibit A2
Estimation of Test Score Fadeout:
Meta-Analytic Results and Power Curve Model

Effect size

Years since the preschool intervention

0.309
0.152
0.097
0.085

Effect size modeled with power curve
Meta-analytic effect sizes
What do we know about producing large gains?

- Intentional teaching
- Individualization & small groups
- Some approaches don’t work very well:
  - Head Start and comprehensive services
- Design programs to have short-term gains at least as twice large as desired long-term gains
Notable recent studies of pre-K effects

• Head Start RCT very small impacts (discuss more later)
• Rhode Island RCT--pilot of pre-K for all
  – Positive gains for all, larger gains for low income children
• TN RCT--randomization did not work for short-term
  – But results are mixed and concerning
• RDD studies in Boston, GA, AR, WV, SC, MI, CA, OK, NM, NJ
  – Results are mixed, some have large positive effects
• Long-term positive effects in TX, GA and NJ
  – In NJ quality is far higher long-term effects are much larger
How well does Head Start work?

• Randomized trial of the effects of 1 year in 2002-2003
• Modest positive initial gains
• Lasting effects of Head Start were small to nil
  – Partly this is catch-up as public schools help controls
• Also, study underestimated effects:
  – Some children do not attend and some controls get into Head Start
  – Controls also attend state pre-K and other programs
  – Spillovers from Head Start children help control children too in K-3
• Nevertheless effects were smaller than we should get
• Head Start reforms have led to larger gains
Head Start Improved Since National Study
NJ’s Abbott Pre-K Program: A high quality example

- Universal: all children in 31 high poverty districts
- Two years beginning at age 3
- Teacher with BA & certification & asst. teacher
- Full-day/school yr (6 hour school day, 180 days)
- Maximum class size of 15 students
- Approved evidence-based curricula (5 models)
- Public private partnership (2/3 private)
- Continuous improvement system with strong PD (coaching)
Continuous Improvement Cycle

First Develop Standards

Measure and Assess Progress

Analyze and Plan

Implement – Professional Development and Technical Assistance
NJ Raised Quality in Public and Private

ECERS-R Score (1=minimal, 3=poor 5= good 7=excellent)

- 00 Total (N = 232)
- 08 Total (N = 407)
Abbott Pre-K Effects on NJASK by Years of Participation


1 year Abbott pre-k: blue, 2 year Abbott pre-k: red
Abbott Pre-K Effects on Retention and Special Education

- **Retention**: 12% (Abbott pre-K) vs. 19% (no Abbott pre-K)
- **Special Education**: 12% (Abbott pre-K) vs. 17% (no Abbott pre-K)
What do we know about State Pre-K?

- Long-term trends nationally
  - Enrollment has more than doubled nationally in 10 years
  - Quality standards have improved
  - Spending has increased, but not enough to keep up with enrollment
- Recession hit pre-K hard
  - Funding declined, especially funding per child
  - Quality standards wavered
  - Most recently enrollment actually declined slightly
- States vary greatly and interstate inequality increasing
  - In some preschool is available to all; in others to none
  - Some have high standards, others have none for some features
  - Spending per child varies by a factor of 10
In 2012-2013, enrollment decreased—by more than 9,000 children at age 4—from the prior year across the 40 states plus D.C. that offer pre-K. This is the first enrollment decrease, nationally, NIEER has observed.

Slightly more than 1.3 million children attended state-funded pre-K, 1.1 million of them at age 4.
Access: Enrollment Growth by Age

Enrollment Growth by Age, 2001-2002 to 2012-2013
Access: Preschool and preschool special education

The graph shows the percentage of children enrolled in preschool and preschool special education across different states. The bars represent the enrollment rates for 3-year-olds (light green) and 4-year-olds (dark blue). The x-axis lists the states, and the y-axis shows the percentage of children enrolled, ranging from 0% to 100%.
Benchmarks, 01-02 to 12-13
# Quality Standards Benchmarks

## 2012-2013 State Pre-K Quality Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Program</th>
<th>ELS</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>Specialized Training</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>15 hours</th>
<th>Class Size 20</th>
<th>Ratio 1:10</th>
<th>Screening Referral</th>
<th>Meal</th>
<th>Site Visits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 8(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA NSECD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Program Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent measuring program quality and/or effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both process quality and program impacts/outcomes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/child outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Most Recent Evaluation Reported, by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (planned)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: State Spending on Pre-K
2001-2002 to 2012-2013
• Total state funding for pre-K programs increased by $30 million in real dollars, about 1%.
• State pre-K funding per child increased by $36 (inflation-adjusted) from the previous year, to $4,026.
Q and A: What do you want to know?

- Effectiveness
- Quality: What works best
- State policies and leading state examples
Questions/Comments
Thank you for your participation
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