

Endnotes

1. A Task Force appraisal of education reform in Florida in 2006 first led me to put a cautious toe into the pre-K pool. See Chester E. Finn Jr., “Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten,” in Paul E. Peterson, ed., *Reforming Education in Florida: A Study Prepared by the Koret Task Force on K–12 Education* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2006), pp. 229-44, http://media.hoover.org/documents/ktf_florida_book_229.pdf.

2. Sam Dillon, “Obama Pledge Stirs Hope in Early Education,” *New York Times*, December 16, 2008.

3. Susan Dosemagen, “Chicago Schools Expand Preschool Program: More Expansion Needed,” *Medill Reports: Chicago*, October 29, 2008, <http://news.medill.northwestern.edu/chicago/news.aspx?id=102553>.

4. The University of Maryland’s Douglas Besharov has remarked that, from a state or school district point of view, pre-K education is a “cheap date” compared with K–12 schooling—and he calculates that much of its recent increase has been funded by slower growth in other forms of child care.

5. Bold Approach Task Force, “A Broader, BOLDER Approach to Education,” Economic Policy Institute, www.boldapproach.org/statement.html. For a list of signers, see www.boldapproach.org/bios.html.

6. David L. Kirp, *The Sandbox Investment: The Preschool Movement and Kids-First Politics* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007), pp. 88-89.

7. National Early Literacy Panel, *Developing Early Literacy: A Scientific Synthesis of Early Literacy Development and Implications for Intervention* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Literacy, 2008), p. vii.

8. David Figlio and Jeffrey Roth, “The Behavioral Consequences of Pre-Kindergarten Participation for Disadvantaged Youth,” in Jonathan Gruber, ed., *An Economic Perspective on the Problems of Disadvantaged Youth* (Cambridge, Mass.:

National Bureau of Economic Research, forthcoming), p.16, www.nber.org/chapters/c0581.pdf.

9. See, for example, David Elkind, *The Hurried Child: Growing Up Too Fast Too Soon* (Cambridge, Mass.: Perseus Publishing, 2001). Also see Elkind, "Much Too Early!" www.besthomeschooling.org/articles/david_elkind.html.

10. See, for example, these illustrative kindergarten "content standards" from California, www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/documents/elacontentstnds.pdf; these from Texas, www.tea.state.tx.us/teks/grade/Kindergarten.pdf; and these from Virginia, <http://141.104.22.210/go/Sols/english.html#Kindergarten>.

11. William J. Bennett, Chester E. Finn Jr., and John T. E. Cribb, *The Educated Child: A Parent's Guide from Preschool through Eighth Grade* (New York: The Free Press, 1999).

12. Kindergarten readiness is of course a moving target, depending on changing expectations and standards as well as vast differences by topic, subject, and demographic group. A sophisticated Educational Testing Service study found that 65 percent of entering kindergartners in 1998 were able to recognize the letters of the alphabet while 93 percent could recognize numbers and shapes. But this ranged (for alphabet recognition) from 85 percent among tykes from the highest socio-economic quintile to 39 percent among those in the lowest quintile. See Richard Coley, *An Uneven Start: Indicators of Inequality in School Readiness* (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 2002).

13. A vast amount of literature on this subject has been produced by many scholars, perhaps most famously Betty Hart and Todd Risley, whose 1995 book, *Meaningful Differences in the Everyday Experiences of Young American Children* (Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing, 1995), has had an enduring influence on our understanding of the knowledge with which kids do and don't enter school. For a concise version of their findings, see Hart and Risley, "The Early Catastrophe: The 30 Million Word Gap by Age 3," *American Educator*, Spring 2003, www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american_educator/spring2003/catastrophe.html.

14. G. Reid Lyon, "What Principals Need to Know About Reading," *Principal* 83, no. 2 (November-December 2003): 14-18. Lyon and others who make such estimates are, of course, referring to the total number of words the child will have heard, not the number of unique words. Thus a five-year-old may have heard "stop" or "love" a thousand times but "albatross" not even once.

15. As recounted in Clayton M. Christensen, Michael B. Horn, and Curtis W. Johnson, *Disrupting Class: How Disruptive Innovation Will Change the Way the World Learns* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2008), pp. 149-53. Other credible analysts are far less gloomy about what can be accomplished, even with disadvantaged children, after they enter kindergarten or first grade—provided that schools do right by them. Reid

Lyon, for example, says that “The majority of children who enter kindergarten and first grade at risk for reading failure can learn to read at average or above-average levels—but only if they are identified early and provided with systematic, explicit, and intensive instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension strategies.” See Lyon, “What Principals Need to Know About Reading.”

16. Richard Barth, e-mail message to author, April 10, 2008.

17. E.D. Hirsch Jr., “Equity Effects of Very Early Schooling in France,” Core Knowledge, <http://coreknowledge.org/CK/Preschool/frenchequity.htm>. For another view of the subject, see Bonnie R. Hurless, “Early Childhood Education in France: A Personal Perspective,” National Association for the Education of Young Children, <http://journal.naeyc.org/btj/200409/hurless.asp>. Note that nursery schooling in France is government provided and operated and, though not compulsory, is universally available to all three- and four-year-olds, nearly all of whom take part in it; recently, some two-year-olds have also been enrolled. The research is not as clear cut as I, an English-only reader, would like. But it suggests higher achievement, as well as less likelihood of having to repeat a grade by grade five, for disadvantaged youngsters who start early.

18. E.D. Hirsch Jr., testimony before the Subcommittee on Children and Families of the Senate Committee on Labor, and the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce (joint hearing), 105th Cong., 2d sess., March 28, 1998, <http://coreknowledge.org/CK/about/articles/headStartTestimony.htm>.

19. See (among many possibilities) www.parentsasteachers.org; www.hippyusa.org; www.ed.gov/programs/evensstartformula/gtepevensstartformula.pdf; www.universalpreschool.com; www.kidsparkz.com/index.html; www.ed.gov/parents/earlychild/ready/edpicks.jhtml?src=ln; www2.scholastic.com/browse/schoolandlearning.jsp; and www.savvysource.com/educational_toys. Unfortunately, while parents have a huge impact on the educational readiness of their children, the effect of most parent-based intervention programs is modest. An Abt Associates evaluation of the federal Even Start program, for example, found no lasting educational result for children whose families participated in it. See Robert St. Pierre et al., *National Evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Plan* (Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, 1995), www.abtassociates.com/reports/evensstart.pdf.

20. Joseph Epstein, “The Kindergarchy,” *The Weekly Standard*, June 9, 2008, pp. 21-27.

21. This can be a mixed benefit. Jay Belsky, Robert Pianta, and other analysts, primarily working with data from the long-running NIH-sponsored “Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development,” have found some evidence that extensive exposure

to center-based (rather than home-based) child-care during the early years is associated with more aggressive and acting-out behavior when youngsters reach school. See <https://secc.rti.org/home.cfm>.

22. My granddaughter, now five years old, has for several years been attending an upscale New York “preschool” of the traditional sort that seems to do a fine job of cognitive development but that, depending on the kids’ ages, operates only three to five hours a day—and offers no after-school care. Hence parents must make a complete set of additional arrangements to pick their kids up at noon or 2 p.m. and look after them until Mom and Dad get home from work. It’s a major hassle—and expensive, too.

23. Another NCES report yields slightly different numbers for four-year-olds in 2005-6: 20 percent with “no regular non parental arrangement”; 57.5 percent in “center-based” programs, of which about one-fifth were in Head Start; and 20.7 percent looked after in “home-based” arrangements with relatives or non-relatives. (An additional 1.9 percent were cared for under “multiple arrangements.”) See U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, “Participation in Education,” <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2008/section1/table.asp?tableID=857>.

24. Iheoma U. Iruka and Priscilla R. Carver, *Initial Results from the 2005 NHES Early Childhood Program Participation Survey*, U.S. Department of Education, NCES 2006-075 (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 2006), p. 59, table 14.

25. Douglas J. Besharov and Douglas M. Call, “The New Kindergarten: The Case for Universal Pre-Kindergarten Isn’t as Strong as It Seems,” *Wilson Quarterly*, Autumn 2008, pp. 30-31.

26. NHES data indicate that 27 percent of three-through-five-year-olds have “no weekly nonparental care arrangement.” Iruka and Carver, *Initial Results*, p. 7, table 1.

27. Indiana’s Family and Social Service Administration explains that “CCDF direct service dollars are to provide financial assistance to eligible TANF and low income families in need of child care. Parents can choose from available licensed or legally license-exempt child care. Types of care might include: center-based care, school-age care, in-home care, relative care, and sectarian child care. All child care providers must meet applicable state and local requirements including CCDF Provider Eligibility Standards.” (TANF refers to the federal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families program that replaced AFDC in the aftermath of the 1996 welfare reform.) See Indiana Family and Social Service Administration, Division of Family Resources, *CCDF Voucher Program Policy and Procedures Manual* (revised

September 29, 2008), p. 3, www.in.gov/fssa/files/CCDFPolicyProcedureManualv10-07__rev_9-29-08_.pdf.

28. Douglas J. Besharov, Caeli A. Higney, and Justus A. Myers, *Federal and State Child Care and Early Education Expenditures, 1997-2005: Child Care Spending Falls as Pre-K Spending Rises* (Washington, D.C.: Welfare Reform Academy, 2007), p. 4, table 1. The category labeled “state-funded pre-K” is, of course, the sum of a number of separate state programs.

29. National Institute for Early Education Research, *The State of Preschool 2007: State Preschool Yearbook* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University, 2007), p. 10.

30. These include both “nursery school” and “kindergarten,” the definitions of which are, frankly, a bit hazy.

31. The profound effect that James S. Coleman’s monumental 1966 study, *On Equality of Educational Opportunity*, has had on American primary-secondary education over the past four decades is sketched in my book, *Troublemaker: A Personal History of School Reform Since Sputnik* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2008), pp. 18-19, 46-47, 101-102 and 200-201. See also Debra Viadero, “Race Report’s Influence Felt 40 Years Later,” *Education Week*, June 21, 2006, <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2006/06/21/41coleman.h25.html>.

32. For example, see David Blau and Janet Currie, “Preschool, Day Care, and After-School Care: Who’s Minding the Kids?” in Eric Hanushek and Finis Welch, eds., *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, Handbooks in Economics, no. 26 (Amsterdam: North-Holland Press, 2006), 2: 1183-184.

33. Albert Shanker Institute, *Preschool Curriculum: What’s in It for Children and Teachers* (Washington, D.C.: Albert Shanker Institute, 2009), p. 2.

34. Jean I. Layzer and Barbara D. Goodson, “The ‘Quality’ of Early Care and Education Settings,” *Evaluation Review* 30 (October 2006): 570.

35. See, for example, Diane M. Early et al., “Teachers’ Education, Classroom Quality, and Young Children’s Academic Skills: Results from Seven Studies of Pre-school Programs,” *Child Development* 78 (March-April 2007): 558-80.

36. Deborah L. Cohen, “Goals Panel Adopts Plan to Develop Early-Childhood Assessment System,” *Education Week*, April 8, 1992, www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1992/04/08/29goals.h11.html

37. Martha Zaslow et al., “Child Outcome Measures in the Study of Child Care Quality,” *Evaluation Review* 30 (October 2006): 592, table 3.

38. Blau and Currie, “Preschool, Day Care, and After-School Care,” pp. 1183-184.

39. A good description of Pianta’s classroom-level observation system, the criteria it uses, and much of what’s been learned by deploying it, can be found at www.classobservation.com/what/index.php.

40. Robert C. Pianta, "Preschool is School, Sometimes," *Education Next* 7 (Winter 2007), www.hoover.org/publications/ednext/4612287.html.

41. Blau and Currie, "Preschool, Day Care, and After-School Care," p. 1195.

42. Andrew J. Mashburn et al., "Measures of Classroom Quality in Prekindergarten and Children's Development of Academic, Language, and Social Skills," *Child Development* 79 (May-June 2008): 732-49.

43. Linda Jacobson, "Teacher-Pupil Link Crucial to Pre-K Success, Study Says," *Education Week*, May 28, 2008, p. 9, www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/05/21/38early.h27.html?qs=Linda+Jacobson.

44. E.D. Hirsch Jr., *The Schools We Need and Why We Don't Have Them* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), p. 79. Hirsch cites as examples of "expert attacks" on structured early learning two books by David Elkind, *The Hurried Child: Growing Up Too Fast Too Soon* (Cambridge, Mass.: Perseus Publishing, 2001); and *Miseducation: Preschoolers at Risk* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987).

45. Iruka and Carver, *Initial Results*, p. 63, table 15.

46. See *Troublemaker*, chaps. 23-24.

47. Bruce Fuller, *Standardized Childhood: The Political and Cultural Struggle over Early Education* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), pp. 208-9. How to interpret "effect sizes" like these is a constant conundrum. By one reasonable interpretation, raising student achievement by a quarter of a standard deviation equates roughly to a half year more of school in the early grades.

48. Figlio and Roth, "The Behavioral Consequences of Pre-Kindergarten," p. 29.

49. Jill S. Cannon, Alison Jackowitz, and Gary Painter, "Is Full Better than Half? Examining the Longitudinal Effects of Full-Day Kindergarten Attendance" (working paper, RAND Labor and Population series, 2005), http://rand.org/pubs/working_papers/2005/RAND_WR266-1.pdf.

50. Fuller, *Standardized Childhood*, p. 284.

51. *Ibid.*, p. 225.

52. Douglas J. Besharov, "Preschool Puzzle," *Education Next* 8 (Fall 2008), www.hoover.org/publications/ednext/27149734.html.

53. Fuller, *Standardized Childhood*, p. 193.

54. Douglas J. Besharov et al., "Summaries of Twenty-Four Early Childhood Evaluations" (unpublished manuscript, July, 2008), p. 4.

55. Michael L. Anderson, "Multiple Inference and Gender Differences in the Effects of Early Intervention: A Reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, and Early Training Projects," *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 103 (December

1, 2008): 1481-495, <http://129.3.20.41/eps/hew/papers/0509/0509008.pdf>.

56. Searching for long-term effects of Head Start, Eliana Garces, Duncan Thomas and Janet Currie found that the program's effects were more likely to fade among African American youngsters than among white Head Start graduates and speculated that the cause is "that African American children who attended Head Start go on to attend schools of lower quality than other African American children." Garces, Thomas, and Currie, "Longer Term Effects of Head Start," *American Economic Review* 92 (September 2002): 999-1012.

57. One might think this problem would gradually disappear as pre-K participation becomes more universal. But until and unless it becomes *compulsory*, that isn't likely to happen. Experience so far indicates that 50-70 percent of four-year-olds are apt to take part in a state-financed "universal" program.

58. After extensive observation of elementary school classrooms, Robert Pianta and his research team concluded that, even for middle-class youngsters, teaching was "geared toward performance of basic reading and math skills, not problem-solving or reasoning skills or other content areas....[S]tudents most in need of high-quality instruction are unlikely to experience it consistently." Pianta et al., "Opportunities to Learn in America's Elementary Classrooms," *Science*, March 30, 2007, p. 1796.

59. The June 2008 draft can be viewed at www.fldoe.org/earlylearning/pdf/2008EdustandFinJune.pdf.

60. VPK arithmetic assessments are also being developed—in number sense and geometry—for statewide use in the 2010-11 school year.

61. Florida Department of Education, 2008 Voluntary Prekindergarten Education Standards, www.fldoe.org/earlylearning/pdf/vpkedstandard.pdf.

62. Early Learning Success Initiative, "Building a Strong Foundation for Florida's Children: Early Success in Reading and Math" (presentation at Florida State Board of Education meeting, April 15, 2008), www.fldoe.org/board/meetings/2008_04_15/Early%20Learning%20Success.pdf.

63. At present, these are a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the Letter Naming Fluency and Initial Sound Fluency measures from the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). The Florida Center for Reading Research is developing new teacher-administered reading assessments, intended to replace DIBELS by 2009-10. Also under development are new VPK assessments of alphabetic knowledge, phonological awareness, and vocabulary that are to be aligned with the new kindergarten assessments and ready for use by 2010-11.

64. Florida Legislature, Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability, Report no. 08-23 (Tallahassee, Fla., April 2008), www.oppaga.state.fl.us/reports/pdf/0823rpt.pdf.

65. See <https://vpk.fldoe.org/Default.aspx>.

66. Kirp, *The Sandbox Investment*, pp. 192-94.

67. David McKay Wilson, "When Worlds Collide: Universal PreK Brings New Challenges for Public Elementary Schools," *Harvard Education Letter*, November-December 2008, p. 2.

68. Lyndon B. Johnson, "Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on Stepping Up the War on Poverty," February 17, 1965, www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=27432. The background and launch of Head Start are well covered in Maris A. Vinovskis, *The Birth of Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

69. Lyndon B. Johnson, "Remarks on Head Start," May 18, 1965, www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=26973&st=Johnson&st1=.

70. Ironically, advocates' efforts to deny that Head Start is an education program may have masked such evidence as there is—modest, to be sure, but not nil—that the program has some lasting positive effects in the education sphere, such as an increased likelihood, at least for white youngsters, of completing high school and going on to college. See Garces, Thomas, and Currie, "Longer Term Effects of Head Start."

71. Hirsch, *The Schools We Need*, pp. 45-46.

72. Edward Zigler and Susan Muenchow, *Head Start: The Inside Story of America's Most Successful Educational Experiment* (New York: Basic Books, 1993), p. 83.

73. A number of other programs that might reasonably be categorized as "education" – such as Indian Education, the school lunch program, and the Defense Department's schools for military dependents – also didn't make it into the new department. I recount this tale in chapter 7 of *Troublemaker*.

74. Edward Zigler, "The Wrong Read on Head Start," *New York Times*, December 23, 2000.

75. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, *Head Start Impact Study: First Year Findings* (Washington, D.C., 2005).

76. Results were, as Douglas Besharov and Caeli Higney acknowledge, a bit better for three-year-olds. See *Giving Head Start a Fresh Start* (Washington, D.C.: Welfare Reform Academy, 2007), p. 3.

77. Muddying this picture, NIEER is in this case not simply counting explicit state-level outlays for programs labeled pre-K or preschool but estimating total

public funding from all sources—including local and federal as well as multi-state programs—expended on behalf of pre-K programs operating under state auspices.

78. Bruce Fuller reports that the true cost of the Abecedarian Project, expressed in 2000 dollars, was \$34,476 per child. Fuller, *Standardized Childhood*, p. 195.

79. Henry M. Levin and Heather L. Schwartz, “What is the Cost of a Pre-school Program?” (paper presented at the American Education Finance Association annual conference, Baltimore, March 23, 2007).

80. Adding very young children would actually boost the cost quite a lot more because state regulations always stipulate significantly richer staff-to-children ratios for babies and toddlers.

81. Kirp, *The Sandbox Investment*, p. 87.

82. Fuller, *Standardized Childhood*, p. 195.

83. John F. Witte, “A Proposal for State, Income-Targeted Preschool Vouchers,” *Peabody Journal of Education* 82, no. 4 (October 2007): 22. The University of Virginia’s Robert Pianta also favors targeting pre-K programs at 150 to 200% of the federal poverty line; he cites evidence that such youngsters often fare poorly in school and that well-crafted pre-K programs show promising results with them.

84. Clive R. Belfield, “Early Childhood Education: How Important Are the Cost-Savings to the School System?” (report prepared for the Center for Early Care and Education, 2004).

85. Analyses such as Belfield’s and Heckman’s are thoughtfully debunked—in the California context—in Chris Cardiff and Edward Stringham, *Is Universal Preschool Beneficial?: An Analysis of RAND Corporation’s Analysis and Proposals for California* (Los Angeles: Reason Foundation, 2006), www.reason.org/ps345_universal_preschool.pdf.

86. Fuller, *Standardized Childhood*, p. 60.

87. National Education Association, *NEA on Prekindergarten and Kindergarten* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 2004), p. 6, www.nea.org/assets/docs/mf_prekinder.pdf.

88. See Council of Chief State School Officers, *Early Childhood and Family Education* (Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1999), p.5, www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/Early_Childhood_Policy_99.pdf.

89. There is a wide range, however – from 14 percent in Michigan to 93 percent in the District of Columbia (2005). See p. 9, table II.2 in Gretchen Kirby and Andrew Burwick, *Using Vouchers to Deliver Social Services: Considerations Based on the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program Experiences* (Washington, D.C.: Mathematica Policy Research, 2007).

90. In 2005, California, for example, estimated its waiting list at 280,000 children. For a relatively lucid explanation of how this complex program works, Indiana's Children's Bureau has helpful information on its website. See www.childrensbureau.org/html/ccdf.cfm.

91. Kirby and Burwick, *Using Vouchers to Deliver Social Services*, pp. 41-43.

92. Witte, "A Proposal," pp. 22-25. For Witte's appraisal of K-12 vouchers in Milwaukee, see his *The Market Approach to Education: An Analysis of America's First Voucher Program* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).

93. Fuller, *Standardized Childhood*, p. 285.

94. A perennial topic in all discussions of vouchers is whether users should be able to supplement them with their own money. That may not be feasible for low income participants, but it is for those with more money—and of course the latter could squeeze the former out of "slots" in the most attractive programs, which might charge as much as the market will bear.

95. Pre-K Now, "Community-Based Pre-K Providers," www.preknow.org/educators/providers.cfm.

96. Fuller, *Standardized Childhood*, pp. xv-xix.

97. Incorporating pre-K programs into school system operations turns out to entail wrenching changes that not all of them can successfully make. See David McKay Wilson, "When Worlds Collide."

98. Fuller, *Standardized Childhood*, p. 223.

99. Florida's public-school systems are required to offer summer VPK programs but not the school-year version. Overall, school systems comprise less than 20 percent of all VPK providers in the state. But the Miami-Dade system, which has heartily embraced this approach, is by far the largest VPK provider in Florida.

100. Tim Craig, "Kaine Trims Pre-K Proposal," *Washington Post*, August 17, 2007, p. B01, www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/08/16/AR2007081602518.html.

101. See, for example, the website of Preschool California at www.preschoolcalifornia.org/about-us/mission-and-work.html.

102. Sara Mead, "Obama's \$10 Billion Early Childhood Education Pledge," *Washington Times*, December 28, 2008.

103. Although it's next to impossible to gauge the size of such a "windfall," RAND analysts estimated that, in California, at least half of the measure's \$2.4 billion annual cost "would go to families who already could afford to pay for preschool." The *Los Angeles Times* editorialized that "in order to pay for 25,000 to 50,000 additional children in preschool, taxpayers would foot the bill for the 325,000 other four-year-olds already in preschool." Fuller, *Standardized Childhood*, pp. 175-76.

104. More precisely, one can draw reasonably clear and definitive conclusions from various studies that differ dramatically from one another. See, for example, Linda Jacobson, "New Analysis Bolsters Child Care, Behavior Link," *Education Week*, April 4, 2007, www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2007/04/04/31nichd_side.h26.html?qs=child+care; and Linda Jacobson, "Studies Find Payoffs, Drawbacks Persist for Pupils in Preschool and Child Care," *Education Week*, November 2, 2005, www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2005/11/02/10care.h25.html.

105. Cardiff and Stringham, *Is Universal Preschool Beneficial?*

106. As Fuller, Besharov and others have noted, some countries have fruitfully focused their early-childhood assistance efforts as much on maternity/paternity leave for new parents, part-time work and job-sharing options, and home-support programs of various kinds as on center-based and school-based programs.

107. "Targeting" doesn't necessarily have to be income-based. Besharov suggests using various indicators of "risk" to the child, such as having a young single mother.

108. That history is recounted in various places including Eric Haney, *The Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment*, vol. 5, *A Technical History of the National Follow Through Evaluation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Huron Institute, 1977); Cathy L. Watkins, "Follow Through: Why Didn't We?" *Effective School Practices* 15 (Winter 1995-96), www.uoregon.edu/~adiiep/ft/watkins.htm; and Maris A. Vinovskis, *History and Educational Policymaking* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999), esp. chap. 4.

109. See Minnesota Early Learning Foundation, *Annual Report* (St. Paul, Minn.: Minnesota Early Learning Foundation, 2008), www.melf.us/vertical/Sites/%7B3D4B6DDA-94F7-44A4-899D-3267CBEB798B%7D/uploads/%7B3376243D-DAF1-48F2-8D1E-11D4BCBD010E%7D.PDF. The foundation is interesting in part because it's one of many results of the efforts made by Art Rolnick, an analyst at the Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank, to call attention to early-childhood education as a smart societal investment. But rather than simply embracing a "universal pre-K" model, the Minnesota business leaders and others who responded opted to undertake a series of careful studies, pilot programs, rival models and careful evaluations in this area, including programs that help needy parents become more effective in their own homes and more sophisticated and informed consumers of center-based offerings.

110. I find considerable merit in Besharov's proposal to intensify Head Start's cognitive focus and target the program more precisely on the most acutely disadvantaged young children, as well as to provide additional services and interventions for parents, even beginning during pregnancy. See Besharov and Higney, *Giving Head Start a Fresh Start*, esp. pp. 13-15.

111. States might opt to develop a two-tier licensure system, one intended for pure “day care” programs, with operators and programs so labeled, the other for “pre-school” programs. Perhaps operators would have to satisfy the latter criteria—and take part in a related results-based accountability system, with transparent public reporting—in order to use the word “school” or “preschool” in their names and marketing materials.

112. See, for example, my book, *Troublemaker*; Terry M. Moe, *A Primer on America’s Schools* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2001); Paul E. Peterson, *Our Schools and Our Future...Are We Still at Risk?* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2003); and John E. Chubb, *Within Our Reach: How America Can Educate Every Child* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005).

113. James J. Heckman, “Beyond Pre-K: Rethinking Conventional Wisdom on Educational Intervention,” Erie Neighborhood House, March 19, 2007, <http://eriehouse.org/article.asp?objectTypeID=11&objectID=1143>.