

---

# *Committee Meeting*

of

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ABBOTT SUBCOMMITTEE

*"Early Childhood Education in the Abbott Districts:  
Children's Needs and the Need for High Quality Programs"*

---

**LOCATION:** Committee Room 1  
State House Annex  
Trenton, New Jersey

**DATE:** January 28, 1999  
10:15 a.m.

**MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE PRESENT:**

Senator William L. Gormley, Co-Chair  
Senator Byron M. Baer, Co-Chair  
Senator Robert J. Martin  
Senator Ronald L. Rice  
Senator Norman M. Robertson  
Assemblyman David W. Wolfe

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Melanie M. Schulz, Executive Director  
Joint Committee on the Public Schools  
Abbott Subcommittee



*Meeting Recorded and Transcribed by*  
The Office of Legislative Services, Public Information Office,  
Hearing Unit, State House Annex, PO 068, Trenton, New Jersey

---





SENATOR ROBERT MARTIN  
CHAIRMAN  
ASSEMBLYMAN DAVID WOLFE  
VICE-CHAIRMAN

SENATE  
BYRON BAER  
WILLIAM GORMLEY  
EDWARD O'CONNOR  
JOSEPH A. PALAJA  
RON RICE  
NORMAN ROBERTSON

ASSEMBLY  
RICHARD BAGGER  
JOSEPH CHARLES, JR.  
JOSEPH V. DORIA, JR.  
RUDY GARCIA  
GERALD LUONGO  
KEVIN O'TOOLE

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

STATE HOUSE ANNEX

ROOM 415

PO BOX 068

TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0068

(609) 633-6787

FAX (609) 292-4912

MELANIE M. SCHULZ  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Joint Committee on the Public Schools

### Abbott Subcommittee

TO: Members of the Abbott Subcommittee

FROM: Senator William Gormley, Co-Chair  
Senator Byron Baer, Co-Chair

The public may address questions and comments to Melanie Schulz,  
Executive Director, at 609-633-6787.

The Abbott Subcommittee will meet Thursday, January 28, 1999 at 10:15 A.M.  
in Committee Room 1 of the State House Annex, Trenton, NJ.

Steve Barnett, from the Center for Early Education at Rutgers, will present his report:  
**Early Childhood Education in the Abbott Districts: Children's Needs and the  
Need for High Quality Programs.**

Issued 1/15/99



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Steve Barnett Economist/Professor Rutgers University	1
Ellen Frede Developmental Psychologist, and Professor Early Childhood Education The College of New Jersey	4
<b>APPENDIX:</b>	
“Early Childhood Education in the Abbott Districts: Children’s Needs and the Need for High Quality Programs” submitted by Steve Barnett and Ellen Frede	1x
lmb: 1-64	



**SENATOR WILLIAM L. GORMLEY (Co-Chair):** Okay. The first witness for today will be Steve Barnett, who will go over the report which he prepared on early childhood education. And following that-- He's joined by Ellen Frede. They are the two main witnesses for today, and we would appreciate their providing us an overview of their report.

**STEVE BARNETT:** Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here. I'm Steve Barnett. I'm an economist and a professor at Rutgers University.

This is Ellen Frede. She's a Developmental Psychologist and professor of Early Childhood Education at The College of New Jersey.

You have a folder this morning that (indicating folder) on the left-hand side has brief biographies, in case you want to know a little bit more about us, and then -- that's behind the cover sheet -- a couple of handouts that will be useful for the presentation. The right-hand side has a copy of our report and a couple of supplemental materials, including a very brief four-page research report that summarizes what we're going to begin with this morning because what we'd like to do is give you first a brief introduction to the preschool research on which our work has been based. It will focus largely on two randomized, controlled trials -- that is, two experiments that were done to look at the impacts of early childhood education on disadvantaged kids. What are the impacts on the kids? What are the consequences for the taxpayers?

And that will lead into our discussion of our report for New Jersey and what we found when we worked with a consortium of 22 of the *Abbott* districts who worked with us jointly to design and then funded this study to assess the needs of the kids in the *Abbott* districts and the capacity of community programs to help meet those needs and, in essence, a kind of needs

assessment for the programs of what would the programs need to partner with the schools in providing the services of the kind that we'll introduce you to first.

So I have a slight presentation for most of this. And Ellen and I are going to just work back and forth as appropriate with our expertise.

SENATOR GORMLEY: If I may?

MR. BARNETT: Sure.

SENATOR GORMLEY: We know there's a problem. So as quickly as we get through the outline of the problem, I'd like to get into a discussion over what you think might work substantively.

MR. BARNETT: Right. That's actually what we're going to be talking about.

SENATOR GORMLEY: That's what I-- Your report was excellent and very thorough, but I think everybody who's here has reviewed it.

MR. BARNETT: Okay.

SENATOR GORMLEY: And it's excellent that it's been-- I mean, we all thought it or knew it, but you've memorialized it, and we appreciate that. I'd like to go the give-and-take of how do we solve it and not with just with something-- What I don't want is a re-creation of the State Plan in terms of land-use planning that's never going to do anything. I'd like something that will have some substantive impact. Okay?

MR. BARNETT: Okay.

What I'd like to show you first is the kinds of programs that have had the impacts-- (begins slide presentation)

SENATOR GORMLEY: Good. Great.



MR. BARNETT: --and to give you kind of an overview of that, and Ellen will fill in the details, what does this really look like in the classroom.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Great.

MR. BARNETT: The first thing I want to talk about is the high-scope Perry Preschool Study: 123 young African-American children living in poverty at risk of school failure. What's important here is that they were poor, not that they were African-American. We've got a lot of studies that show that it's not the ethnicity of the kids. It's the poverty. They were randomly assigned to two groups. This was in the early 1960s before you had Head Start, so they go to preschool or they don't. It's four teachers, 20 to 25 kids. So what you got are classes of 12 to 13 kids with two teachers. It's in a public school. The four-year-olds-- They make weekly home visits in the afternoon, spend about an hour and a half with the family. They have classes in the morning. The preschool program--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Now what school was this?

MR. BARNETT: This is the Perry Elementary School, which is why it's called the Perry Preschool Study in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

SENATOR GORMLEY: All right. Ypsilanti, Michigan.

MR. BARNETT: Yes. It's outside of Detroit. It's a public school. Now, of course, when they're getting this started-- There's always start-up problems in the first year. They're in a church basement. The second year they're in an auditorium, and eventually they get classroom space. That's the way these things work.

SENATOR GORMLEY: So this is a program you consider to be a model program.

MR. BARNETT: That's right. It's one of the programs cited by the court as an example.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Do we have the cost in Michigan for this program as opposed to the cost for other educational programs in Michigan? That's the part we have to simultaneously do with this. What does it cost?

MR. BARNETT: You can work the cost up from the staffing. It's the teachers that are the primary expense of the program, especially when you start off in a church basement.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Okay.

SENATOR RICE: Excuse me. I don't mean to delay this. I'll be interested sometime later in all the variables, all the characteristics of the locations geographically because too often studies are done where you're not comparing similarities. For example, they compared police in Newark with some of those smaller towns. I'd just like at some point in time in Michigan wherever you are what it looked like--

SENATOR GORMLEY: It brings up a good point. I guess the question would be median income in Ypsilanti which -- and I think you are taking the right direction, because you are doing it on income.

MR. BARNETT: These are the poorest of the poor in 1962. If you remember the early '60s, we don't have much poverty like that.

E L L E N F R E D E: Steven, I think you need to-- Let me back up for a second.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Go ahead.

MS. FREDE: What Steven is trying to do right now is show you some longitudinal research on the effects of high-quality preschool. So he's

going to give you a couple of examples of some studies that have shown long-term effects of high-quality preschool that the court predicated their decision on.

MR. BARNETT: And I'll generalize this after giving you the examples.

SENATOR GORMLEY: What year was the study done?

MR. BARNETT: It's still going on.

SENATOR GORMLEY: When did it start?

MR. BARNETT: It started in 1962.

SENATOR GORMLEY: It sounds like the Legislature and car insurance. (laughter)

MR. BARNETT: We're still following these kids.

MS. FREDE: They're not kids anymore.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Okay. No. No. Actually that's very good. I'm sorry. Now go ahead.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: But which children are you following? When were they educated?

MR. BARNETT: They were educated-- There's five waves of kids, so they're educated in the early to late 1960s in preschool.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: And I realize their education's been ongoing but--

MR. BARNETT: Right.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: --for the purposes of illustrating the point--

MR. BARNETT: The most recent follow-up was age 27. We're now planning age 40 follow-up.

SENATOR GORMLEY: They have one of them here today, David Sharp (phonetic spelling). (laughter)

Go ahead.

MR. BARNETT: I'm not all that much older than these kids.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Oh, I'm sorry I didn't bring up age. (laughter) I apologize. I won't interrupt again.

All right, David, you look younger.

Okay. Go ahead.

MR. BARNETT: Okay. Now, the first thing that everybody noticed in the Perry Preschool Study and all these studies was a big boost in IQ. That's what everybody focused on at the time. You have a big jump in IQ during the preschool program. Over time that declines, but it turns out you get very substantial long-term educational impact. So by the time the kids are adolescents, there are very substantial differences in their school achievement, there are big differences in special education placement, and there are sizeable differences on high school graduation.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Now, we're talking the two years of preschool. The two years of preschool--

MR. BARNETT: We're talking two years of preschool for most of these kids.

SENATOR GORMLEY: And that has that long-term effect?

MR. BARNETT: And that has that long-term effect. That's very intensive.

SENATOR GORMLEY: I understand that.

MR. BARNETT: One of the most striking things is differences in arrests. There are half as many arrests for the kids who went to preschool.

SENATOR RICE: At what age?

MR. BARNETT: At age 27. This is a pattern you see all throughout. For example, the self-reported data on involvement and delinquency when they're teenagers shows strong differences as well. This isn't something that just pops up when they're 27, but if you want to look at impacts on crime, you want to look at it through adolescence into the adult years.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Excuse me. Has this been replicated anywhere else?

MR. BARNETT: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Have there been other studies which show similar results?

MR. BARNETT: I'm going to talk about that.

SENATOR GORMLEY: So we're talking all day?

MR. BARNETT: No. This is a half-day preschool program.

SENATOR GORMLEY: This is a half day?

MR. BARNETT: It's a half day with the second half of the day spent working one-on-one with the kids and their families.

SENATOR GORMLEY: How many days a week one-on-one with the families?

MR. BARNETT: Well, you've got 12 kids. You've got five days, so how many hour and a halves can you work into--

MS. FREDE: And you have two teachers. It was once a week.

SENATOR GORMLEY: It was once a week they did that?

MS. FREDE: Yes. Once a week. Weekly home visits an hour and a half with intensive tutoring--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Okay.

MS. FREDE: --which we're willing to settle -- a half-day preschool plus an hour and a half at home.

MR. BARNETT: This is a model for--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Oh, no, no, no. I appreciate that because maybe there is a blend.

MS. FREDE: Well, it's going to be just as expensive.

MR. BARNETT: This is a model for 1962 when kids are home with mom. (indicating slide) Moms aren't really working much here. The educational effects that I showed you earlier have long-term economic effects. By the time the kids are 27, substantial differences in income, substantial differences in home ownership, substantial differences in who's been on welfare for the last decade.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Was the program mandatory for every child? Could a parent opt out of the program, a portion of the program?

MR. BARNETT: It's a randomized--

SENATOR GORMLEY: I'm just wondering because there's interaction with the family.

MR. BARNETT: It's a randomized trial, so you have a group that volunteers for it. It's like a cancer study or a drug study.

SENATOR GORMLEY: No, this is important. Was this every child in the system--

MR. BARNETT: No.

SENATOR GORMLEY: --or a group of parents that volunteered for it?

MS. FREDE: They didn't volunteer. They were randomly selected.

MR. BARNETT: They have to--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Okay. That's important because it wasn't everyone.

MR. BARNETT: Families could have said, "We don't want to do this." But the other thing is they didn't just take families from their communities, they took families that were the poorest from their community. So this is really focusing on the kids who have the greatest need, whose parents are most likely to be unemployed, whose parents have the lowest education levels.

SENATOR BAER: But the selection process itself, could that therefore have introduced any correlation itself?

MR. BARNETT: Not any difference between the two groups. They're exactly the same to start with.

SENATOR BAER: Okay. I won't go into all the subdetails of it, but I assume it was examined very critically for that.

MR. BARNETT: That's right.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: But the sample size-- If I might through you, Mr. Chairman, the sample size for the program and nonprogram group was 127--

MR. BARNETT: Is 123 kids.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: In each group?

MR. BARNETT: No. Total.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: All right. So you're talking about 62 in one group and 61 or 62 in the other group?

MR. BARNETT: Right. It's a little less even than that but yes.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: Well, then how many in the program group?

MR. BARNETT: I think it's 65 and 58.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: Sixty-five program? (no response)  
The reason I'm just trying to get an idea of when I take a look at percentages.

MR. BARNETT: Those 58 program kids-- This is a very small study. What it is, is a small number of kids but very deep in terms of follow-up and also the amount of data you collect on these kids. There's always a tradeoff. Do you want to measure one or two things once or twice on thousands of kids, or do you want to measure a lot of things and understand very well what's going on with children and families on small numbers? Now I'm going to put this into context. If we just have this one study, this wouldn't be nearly so strong as if we had 40 more studies that we could throw into the pile. But this is the one where the results are easiest to understand in part because it is a randomized trial. I can't emphasize that too much. It's a true experiment. If it's not a true experiment, then you have some parents choosing



to do it, some parents not choosing to do it. Those families are different for all kinds of reasons that make it very hard to figure out why they're really different.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: You say most of the-- The cohorts are now 40, in their 40s? Is this in 1998 dollars or 1985 dollars?

MR. BARNETT: This is in 19-- Well, you'll see on the next slide. (indicating slide) I think it's 1992 dollars.

Because my job as a economist was primarily to figure out, "So what's the value of all of this? What's the value from the reduced crime in delinquency? What's the value from the education savings? What's the value from the extra earnings and fringe benefits these kids earn because they're more productive, because they stayed in school, because they learned more when they were in school?" All right.

This is discounted present value. So this is a standard economic analysis, the kind of thing you would do to evaluate a mutual fund, for example. So discounted at 3 percent annually that means right off the top the idea was you got to get at least 3 percent above inflation. If you don't do that, you might as well put the money in the bank. Give it to the kids when they turn 27 if the program's only that effective.

SENATOR GORMLEY: It's one of the coldest ways I've ever heard of looking at it. I don't question your sincerity. It's just-- (laughter)

MR. BARNETT: We usually open up with the story about the economists--

SENATOR GORMLEY: You didn't look like Greenspan to me. (laughter) This is a little on the cold side.

MR. BARNETT: --and legislators, and maybe I'll tell that after I'm through here.

SENATOR BAER: Maybe that's based on his assumption as to how we think.

SENATOR GORMLEY: No. I--

MR. BARNETT: No. Economists are cold. No question about it. We have a long history of referring to us as the dismal science. There's a reason for that, and we have yet to figure out whether it's a personality defect or you actually learn this in school.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: Through you, Mr. Chairman, the previous slide, I take it then that the nonprogram group -- 80 percent of the nonprogram group wound up on welfare at some time during their adulthood.

MR. BARNETT: That's right. Absolutely.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: And nearly 60 percent from the program -- 59 percent.

MR. BARNETT: Sixty percent of the control group that didn't go to preschool wound up on welfare. No, I've got that backwards. You're right. It's 80 percent and 60 percent. That's exactly right.

SENATOR GORMLEY: So 20 percent loss.

MR. BARNETT: They weren't necessarily on welfare the whole time, right.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: No. No. No.

MR. BARNETT: It's just that they'd need it ever.

SENATOR RICE: Mr. Chairman?

SENATOR GORMLEY: Yes. I'm sorry.

SENATOR RICE: Before you go any further, I certainly want to listen, but I'm already starting to get a little concerned from your academic perspective. Those of us who believe or understand a little bit about how longitudinal studies are supposed to be done and understand statistics and measurements and outcomes, I'm hoping that at some point in time you're going to tell us that over the period of years you just study, monitor, analyze, evaluate, watch the data on these students. But my concern is in the '60s -- and I noticed when you first started, you said it was 123 African-American students. Is that correct? The history of the '60s coming out of the '50s was all movements -- Voting Rights Act, demonstrations, up to the period of the riot. There was a different value situation in terms of families, spiritually, etc., regardless of economics. There weren't all these abandoned buildings and the drugs--

MR. BARNETT: And I'm not talking about a study from the '80s right after this.

SENATOR RICE: I understand that. That's my point. Okay. My point is, is that now, once you hit '67 in this country, after the '64 voting rights, you have to take another look at what was changing in these same communities or like communities. So even though you're studying this population, what's happening to this preschool over here that's getting started in the same community? And you move it into today's times.

MR. BARNETT: That's right.

SENATOR RICE: And I hope that that's where we're going to go--

MR. BARNETT: That's where we're going to go.

SENATOR RICE: --because if we don't see if there's some commonalities, okay, or elements that we can pull out of value to us, then we'll be wasting our time on the studies.

MR. BARNETT: Yes. I would not be too quick to jump to conclusions here.

SENATOR RICE: I just want to be sure.

MR. BARNETT: There is no evidence that the effects of preschool programs in the 1960s or the 1970s or 1980s or 1990s differ at all. You just don't find that. And I've looked at all of the studies that have followed kids to at least third grade, and that's about 40-something of them. You have a summary of that study in your packet. And you'll see you get the same kinds of things. It's just that people haven't looked at nearly so many things as we were able to do in this study.

SENATOR BAER: Could you provide later, since it's not in the packet, hard copy of the charts and--

MR. BARNETT: Yes.

SENATOR BAER: --any other things that you might be referring to?

MR. BARNETT: Absolutely. And the book that you have has a detailed description of all of these longitudinal studies.

SENATOR BAER: They're all in here. (referring to book)

MR. BARNETT: The first chapter.

SENATOR GORMLEY: We'll be tested in April. (laughter)

MR. BARNETT: In any case, the average cost across the two years discounted for this program in '92 dollars was \$12,000. That's partly because

of the first wave of kids only got, which was 13 kids, one year. Now because there's only 13 of them, you cannot do a statistical analysis that will tell you were the effects small or from one year, then two years with this study-- It's something we can address elsewhere, but this study doesn't answer that question. The cost of one year of the program is about \$8000 in current dollars roughly. That's with Michigan teachers' salaries.

The annual return on this investment, if you look at it that way, above inflation is 11 percent. For comparison over the same period of time, a capitalization-weighted average of the return in the New York Stock Exchange and NASDAQ is just under 7 percent. So this preschool program is outperforming the stock market in terms of return to society.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Well, no one can claim that you made a bleeding-heart argument. (laughter)

SENATOR BAER: Eleven percent of the--

MR. BARNETT: I'll get there. (laughter)

SENATOR BAER: Eleven percent over what period of time?

MR. BARNETT: Actually that's calculated over the entire life span of the kids through age 65 -- 11 percent. To get the same flow of benefits, you'd have to get 11 percent every year. That's not how this works, of course.

SENATOR BAER: That's based on, then, projections because the study hasn't gone that far.

MR. BARNETT: That's right. That's based on-- There are two kinds of data.

SENATOR BAER: But based on assumptions, I guess, because of where they are in the employment and everything, skills.

MR. BARNETT: Absolutely. That's exactly right. There are two kinds of estimates here. One is up to age 27 where we've got the numbers. Those are locked in, and that's the vast majority of them. But, of course, if you're earning more money at 27, as I think you're suggesting, you don't suddenly not earn more money for the rest of your life.

SENATOR GORMLEY: All right. We're now going to try an experiment.

MR. BARNETT: Okay.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Ten minutes without a question. Go ahead. (laughter)

MR. BARNETT: One of the things that was most striking and I don't think that people expected was that-- This is just looking at the taxpayer part of the benefits. The vast majority of the benefits that you can put an economic value on go to the taxpayers, not to the kids and families. That's because, when you go off welfare and get a job and pay taxes, the difference for the taxpayer is considerably bigger than it was for the recipient. I'm maybe not making that much more money now, but from the taxpayers' point of view, I'm not using the taxpayers' money and I'm putting money into the tax coffers. In terms of crime and delinquency, the returns to engaging in crime are not really very high when you look at them from an economic perspective, but the cost to the taxpayer are immense both in terms of victim costs and the cost of the criminal justice system.

It is valuable that they got a better education. Aside from their earnings, we can't put an economic value on that to the child. We know it's valuable. But to the taxpayer, we can really account for "So how much did we lower the cost because kids don't repeat a grade? How much do we lower the cost because they don't need special education?"

All right. So one of the questions that's been lurking here is-- Okay, that's great. That study did that and started in the 1960s and these folks could do it, but what happens generally? And so what I've done in this study is both summarized in a short paper and there's a longer article on this in the book I gave you. It says, "Okay, what happened in all of the model programs that have been looked at up till now. What happens in ordinary Head Start in public school programs that have been studied." Now, you've got to be a little careful about that because it's not like we studied every public school and every Head Start Program, and I'm a little suspicious the ones that get studied may be somewhat better than average, but that's hard to figure out.

And for special education and grade repetition, we have a fewer number of studies -- a couple of dozen of each type. When you get to high school graduation, now we're talking two or three studies in a category, and I'm not very confident that's representative. So if you look at special education and grade repetition, this is what percentage point reduction? So the model programs reduce special education by 20 percentage points, so if you're working with a group of kids where the special education rate is 30 percent, that's dropping it down to 10 percent. That's a big reduction.

Grade repetition, the model programs are reducing at maybe 15 percentage points. So if it's 30 percent of the kids that are repeating a grade,

now it's only 15 percent of the kids that are repeating a grade. What you see is that the public school and Head Start Programs have considerably smaller effects. That's not too true on high school graduation, but on Head Start I think you're looking at one program where they actually followed the kids that far, not a dozen programs the way you are in the other categories. So this raises a concern, I think, not that our public school, preschool programs, and our Head Start Programs are not working, because they are. They're having the kinds of effects that we'd like, but they're not as large as the model programs are having. When you look at the two kinds of programs, what you see -- the model programs are much better funded. They have better paid, higher-qualified teachers and smaller classes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: I have a question. Could I interrupt?

SENATOR GORMLEY: We're over nine minutes. Go ahead.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Run through one more time the repeat grade category -- the percentages--

MR. BARNETT: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: You're saying 14 percent do repeat?

MR. BARNETT: No. If you look across all these studies, the base rate for the groups--

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Right.

MR. BARNETT: --in each study is different.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Okay.

MR. BARNETT: So I can't put up a figure there and say it went from 50 percent to 35 percent or it went from 30 percent to 15 percent because that's different in every study. But the average effect in each study,



if you look at grade repetition for that blue line (indicating chart) for model programs, is a 15 percentage point reduction. So that if on average, let's say, it's 30 percent, that's kicking it down to 15 percent.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Okay. So it would be 10 percent in the public?

MR. BARNETT: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Okay. Gotcha.

SENATOR BAER: Which is cutting it in half.

MR. BARNETT: That's right. It's not a 15 percent reduction. It's a 50 percent reduction, but it depends on what your base rate is. If you were to do these programs for kids who aren't ever placed in special ed or never retained in grade and don't drop out of school, you're not going to see much of a reduction in those problems.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: What is the public portion that it refers to?

MR. BARNETT: Public is public school programs.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: Public school pre--

MR. BARNETT: Public school preschool programs.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: Okay. And the model programs tend to be in the private sector?

MR. BARNETT: The model programs can be run in a public school. They can be run out of a university. They can be run even in Head Start, but the difference is the researchers have put resources into those programs to make sure -- because they want to look at what's the effect of this

program. So they're funded at a level much higher than the typical public program.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Could that be an enhanced Head Start Program?

MR. BARNETT: Absolutely.

SENATOR GORMLEY: One of the questions will be if we have a Head Start Program, one, is this a matter of supplementing the Head Start Program? And one of the questions is, is it -- can it-- Of course, money as long as it's honest is fine. Could it be foundation money, which maybe some of the models are based upon? Are they based upon some private foundation money?

MS. FREDE: Yes, they are, but the problem is you can't--

MR. BARNETT: Well, I was going to say--

SENATOR GORMLEY: No. No. No. Listen. No.

MR. BARNETT: --it's almost always Federal dollars--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Well, you see--

MR. BARNETT: --that went into these programs.

SENATOR GORMLEY: A question. Do you need greater flexibility with Federal dollars? Are they limited? Is there a limit? In terms of Head Start, would you prefer more flexibility so they can be directed more towards the model programs than the Head Start Program?

MR. BARNETT: Well, when I say a model program, that could be run by a church, it could be run by a Head Start, it could be run by anybody. The model part of it is in terms of defining the staffing, the class size, and the curriculum and the resources needed to do that.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Well, the models you've chosen are really based upon result.

SENATOR RICE: Yes, but the results are defined by the human resource and financial resources. The Head Starts-- I'll use Newark, for example. The majority of our Head Starts have been known to do a great job keeping young people busy, etc. We have not been in a total academic mold where you're moving them from this level to another level of academics, which means at Head Start Newark, which I'm going to insist on and throughout the state, if they're going to move into preschool -- and they should to save us facility dollars, which is big money -- what they should do is we should make sure there are certified teachers working with those groups. That's just one example of a variable that's got to be put in the mix to help establish the models that will affect it.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Well, but in looking at the report, I noticed that some of the issues like knowing colors -- knowing the four basic colors-- And I'm not saying no certification, but that wouldn't necessarily not need somebody who is certified to teach. There is a question of when is it more the lack -- when is it more of a problem of a dysfunctional family without the parenting there, and when does it be the teacher. And I'm agreeing with you, how can we get the most out of the dollars?

MR. BARNETT: We're going to address that question--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Okay.

MR. BARNETT: --exactly that question.

MS. FREDE: We need to move on, okay, because we're going to keep getting questions about something we're going to talk about later.

MR. BARNETT: This is a study -- abecedarian study. It's the only other true experiment we have that followed the kids long periods of time.

SENATOR RICE: What state, what city?

MR. BARNETT: This is in North Carolina, Chapel Hill, not the best place to have done it.

SENATOR RICE: We know where it is. (laughter)

MR. BARNETT: But it's decades later than the Perry Preschool stuff. All right. So we're in another historical context. Same preschool ratio, this is a program birth to five, full day, every day. They actually start maybe after six weeks.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Birth.

MR. BARNETT: And I just want to give you a comparison. If you look at Perry and abecedarian, right off the bat you notice one thing you get from abecedarian is a permanent five-point IQ gain that you don't see from the Perry Preschool Program. We don't know if that's because it started earlier or because it was just much, much more of it. It's full day, every day.

SENATOR RICE: Once again, through the Chair, Perry -- Chapel Hill, North Carolina versus Michigan, just in terms of the community and the sociology of demographics-- I don't know the Michigan, but some of us who used to wear different types of clothing used to run through Chapel Hill. Are there comparisons? One is--

MR. BARNETT: Clearly, the Perry Preschool group in some ways--

SENATOR RICE: I'm talking about in terms of people density, you know, those kinds of problems that you would find -- urban versus country, rural.

MR. BARNETT: The housing project that the Perry Preschool kids are from is pretty urban.

SENATOR RICE: All right. So they'd be kind of a good match between the two, Perry and--

MS. FREDE: Their incomes and family profiles are very similar.

SENATOR RICE: Okay. That's what I'm trying to figure out.

MR. BARNETT: What you see is that the impacts on special education and grade retention are much larger from the abecedarian program.

SENATOR RICE: Right. Southern values.

MR. BARNETT: Right. What you don't see in abecedarian is an affect on crime, but that's because the base rate-- First, they measure it earlier than we do, so there hasn't been as much opportunity. But also the base rate for crimes is very low in abecedarian. I tend to think that's a characteristic of Chapel Hill--

SENATOR RICE: Exactly.

MR. BARNETT: --as opposed to being outside of Detroit.

SENATOR RICE: Southern values. They still have southern values.

SENATOR BAER: Were your earlier charts, where you spoke of the 11 percent return, including the crime assumptions? And will we find within the study itself the specific assumptions?

MR. BARNETT: Yes.

SENATOR BAER: Okay. And calculations and stuff?

MR. BARNETT: Since you're particularly interested in that, I'll give you-- I have a whole book that has all that in it. I'll give you a copy of it before I leave.

SENATOR BAER: Very good. Thank you.

MR. BARNETT: It's my favorite book actually. It's my favorite book by myself. I had to clarify that.

SENATOR GORMLEY: You might have reading for the next five years by the time you're done. (laughter)

MR. BARNETT: The last thing I want to touch on just quickly is another randomized trial. It comes along from high scope after the Perry Preschool studies, so these are later waves of kids. And here what they did, they got two teachers daily classes, 15 to 16 three-, four-year-olds. Now, they've reduced the home visits to biweekly. And they want to know what is the impact of different curriculum models. It turns out, this is pretty important, they look at a direct instruction model that's highly scripted. We tell the teacher pretty much exactly what to say. The teacher tells the kids what to say. The point of this is to spend lots of time on the academic task and not let the kids do other stuff. The high-scope model--

MS. FREDE: Do you want a demonstration--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Go ahead.

MS. FREDE: --of a direct instruction model?

SENATOR GORMLEY: Yes.

MS. FREDE: You have to pretend that I'm holding up a card that has a hamburger here (indicating pretend card) and an orange here, and you have to be the children. (laughter)

SENATOR GORMLEY: Are you going to quiz us? (laughter)

MS. FREDE: Yes. (laughter)

SENATOR GORMLEY: No you're not, but go ahead, just give us the example. No. I want you to do this to the media. I want to see if they--

MS. FREDE: There's a hamburger here, there's an orange here, right? This is a hamburger, what is this?

SENATOR GORMLEY: No. No. We're not--

MS. FREDE: Oh, come on. You can't get it unless you--

SENATOR GORMLEY: No. We're not going to go through the drill. Just--

MR. BARNETT: You want to have the audience do it?

MS. FREDE: Somebody's got to do it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM AUDIENCE: This is a hamburger.

MS. FREDE: Very good. You said the whole sentence, "This is a hamburger."

This is an orange. What is this?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM AUDIENCE: This is an orange.

MS. FREDE: Good. Most people don't do the whole sentence, but that's the whole thing. I taught this for a little while.

MR. BARNETT: He's been to preschool. (laughter)

MS. FREDE: That's the kind of-- It's to teach "a" versus "an".

MR. BARNETT: That's the level at which that curriculum is worked out and given teachers.

In the high-scope model, children learn through plan, do, review. They generate activities. They also group times. There's a lot of emphasis on teacher-child interaction. The teacher's role is to engage the child in progressively more complex activities based on each child's individual characteristics. Where is this child right now? What is this child working on learning? Maybe a child is actually near the point of beginning to read, and I'm going to work on that.

There's another child that's not where they are developmentally now; I'm working on something else. The teacher has to know those things, has to be working with each child, also, the environment that you set up so that the child is engaging in challenging activities, and the teacher is providing what is called "scaffolding," that is, helping the child to work with things in the environment at a level the child could not do on their own. The traditional nursery school model says children learn through play. It's not just that the kids are playing. It's also called a unit-based curriculum.

Do you want to do an explanation of what that means?

MS. FREDE: Sure.

You might do a theme on the farm, and children learn about different animals on farm versus animals elsewhere and learn about things that come from the farm.

MR. BARNETT: That's how a unit-based curriculum moves. That's the kind of traditional nursery school approach.

Go ahead, sorry.



MS. FREDE: Who's the economist and who's the developmental psychologist? (laughter)

The idea is there is school-like content that children are learning, but they're learning in a very playful way. They pretend to be farmers or pretend to milk cows. They're engaged in building farms, but again it's not like the direct instruction model where you would be taught, "This is a cow, what is this?"

MR. BARNETT: Okay. And they actually looked at the classrooms to see if they were different. You can see there's lots of teacher-directed stuff happening in all the models, but in the direct instruction model there's very minimal -- almost no child-initiated activity. They all get this big boost in IQ. But then if you look at nearly half the kids in the direct instruction model were later classified as emotionally impaired, there are much higher rates of teen misconduct. They're much more likely to believe that people give them a hard time when you ask them.

On the socioemotional, or social outcomes, the direct instruction model looks like the control group in the Perry Preschool Study. They look like the kids who didn't go to preschool in that study. Then if you look at the number of arrests of the traditional nursery school and the high-scope model that allow for lots of child interaction where kids can engage in social activities and then teachers can teach them about how to interact with each other, they have much lower arrest rates than the kids who were in the purely direct instruction model.

There's also prosocial differences. So they're much more likely-- The kids who went in the model where they had the good socialization

experiences are much more likely to do things for their community, much more likely to have engaged in sports. They have a more positive outlook on their future lives. Okay. So here are conclusions from--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Surprise.

MS. FREDE: I just wanted to make a couple of comments about that curriculum comparison study. One of them is that the curriculum in early childhood needs to look at socialization, not just academic, but also all of the teachers were certified teachers across all three curricula. But the other thing that we know from other research that's important when we look at that study is that teachers who -- child caregivers who have less education are more likely to teach with the direction instruction mode than are teachers who have been trained in early childhood education. So that you're going to more likely have this less-effective mode of teaching if you have teachers who are less well-trained.

MR. BARNETT: Now, I was going to take you through what we found in the study--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Excuse me. Excuse me.

MR. BARNETT: Okay.

SENATOR GORMLEY: But is there a blend somewhere?

MS. FREDE: I don't know what you're asking.

SENATOR GORMLEY: All right. Let's take somebody who doesn't have preschool but has a functional family unit, and one of the parents spends time teaching the colors the old-fashioned way. Okay. And I know the old-fashioned way is often used as the excuse of "Why don't they do it the old-fashioned way? We shouldn't spend money." I don't mean it from that

direction, but we're trying to stretch dollars. Where is there a break off point? I mean, where could-- I think you have to look at almost every school is unique, every district is unique unto itself, as Ron brought up. But there has to be a point where somebody who does not have a certificate could do something, and that wouldn't be as expensive to have that person do it, but the care and the nurturing and the love for the child would be there. There is a point where you need someone who does have that degree. That's the point. You can say, "Well, if they're all degreed." I'm not saying you're saying that, but we can always give a conclusion if we had somebody with a doctorate handling everything. It would be far better if you were personally with each child, it would be better.

MS. FREDE: It would be. Absolutely.

SENATOR GORMLEY: No question about that. I don't know. He'd get them really-- (laughter)

MS. FREDE: He has a very good 10-year-old.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Oh, yes, okay. I could imagine. (laughter)

But the point is we have to try to work with the Department to try to come up with something that works. Your conclusions -- anyone who doubts your conclusions-- They're correct. And it's good that from a dollars-and-cents point of view, we can now articulate it because of the study. But now we have to get into delivering to that child.

MS. FREDE: Let me try to answer that.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Go ahead, but what's your -- let's go over the model. What do you recommend? How would you like to see it done?

MS. FREDE: That kind of goes right into--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Go ahead.

MS. FREDE: Let me just specifically answer-- First, let me just quickly answer your question, and then I do have some presentation that's related to your question.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Sure.

MS. FREDE: The first was, is there something less than a certified teacher that would work? My one response that I have to that is the research doesn't indicate that very well, that the less you spend on the education of the teacher, the less benefit that you're going to get. And the whole idea of this is to get benefit from it.

SENATOR GORMLEY: You see, this is where I have a problem. I would submit to you that in the basement of that local facility there is a role model. Now, that role model might not have multiple degrees. And that's also not to take away from the person who has the degrees. There's got to be a blend here. We can't just say that what worked in traditional -- and not to throw tradition at you, but to say that working in society for decades and decades when families were functional in terms of role models, or whatever, that we have to go in such a direction that it's only if it-- Fine. My program is you've got to be there one-on-one with every child, and that's better than the program that you're recommending and it would be. There's got to be a point where we--

MS. FREDE: Well, no, there's a matter of diminishing returns.

SENATOR GORMLEY: There has to be a blend here somewhere.

MR. BARNETT: There is a blend.

SENATOR RICE: Before they respond, Mr. Chairman, let me say something because I'm really familiar with Head Start.

I come from the biggest city, okay. And let me tell you something. The programs that receive, particularly in urban districts, the most recognition what's happening with the young people happen to be Head Starts, the day cares, etc. And let me tell you why. Because the people who are involved in those programs are not making a lot of money, but there's a lot of compassion there. Even though moms may be at work or possibly they don't get it at home, that needs to stay in place. And I think that is what the sender is talking about. What I've said that needs to be added is now we're moving into an area where young people need to understand the complex world at that level -- numbers and reading and writing -- and there are ways to handling that academically, but it really requires some certification in my estimation -- teacher certification.

So you may have a program with 10 bodies there in terms of the human resource people running the program. And I'm saying that if that's the case and you have a student population of preschoolers of 15, then I want a certified teacher there but keep those parents there because that's the link. It's a combination of those two things that makes the difference. And those compassionate people that I deal with every day learn from the educators who are in programs. Some of them have them, some of them don't. It just happens to be that way. Some of those individuals who are running Head Start are certified teachers; they're just not running them as such. They just transition into another job, but it's their background. And I think if you look at -- maybe some of the models that's moving in that direction, like Hudson

County, for example, versus, say, other counties, you're going to start to see that that's the direction we move in.

And as for bringing more resources -- financial resources -- that are necessary to the preschool program, but keep it at a level that is more manageable. You can't remove what's in the Head Starts right now. That has been Head Start, and that's the one program in this country that has proved to work. And it worked because of the people Senator Gormley is talking about who are now certified. They stay in place. You bring on a component. You don't need four or five teachers in a program of 15 students, but I do think you need one certified person for every 15 or 20 students along with the other people.

MS. FREDE: Can I make a brief presentation about this because I think it will help.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Sure. Go ahead.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question before you start.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Hey, we're interested.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: This is an excellent presentation, number one. Secondly -- I want to say this the right way. Are there any other studies that show non -- let's say, the impact of these programs for nonpoverty kids?

MS. FREDE: There are some. As you can expect, as Steve said, if you don't have much dropout in a population, you're not going to have much impact on dropout rates. There are some studies again looking at quality, which is what I was actually going to go into, that the quality of programs for

young children matter regardless of the income level of the child. In fact, poor quality child care can have a negative effect on children from intact middle-class families, but the family mediates that. So that if they are in the better situation in their family, the less likely the poor-quality child care is to impact it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: So it's done on parental involvement.

MS. FREDE: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Okay.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: And if I might as you go into that, through you, Mr. Chairman, one of the questions that we're going to have to deal with as we take a look at what our options are is the question of delivery systems. And at some point, I really want to know and want to see the hard evidence to suggest that one type of delivery system is clearly better than another, not just from the sense that, well, if the person's certified, it must be better. But really, I don't know if there have been any studies done with respect to delivery systems that are other than certified in the same way that this has been done.

MS. FREDE: I don't have-- I'm sorry, I'm not as high tech as Steve. I don't have-- I did have some overheads, but we can't make the overhead projector work. You have copies of this in your materials. There's first the quality standards for preschool classrooms.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Can I ask you a question?

MS. FREDE: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Based on what you said and what you're going to say, which I know what you're going to say, does New Jersey have the quantity of trained people to do what you're proposing to do?

MS. FREDE: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: No. Say, certified people? They don't have the certified people?

MS. FREDE: No.

SENATOR RICE: No, but we have the potential--

MS. FREDE: Right. We do have the potential, but we don't have--

SENATOR RICE: We have the potential in a short period of time. Let me say something to you once again. I'm a strong proponent of Head Start parents who are ready. Okay. We have the ability to do things at preschools that we've been doing in the other academics, and it costs us almost nothing, etc. And then that's my concern because I can see where we're going to dance around the resources. We want to keep the resources minimum. We are going to dance around certification. Now, it also says something else to you: no one model is going to work for New Jersey -- no one model. But what parents and Head Start and preschool -- they have always been more so than the academic arena -- they have been more acceptable to taking any curriculum that makes sense and following it. You don't get the resistance you get in secondary school or elementary school, etc. Their only fight has always been financial resources. They ask for the kinds of things like that. So I want to be clear because you're talking about a different subculture groups, as well as different cultural groups, etc.



MS. FREDE: Can I--

SENATOR BAER: I just want to break in one moment to say this. I can see, because we're also turned on by this, we have many questions, and we're frustrated in not being able to get them all out, and you have a lot you want to say to us because you're frustrated and you can't get out. No matter what we cover here today, I think we're going to need to find some way for continuing this dialogue and for you presenting us with other material that you think is pertinent as a result of the dialogue, and for us forwarding to you questions which we weren't able to get in today.

SENATOR GORMLEY: What I wanted to recommend is that for the next hearing Senator Rice pick the site in Newark. And what I'd like to do is actually go through a program or a neighborhood or what works. I think we're dealing-- By the way, as I said, the study is invaluable to demonstrate the dollar value, and I mean that sincerely. But at the same time, I think it would be good for the Committee, because there's a real interest here, and this is not political -- they want to see a product delivered. I'd like to go to a neighborhood-- Whatever he picks we'll go there, and I'd like to see, how do we look at the demographics in that neighborhood? How do we provide enough flexibility to that neighborhood and to that school in that area? How do we work with the people? I think we have to engage now on the local level.

I'd rather have the Committee at least say we had one or two success stories that we actually worked with you to do and looked at the idiosyncracies. And then, when we talk about what the programs are going to be for the State, we say, "Wait a second. We actually looked at a three-year-old. We looked at a dysfunctional family." Because what I find is

we deal with this from the top down. We have a hearing. We say, "You're right." And then people like Ron have to go back to "the city" that's the subject of the report and go, "Wait a second. There are day-to-day issues you just don't quite understand." I don't mean that in a mean-spirited way. So this is-- And I apologize for the interruptions, but believe me--

MS. FREDE: No, it's fine.

SENATOR GORMLEY: --if they just let you go through and go, "Is it over?"-- There's a real interest here. I mean, there's a real interest here.

MS. FREDE: I really think I'll answer some of your questions if you let me talk. That's all.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Go ahead.

MS. FREDE: What I want to talk about is what does a quality preschool look like, and then when we go out together, you'll know what to look for.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. FREDE: What I'd like to have you do is look at -- there's a handout in your materials that, at the top, says, "Quality Factors and Longitudinal Studies of Early Childhood Efficacy." It says ECEF. It should be about the third one on the left-hand side. What I did-- The 40 studies that Steve showed you of different kinds of programs that have shown longitudinal effects of preschool, I went back and looked at all of those and looked at what factors were common across those studies. One of the things that we found that was very important was that there are teachers with -- there are supervisors working with the teachers in helping them develop their models, supervisors who understand early childhood education.

The reason I'm saying this right now is because, when we show you our results from our community needs assessment, you'll see that less than half of the directors of the community programs have a background in early childhood education. And this is a key element for success is that the director have an background in early childhood education, let alone the teacher.

All of these programs had small class sizes and low teacher-child ratios. This is also a key issue, and I want to explain it to you. Fifteen is very clearly the maximum size that you can have in a class and have the kinds of effects we're talking about. It's not a matter of taking that ratio of seven-to-one and now having 21 or 20 children and three adults. You don't get the same results. You need to have a small class size. You also need the ratio of a one-to-seven, and that's maximum. Because we're talking about classrooms, now when you start having publicly supported preschool, you will by Federal law have to include children with disabilities. Fifteen is going to be a large class size when you have children with disabilities included. And many of these children, as you know, who are not children who are identified as children with disabilities, have special needs that need extra attention. So 15 is a maximum class size, not a minimum class size, with two adults. Both of these adults need to have expert training in early childhood education. They don't both have to be certified teachers, but we know that you get more with a certified teacher, and so one of them needs to be a certified teacher with specialization in early childhood -- another important policy issue we do not have, early childhood certification, in this state.

Students leave my college with a certification of nursery through grade eight. We can't give them the specialized training they need in early

childhood unless they major in early childhood, which means that they're not ready to teach seventh and eighth graders. It's not possible in undergraduate programs to have them do both. So we really need to-- One of the things that I want to ask you for is to reinstate the early childhood certification that was done away with a few years ago. But they need specialized knowledge of early childhood education. There are ways to make this happen with endorsements for people who are already certified. That's a key issue.

Another key issue is the program needs to be both intense and there needs to be continuity for the children. The most intense program, as you saw in Steve's slide, the abecedarian study, worked with children full day, full year, year-round for five years, but there's other ways to get intensity. The Perry Study, although it was a half-day program, only had a ratio of one-to-six teachers with master's degrees, and they had one and a half hour home visits each week. So it's another kind of intensity. The continuity issue is very important as well. If children are spending a half day with one set of adults and one set of children and then they're having to transfer to another place for their child care because their parents work, they're getting discontinuity in their program. And that we also found is not an effective method.

Partnerships with parents, you've been talking about how important parent involvement is, and that is a very important--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Senator Martin meant to question you about a hamburger or an orange right now. (laughter)

MS. FREDE: I'll quiz him later.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Quiz him later. Okay, thank you.

MS. FREDE: In all of these effective preschool programs, partnerships were formed with parents. All of this is an aid of the teacher understanding the child because you can't teach a child well unless you understand a child well.

And finally across all of these studies, you saw what I called school-like discourse patterns, and that's my academic stuff coming in. But what I mean is, that in school you hear a teacher asking a child a question, the child responds, the teacher gives an evaluation. What you hear in high-quality preschool programs is the teacher may ask a question, but the question is something like, "Which of these toys do you think will float when we put them in the water?" And then the child gives a response, and the teacher says, "Well, let's find out." It's that same pattern, although it's not as oriented to right and wrong answers, as you might get with older children. Learning how to answer questions that you know the adult knows the answer to is something that children don't do naturally. They have to have had some practice with it because it's weird to be asked a question that you know the person asking the question knows the answer to.

Then finally there's also school-like curriculum content. I talked to you about the farm. That doesn't sound very school-like, but it's a kind of science topic. There's also an interest in mathematics, an interest in emergent literacy. The classroom is rich with those things. Those are the things we found across the longitudinal studies that was common, and these factors seem to be necessary if you want to get benefit from your preschool program.

If you look at the next handout in your packet, it's a diagram. I want to just real quickly show how this works. It's a diagram that looks kind

of like that. (indicating handout) A number of other studies have looked at what happens in preschool classrooms to have good effects on children, and that's the kind of research that I do. I go in and observe in preschool classrooms, and I look at what the outcomes are, and I compare across them.

We find that there are static variables that matter, and we've talked about those -- teacher characteristics, specialized knowledge in early education, group size maximum of 15, teacher-child ratio one-to-seven, one-to-seven-and-a-half. Meeting those static qualifications leads to some changes in what happens in the classrooms. If you have teachers with specialized knowledge in early childhood education with a bachelor's degree certification, you get then better teacher-child interactions. You have teachers who are focusing on thinking and reasoning on the problem solving of the children, but also on their social development, helping the children learn how to get along with others and work in a group. They use more positive guidance techniques, and they give children more individual attention. Less well-trained teachers are likely to teach more in a whole group and not individualize; whereas, well-trained teachers understand the need to individualize teaching.

Those two things together, you have the static variables and the dynamic variables. You put those together and you get some changes in child behavior right in the classroom. Children are more engaged, there's less aimless wandering, so there's more productive activity. There are more positive interactions among the children. The children get along better, which also leads to more productive activity. They're more attentive and they're more independent. And then you take all of these things, the static, the teacher qualifications, class variables, the dynamic differences in their interaction, the

changes in child behavior, and all of those things together lead to gains in social and emotional outcomes for children.

In poor-quality programs-- This shows you what you get in good-quality programs. You get greater self-esteem, greater self-confidence, sociability, language ability, improvements in cognitive and academic tests. In poor-quality programs what you get is an increase in stress level in the children. You get much more behavior disorder. You get immature social development.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Do we have an example of a poor program? I'd just be curious.

MS. FREDE: Well, a poor program would have less-- Reverse all these variables I just gave you. You'd have less well-trained teachers--

SENATOR GORMLEY: No. No. No. I mean, I'd like to know the name of a town.

MS. FREDE: Oh, wait, we'll show you in a minute.

SENATOR GORMLEY: I want one. Give me a bad one.

MS. FREDE: Well, I'm not going to tell you--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Oh, yes. Come on, that's why you have hearings.

MR. BARNETT: You don't have to give a name of a town. Study after study shows that the majority of the early childhood programs that we have out there in communities don't do this. The majority of them don't meet children's basic needs, and we can show you what we found in New Jersey.

SENATOR GORMLEY: I'm going to be honest now. I want the towns, and I want the examples. That's the best way I can deal with this.

SENATOR RICE: Plus, I think, you have to be, through the Chair, you have to watch your terminology. If, in fact, you're saying that the majority of the early childhood programs -- the way you said it is -- you're correct. But they are meeting what they are there for. They're there right now to primarily keep some discipline and provide for children and give people an opportunity to work. The whole idea of preschool and why we're so interested is to how do we take those types of programs and make them substantially more positive and move the young people towards an academic life.

MR. BARNETT: Absolutely. And you're going to see that Head Start Programs, for example, are head and shoulders above the others because they have a different mission. They have more resources and they have higher standards.

SENATOR RICE: You're going to also find, if you do research further for your next book, that the young people and the families are okay in here to start. Guess where the breakdown is? They're moving in a positive direction. When they get to kindergarten, everything in their lives change because there's no continuity or consistency through, and that's a fact. I mean, you talk to my Head Start people, they would tell you that. So that's why the certification becomes important, but I think what we're going to have to do at some point in time, get with the Committee in Education and figure out, well, if we feed preschoolers into the system, what happens once they get in to keep their beginning moving with some consistency forward?

MS. FREDE: These are some results from the needs assessment that we conducted -- community needs assessment that we conducted in the 22 consortium districts, the 22 *Abbott* districts that were part of our



consortium. I'm going to embellish this with some stories, but I am not publicly going to name any researchers, and that would be unethical for us to do that.

SENATOR RICE: That's like a client privilege.

MS. FREDE: I'd be happy personally to do that, but publicly I can't name a program here that I think is poor quality.

SENATOR GORMLEY: No. Wait a second. Wait a second. If, for example, in New Jersey--

MS. FREDE: There are--

SENATOR GORMLEY: No. No. But the people who hired you in New Jersey would waive any ethical restrictions. If they have some problems in their towns, they'd love you to say it.

MR. BARNETT: When you observe--

SENATOR GORMLEY: So we'll check with the 22 districts that hired you and ask them to waive it.

MR. BARNETT: When you observe--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Oh, no. We'll do that. They'll waive it. Sure they will.

MR. BARNETT: When you observe in a program the conditions under which you observe is that they retain--

MS. FREDE: Anonymity.

MR. BARNETT: Right. But you want to tell them about the for profit and nonprofit.

MS. FREDE: Let me--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Go ahead. Go ahead.

MS. FREDE: First of all, let me tell you there's something mistaken in the slide. (indicating slide) Where it says for profit, it should say nonprofit; where it says nonprofit, it should say for profit. Now let me explain what we did. We sent to all of the DHS-licensed centers in the 22 districts a questionnaire that where they rate -- it's a self-report questionnaire -- their own characteristics on a scale of one to five. From that, districts may have chosen to observe in programs that scored a 3.5 or higher on that scale. So that we then went out and observed using the classroom practices inventory. So the first one is the self-report -- the brown is the self-report, the yellow is the direct observation. But the direct observation has fewer cases, and they were the higher-quality cases.

But let me tell you some more about the scales first. The scales we rate -- they're based on the guidelines for developmentally appropriate practice of the National Association for the Education of Young Children. You rate the program on items such as "Teachers ask questions that encourage children to use complex language and to enhance problem-solving skills." And you'd say, one, not at all like this classroom; five, very much like this classroom.

These are not the best observation and questionnaire instruments that we have because it was done in a very quick way. What's expected on this kind of observation is that a program will score between 4.5 and 5.0 if it's a high-quality program. So you can see that while the majority -- well, almost half of the Head Start Programs -- reported themselves as being there. When we observed, it was a little less than that. You can also see that the nonprofit -- remember we have to reverse nonprofit and for profit-- The nonprofit programs, which is the largest group, was of higher quality both in their own

report and in our observations than the for profit or the religious-based programs.

SENATOR RICE: The yellow is your observation. (indicating color on slide)

MR. BARNETT: That's right.

MS. FREDE: Yes.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: Through you, Mr. Chairman, to what extent, if any, does Head Start purport to subscribe to those standards?

MS. FREDE: Very much so.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: All right. To what extent, if any, do, for instance, religious groups purport to--

MS. FREDE: That's a good point. The religious groups are often using a much more didactic approach because--

SENATOR ROBERTSON: Absolutely. That's not to say that we should not necessarily conclude that those schools and those formats could not be tailored so as to meet a higher level of acceptability. It's just that left on their own this happens to be the way that they were doing it.

MS. FREDE: Are you saying, are they trainable? Some of them probably are, and let me talk about that.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: It's not a question of being trainable because they're not doing tricks.

MS. FREDE: Well, let me give you some examples.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: No. But my point is that I'm not sure what that--

MR. BARNETT: I think, if you see the examples, you'll see the problems aren't differences over curriculum theory. That's not the problem here. We're not even close to that.

MS. FREDE: I want to give you some examples.

SENATOR BAER: Let me interrupt just a moment, please. I find this fascinating and I want to review it later. I see you're no where near a microphone. This is being audiotaped, and I was going to ask if, in fact, the backup that you're giving us is also in the fuller book that--

MS. FREDE: This is in your report. The report that's in your packet.

SENATOR BAER: But some of the explanation that you're giving us is not duplicated here. Right?

MS. FREDE: Some of it is not.

SENATOR BAER: So I wanted to make sure this is on the tape. And if there is a book that provides further, as in your case, I'd like to know about it.

MS. FREDE: This is hot off the press, as we've just released this report. So it's not in a book yet.

SENATOR BAER: Okay.

MS. FREDE: But certainly some of what I'm saying is in the report, and other things I'd be happy to give you some more. What I want to do is contrast some -- give you a contrast of some of the things we saw that would be considered poor quality so you really understand what we're saying when we say poor quality. And also, an example of a very high quality observation so that you just have a sense of the two kinds of things.

In one center, the teacher was working with a group of three-year-olds. She said to the three-year-olds, "We're going to learn about the silent *E* rule today." And she held up a plastic cup that had the word five written on it. Then she said to one of the little girls -- and since you won't play with me, I'll have Steve do it -- "Stand up, Steve, I want you to be a silent *E*. Now stand still. Now that's what silent *E* does -- nothing." That was a lesson for three-year-olds in the silent *E* rule. First of all, let me unpack it a little bit. First of all, it's an absurd thing to be teaching three-year-olds. That kind of level of phonics-- Well, emergent literacy is happening for three-year-olds. Certainly they're understanding sounds, they're listening to the similarities in sound, alliteration, rhyming. They're making these connections and picking up huge amount of vocabulary at this time, but they have to be hearing it, and they have to have good interaction with adults. You can't just hear it on TV and pick up language. Children don't learn language from TV. Tried listening to the Spanish language channel that I have, and I can't learn any Spanish that way.

The other problem with this is it is very directed. There's no developmental appropriateness. Finally, my other big problem with this particular lesson is that it's wrong. Silent *Es* don't do nothing. They affect the vowel that precede them. So even if it had been developmentally appropriate, even if it had been well crafted to be right for that individual child, it's just wrong. Okay. That's one example.

Another example, the teacher held up a picture of a diamond and said to children, "This is a triangle," and proceeded to talk about triangles, but she was holding up a picture of a diamond. These are real. I'm not making

these up. We saw these. In another -- this is the most troubling to me actually when you talk about the nurturing -- the teacher came out to the playground with her coffee cup, sat at a picnic table. The children kept approaching her, and she kept saying, "Don't touch that. Get away from me," pushing them out into the yard to play -- in that tone of voice, too. (indicating harsh tone of voice) This is when I actually observed personally, so the others were retold to me. So this happened for about five minutes, wouldn't talk to the children, kept telling them to get away from her, not touch her stuff, and finally yelled across the yard so everybody heard, "I can't wait to get out of here."

SENATOR RICE: That was in the suburbs. We don't have picnic tables. (laughter)

SENATOR GORMLEY: Now I know where it is. I know that picnic table. (laughter)

MS. FREDE: None of these were in suburban areas. They were only in-- And those were extreme examples, but the fact that I can give you three off the top-- There are many more like that. They're extreme, but there are many more like that. So there's a real concern about quality here. I want you to really understand it. But let me also give you the other side, another observation.

SENATOR RICE: Excuse me, when you mentioned quality in the study, once again that goes back to training.

MS. FREDE: Yes. Yes. Definitely it's a training issue in my opinion. I don't know. That last person, I'm not sure. She may have needed drugs or something, but--

SENATOR RICE: Hers may have just been the check she gets. She needs another system where she can get more money.

MS. FREDE: Right. In another observation -- this is a good quality one. I saw a little boy whose mother had just had a new baby. And the teacher in an effort to help him talk about this process and deal with the process had him tell a story, and she wrote down the story for him, which is a very good early literacy activity to take dictation from children so that they understand that oral language can be written down, and they make that connection. He wrote a story about a lion family with a new baby, which is typical of children. They project it into some other kind of fantasy rather than about themselves. The teacher then typed it, she printed it out, and the child drew pictures to go with it. He then read this story to the whole class, and the class acted out the story. There were lots of discussion about how they would decide who could be which person in the story. So there was a lot of social problem solving that was going on.

Obviously, this activity had emergent literacy. There were concepts about time, sequential issues, concepts of size, mental and also graphic and dramatic representation, which is all very important for children this age, also, then, social and emotional development: the child himself dealing with this major event in his life, but also the children dealing with just basic, "How do we work out a system as a group of children to do this story?"

While there are some concerns in terms of the quality of what we saw in the programs, there are also high-quality interactions going on as well. What we found about community programs, some other issues, other quality factors -- and you have more of this in your report -- is 44 percent of the

directors have bachelor's degrees in early childhood education. So less than half of the people who are supposed to be the educational leaders in the program have a background in early childhood education. Seventeen percent don't have a college degree at all, and that's the director, not the teacher.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Seventeen percent of the directors?

MS. FREDE: Of the teachers, 17 percent have a bachelor's degree or higher in early childhood education, and 16 percent have a bachelor's degree in something else. So altogether, 33 percent already have a bachelor's degree, and that's 30 percent of the teaching staff. So it's two-thirds of the teachers, the person who would be considered the head teacher in the classroom. So that what I'm trying to say here is there's a lot to work with in terms of getting certification -- teachers who are certified in every classroom.

Along this line, I just want to comment on the CDA and what it is and make sure you understand it.

SENATOR RICE: Before you do that, a quick question, through the Chair. The examples you gave of poor quality, I'd like to think and not make assumptions -- I'd like to think that when you made the observation you also took some data -- what the head teacher, what the director, if they have a bachelor's degree or-- I mean, in those poor-quality districts, what did you have in terms of the leadership with the people there?

MS. FREDE: I can get you that information. I don't have it. But in a couple of the cases, I know that they were in what I kind of call a ma-and-pa child care centers. In other words, somebody who decided to take this up as a job, and maybe they had been a family day care provider before, or something, and then started a program based on that. None of these were



in Head Start Programs, none of the examples I gave you. That doesn't mean we saw perfect things in every Head Start Program either, but we saw a lot of good things. What I typically say about early childhood care and education is there's plenty of praise and plenty of blame to go around. There are good programs is every auspice.

We also have to state here that we did not observe in public school preschool programs because that wasn't our charge and not what-- But that would be an interesting next step is to see how well they're doing.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: Just, through you Mr. Chair, why not?

MS. FREDE: Because we were trying to learn about capacity in the community. To help the districts develop their early childhood plans, they needed to know where they could work and with whom and what the capacity was.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Off-site potential.

MS. FREDE: Right. Exactly. They knew what their own classroom capacity was. We did recommend to them that they observe in their classrooms, but there wasn't time, basically.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: The only reason I say that is because for qualitative purposes if we're to gauge what our delivery options are, it would sort of be nice to know how the public systems-- Because those are anecdotal, obviously, and I understand that. I can remember, as a student in Paterson, my English teacher gave us a multiple choice question or an either-or choice question with something like, "Elizabeth Taylor stunk or stank in that role," and I didn't particularly think that was very well done either, but that's anecdotal.

MS. FREDE: Right. Well, these were anecdotal, but if you put it with the numbers we've got-- We've got quantitative data to go with it.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: The point is-- But you're suggesting qualitative conclusions be drawn here when some of the areas don't purport to be wedded to those quality standards and those who do aren't there.

MS. FREDE: Well, actually, the Department of Human Services does have similar standards that the child care persons are supposed to meet. Their standards are very similar to the developmentally appropriate practice standards. I'm willing to concede that some of the religious programs certainly have a different purpose, which means they have a different purpose. And, in fact, another example of something that I saw was the teacher having a lesson with the children telling them that today we're thankful to God for stretching. And the children were all supposed to repeat that they were thankful to God for stretching, and "What are we thankful for? Stretching." And, obviously, the public dollars can't go to support that either because that's the separation of church and state issue.

SENATOR RICE: Excuse me, through the Chair. I think Senator Robertson was -- you said that you didn't measure certain things-- You're talking about the 22 districts, and you're saying that's all outside, so-- But the charge came from the Department of Human Services?

MS. FREDE: No.

SENATOR RICE: Department of Education? Where did your charge come from?

MS. FREDE: Our charge came-- The 22 *Abbott* districts formed a consortium, and they paid for this research.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: And they said, make sure you say everybody else but don't take a look at us.

MS. FREDE: No. No. No. The purpose of this study was to help them prepare their early childhood plans that were due November 2. The study started September 1. We had very little time to do this in. The purpose was for them to understand-- They wanted to collaborate with community programs. It was in our regional recommendations that there should be collaboration with community programs, but they had to know-- They don't want to collaborate with programs that aren't going to do good for their kids. So they wanted to know what is the capacity and quality of those community programs. They do evaluate their own programs. That just wasn't part of -- the purpose of our study.

SENATOR RICE: What is-- The State takeover is at least three cities. They opted not to participate. Is that correct?

MS. FREDE: They may have opted, but the Department of Education told them that they couldn't.

MR. BARNETT: Ellen, you don't know that.

MS. FREDE: I don't know that? I'm sorry. I don't know that.

SENATOR RICE: Excuse me. Through you, Mr. Chairman, could you-- Is it possible for this Subcommittee, as we move forward on what we're getting in the future in other meetings-- Is it possible we could get the administration, or if necessary, get our own folk to start to assess to a similar assessment on the public aspect of this from the public school perspective and also to make sure that an assessment takes place in these takeover districts? I think that's very important. We have combination of pride with the church,

schools, etc., and we needed a whole picture, and I agree with Senator Robertson.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: If I may, Mr. Chairman, just make an observation unrelated to the presentation today, but I think important to this panel. We're being asked to do a very difficult job here, and this is the second meeting, although this is a lot more germane than the first meeting, but this is the second meeting that we've had where we're being given a presentation which is nice on a subject which is important, but at the heart of what we have to do is the *Abbott vs. Burke* decision and the complex legal and constitutional issues that are inherent therein. And we need to know what, if anything, the Department of Education is doing itself to respond to *Abbott vs Burke*.

And I read of all sorts of initiatives when I see State of the State messages or budget messages or legislative programs, and I'm finding myself taking my time out sitting at meetings, listening to presentations which may have a bearing on one very small aspect -- this is not particularly very small, the last one was extremely small -- of a much larger problem, when in fact we're not taking a look at the problem in the beginning, which is to say what is the charge that the Supreme Court -- and I know there are differences of opinions on this, but what is the charge that the Supreme Court is giving to the State of New Jersey? To the Legislature? Because constitutionally, it's the Legislature that has to do this. What is the charge to the Legislature, and what if anything is the Department of Education doing? Because frankly from what little I've seen, I'm not at all certain that the Department has been giving adequate resources to the special needs districts to begin to formulate their programs.

Now, for us to be talking about this months later and having presentations on theory and studies which are well-appreciated by us, it seems to me-- Well, I was going to say, the cart before the horse. I'm not sure where the cart is. I'm not sure where the horse is. I'm not sure what order we're in at this point.

SENATOR GORMLEY: I think that you raise a very valid point. That's why I think if the Committee, beyond just having a hearing, actually tries to become focused in terms of a particular neighborhood or school or whatever, maybe we could-- I mean, everybody is going to have to do a little bit of this together. Maybe we could be somewhat more helpful than just saying, "That's right, that's wrong," and our pointing the finger at who didn't do what. But one bit of commentary regarding whether or not the expertise in certain areas be in the church or not, what I have found in these urban -- in certain urban settings-- A key word I think we all agree about is the need for stability. And sometimes the only strain of stability is the structure of churches in the urban setting, and we have to blend the two. They might not have the expertise, but they sometimes are the only source of a role model and they are the only source of stability.

That doesn't preclude what you're bringing up, that people have to have the training to make it work. I don't think either are mutually exclusive of another. And if somebody slips once in a while and says, "God," I don't think anybody is going to file suit. I hope they don't. But I think the point is to merge that stability that they provide. People talk about faith-based initiatives and whatever and see how we can merge-- The requirements like--

You brought up some very valid points about minimum training in terms of a director, or whatever.

What is frustrating to me, we can have these hearings go on and on and on about theory, and everybody can be right about why the other person's wrong. That's why I would like to at least get our hands on a couple examples and try to work from that basis.

Senator Martin, want to say something?

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, I can talk, but if you want me to speak, I guess, I have to get the red button on. (referring to microphone button)

SENATOR GORMLEY: No, just speak.

SENATOR MARTIN: I think Senator Robertson raised some good points about what the objectives are of this Subcommittee. I can just give you some overview of why -- when I charged the three Subcommittees to try and do some business, what was at least in my mind. I'll begin with sort of a criticism. I think a lot of this-- If the Department of Education were focused in a different way, maybe some of this Committee's work would not have to be done because I really think this is primarily something that should be handled by the Department. I don't think we're particularly well-suited to really be doing some of the kind of nuts and bolts of educational organization and management. But I have heard from a number of different constituencies, one of which are various segments of the 28 *Abbott* districts, that they are unhappy with the guidance and direction of the Department and have asked somebody in the Legislature, since there aren't many other sources that they can go to, for assistance. And I think we do have that, at least, responsibility to try and

ascertain whether there should be some way in which we can nudge or redirect by law or some other way, perhaps, to get the Department to do some things that they may not be doing well. Maybe they are doing better than what some of the districts think, but I think it warrants review.

That being said, the key areas I think this Committee, since it is looking at the *Abbott* districts, should focus on would be; one, the requirement of whole school reform which did come out of the *Abbott* cases and which the Department and the districts are obligated to do. How whole school reform develops is mind-boggling in its sort of entirety, but the districts are being asked to do this, and there has been some criticism about the way that plays out. So that is certainly one issue that has to be addressed.

School construction, which is another part of the *Abbott* decision itself, how those schools get built, what the size are. We saw some of this with our Education Committee just a few days ago, but that is something which is monumental in terms of the *Abbott* districts.

And thirdly, the issue that you're talking about today. Admittedly, this may be just a substrata of it, but it is important because we have decided, and the Department has agreed, that early childhood should be a component of the education in the *Abbott* districts. And while the agreement was as a minimum, it should be for three- and four-year-olds. There's also an understanding that it may be expanded from half day to full day, what the nature of those programs are, who's going to provide it, whether it's the districts themselves or whether they borrow on some of these community-based programs, I think is an important issue. And there's probably some more, but those three issues if this Subcommittee could try to at the very least see what

the problems are and see whether the Department is providing adequate relief would be tremendous help to the Education Committees in both the Assembly and the Senate, which are now burdened with several other issues in addition to these.

So that is the direction I would ask of the Committee. That's not easy, and it's going to be messy, and you're going to get some bits and pieces, and I know you're going to get conflicting opinion as to the success. Some of it, frankly, is tied into cost considerations, which get us into even other issues about resources of the State. I don't know if that helps, but that's what I thought the Committee might be able to do to give us some assistance.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Well, in terms of this area that we're dealing with today, I think we are taking up the mantle and the direction that you're recommending. And to say that, yes, we've both heard the same thing -- what's the program and where it's going. And we're going maybe further than we should because we're going to go into wherever-- Ron's going to pick the next site. What I want to do is try to do this around a school or a neighborhood or something and see how this is going to work.

Believe me, I do not want to do regulations. Wow. I don't want to go there. However, I think the process has to be moved a little further. We just can't just deal in sound bites and theory, and we have to try to put some meat on the bones to the program to move this along.

School construction, we are spending time with that. We have some meetings set up with the Governor's Office, with the Treasurer, and those are very complex issues. I can't think of a better way to do it than to start-- Well, let's start with one neighborhood and one school and let's go back and



forth and see how it would be done. There might be better ways to do it, but we might as well deal with it on a practical basis. We will make mistakes and we will say things that, obviously not being certified, I'll say absolutely the wrong thing. That's why I didn't want to do your quiz because I'd pick the apple, the orange, or the pear and ruin it, "You know, Gormley picked the pear." We never got over the Vice-President potato. (laughter) Do you understand?

MS. FREDE: Right.

SENATOR GORMLEY: So that's where you were going. No, you're not going there with me. No, we're not doing the spelling bee either. Don't go there next.

MS. FREDE: That's poor-quality practice.

SENATOR GORMLEY: The point is we have to get the Department with the Legislature with the people who are representing the districts, and we have to get together and let's start with a practical example. So that a person who is a layperson and doesn't have your background in this area can get a sense of what we're trying to do. And we go back and forth over the traditional arguments, not so somebody has an excuse why they can't agree, but to find out areas where we have some common agreement. And that's why, as I said, we'll schedule and we'll follow up on this.

And, as Senator Martin pointed out, on school construction, we are spending time on that right now. Some people in the Department, or some people would say in government, have asked for a little more time, which it is a massive undertaking -- \$5.5 billion or whatever. We'll give them another day and a half or so, but we are working on that. This is a very complex issue, and

I don't want to let either side to be able to say, "Well, we gave them a theory. They didn't pay attention." We've got to get the theories together and see what works, and I'd rather start with an inner-city example and see if we can get something resolved.

MR. BARNETT: I think you're right on target.

SENATOR RICE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not cutting you off. In regards to this meetings versus the last meeting, I think now we're starting to really move in the right direction. But I do believe that Senator Robertson -- because we raised this before, he and I both -- maybe in between moving further on this issue in construction, and etc., I think what I'm hearing is that-- The Supreme Court gave a decision, which we all have a copy or summary of. I think what I'm hearing is that we should not be presumptuous as to the Committee knowledge of what the Supreme Court is actually saying. So maybe at a meeting, a subsequent meeting, we can bring in people, whether it's the Education Law Center to Mr. Klagholz's Commission and everybody else, and say, "Okay, here's what the Supreme Court in summary has said," etc., etc.

SENATOR GORMLEY: In all courtesy to the Supreme Court, I want to go to a school. I want to see the problems with the children. I want to get everybody in the community together with the Legislature with the teachers, and I want to see what we can come up with.

SENATOR RICE: I agree.

SENATOR GORMLEY: I remember when some of those people in the court were various governor's offices. Believe me, they made us look very directed when they had to handle this end of it.

SENATOR RICE: Sure. I'll agree, but I think--

SENATOR ROBERTSON: But that's the point.

SENATOR GORMLEY: Yes, that's it.

SENATOR RICE: What I'm saying is that if someone didn't read the document and know that the Supreme Court, they should look at this direction and that direction. I think it's a summary type of a meeting I'm talking about, and then we moved back into where we were going. At least everybody is on the same page as to what everybody's saying about that decision and the time frames and things like that.

SENATOR ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, if I might, I really do agree with Senator Rice on this. And I agree with you that we do have to get in the field and we do have to see programs that work and we do have to understand what's going on in the various special needs districts, not only the real, real urban ones, but also the ones that aren't quite as urban. But what you pointed out about the Supreme Court is absolutely right, and we've gotten ourselves in a situation over the last several years where policy is being made by judicial edict.

In *Abbott vs. Burke*, there were representatives of the administration, representatives of schoolchildren, and there was no-- The actual theoretical people's representatives in government did not have a seat at that table when those important issues were being discussed. So I think it's important for us to know what we've been directed to do, understand what room we have because, frankly, this is, in my opinion, potentially the most socially divisive issue in this state over a period of years. You have a lot of urban communities, you have a lot of suburban communities that live cheek to jowl with urban communities whose school aid is being cut or capped or

their opportunities to expand and provide futures for their children are somehow being curtailed because a lot of money is being spent to do the sort of job that should be done in urban areas. So that we really have an obligation, not only to absolutely make sure that the job is being done with any money that we spend in the urban areas or in the special needs districts, but that we can do it in such a way so that there is some money for education as a whole in New Jersey, or else this is going to be extremely socially divisive.

And that's why, in my opinion, we really have to understand that decision and understand how far the Department of Education has gone and is willing to go and then take up these questions, the two or three most critical portions of that decision. I don't want to come back in two years and be complaining about the next Supreme Court decision not having made any progress.

SENATOR BAER: Well, it certainly is the biggest challenge, not only because--

SENATOR GORMLEY: I say this respectfully.

SENATOR BAER: --of its potential for--

SENATOR GORMLEY: We'll have the Attorney General at one table, we'll have David at the other table, and we'll go back and forth over-- We have to put some meat on the bones to this, and they're going to offer very sincere, thoroughly prepared reviews of the impact of this. I'd rather start with what's real and what works and try to get to that. And then, if I have to back in to say, and that's what they intended, that's what I'd say. I feel very strongly about this. I think we have dealt with a lot of theory, and I think that

if reading the decision-- Everybody can take from the decision what they choose to.

Senator Martin, how many conferences have you been to, how many presentations on public television where it's gone back and forth? And people are going, "What does that mean?" I want to get to a child. If we can get to 50 or 60 or 100 or 200 children on a practical basis and say, "Here's what we think," I'd like to know how we honestly feel about a delivery of services to children. And then let the Education Law Center or let the Attorney General say that we're wrong, but I'd rather start with what we think works for children because that seems to get lost in all this by the time we weed through all the theory.

Any other comments?

SENATOR BAER: Well, I was starting to say, I think all these things are valid--

SENATOR GORMLEY: Yes.

SENATOR BAER: --no single thing by itself; the practicals you point out and, with as much clarity as possible, what the *Abbott* decision is and all these things that are mentioned -- how these things can be derived, as Senator Robertson pointed out. Because a lot of the stuff that's coming out of the Department it is hard to know exactly how it was decided to be included in and how things were decided to be included out, the simplest of which is, of course, just that number of so many thousand dollars that there is some question in terms of the deriving of that. But I think that we should look at all these things.

SENATOR GORMLEY: What I'd like to do is, I'm going to go over this with the Committee members. And I think everybody's goals will be achieved in terms of review. I'd like to compliment the Committee members because no one can say anybody's passive about this, and no one's wearing a party label on this. This is a genuine concern or these people wouldn't be on this Committee.

SENATOR BAER: Absolutely.

SENATOR GORMLEY: And I think we all want to make a difference for real and not just rush off and hide behind a theory or some simplistic rhetoric.

So thank you. I'm sorry I didn't participate. I won't participate.

MS. FREDE: When we get out in that preschool, we'll make you.

SENATOR GORMLEY: But you had a very difficult task because of the complexity of this and all the elements that go to it. What we'll do is we'll survey the Committee members, we will schedule the next hearing, and we'll try to coordinate the various goals and objectives beforehand before we schedule the next hearing. But we will be -- as Senator Martin said, I think we have to be very active on this issue, and I think we have to be goal oriented. I think we might have to nudge some people along, even if we go further than what might be the traditional legislative role, but I think that's why there's an interest in this Committee. They see a need to possibly go a little further than the normal legislative role, and they want to do it. I appreciate the opportunity that Senator Martin has provided us to be able to do it.

Thank you very much, everybody.

**(MEETING CONCLUDED)**

## APPENDIX





**EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN THE ABBOTT DISTRICTS:  
CHILDREN'S NEEDS AND THE NEED FOR HIGH QUALITY PROGRAMS**

AN INITIAL REPORT OF RESEARCH ON CHILDREN'S EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND COMMUNITY  
CAPACITY FOR THE ABBOTT DISTRICT EARLY CHILDHOOD CONSORTIUM

JANUARY 5, 1999

STEVE BARNETT  
JULIE TARR  
ELLEN FREDE

CENTER FOR EARLY EDUCATION AT RUTGERS  
Graduate School of Education  
10 Seminary Pl.  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901  
(732)932-7496 ext. 235/240

Support for this work was provided by the school districts of the Abbott District Early Childhood Consortium: Asbury Park, Bridgeton, Burlington, Camden, East Orange, Elizabeth, Gloucester City, Harrison, Hoboken, Keansburg, Long Branch, Millville, New Brunswick, Passaic, Pemberton, Perth Amboy, Phillisburg, Pleasantville, Trenton, Union City, Vineland, and West New York.

## **Executive Summary--Early Childhood Education in the Abbott Districts: Children's Needs and The Need for High Quality Programs**

### **Why was this study conducted?**

- Last year's State Supreme Court Decision in *Abbott v. Burke* ordered the provision of preschool education to all 3- and 4-year olds in the Abbott districts by the fall of 1999. These programs must be designed to meet the needs of children in each district so as to enable them to compete with their more advantaged peers at school entry. Although schools can collaborate with community early childhood programs, the goals of Abbott require a level of program quality and intensity that is unprecedented. A Consortium of 22 Abbott districts joined with the Center for Early Education at Rutgers (CEER) to conduct a comprehensive assessment of children's needs and to evaluate the capacity of community programs to assist in meeting those needs.
- In total, 2,200 kindergarten students were assessed, over 3,000 parents of 3- and 4- year old children were surveyed, and all community early childhood program providers indicating a desire to collaborate with the public schools were evaluated with respect to their quality, capacity, and resources needed to ensure that all programs, including community partners, can meet child needs.

### **What are the needs of children in the Abbott districts?**

- Children in the Abbott districts start school at a significant disadvantage to children in non-poor areas. Compared to national norms, children in the Abbott Districts enter kindergarten a half year behind in their academic age, and 1 1/2 years behind in communication age.
- Thirteen percent of Abbott children are so significantly delayed in academic development that they are likely to encounter serious difficulties in school. An additional 17% of children were classified as borderline in their academic development and have a potential for significant difficulties in school without intervention.
- Thirty percent of Abbott children are significantly delayed in communication abilities and 27% are borderline.
- More than half of all children were classified as delayed or borderline delayed in either their academic or communication development.
- Eight percent of the kindergarten children tested have a high probability of a disability despite the fact that children with disabilities leading to placement in special education classes and those retained in kindergarten were excluded from the sample. The typical rate for kindergartners in the United States to be placed in special education is 5-7%.
- Children in the Abbott districts are considerably behind their peers by the ages of three and four in their academic abilities. Nearly 40% of the Abbott children do not know the four colors red, blue, yellow, and green, compared to only a quarter of children in a national sample and less than 10% of more advantaged children. Nearly 2/3 do not know most of their letters. More than half cannot count to 20 compared to a third of more advantaged children.

- One-third of children ages three and four in the Abbott districts had fewer than 10 books in their home compared to 15% of their peers nationally and only 2% of more advantaged children. More than 10% are not read to even once at home in a given week. Virtually every child in families with annual incomes over \$50,000 is reportedly read to everyday at home.
- The vast majority (79%) of parents responded that a full-day program would be educationally better for their child than a half-day program. Almost as many (73%) indicated that a summer program would help their child learn and prepare for kindergarten “a great deal.” Even parents who did not send their child to any center-based program at all, overwhelmingly supported full-day and summer programs for educational reasons.
- Half-day programs offered in the afternoon will not work for over 61% of children who nap in the afternoon. Nearly a quarter of parents reported that their child would attend a half-day program only if it was available in the morning. A quarter reported that their work schedules would not allow them to send their child to a half-day program.

#### **What are the capacity, quality, and needs of community early childhood programs?**

- Half of the preschool children in the Abbott districts do not attend any kind of center-based early childhood program. Half of those are cared for by someone other than a parent in their own home or in another home on a regular basis. Many children who attend a preschool center of some type do so for only a half-day.
- Children who were not enrolled in any center-based preschool program have the greatest developmental needs and the most to gain from the provision of additional programs in the Abbott districts. Head Start serves children with greater needs than do public school and private programs who serve the least disadvantaged. Children attending private programs come from homes with the highest incomes and highest parental education levels.
- Community programs do not now receive the funding and other support they need to provide the quality and intensity of services required by children in the Abbott districts. State licensing standards do not require that programs attain these levels of quality and intensity and state reimbursement levels are insufficient to sustain such efforts. Most community programs need additional resources, particularly for additional staff and increased staff compensation and professional development in order to provide the high-quality intensive educational services needed by children in the Abbott districts. In many programs developmentally appropriate practices occur less often than is required to have an effective program, and there is also a moderately high level of inappropriate practices.
- Quality varies by type of preschool program due to differences in access to resources and program standards. Head Start programs that have more resources to pay higher salaries and benefits and have stricter program standards than state licensing. As a result, they have better staff qualifications and staff/child ratios that lead to higher quality. In addition they deliver comprehensive services that address health and nutrition needs and the special needs of children with mothers who work outside the home. On average, they scored a full point higher on a five point quality scale than other community programs. However, some other community programs showed evidence that they can provide the quality needed despite their current funding levels and the lack of any state requirements that they attain these high quality standards. If provided with higher standards and sufficient funding and other assistance, many community programs could provide the needed services.

### How should the state of New Jersey respond to this new information?

- The state must set standards for all early childhood programs serving children in the Abbott districts that require them to provide the quality and intensity necessary to meet children's needs. It also must ensure that sufficient funding and other assistance is available so that all programs can attain those levels of quality and intensity. As the needs of low-income children in the 125 other districts receiving Early Childhood Program Aid (ECPA) are likely to be similar to those of children in the 22 Abbott districts we studied, it would make sense to extend the standards and funding provisions to all ECPA districts.
- Needs and capacity vary across districts. In reviewing district plans, the state should carefully consider specific information on children's needs and community capacity including the needs of existing programs, public school and community-based, for additional resources. Any plans that do not ensure that all program providers have the necessary resources to provide programs that meet needs in their communities should be revised.
- Most Abbott districts should provide full-day programs in 1999 or at the earliest possible date if this is not feasible. A half-day is unlikely to close the gap in development between Abbott children and their peers elsewhere, and some children will not attend a half-day.
- Schools should be encouraged and assisted to work with community programs that have the potential to provide high quality, intensive preschool education and to assure that such programs receive the supplemental funding and resources needed to attain the necessary quality and intensity.
- Summer, year-round, and extended day programs should be provided for the many children who need and will use these services.
- Funding should be provided for ongoing evaluation of program quality (whether in the public schools or the community) and of programmatic success in achieving the goals fostering improvements in the learning and development of young children in all districts receiving ECPA funds.
- The State must move quickly to fund facilities and streamline the process for construction and renovation. Without rapid expansion, Abbott districts will not have nearly enough classroom space for next year even if they use all existing community facilities.
- Early childhood teacher certification should be reinstated and new professional development programs created to upgrade the training of existing public school and community program staff and to prepare new teachers. Emergency programs are needed to prepare the personnel needed for this fall, and permanent programs are needed to meet long-term needs for personnel. As many of the staff who work in community early childhood programs are themselves low-income, special funds should be made available to pay for the professional development that will allow them to upgrade their qualifications and expertise.

**Table 1. Needs of children ages 3 and 4 in Abbott district families.**

<u>Need Indicator</u>		<u>22 Districts N=3092</u>	<u>National Data</u>	<u>Wealthier Families</u>
Mother's Education:	< 9 years	8%	3%	0%
	9-11 years	14%	11%	0%
	12 years	39%	35%	17%
	>12 years	39%	49%	83%
Income under \$25,000		42%	46%	NA
Primary language in the home is not English		27%	9%	4%
Mother Works		60%	50%	70%
Average hours worked per week		36	33	35
Academic Index		2.35	2.8	3.6
Does not know basic 4 colors		39%	24%	7%
Does not know most letters		65%	59%	38%
Cannot count to 20		54%	51%	34%
Has fewer than 10 books		33%	15%	2%
Never read to at home		11%	5%	0%
Read to everyday at home		41%	53%	67%
Health less than good		6%	2%	0%
Never seen a dentist		45%	42%	30%
Missed breakfast sometime during week		14%	8%	6%
Did not get at least 1 hot meal everyday		16%	11%	9%

Appendix--Table 1A

Need Indicator	Unweighted	Weighted by population	Weighted by mother's education	National Data	Wealthier families
Income under \$25,000	37%	42%	43%	46%	NA
Mother's Education					
<9 years	6%	8%		3%	0%
9-11 years	14%	14%	26%	11%	0%
12 years	41%	39%		35%	17%
>12 years	39%	39%	75%	49%	83%
Primary language in the home is not English	21%	27%	27%	9%	4%
Mother works	61%	60%	59%	50%	70%
Average hours worked	35	36	36	33	35
Academic Index	2.4	2.35	2.3	2.8, sd=1.6	3.6, sd=1.3
Does not know basic 4 colors	36%	39%	39%	24%	7%
Does not know most letters	63%	65%	66%	59%	38%
Cannot count to 20	53%	54%	58%	51%	34%
Has fewer than 10 books	28%	33%	33%	15%	2%
Never read to at home	8%	11%	13%	5%	0%
<del>Not read to everyday at home</del>	<del>36%</del>	41%	47%	47%	30%
Health less than good	5%	6%	6%	2%	0%
Emergency room for routine care	8%	-	9%	8%	0%
Never seen a dentist	45%	45%	45%	42%	30%
Missed breakfast sometime during week	13%	14%	14%	8%	6%
Did not get at least 1 hot meal everyday	15%	16%	16%	11%	9%
No food for >1/2 a day	2%	1%	1%	<1%	0%
Full day better education	72%	79%	79%		
Attend morning only	22%	24%	24%		
Attend afternoon only	5%	5%	5%		
Child naps afternoon	56%	61%	60%		
Child naps morning	4%	4%	4%		
Child doesn't nap	40%	35%	35%		
No safe place to play outdoors	36%	43%	44%		
Summer program would help a great deal	69%	73%	74%		

6x



2951 TD 524  
12-30-99 160265 MC