

CARNEGIE SUMMER 2006 Results

Carnegie Results is a quarterly newsletter published by Carnegie Corporation of New York. It highlights Corporation-supported organizations and projects that have produced reports, results or information of special note.

Why Preschool Pays Off *A breakthrough study links early education to better life choices*

A new report revisits Carnegie Corporation grantee the Brookline Early Education Project (BEEP), which existed from 1973 to 1981 and was the nation's first health and developmental program sponsored by a public school and open to children from birth to three years in adjacent urban and suburban communities. Results of a 25-year follow-up study,¹ conducted between 1998 and 2001, show the potential of high-quality early intervention programs to level the playing field and lead to measurable improvements in participants' school performance and adult life choices—saving taxpayers' money over time.

Early childhood education is *not* as easy as A,B,C. It is challenging and costly, with benefits that can be difficult to quantify. While preschool may be thought of as a recent development in the history of U.S. public education, it's really been around since the 17th century, when the English charity school movement was formed in an attempt to educate poor children. Infant Schools for factory workers' children were adopted by U.S. educators and reformers during the Industrial Revolution, but died out within two decades as American social values changed and mothers were again tasked with educating young children at home. For over a century, preschool's popularity rose and fell with the swing of the economic pendulum, and a two-tier system (custodial day care for the poor versus supplemental nursery school for the affluent) evolved for the care and education of the very young child.² Eventually, the sweeping intellectual

[MORE >](#)



CARNEGIE
CORPORATION
of New York

and social change of the 1960s and 70s dramatically altered the outlook for early education.

Established in 1965 as part of the “War on Poverty,” Head Start, the flagship national program for three- to five-year-olds, is still the largest funded program among an array of federal early childhood education and care programs, according to the U.S. Government Accounting Office.³ The history of Carnegie Corporation’s advocacy on behalf of young children’s care and education is closely intertwined with that of Head Start. Throughout the 1960s, the Corporation supported research that proved crucial in securing and safeguarding federal funds for that groundbreaking program. Over time, when political support for the program flagged, the strength of Corporation-funded projects such as the High/Scope Perry Preschool in Ypsilanti, Michigan sustained policymakers’ belief in the benefits of early education, especially for disadvantaged children, and helped keep Head Start alive. By 2006, more than 23 million children had been enrolled in Head Start at a cost exceeding \$86 billion, and the budget was set at \$6.79 billion for fiscal year 2006.⁴ Given the size of the investment, persistent questions about early education results are inevitable: Are preschool programs effective? Do they reach the right children? Could they do more...or do it better?

For decades, Carnegie Corporation has sought answers to these and other fundamental questions: How do children learn? What do they need to survive, to excel? How should these needs be met? When, in the mid 1960s, the country’s concerns shifted toward social justice, the Corporation’s support went to programs aimed at helping chil-

dren “because they are the least able to protect themselves and because they represent our future,” said Alan Pifer, Carnegie Corporation president, 1967–1982. Program staff saw the existence of Head Start and other expanding support for federal education as providing an opportunity to help shape early childhood education policy by producing sound scientific information on early learning, and one of the primary goals was to achieve a better understanding of the essential, most widely replicable elements of effective preschool programs. Appropriating over \$18 million toward child development projects, the Corporation became the leading foundation in the field.

Given what we now know about the rate and scope of development during a child’s first years of life, the assumption that early education matters may seem obvious. But years of study were required to prove that experiences during this critical period have lifelong implications. A report from the Carnegie Task Force on Meeting the Needs of Young Children concluded that from birth to age three, brain development is rapid, extensive and vulnerable to environmental influences, making children highly sensitive to the protective mechanisms of parental and family support. A strong start in life including such factors as good nutrition, dependable caregivers and community support can promote learning and prevent damage, the study says, influencing how individuals function from the earliest preschool years all the way through adolescence and even adulthood.⁵

Although the scientific community had been aware of the dramatic findings on brain

development for decades, the 1990s saw a burst of enthusiastic activity by zero-to-three advocates that led, some experts felt, to an overemphasis of early development at the expense of other critical developmental periods such as adolescence. Today, most educators and child advocates would recommend a balanced allocation of resources throughout all developmental stages. Still, it is generally accepted that the early years are crucial ones, and although children are resilient and can benefit from later intervention, the costs of reversing the effects of a poor start in life increase as the child grows older. These facts have serious implications for parents and policymakers.

With increasing numbers of children growing up in households where all adults work full time, the demand for optimum preschool and care services, especially for low-income families, is greater now than ever. Yet only three out of five eligible children are served by basic Head Start, early education advocates claim, and only one out of twenty eligible infants and toddlers is enrolled in Early Head Start (which targets the very young). All eligible children—1.5 billion—could participate with a budget of \$10 billion, they contend, and the increased cost would be worth it because public money could be saved in the long run.⁶

A 2005 study conducted by the Rand Corporation, for example, found that “investing public money to make preschool available to every 4-year-old in California would generate an estimated \$2 to \$4 in benefits for every dollar spent.”⁷ A 2005 proposal by the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis states that the annual rate of return on investment in good early childhood develop-

ment programs is 12 percent for society in general.⁸ While there are reasons far beyond economics for protecting young children and their families, the issues of human capital—the combined skills, knowledge and ideas of a nation’s people—are real. For most of this century, increased productivity rates have been attributable mainly to improvements in human capital, a trend that is expected to continue and intensify. According to the Carnegie study, by supporting families during the child’s earliest years, society ensures that children will enter school ready to learn and ready, in time, to be productive workers and good parents.

Despite these reports, there is a lack of national consensus on the benefits of basic early childhood education. Rather, preschool has been a political hot potato from day one, with skeptics claiming there’s no definitive evidence such high-price programs make a lasting difference. The Department of Health and Human Services has a study underway tracking thousands of Head Start participants through the first grade—the outcome of which may largely determine what the future holds for federally funded early childhood education. Preliminary results released in 2005 were open to interpretation. Proponents found evidence that good programs “narrow the school readiness gap between low-income children and their more advantaged peers,” according to the National Head Start Association.⁹ But the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research argued, “this new report found that Head Start has disappointingly small impacts on disadvantaged children.”¹⁰

At the same time, the nonprofit research and service agency WestEd evaluated a number of

smaller programs located in various U.S. communities over the past several decades and determined that, “investing in high-quality early childhood development programs can positively impact children, their families, taxpayers, and the government.”¹¹ Taking a wider view, international studies show other industrialized countries—some far less prosperous than the United States, and representing a wide spectrum of political viewpoints—have made preschool for all children a priority. Early childhood teachers in these countries are also required to have four-year university degrees or to receive specialized training, which helps ensure the programs’ high quality, the American Federation of Teachers claims.¹²

Politics aside, it should be noted that differences in opinion on this subject reflect, to a degree, the inherent difficulties of designing and carrying out reliable research on interdisciplinary programs involving very young children—especially research that involves the entire family and takes place over decades. Nevertheless, there is a growing body of knowledge, based on studies of a variety of programs and approaches, that is helping to fill in some of the gaps in government research, and to which the BEEP follow-up study discussed here may make a valuable contribution.

A Strong, Early Start

In 1972, all expectant parents in Brookline, Massachusetts were offered the opportunity to enroll in an innovative child health and development program, beginning three

months *before* the birth of their baby and continuing until kindergarten. The Brookline Early Education Program, which received over \$2.8 million in grants from Carnegie Corporation of New York plus funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, offered guidance and support to participating parents and their very young children, with the goal of starting the youngsters off in school healthy and ready to learn. In their initial proposal submitted to the Corporation in 1970, the program’s designers explained the thinking behind BEEP: “Although modest gains have been achieved in preschool programs, we do not believe that a comprehensive approach to early education throughout the first five years of life has been tried anywhere,” they wrote. “There is a need for organization of facilities and personnel and for greater continuity of care for each child.”

Carnegie Corporation’s interest in BEEP was consistent with its established philosophy of confronting problems of educational access and equal opportunity. Alan Pifer wrote, “No nation, and especially not this one at this stage in its history, can afford to neglect its children. . . . Not only are they our future security, but their dreams and ideals can provide a much-needed renaissance of spirit in what is becoming an aging, tired and disillusioned society. In the end the *only* thing we have is our young people. If we fail them, all else is in vain.”¹³ In the years leading up to this program, a series of studies on early learning had provided intellectual justification for many of the federal government’s antipoverty programs. At the same time, the groundbreaking book *Intelligence and Experience* by J. McVicker Hunt demon-

strated that intelligence is not determined at birth and fixed forever. Along with other studies of young children's cognitive development, it turned the spotlight on early childhood experience, showing it to be critically important for educational competence and achievement. Reevaluating hundreds of studies of young children, Benjamin Bloom had confirmed the direction of this work in his 1964 book *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*, concluding that, by the age of school entrance, children had developed most of the intelligence they would have at maturity—50 percent by the age of four and an additional 30 percent by the age of eight.

Having helped to establish a foundation of policy-directed scholarship in cognitive psychology since the 1950s, the Corporation chose to build on what was already known by financing experiments in early childhood and preschool education. The Brookline program was one such endeavor. It began, simply enough, because the school superintendent, Robert I. Sperber, had uncovered a problem, explained Margaret E. Mahoney, who was then an executive associate at Carnegie Corporation and later went on to become president of the Commonwealth Fund—the first woman president of a major foundation. “He was extraordinary,” she recalled. “I was sent to talk to him, and he told me that the kids in kindergarten and first grade ‘can’t play with others.’ I came back and told my colleagues that something was wrong, and something had to be done about it.” At her urging, other Corporation staff took a closer look at BEEP and decided it had potential.

Seeing serious problems in the youngest students, Sperber was concerned that public schools

spent more on high school than on kindergarten and primary school, despite evidence that critical cognitive development was taking place in the first eight years of life. And he worried that children who entered school with a learning disability would end up in a cycle of failure, despite the best efforts of talented teachers. Consulting with preschool experts led him to conclude that for programs to have a lasting effect, they should shift their emphasis to prevention, starting not at age three or four but, ideally, at birth. And so the aim of BEEP became to help every child experience the best possible beginning in life by providing resources for the parents, and to draw the family, the school and the medical profession into a relationship of shared responsibility for the child's early development.

“I believe that this is a most significant step forward in the building of sound early education programs,” wrote Mahoney's colleague, the late Barbara Finberg, who believed in and advocated for the program throughout its existence, seeing it as central to the Corporation's interests in learning how to enhance children's cognitive development and help families foster their children's growth in all its aspects. “Brookline proposes not just to develop and carry out a comprehensive program for its children; it intends to examine closely the planning and execution phases, what succeeds or fails and why, the benefits to the children, the families and the community, and the benefit to the school system, educationally and financially,” she wrote.

During her 38 years with the Corporation, Finberg essentially shaped the early childhood education field, emphasizing the need for research about how babies and toddlers learn and draw-

ing attention to the absence of a national policy concerning the early years of children's development, and influencing the board to help bridge the gap in this area of study. The question she strove to answer was not *whether* early childhood education should be available to all, but *how* to provide it.¹⁴ The same search for answers that, on Finberg's recommendation, prompted the Corporation and others to fund Children's Television Workshop and its creation *Sesame Street* in 1968, led soon after to support for the Brookline Early Education Program*, support that continued for over ten years.

BEEP was an experimental medical, diagnostic and educational program aimed at determining whether comprehensive services delivered under public school auspices could enhance children's development in the first five years of life and increase their ability to take advantage of school. Dr. Mel Levine, the program's medical director, developed many of his groundbreaking ideas on neurodevelopment and learning while working with BEEP children and families. He has since written the best sellers *A Mind at a Time* and *The Myth of Laziness*, which explain the effects

**Carnegie Corporation was one of the first foundations concerned with early childhood development, care and education and has continued funding in these areas for over 30 years, influencing social policy and helping to create many innovative programs. In the 1980s, the Corporation's work in middle school reform helped accomplish a restructuring of schools to better meet students' needs. Having met these goals, for the immediate future, the Corporation will concentrate its resources on several large-scale, long-term programs in the areas of advancing adolescent literacy, reforming urban schools and reforming teacher education.*lotta

of variations in the way children learn, and he is a co-founder of All Kinds of Minds, a nonprofit institute dedicated to helping families, educators and clinicians provide strategies to help every child be a more successful learner.

The Brookline Early Education Program's ambitious design involved multifaceted health and education activities—a response to the growing understanding of how children's development was influenced by early experiences, which in turn depended on the involvement of children's families as their first and best teachers. BEEP was a service program, a research project and a social change agent. Because of its longitudinal approach, the study was watched closely by leading education and child development experts. (One problem the staff regularly had to deal with was too-frequent requests for site visits by educators from all over.)

“BEEP was the first program I knew of that was so well integrated,” says Penny Hauser-Cram, an author of the follow-up study who had worked for BEEP first as a preschool teacher and later, during her doctoral studies, as an evaluator. She is now associate professor of counseling, developmental and educational psychology, Boston College and co-chair of the editorial board, Harvard Educational Review. “Besides the innovative combination of services there was a real cross-section of kids, which was exciting for us and de-stigmatizing for the families. It's something that's always talked about but rarely executed.” The program was multicultural and multilingual, and it was open to all residents of the community in the belief that many families

who needed help could best be reached if the program was not labeled as exclusively for “problem” or “high risk” children. “It was a positive, not deficit, approach,” Hauser-Cram says. “Families still look back and say it was the most important thing in their lives.” In 1986, the American Psychological Association Task force on Promotion, Prevention and Intervention Alternatives in Psychology named BEEP as one of a small number of outstanding models to be included in a casebook for dissemination to the practitioner community.

Several circumstances made BEEP unique: The school superintendent’s interest in supporting children’s developmental well-being starting before they were born; the community’s proximity to Roxbury, a racially diverse section of Boston, which opened the door to children from nearby urban neighborhoods (and a separate program that allowed them to stay in Brookline schools through high school); participation of health professionals from Boston Children’s Hospital, the Harvard School of Public Health and the Harvard Graduate School of Education; and continuous input from the project’s dedicated parent advisory council. BEEP was committed to the idea that the family is the most important educational force for a young child. Consequently, much of the program’s work was with parents, increasing their understanding of child development and sharing with them the design of home conditions that would encourage the child’s emerging abilities.

Located in a spacious brick house converted into “The BEEP Center,” the program offered an impressive array of services such as medical screenings, home visits by health and child development experts, playgroups and parenting groups, call-in or

drop-in assistance and a lending library of educational materials and toys parents could take home—all in attractive, functional surroundings that also served as a passive childproofing teaching tool. The program staff emphasized and facilitated children’s access to regular healthcare, and all children had a pediatric primary healthcare provider. The educational philosophy underlying BEEP did not promote accelerating or forcing children’s development; instead, it was “oriented toward arranging for each child an environment rich in resources and in opportunities for the exercise of his or her natural talents,” according to program director Donald Pierson.

The initial enrollment totaled 282 children, one-third of whom were of other than Euro-American background, primarily black, Latino or Asian. As part of the experimental design, upon joining BEEP, families were randomly assigned to one of three groups that would determine the level of program services (assessments, education activities and child programs) available to them. All three groups took part in regular parent conferences and information sessions. The need to randomize did pose a dilemma for staff, according to Hauser-Cram, especially when, due to the experiment’s requirements, families who would have benefited from the most intense level of services ended up in the less-served group. “Inequities within a single program are hard to deal with,” she says.

A study was conducted to evaluate BEEP children and assess the program’s effectiveness when participants entered kindergarten and again in the second grade. By kindergarten, 169 of the original children still attended local schools. (Most of the families lost to attrition had moved away from the Boston area, but

the demographic makeup of the remaining group was relatively unchanged.) At both points in time BEEP children scored higher and demonstrated fewer difficulties in social development and learning skills than comparison children from the same classrooms and similar family backgrounds.

Overall, the greater the child and family's involvement with the program, the more positive the results. Participation in the highest level of program services, for instance, tended to close the performance gap between children of more educated and less educated mothers—a deficit which researchers believed potentially put a child “at risk.” Classroom observations of BEEP kindergarteners in the areas of organization, social behaviors and use of time revealed that participants demonstrated higher levels of competence and school readiness than non-participants from their first days in the classroom. The second-grade results confirmed these findings and provided solid evidence that children's academic performance was influenced for the better.

The Dilemma of Lasting Change

The short-term positive effects of BEEP and similar early education programs on children's social development and academic performance are unmistakable—but the question is, do they hold up over time? A definitive “yes” answer could help secure the future of preschool programs in this country. But the likelihood that measurable positive changes, no matter how significant, will suffer

the “washout effect” as children age has always been a concern for educators, parents, policymakers and taxpayers. This potential problem was addressed by the program's founders, including pediatrician Burton L. White (author of *The First Three Years of Life*), who expressed his belief that the program's continuous parent involvement and health and diagnostic component would increase the odds that children who started out stronger than their peers would maintain that advantage over the long haul.

Expectations for lasting change ran high at BEEP, and there were a number of other programs begun around the same time that were also banking on the promise of new research into early development. While assessments of the long-range returns from early childhood education are still in the primary stages of study and understanding, the earliest rigorous experiments on preschool efficacy have been evaluated. The most promising findings indicate that the real benefits come from nurturing noncognitive skills—social, emotional and behavioral competencies that lead to success later in life—and that positive effects are stronger when programs begin early, because initial improvements help students gain additional skills at the next stage of development.

During its lifespan, BEEP made a positive impression on many in the early education field—so much so, that in the 1970s a number of programs modeled on it were already in existence elsewhere in the country, according to a 1982 article in the *Boston Globe*. This article noted the frequently heard criticism of Head Start that IQ gains were short-lived, but also cited studies conducted over

20 years ago, which demonstrated “the program’s beneficial impact on community activism, aspirations and feelings of enfranchisement.” According to the *Globe*, in 1979, Cornell’s Consortium for Longitudinal Studies had reversed many negative opinions about the value of early interventions by proving that few Head Start children were assigned to special education classes or held back to repeat a grade.

Two more recent benchmark studies in the field, of the High /Scope Perry Preschool Program (1962–1967) in Ypsilanti, Michigan (also a Carnegie Corporation grantee) and the Abecedarian Early Childhood Intervention project (1972–1979) in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, have produced cost/benefit analyses that attempt to quantify the programs’ long-term benefits. In both cases, increased earnings and decreased social costs (e.g., crime and welfare) lead to projections of significant net lifetime social benefits (approaching \$100,000 per participant) from both these experiments.¹⁵ The BEEPers Come of Age study complements these other studies of early intervention, adding valuable information on the effects of services integrated across disciplines—with a particular emphasis on health.

It is a truism that healthy children learn better than those who are physically or emotionally unwell. Ample evidence also exists showing children in families with low educational opportunity are at risk in the areas of health and development. Publicly funded programs including Head Start, which are dedicated to improving outcomes for low-income children, provide a range of individualized services beyond education and development; medical, dental, mental health and nutrition components are living proof that the link between health and learning is

widely accepted.¹⁶ At the same time, these programs vary widely in level and quality of services provided, and most experts and advocates think we can do better. The pediatrics field has been called upon to find new ways to coordinate more effectively with early childhood education efforts. And in addition to the integration of professional services, family involvement, increasingly viewed as a critical component of programs aiming for long-term impact, could play a bigger part.

BEEP, arguably ahead of its time in emphasizing health management and inviting substantive input from parents, has much to contribute to the present-day conversation on the health, educational and psychological benefits of comprehensive preschool programs. The follow-up study conducted by Judith S. Palfrey, M.D., Penny Hauser-Cram, Ed.D., Martha B. Bronson, Ed.D., Marji Erickson Warfield, Ph.D., Selcuk Sirin, Ph.D. and Eugenia Chan, M.D., MPH aimed to identify what long-term effects, if any, BEEP had on participants, and which aspects of the program parents considered most and least beneficial. The study tested the hypothesis that, compared to their peers, children who were part of the BEEP program would go farther in school, have higher incomes and be more physically and mentally healthy.¹⁷ Test subjects were young adults who had been enrolled in BEEP from 1973 to 1978, who were, by the time of the follow-up study, between 26 and 30 years old. The research team spent two years locating people who had been in the program, and almost everyone they found was willing to participate.

Of the 169 children who were part of the program’s second-grade evaluation, 120 young adults were in the follow-up sample. They were compared

to an equal number of Boston and Brookline residents who had *not* been enrolled in BEEP and were of matching age, ethnicity, mothers' educational level and childhood neighborhood. Both groups completed surveys that focused on health, education and income and included questions about receipt of public assistance, employment status, arrest rates and voting (an indicator of civic engagement). The survey, which focused more extensively than any previous study on health-related outcomes, measured three key factors—health behaviors, health efficacy and mental health—all of which are related to the overall life functioning of young adults.

The questions touched on a wide range of behaviors: smoking, drinking alcohol, use of marijuana or other recreational drugs and chemicals, exercising, caring for personal hygiene, sleeping, stress management, medical check-ups, eating nutritiously, controlling weight and using safety precautions. The extent and frequency of depressive symptoms were also measured as an important aspect of mental health. Results were analyzed for BEEP versus comparison samples and urban versus suburban location as well as the interaction of these factors. Participants' parents were also interviewed about their experiences.

Survey results showed the following:

- Whether they were in BEEP or not, young adults from the suburbs had attained higher levels of education than their urban counterparts.
- There was virtually no difference in educational level between suburban BEEP participants and their suburban comparison group.

- Urban BEEP participants had completed more than one additional year of schooling than their urban comparison group.
- Fewer BEEP young adults reported having a low income (below \$20,000). The widest gap existed between the two urban samples: only 28% of BEEP participants had low incomes, compared to 72% of non-participants.
- More than 80% of both suburban samples reported being in very good or excellent health (above the national average of 75%), and they reported having more positive health behaviors and less depression than either urban group.
- While both urban samples reported significantly lower percentages of general good health (64% of the BEEP group and 42% of the comparison group), the BEEP

BEEPers at a Glance

- 93% are employed or in school
- 72% have graduated from college (only 3% did not finish high school)
- 8% were in graduate school at the time of the survey
- 16% are married
- 16% are raising children
- 75% are registered to vote
- 46% have done community service post high school

group reported better health behavior and self-worth and less depression than the comparison urban group.

- Overall, a greater percentage of suburban subjects had private health insurance, but the BEEP urban group had higher rates of coverage than the comparison urban group.
- BEEP participants who stayed in the program longer are doing more intellectually challenging work than other BEEP participants.
- Participants who had the highest level of BEEP services have the best relationship with their parents.

Why did urban BEEPers surpass their peers in educational achievement and income as well as in physical and mental health? The executive skills participants had acquired in their earliest years of schooling, such as planning, organizing and following through, were applicable to non-school tasks and gave these young adults distinct advantages when they became responsible for their own lives, researchers concluded. Along with earlier longitudinal studies, these results indicate that participants in high-quality intervention programs reap long-term benefits that translate into more rewarding lives for themselves and their families as well as savings for taxpayers in the areas of health, education and public assistance. The study also demonstrates that well designed, intensive early education bridges the gap between urban and suburban populations, not only in such expected areas as education and employment potential, but also in personal health management.¹⁸ While there's no real way to test why inclusion

yields good results, "many of the advantages of BEEP have to do with the mix," says Hauser-Cram; "it blunts differences and provides good models."

"The results in health efficacy, especially for participants in urban centers, was surprising," Hauser-Cram says, "since no other study hypothesized this outcome. Clearly, there were advantages to the families, which helped children all the way through. Over time, improved executive function turns into taking charge of their own health care, getting more education and managing life's ups and downs." Families were strengthened by their participation in BEEP, Hauser-Cram found when she conducted a blind study of family/teacher interaction for her doctoral dissertation. Benefits were obvious by second grade, and teachers reported that BEEP parents initiated much more frequent interaction, asking "what can I do for my child?" and demonstrating their desire to be partners and advocates. For these families, Brookline public schools presented an open door.

Parents who participated in BEEP reported overwhelmingly (97%) that they would do it over again, and mothers said they would recommend such a program to their children. More than two-thirds felt the program had an enduring effect on them, especially on their parenting skills, and more than half believed BEEP had made a lasting difference for their child, most notably in the areas of learning and motivation. Over 70% of parents could not think of any negative aspect of the program; the one negative comment mentioned by several people was that services should have continued beyond kindergarten. Mothers valued the home visits more than any other part of the program, urban parents appreciated the learning opportunities provided to their chil-

dren and suburban parents considered the medical and developmental exams to be most important.

Smarter Kids, Healthier Adults

What do the lives of BEEP young adults teach us? According to the researchers, program participants, especially those living in urban communities, are significantly better off than their peers in terms of education and income, and appear to be better caretakers of their own physical and mental health. These findings are consistent with kindergarten and second-grade evaluations of BEEP, where children had more positive peer relationships and stronger skills than other students, and they point to an important, understudied, potential result of comprehensive, family-focused, early education programs. In other words, it's important to look beyond the temporary IQ gains and take into consideration the improved life skills that have lasting impact.

BEEP could be replicated today, in Hauser-Cram's opinion, but it would *not* be inexpensive. "With commitment on the part of school systems, we could well be moving toward public preschools as a way of serving all children. It is possible." She sees a trend emerging for centers providing a range of services to move further into early childhood. In fact, a number of full-service, or integrated service, schools, already exist and evaluations of them are just now beginning to come out. These community-based institutions offer legal, health, psychological and social services and ESL for par-

ents, all in the school building, often after hours. "It's one-stop shopping and it works much better than a piecemeal approach," says Hauser-Cram. Cross-discipline training is essential for these new, integrated models, she cautions, and professionals must take steps to prevent hierarchies that elevate one discipline, such as medicine, above all others because, "we all have something to learn from each other."

BEEP would also be relevant today. Its inclusive approach predated the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by decades and the mix of participants, including children with autism, developmental delays and mental retardation, might be similar to that found in an early childhood program in 2006. There is also a growing interest in programs like BEEP, because they stress parent involvement and emphasize self-regulation and executive functioning skills. However, "these are different times," Hauser-Cram stresses, "and future projects must take into account social issues such as racism, neighborhood safety, economic disparity and the excessive pressure on today's children." She is concerned that the present emphasis on measurable academic achievement may mean that social interactions are neglected. In her view, "there is a critical need to deal with behavior problems and to provide mental health services for young children—and for parents who may need help helping children." Although the BEEP follow-up study's small sample size, particularly for urban youths (a total of 50 subjects) was a real limitation, the long-term benefits it reveals still prove that the best early interven-

tion programs pay off by lessening the need for costly remediation later, among other benefits, and that children who have been part of such a program are more likely than their peers to make a positive contribution to the community. While young adults are generally healthy, outcomes such as early death, HIV and teen pregnancy, which disproportionately affect youths in low-income neighborhoods, might be mitigated by high-quality preschool programs, giving urban and suburban children similar chances of success. There are also important implications here for continuous involvement by pediatricians and parents, the authors conclude. Given the vital importance of healthy behaviors and adaptive mental health during the young adult years, these findings add a significant dimension to what is already known about the benefits of early education.

Endnotes

- ¹ “The Brookline Early Education Project: A 25-Year Follow-up Study of a Family-Centered Early Health and Development Intervention,” *Pediatrics* 2005.
- ² Cahan, Emily D. *Past Caring: A History of U.S. Preschool Care and Education for the Poor, 1820–1965*, New York: National Center for Children in Poverty, 1989.
- ³ “Education and Care: Head Start Key Among Array of Early Childhood Programs, but National Research on Effectiveness Not Completed.” Statement of Marnie S. Shaul, U.S. General Accounting Office Testimony Before the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.
- ⁴ Head Start Program Fact Sheet (www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/hsb/research/2006/html).
- ⁵ Carnegie Corporation of New York, “The Quiet Crisis.” In *Starting Points: Meeting the Needs of Our Youngest Children* (www.carnegie.org/starting_points/startpt1.html).
- ⁶ Background on 2005 Head Start Reauthorization

(www.results.org/website/article.asp?id=618).

⁷ Karoly, Lynn A., and James H. Bigelow. *The Economics of Investing in Universal Preschool Education in California*. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 2005.

⁸ Rolnick, Art, and Rob Grunewald. “Early Childhood Development: Economic Development with a High Public Return.” Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, *Fedgazette* March 2003 (minneapolisfed.org/pubs/fedgaz/03-03/earlychild.cfm).

⁹ Background on 2005 Head Start Reauthorization (www.results.org/website/article.asp?id=618).

¹⁰ Besharov, Douglas J. “Head Start’s Broken Promise.” *On The Issues* American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, October 2005.

¹¹ Lynch, Robert G. “Early Childhood Investment Yields Big Payoff.” *Policy Perspectives*, 2005.

¹² “Early Childhood Education: Building a Strong Foundation for the Future.” American Federation of Teachers, Educational Issues Policy Brief, July 2002.

¹³ Pifer, Alan. “The Report of the President.” Annual Report, Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1978.

¹⁴ Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe. *The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy*. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1989.

¹⁵ “A New Framework for Assessing the Benefits of Early Education.” Committee for Economic Development (CED), September 2004.

¹⁶ About Head Start (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/hsb/about/generalinformation/index.htm>).

¹⁷ “The Brookline Early Education Project: A 25-Year Follow-up Study of a Family-Centered Early Health and Development Intervention.” *Pediatrics* 2005.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

Written by: Karen Theroux. Theroux is an editor/writer in the Corporation’s Public Affairs department with many years’ experience in educational publishing and communications.

BEEP Program Publications

- Blackman, James A., Melvin D. Levine, Martha T. Markowitz and Cary L. Aufseeser. "The Pediatric Extended Examination at Three: A System for Diagnostic Clarification of Problematic Three-Year-Olds." *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics* September 1983.
- Bronson, Martha B., Donald E. Pierson and Terrance Tivnan. "The Effects of Early Education on Children's Competence in Elementary School." *Evaluation Review* 1984.
- Hanson, Margaret A. "The Nurse's Role in Early Childhood Education." *Pediatric Nursing* November–December 1977.
- Hanson, Margaret A., and Melvin D. Levine. "Early School Health: An Analysis of Its Impact on Primary Care." *Journal of School Health* December 1980.
- Hauser-Cram, Penny, Donald E. Pierson, Deborah Klein Walker and Terrance Tivan. *Early Education in the Public Schools: Lessons from a Comprehensive Birth-To-Kindergarten Program*. Hoboken, N.J.: Jossey-Bass, 1991.
- Kronstandt, Diana, Frank Oberklaid, Thomas E. Ferb and Janet P. Swartz. "Infant Behavior and Maternal Adaptations in the First Six Months of Life." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* July 1979.
- Levine, Melvin D., Robert Brooks and Jack P. Shonkoff. *A Pediatric Approach to Learning Disorders*. New York: John Wiley, 1980.
- Levine, Melvin D., Lynn J. Meltzer, Betsy Busch, Judith Palfrey and Maureen Sullivan. "The Pediatric Early Elementary Examination: Studies of a Neurodevelopmental Examination for 7- to 9-Year-Old Children." *Pediatrics* June 1983.
- Levine, Melvin D., and Frank Oberklaid. "Hyperactivity—Symptom Complex or Complex Symptom?" *American Journal of Diseases of Children* April 1980.
- Levine, Melvin D., and Frank Oberklaid. "Precursors of School Failures." *Pediatrics in Review* July 1980.
- Levine, Melvin D., Frank Oberklaid, Thomas E. Ferb, Margaret A. Hanson, Judith S. Palfrey and Cary L. Aufseeser. "The Pediatric Examination of Educational Readiness: Validation of an Extended Observation Procedure." *Pediatrics* September 1980.
- Levine, Melvin D., and Judith S. Palfrey. "The Health Impact of Early Childhood Programs: The Assessments of Program Effects." Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, January 1982.
- Levine, Melvin D., and Judith S. Palfrey. "The Health Impact of Early Childhood Programs: Perspectives from the Brookline Early Education Project." In *Learning From Experience: Evaluating Early Childhood Demonstration Programs*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 1982.
- Levine, Melvin D., Judith S. Palfrey, George A. Lamb, Herbert I. Weisbert and Anthony S. Bryk. "Infants in a Public School System: The Indicators of Early Health and Educational Need." *Pediatrics* 1977.

- Levine, Melvin D., Ruth Wolman, Frank Oberklaid and Donald E. Pierson. "The Systematic Monitoring of Findings in Childhood: An Interdisciplinary Evaluation Process." *American Journal of Diseases of Children* 1981.
- Levine, Melvin D., Ruth Wolman, Frank Oberklaid and Donald E. Pierson. "The Longitudinal Study of Findings in Childhood: Analysis of an Interdisciplinary Process." *American Journal of Diseases of Children* April 1982.
- Meltzer, Lynn J., Melvin D. Levine, Margaret A. Hanson, Richard Wasserman, Deborah Schneider and Maureen Sullivan. "Developmental Attainment in Preschool Children: Analysis of Concordance Between Parents and Professionals." *Journal of Special Education* Vol. 17, No. 3, 1983.
- Meltzer, Lynn J., Melvin D. Levine, Judith Palfrey, Maureen Sullivan, Cary L. Aufseeser and Frank Oberklaid. "Evaluation of a Multidimensional Assessment Procedure for Preschool Children." *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics* September 1981.
- Palfrey, Judith S., Melvin D. Levine, Frank Oberklaid and Marc Lerner. "An Analysis of Observed Attention and Activity Patterns in Preschool Children." *Journal of Pediatrics* June 1981.
- Palfrey, Judith S., Melvin D. Levine and Donald E. Pierson. "Antecedents of Middle Childhood Performance: A Study of Preschool Service Needs." In *Middle Childhood: Development and Behavioral Pediatrics*. Baltimore, Md.: University Park Press, 1985.
- Palfrey, Judith S., Melvin D. Levine, Deborah K. Walker and Maureen Sullivan. "The Emergence of Attention Deficits in Early Childhood: A Prospective Study." *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics* Vol 6, No. 6, December 1985.
- Pierson, Donald E., Martha B. Bronson, Elizabeth Dromey, Janet P. Swartz, Terrence Tivnan and Deborah K. Walker. "The Impact of Early Education: Measured by Classroom Observations and Teacher Ratings of Children in Kindergarten." *Evaluation Review* April 1983.
- Pierson, Donald E., and Robert Sperber. "The Brookline Early Education Project: An Issue for National Educational Policy." *Childhood Education* January 1974.
- Pierson, Donald E., Deborah Klein Walker and Terrance Tivnan. "A School-Based Program from Infancy to Kindergarten for Children and Their Parents." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* April 1984.
- Swartz, Janet P., and Deborah Klein Walker. "The Relationship Between Teacher Ratings of Kindergarten Classroom Skills and Second-Grade Achievement Scores: An Analysis of Gender Differences." *Journal of School Psychology* Vol. 22, 1984.
- Tivnan, Terrence, and David B. Pillemer. "The Importance of Small but Consistent Group Differences on Standardized Tests: The Case of Sex Differences on the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* April 1978.
- Whitesides, Barbara. "The Brookline Early Education Project." *Young Children* November 1977.

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 371-3200
Fax: (212) 754-4073
Web site: www.carnegie.org

Vice President, Public Affairs:

Susan Robinson King

Editor, Director, Publications

and **Public Affairs:** Eleanor Lerman

Editor/Writer: Karen Theroux

Program Associate: Ambika Kapur

Communications Coordinator: Adrienne Faraci

Editorial Assistant: Philip A. Sanchez

Public Affairs Assistant: Patricia Pagnotta

Researcher: Ronald Sexton

Carnegie Corporation of New York is a philanthropic foundation created by Andrew Carnegie in 1911 to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States. Subsequently, its charter was amended to permit the use of funds for the same purposes in certain countries that are or have been members of the British overseas Commonwealth.

Board of Trustees

Helene L. Kaplan, Chairman

Martin L. Leibowitz, Vice Chairman

Vartan Gregorian, *Ex officio*

Bruce Alberts

Pedro Aspe

Geoffrey T. Boisi

Richard H. Brodhead

Fiona Druckenmiller

Amy Gutmann

James B. Hunt, Jr.

Thomas H. Kean

Olara A. Otunnu

William A. Owens

Ana Palacio

Norman Pearlstine

Thomas R. Pickering

Richard W. Riley

Janet L. Robinson

Raymond W. Smith



©2006 Carnegie Corporation of New York. All rights in photographs, illustrations, artworks and other graphic materials are reserved to Carnegie Corporation of New York and/or the copyright holders (licensors).

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

BARBARA FINBERG

1929–2005

Barbara Denning Finberg was a philanthropist and nonprofit leader credited with focusing the nation's attention on the need for early childhood education policy. During her 38 years at Carnegie Corporation of New York, her work spotlighted research about how babies and toddlers learn and revealed the absence of crucial national attention to the early years of children's development. While at Carnegie Corporation, Finberg, both a program officer and corporate officer, made many grants that advanced research and practice in the child development field. Among many other accomplishments, her work led directly to the creation and launching of the PBS television show *Sesame Street*, which was funded by the Corporation. When she retired from Carnegie Corporation in 1996, Finberg was executive vice president overseeing the administrative and programmatic work of the foundation begun by Andrew Carnegie in 1911. Upon retirement, she became a partner in MEM Associates, a consultancy for philanthropy and nonprofits

Non-profit Org.
US Postage
PAID
St. Louis, MO
Permit No. 4767