

Madam Chair, Senator Casey, members of the committee, thank you for inviting me to testify on this important topic.

Because I understand that the other witnesses will make the case for investing in young children (something that I strongly agree with in theory), I will discuss what I see as the underlying question before you: Deciding how to make that investment so that it has a reasonable chance of being a success, or, to borrow a phrase from the investment world, does not go sour. That is the real challenge before you, and the nation.

Because my time is short, I decided to put my testimony in the form of a series of questions and at least partial answers. Also, although there has been a tendency to speak about the goal of “universal preschool,” I will address only programs for low-income children because their needs are greatest.

Many of the points I make below are discussed in greater detail in “Giving Head Start a Fresh Start” in *Handbook of Families and Poverty*, eds. Russell Crane and Tim Heaton (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, forthcoming, 2007).

1. *Is there a serious achievement gap between low-income and more fortunate children, and should it be a matter of government concern?*

Yes. On a host of important developmental measures, a large and troubling gap exists between the scores of low-income children and more fortunate children. This gap, commonly called the “achievement gap,” but really much more multi-dimensional, curtails the life choices, employment opportunities, and earnings potential of large numbers of children, especially African Americans, Latinos, and other disadvantaged minorities.

Regardless of what causes the gap, government should be concerned about its impact on the children and families involved as well as on the larger society. Government’s response, however, should be guided by a full and accurate understanding of what causes the gap and what can be done about it.

2. *What is the cause of the achievement gap, and can a preschool program reduce it?*

The achievement gap has many causes, from the poverty stemming from a history of discrimination and curtailed opportunity to the child-rearing styles of many disadvantaged families—with cause and effect intermingled in multiple and controversial ways. The plain fact is that the family is the primary teacher of young children—and compensatory programs face a much larger challenge than the advocates’ rhetoric commonly suggests.

The argument that preschool programs “work” stems largely from the widely trumpeted results of two small and richly funded experimental programs from 40 and 30 years ago: the Perry Preschool Project, and, later, the Abecedarian Project.

*Douglas J. Besharov is the Joseph J. and Violet Jacobs Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research and a professor at the University of Maryland School of Public Policy. He was the first director of the U.S. National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, and is the author of *Recognizing Child Abuse: A Guide for the Concerned*, published by the Free Press.

They cost as much as \$15,000 per child per year in today's dollars, often involved multiple years of services, had well-trained teachers, and instructed parents on effective child rearing. These programs are more accurately seen as hothouse programs that, in total, served fewer than 200 children. Significantly, they tended to serve low-IQ children or children with low-IQ parents.

As you may know, I have been a critic of too easy assertions that Head Start, pre-K, and other early childhood education programs can reverse such deep-seated developmental deficits. Many of the studies that are used to support this line of argument are, simply put, not methodologically sound. Furthermore, most advocates tend to ignore the many studies that show these programs have little effect on children. For example, most objective observers have labeled the results of the Head Start Impact Study "disappointing." If this study is to be believed, Head Start simply fails in its mission to help prepare students for school.¹

I point this out not because I am hostile to the idea of Head Start—far from it—but because it hurts me to see a program so important to disadvantaged children not be successful.

That's why the findings of recent studies are so heartening. Both "Project Upgrade" (funded by HHS and evaluated by Abt Associates) and "Reading First" (funded by the Department of Education and evaluated by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.) used the most rigorous techniques—and they both show that a properly or narrowly focused, early childhood intervention can make a significant improvement in at least some elements of the cognitive development of disadvantaged children. (The same seems to be true for a number of state preschool or pre-K evaluations.)

But those four words—"properly or narrowly focused"—hint at how complicated and politically controversial the next steps will be. Many experts in child development have successfully argued for less direct, cognitive-oriented instruction and more play-oriented and discovering-learning activities. Yet, according to Nicholas Zill, former director of Child and Family Studies at Westat, Inc., "the latest research evidence indicates that direct assessments of cognitive skills at kindergarten entrance are predictive of both early and later achievement, into the later grades of elementary school and beyond."² In fact, the most successful interventions tend to use specific curricula that focus on building specific cognitive skills (such as reading, vocabulary, and math). But even these "successful" models do not make a socially significant improvement in many areas of child development—and many tend to ignore the child's social development.

Let me be as clear as possible here: *I read the research literature to say that preschool programs can probably make a marked improvement in the lives of disadvantaged children, but that we have only a partial idea of how they should be organized and managed, that is, brought to scale. As of now, there is no actual model of preschool services that has been proven successful in closing the achievement gap, and any additional funding should be used to create a flexible system that can change—and improve—as more knowledge is accumulated.*

3. Should funding for early care and education be expanded, and if so, for whom?

As asked (and answered), this question usually assumes that most poor children do not now receive early childcare or education. But that is not quite correct, and an accurate answer to this question requires an understanding of current patterns

¹See U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, *Head Start Impact Study: First Year Findings* (Washington, DC: HHS, June 2005).

For 4-year-olds (half the program), statistically significant gains were detected in only six of thirty measures of social and cognitive development and family functioning (itself a statistically suspect result). Of these six measures, only three measures—the Woodcock Johnson Letter-Word Identification test, the Spelling test and the Letter Naming Task—directly test cognitive skills and show a slight improvement in one of three major predictors of later reading ability (letter identification). Head Start 4-year-olds were able to name about two more letters than their non-Head Start counterparts, but they did not show any significant gains on much more important measures such as early math learning, vocabulary, oral comprehension (more indicative of later reading comprehension), motivation to learn, or social competencies, including the ability to interact with peers and teachers.

Results were somewhat better for 3-year-olds, with statistically significant gains on 14 out of 30 measures; however, the measures that showed the most improvement tended to be superficial as well. Head Start 3-year-olds were able to identify one and a half more letters and they showed a small, statistically significant gain in vocabulary. However, they came only 8 percent closer to the national norm in vocabulary tests—a very small relative gain—and showed no improvement in oral comprehension, phonological awareness, or early math skills.

For both age groups, the actual gains were in limited areas and disappointingly small. Some commentators have expressed the hope that these effects will lead to later increases in school achievement; however, based on past research, it does not seem likely that they will do so.

²Nicholas Zill, e-mail message to Douglas Besharov, May 3, 2006.

of childcare and early education. That is not as simple as one might think because of the overlap among various programs and the lack of a centralized program data base.

We have created such a data base, with financial support from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (childcare Bureau and Head Start Bureau), the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) (at Rutgers University), and the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Our Early Education/childcare (“ee/cc”) Model is essentially an Excel-based model of current childcare and early education program spending and enrollment. According to our model, which has been widely vetted:

- almost all *poor 5-year-olds* are in kindergarten or another school or preschool program (about 96 percent);
- almost 85 percent of all *poor 4-year-olds* are in either Head Start (about 48 percent); a full-time, subsidized childcare program under the Child Care and Development Fund (about 29 percent); or a preschool program (about 7 percent);
- about 43 percent of *poor 3-year-olds* are in such organized programs; and
- much lower proportions of *poor children under age 3* are in such programs.

(See table 1.)

Hence, the question is not simply whether funding for preschool programs should be increased, but, just as important, how any new funding should be spent within the context of existing services.

4. *What are the options available to Congress for expanding childcare and early childhood education programs?*

Congress’ decision about how to expand early care and education programs is complicated by the fact that three largely separate and independent programs uneasily coexist in most communities. Each has major strengths and weaknesses, and any expansion effort should try to rationalize their currently uncoordinated operations.

1. *Enrich childcare programs by encouraging or requiring the use of curricula with a proven ability to raise achievement. An increasing number of low-income mothers have jobs, especially since welfare reform.* According to the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), in 2002, about 19 percent of poor mothers of 4-year-olds worked full-time, and about 16 percent worked part-time. For 3-year-olds, the respective figures were both about 17 percent.³ As a result, enrollments in childcare programs have increased substantially, and Head Start no longer enjoys the dominant place in the constellation of Federal childcare and early childhood education programs.

As late as the 1980s and early 1990s, Head Start was by far the largest early childhood program, amounting to over 40 percent of all Federal and related-state spending in some years. But by 2003, Head Start had fallen to only about 32 percent of total childcare spending,⁴ largely because of recent increases in childcare funding associated with welfare reform. (Between 1997 and 2004, for example, spending under the five major childcare programs—the Child Care and Development Fund, Head Start, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, the Child and Adult Care Food Program, and the Social Services Block Grant—rose about 79 percent, from about \$11.65 billion to about \$20.89 billion, compared to only about 45 percent, from \$4.69 billion to \$6.77 billion, for Head Start.⁵)

For many years, it was said that the nation had to make a tradeoff between high-quality but expensive programs like Head Start and lower quality childcare programs designed to help low-income mothers who have jobs. Recent research efforts such as “Project Upgrade” and “Reading First” strongly suggest that, at modest additional cost, childcare programs can be more effective than Head Start in narrowing key elements of the achievement gap. This would have the advantage of being the least expensive option (see table 2), but would not deal with the children in Head Start nor those with parents who are not working. It would be an incomplete solution, at best.

³ Authors’ calculation based on U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation 2001 Panel Wave 4, from data files downloaded at <http://www.bls.census.gov/sippftp.html#sipp> (accessed February 1, 2005).

⁴ Douglas J. Besharov and Caeli A. Higney, “Federal and State childcare Expenditures, 1997–2004: Rapid Growth Followed by Rapid Spending” (College Park, MD: University of Maryland, Welfare Reform Academy, 2006), <http://www.welfareacademy.org/pubs/childcare/childcarespending060907.pdf> (accessed January 26, 2007).

⁵ Douglas J. Besharov and Caeli A. Higney, “Federal and State childcare Expenditures, 1997–2004: Rapid Growth Followed by Rapid Spending” (College Park, MD: University of Maryland, Welfare Reform Academy, 2006), <http://www.welfareacademy.org/pubs/childcare/childcarespending060907.pdf> (accessed January 26, 2007).

Moreover, despite the recent extremely promising evaluations of focused curricula, many childcare specialists think that making a meaningful improvement in the quality of childcare would require much more money and a high level of regulation. There is also some reluctance to embrace curricula that focus on cognitive achievement at the cost of social development. Most important, without addressing Head Start's problems, this strategy would not address the needs of the much larger number of children in that program.

2. *Improve Head Start's services so that it does a better job closing the achievement gap and expand its hours of operation to meet the needs of working mothers.* This would have the advantage of building on an existing nationwide network of federally funded programs focused on poor children. But besides Head Start's disappointing impacts on child development, reorienting it to serve the growing number of children whose mothers have jobs would be a major and severely disruptive undertaking.

It would also be very expensive. (See table 2.) Head Start is already the most expensive form of early intervention. By our estimate, the basic, part-day program costs about \$5,608 per child. Expanding Head Start to full-time, full-year would bring costs to about \$20,607 per child—and that would not address Head Start's apparent inability to meet the developmental needs of poor children. Moreover, if the past is any guide, the Head Start community would oppose such moves and, instead, press for the program to serve younger children and higher-income children without changing its approach to early childhood educational services.

It is worth noting that private foundations, state policy-makers, and parents have decided against the Head Start option. Many liberal foundations have already shifted their support away from Head Start and toward the expansion of preschool or prekindergarten ("pre-K") services—which siphon off hundreds of thousands of children from Head Start programs. Many states have likewise begun funding expanded prekindergarten programs, again at Head Start's expense.

Perhaps the best indication of Head Start's slumping reputation comes from low-income parents themselves, who often choose not to place their children in Head Start. One can see this in the declining proportional enrollment of 4-year-olds, Head Start's prime age group. Between 1997 and 2006, even as the number of poor 4-year-olds increased and as Head Start's funded enrollment increased by about 15 percent (about 115,000 children) almost all of this increase went to 3-year-olds and to Early Head Start. In those 8 years:

- the number of enrolled 4-year-olds *decreased by about 3 percent*, from 476,285 to 463,693;
- the number of enrolled 5-year-olds *decreased by about 24 percent*, from 47,629 to 36,368;
- but the number of enrolled 3-year-olds *increased by about 33 percent*, from 238,143 to 318,220;
- the number of children in Early Head Start *increased by about 186 percent*, from 31,752 to 90,920; and
- the number of children enrolled in Head Start for 2 or more years *increased by about 55 percent* or about 100,000 children (from about 180,000 to about 280,000).

3. *Expand state pre-K and preschool programs.* The new prekindergarten/preschool programs for low-income children established in many communities seem to be enormously popular. State spending on these state-funded prekindergarten/preschool programs, which serve mostly low-income children,⁶ increased greatly over the last decade and a half. Comparing estimates from the Children's Defense Fund and from the NIEER, it appears that state spending on these programs about tripled between the 1991/1992 and 2004/2005 school years, going from about \$939 million⁷ to about \$2.75 billion (\$2.84 billion in 2005 dollars).⁸

School-based prekindergarten programs, alone, now enroll more children (of all incomes) than Head Start, and at their current growth rate, will soon be the dominant early childhood education program for low-income children. According to the U.S. Department of Education, total prekindergarten enrollment (of all ages and in-

⁶The National Institute for Early Education Research, *The State of Preschool: 2004 State Preschool Yearbook*, stating: "Most states targeted their programs to low-income children and children with other background factors that place them at risk for starting school behind their peers."

⁷Karen Schulman, Helen Blank, and Danielle Ewen, *Seeds of Success: State Prekindergarten Initiatives 1998–1999* (Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, 1999), p.31.

⁸W. Steven Barnett and Kenneth B. Robin, "How Much Does Quality Preschool Cost?" (working paper, National Institute for Early Education Research, 2006), <http://nieer.org/resources/research/CostOfEffectivePreschool.pdf> (accessed March 9, 2007).

comes) almost tripled between 1990/1991 and 2000/2001 (the latest year with comparable data), rising from about 300,000 children to about 800,000 children.⁹

The expansion of these programs is still uneven. In the 2004/2005 school year, ten states had no program at all.¹⁰ Others were quite small. Nebraska's, for example, covered only about 1,000 children at a cost of about \$2.1 million. But a few are effectively universal, such as Georgia's, which now provides prekindergarten/preschool access to all 4-year-olds, regardless of family income. The program operates 5 days per week for at least 6.5 hours per day. During the 2004/2005 school year, the program spent about \$276 million and served over 70,000 4-year-olds (covering about 55 percent of all 4-year-olds, and about 26 percent of all 3- and 4-year-olds), resulting in an average per-child cost of about \$3,899.¹¹

Why the apparent preference for prekindergarten programs? Perhaps parents find them more attractive than Head Start because of their seeming universality. Although most pre-K programs are directed to low-income children, they generally serve children from families with incomes as high as 185 percent of the poverty line.¹² Or perhaps it is because parents deem pre-K programs to be superior, especially since they are usually in school buildings and staffed by better educated teachers. Certainly, the few evaluations of these programs suggest that they are substantially more successful than Head Start.

In any event, judging from the growth in enrollments, expanding preschool programs is apparently the most popular option available to Congress. Doing so, however, would not provide assistance to low-income children under age 4, and would also be expensive if expanded to cover the full-time care needed by the children of working mothers. (The NIEER estimates the cost to be about \$13,556 per child.)

Moreover, these pre-K programs are unlikely to have a meaningful impact on the most distressed children and families—who need earlier and more intense intervention.

4. What should Congress do?

To be successful, any expansion of early childhood education programs should (1) build on—but also rationalize—these three key programs and (2) allow them to change over time as needs change and as experience and research suggests programmatic shifts.

Rationalizing the three key early education programs starts with the understanding that we should not have a one-size-fits-all approach to early childhood education. Head Start, for example, tries to do too much for some children—and too little for others. Despite the conventional rhetoric, not all poor children have the cognitive and developmental problems that prompted Head Start's creation. Many poor children do not need the array of support services provided by Head Start and, based on the evidence, do just fine in regular childcare when their mothers work. Children from the most troubled families (usually headed by young, single mothers), however, need much more than the program currently provides.

Hence, at the risk of being wildly impractical, I would suggest an approach that recognizes the differing needs of low-income children:

(1) *Childcare programs.* A strong commitment to early childhood education should be added to childcare programs funded under the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF). This program is largely and successfully operated through a voucher system to parents. Although this should not change, a systematic and on-going effort at both the Federal and state levels to identify effective curricula and program

⁹U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics 2003*, NCES 2005-025, "Table 40. Enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools, by level and grade: Fall 1987 to fall 2001," (Washington: U.S. Department of Education, 2004), <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d03/tables/dt040.asp>, (accessed April 11, 2005). These data on 1990/1991 and 2000/2001 prekindergarten enrollment come from the Common Core of Data, as reported by the Department of Education's *Digest of Education Statistics*.

¹⁰The states offering no prekindergarten/preschool program were Alaska, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. See, W. Steven Barnett, Jason T. Hustedt, Kenneth B. Robin, and Karen L. Schulman, *The State of Preschool: 2005 State Preschool Yearbook* (New Brunswick, NJ: The National Institute for Early Education Research, 2005), <http://nieer.org/yearbook2005/pdf/yearbook.pdf> (accessed March 16, 2007).

¹¹W. Steven Barnett, Jason T. Hustedt, Kenneth B. Robin, and Karen L. Schulman, *The State of Preschool: 2005 State Preschool Yearbook* (New Brunswick, NJ: The National Institute for Early Education Research, 2005), <http://nieer.org/yearbook2005/pdf/yearbook.pdf> (accessed March 16, 2007).

¹²W. Steven Barnett, Jason T. Hustedt, Kenneth B. Robin, and Karen L. Schulman, *The State of Preschool: 2003 State Preschool Yearbook* (New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research, 2003).

approaches (such as those described above) could be the basis of professional and parental education and, hence, wide-scale program improvement.

(2) *Pre-K and other preschool programs.* As described above, these programs have grown dramatically; they already enroll more children than Head Start. Because these programs are largely state-funded, the first question one might ask is whether the Federal Government should become involved at all. But that is probably a naive question. Even those states already spending money on preschool programs will be eager for Federal assistance, despite the possibility of more Federal oversight.

My concerns are two-fold. First, it is not clear how most preschool programs will be integrated into full-time childcare arrangements for the children of working mothers. At present, they seem to require the same kinds of awkward “wrap-around” services as Head Start. Second, most of these programs have been established in public schools and it is not clear to me whether we want to create another education monopoly. Why not give parents the right to select the preschool program of their choice? (As mentioned above, the CCDF operates largely on that principle.) That would also encourage the creation of flexible programs that meet the varying needs of working mothers.

(3) *Head Start.* The current Head Start model is just not sufficient, in terms of both its services and curriculum. It generally consists of only 4 hours a day of classroom instruction (some grantees provide more), for less than 9 months. And, despite Head Start’s claims about “parent involvement,” there seem to be no systematic efforts to include parents in the program or to give parents better child-rearing skills.

The best thing would be for Head Start to go back to its roots, to search for ways to make a meaningful improvement in the lives of the poorest, most disadvantaged children. It might, for example, provide services to unwed teenagers that start during their first pregnancy. Focusing on the most in need, the new Head Start would be truly two generational, that is, with real services for parents (not just the current lip service to parent involvement), and it would bring to bear all the programmatic services that have developed since Head Start was first conceived—the Women, Infants, and Children program (WIC), Medicaid, the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant program, the Community and Migrant Health Center Program, and the Title X program, which seeks to reduce unintended pregnancy by providing contraceptive and related reproductive health care services to low-income women.

Before closing, I want to emphasize what I hope has been my clear theme: A strong case can be made for expanded early childhood education services, but only in the context of program flexibility (enhanced by vouchers) and systematic and rigorous research and evaluation. We have so much more to learn.

Congress should mandate a systematic program of research and experimentation, one that tries and evaluates different approaches to see what works best. We simply do not have a scientifically tested knowledge base about which approaches work—and for whom. Needed is a scientifically rigorous inquiry into the comparative effectiveness of various curricula and program elements, such as full-day versus part-day and 1- versus 2-year programs, traditional 9-month versus full-year programs, classroom size (paralleling work on class size done at the elementary level), the training or formal education of teachers, and effective ways of helping parents do a better job meeting their children’s needs. Most important, distinctions among children from different family backgrounds and with different degrees of need will be crucial.

Such a multifaceted research and development effort could be patterned after the new one for K-12 education established under the No Child Left Behind legislation. That effort enjoys a \$400 million annual budget, compared to only \$20 million for Head Start research. A tripling of Head Start’s research budget would be a good start. If no new money is available, Congress could reallocate some of the \$30 million to \$111 million now designated in the pending reauthorization bills for quality improvements (especially since about half of these funds go to raise the salaries of Head Start staff, already among the highest in the early childhood education world).

Conducting such an inquiry will require substantial intellectual and political effort—because of the turf battles it would trigger, the scientific challenges involved in designing so many multi-site experiments, and the sustained monitoring and management needed. Nevertheless, without an effort on this scale and without such intellectual clarity, it is difficult to see how better approaches to childcare and early childhood education can be developed.

Thank you.

Table 1.—Combined Coverage of Income-Eligible Children in Head Start and Selected Other Arrangements
By Age
(2000/2001)

Age	Total poor children		At enrollment								Total combined coverage of poor children
	Number		Nonpoor children in Head Start		Poor children in Head Start		Poor children in preschool, prekindergarten, and school		Poor children in full-time, subsidized childcare		
			Number	Coverage	Number	Coverage	Number	Coverage	Number	Coverage	
3	694,743	86,426	209,536	30%	38,574	6%	50,871	7%	43%		
4	697,681	137,032	332,226	48%	201,216	29%	50,871	7%	84%		
5	673,753	11,064	26,823	4%	580,992	86%	39,131	6%	96%		
3-5	2,066,177	234,522	568,585	28%	820,782	40%	140,872	7%	74%		

Sources and notes: "Total poor children" based on special tabulations by Richard Bavier, Office of Management and Budget, based on: U.S. Census Bureau, 2002 Annual Social and Economic Supplement to the Current Population Survey (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002); U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Head Start Program Information Report for the 2000-2001 Program Year" (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, undated); U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "Prekindergarten in U.S. Public Schools: 2000-2001," NCES 2003-019 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2003), <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsub/2003019.pdf> (accessed December 19, 2003); U.S. Census Bureau, "School Enrollment—Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 2001, Detailed Tables," table 2, "Single Grade of Enrollment and High School Graduation Status for People 3 Years Old and Over, by Age (Single Years for 3 to 24 Years), Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: October 2001," <http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/school/cps2001/tab02.pdf> (accessed April 25, 2005); and Child Care and Development Fund: Special tabulations of 2001 CCDF data prepared for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, childcare Bureau, by Anteon Corporation, 2003. "Nonpoor Children in Head Start" is Table 1's "Total reported nonpoor enrollment," divided by the PIR's age distribution for cumulative enrollment. "Poor children in Head Start" is the total Head Start funded enrollment, distributed by age, minus the number of nonpoor children. "Total combined coverage of poor children" is the number of poor children in Head Start added to the number of poor children in preschool, prekindergarten, school (including kindergarten), and full-time, subsidized childcare.

Table 2.—Cost Comparisons: Head Start, Early Head Start, CCDF childcare, and
Prekindergarten/Preschool
(2003/2004)

Cost	Head Start		CCDF		Pre-K/ Preschool
	Ages 3–5	Ages 0–2	Ages 3–5		Ages 3–4
	(HS)	(Early HS)	Center	Family	
Average per child (regardless of hrs)					
Head Start Bureau estimate ..	\$7,222	\$7,222
Besharov/Myers estimate	\$9,381	\$15,999	\$8,100	\$7,225
NIEER estimate	\$3,435
Part-day and full-day sessions					
Besharov/Myers estimate					
(part-day)	\$5,608
Besharov/Myers estimate					
(full-day)	\$12,570
Hourly (across all durations)	\$8.99	\$10.21	\$4.18	\$3.81	n/a
Hourly (full-time)	\$8.41	\$10.17	\$3.52	\$3.15	\$5.53
Hourly (part-time)	\$10.51	\$12.71	\$4.45	\$3.96	n/a
Full-time, full-year (50 hours/ week, 49 weeks/year)	\$20,607	\$24,904	\$8,616	\$7,709	\$13,556

Source: Douglas J. Besharov, Justus A. Myers, and Jeffrey S. Morrow, "Costs Per Child for Early Childhood Education and Care: Comparing Head Start, CCDF childcare, and Prekindergarten/Preschool Programs (2003/2004)," (June 22, 2007).

