

**MULTIPLE PROGRAM COORDINATION IN EARLY
CHILDHOOD EDUCATION**

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT
MANAGEMENT, RESTRUCTURING
AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————
MARCH 25 AND MAY 11, 1999
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Governmental Affairs



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

57-615cc

WASHINGTON : 1999

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

FRED THOMPSON, Tennessee, *Chairman*

WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr., Delaware	JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut
TED STEVENS, Alaska	CARL LEVIN, Michigan
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine	DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio	RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico	ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi	MAX CLELAND, Georgia
ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania	JOHN EDWARDS, North Carolina
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire	

HANNAH S. SISTARE, *Staff Director and Counsel*

JOYCE A. RECHTSCHAFFEN, *Minority Staff Director and Counsel*

DARLA D. CASSELL, *Administrive Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT,
RESTRUCTURING, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio, *Chairman*

WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr., Delaware	RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire	ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey

Kristine I. Simmons, T3Staff Director

Marianne Clifford Upton, *Minority Staff Director and Chief Counsel*

Julie L. Vincent, *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

Opening statements:	Page
Senator Voinovich	1, 21
Senator Durbin	3

WITNESSES

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1999

Marnie S. Shaul, Ph.D., Associate Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, accompanied by Eleanor Johnson, Ed.D., Assistant Director; Harriet Ganson, Ph.D., Assistant Director; and Janet Mascia, Senior Evaluator, General Accounting Office	5
---	---

TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1999

Olivia A. Golden, Assistant Secretary, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	24
Judith Johnson, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of elementary and Secondary Education, U. S. Department of Education	26

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

Golden, Olivia A.:	
Testimony	24
Prepared statement	51
Johnson, Judith:	
Testimony	26
Prepared statement	54
Shaul, Marnie S.:	
Testimony	5
Prepared statement	45

MULTIPLE PROGRAM COORDINATION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1999

U.S. SENATE,
OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, RESTRUCTURING,
AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:04 a.m., in room SD-342, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. George Voinovich, Chairman of the Subcommittee, presiding.

Present: Senators Voinovich and Durbin.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR VOINOVICH

Senator VOINOVICH. I call this Subcommittee to order. Good morning. I am not as good as the Chairman of this Subcommittee on being on time, but it is not too bad. We would like to welcome you to this hearing on Coordination of Early Childhood Programs Across Federal Departments and Agencies.

This is the first hearing of the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management in the 106th Congress, and I am pleased that we are holding it on a subject as important as early childhood education. Ensuring the best learning environment of our children, even before they reach school age, was my number one priority when I was governor of the State of Ohio.

It is also important to know that all children entering school ready to learn is the number one national education goal. I think we forgot about our eight national goals. But number one is that all children by the Year 2000 will enter school ready to learn. Every year, while I was governor, we put out a report on how we were doing on those eight national goals.

In my first State of the State address as governor, I said the only way to stop the cycle of poverty is to pick one generation of children, draw a line and say this is where it stops.

In order to deal with that, we created something called Family and Children First, and that was an effort to promote coordination and collaboration among State and local governments, nonprofit organizations and parents and bringing together service providers to cut red tape and refocus systems on families rather than on bureaucracy, and it has really given us a boost in terms of dealing with the problems of our youngsters. I am proud to say that every eligible child, whose parent wants them to be, is in Head Start or preschool.

I would like to see if the commitment that I have had could be followed here in the Senate. And that is why I have been disturbed by recent reports putting the number of Federal education programs in the hundreds. A high number of programs was not always indicative of a well-managed effort. In fact, it may indicate that we have lost track of what is out there and who is being served.

The House Education and Workforce Committee's Education at the Crossroads Project produced a comprehensive list of 760 Federal education programs across 39 agencies. And Senator Frist's Education Task Force published a figure from the General Accounting Office stating that there are 552 Federal education programs and 31 agencies.

If you look at the chart behind me, you can see for yourself that GAO found that just 34 of the 552 programs are within the Department of Education. Twenty-eight other programs, like Head Start, are administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, and scores more by other departments and agencies. It is all over the place. It will take you several hours to figure out what is going on there, and then some.

In the long term, I believe we need an accounting of these programs to find out the extent to which they overlap and duplicate each other, identify gaps in coverage that need to be filled and learn whether this web of education programs we have developed is the most efficient way to benefit student learning and support quality teaching.

In the short term, we need to examine the degree to which the programs we already have are being coordinated in order to achieve maximum results. This need for coordination among agencies with responsibility for early childhood development is the focus of our hearing this morning.

Every day I wear this pin, it says, "Our Children," and people think I am kind of a nut because I always wear it, and I wear it because it reminds me that you can make a difference.

It came about as a result of Mothers of Fragile Children picketing my office as governor for 6 months, and they wanted to have their children taken care of at home rather than in institutions. I was told by my agencies there is not anything we can do for them. And after we created our Children and Family First Cabinet Cluster, we got all of the agencies in State government that deal with children and families and got them in the same room. We spent a year, actually, kind of getting them to understand they had a symbiotic relationship.

The first challenge I gave them was figure out how we can take care of these moms, and they figured it out. Today, we have 3,000 kids that are at home that are fragile. As a result of that effort, we have two child care centers now in the State that are open for these fragile children and regular kids, where they can go to school together. It proved to me that if you can get everyone working together, if you have shared goals, that a great deal can be accomplished.

I have been working on a piece of legislation to deal with prenatal to 3 and looking at various Federal programs. But I am convinced that far more will occur, in terms of prenatal to 3 if we could get all of the Federal agencies together at a table, have them

talk about the challenges that are there and figure out how they could do a better job of coordinating their efforts. That would really, I think, make a much better difference than perhaps legislation that we would pass because the people who really know the programs would be getting together and talking about how it can be done.

Today, we are going to be hearing from the General Accounting Office. I understand at the Federal level that we have something called the Government Performance and Results Act. Senator Durbin, I think they call it the Results Act. I guess that is the vehicle to bring all agencies together. I am anxious to hear from the General Accounting Office just how well they are coordinating their efforts and if there is duplication. I would like to welcome today witnesses from the General Accounting Office.

Before we proceed, though, to introduce you, Marnie, and other members that are here with us this morning, I would like to call on Senator Durbin, who is the ranking member of this Subcommittee, for his comments.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR DURBIN

Senator DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really appreciate the opportunity to have this hearing. Education is so near and dear to my heart and yours as well. I know from our conversations that, as governor of Ohio, you made it one of your highest priorities.

It is interesting to me that there are times that are kind of downers or depressing in public life, and whenever I feel that way I head on out to a Head Start program. It is a real shot in the arm to sit there with those kids and those teachers. I always leave there charged up and ready to go. That is just one example.

Education, particularly of the youngest, really gives me such hope for this country. I mentioned to Senator Voinovich yesterday that I put my staff to work to answer a very basic question, and that is why education in America starts at age 6. How did we come up with age 6? They never could find an answer. They went to the Congressional Research Service, the Department of Education, and I finally concluded, just from my experience as a parent, that is about the age when kids will sit still. When I started school, that was one of the prime requirements; sit at your desk and be quiet, and if you could not do that, you were in deep trouble.

But I think that this is important because, as I reflect on education, I really come to the same conclusion as the Chairman of this Subcommittee. The educators I speak to, if you ask them, "If we could add a year of education to a child's education, where would you put it?" without fail, say at the beginning, an earlier start in education so that we can really try to give kids a positive learning environment and some constructive help toward becoming productive citizens. And that is why these early childhood programs are so important.

Having said that, I think some of the agencies involved here and some of the people involved here, despite their best intentions, get caught up in a mind set, a turf battle, jurisdictional problems. I read here that the Federal Government administers 90 early childhood programs through 11 agencies and 20 offices. That is a recipe for duplication and inefficiency.

I have addressed the food-safety issue, which has similar contours in terms of its problem. But when it comes to education, we have so few dollars and so many kids, we just cannot waste them on overlapping administration and conflicts that are created by bureaucracy inspired by Congress or other sources, and that is why this hearing is so important.

I hope that the General Accounting Office will help us get to the bottom of this and to try to find ways to come up with more effective delivery of resources so the kids across America have a fighting chance. And I hope that we will challenge some of the basics before it is all over.

We are about to embark on a new century, and I would like us to really step back and ask a few basic questions. Should school start before the age of 6? Should a school day end after 3 o'clock? Should kids be off for 3 months in the summer? There are some students back here who will probably nod yes, but that really comes back to us from an era when kids had to go work on the farm, and I do not think a lot of kids do that any more.

There are some basics that we ought to be asking and answering, and I am glad that this opening session of this Subcommittee will start asking those questions.

Thanks, The CHAIRMAN.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you, Senator.

I think that the one fact that the American people have got to understand is that all of the research shows that what happens from conception to age 3, that period, is the most important period in the development of a child, and it is probably the most neglected area on the Federal and on the State level. I would hope that, as a result of the efforts that we are making, that we can reorder our priorities and start putting our resources into that area, where it will make the most difference in the lives of children. And the other side benefit of that is, is that it be the greatest return that we can make on investing in education.

It would be interesting, Senator, for you to know that when I got started with this effort to increase Head Start in Ohio that many people did not look at Head Start as education. We had to convince some of the teachers that, if the kids do not get the Head Start, when you get them to school, they are not going to be successful when they are there and that, frankly, if that money is not invested, your chances of being successful with them later on are diminished.

So we are looking forward to the testimony this morning. We have with us, today, Marnie Shaul, Associate Director of Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues for the General Accounting Office. That is a mouthful, Marine.

Ms. SHAUL. It is also our new name. We just merged with another group on Monday.

Senator VOINOVICH. Dr. Shaul is accompanied by Eleanor Johnson, Assistant Director; Harriet Ganson, who is the Assistant Director; and Janet Mascia, who is the Senior Evaluator. All of them are with the General Accounting Office.

We welcome you today, and we are anxious to hear what you have to say.

Dr. Shaul.

TESTIMONY OF MARNIE S. SHAUL, PH.D.,¹ ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, EDUCATION, WORKFORCE, AND INCOME SECURITY ISSUES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, ACCOMPANIED BY ELEANOR JOHNSON, Ed.D., ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE; HARRIET GANSON, Ph.D., ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE; AND JANET MASCIA, SENIOR EVALUATOR, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Ms. SHAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee. We appreciate the opportunity to discuss how the Results Act can assist congressional oversight, especially in the area of early childhood where, as was pointed out, the Federal Government invested about \$14 billion in multiple programs across multiple agencies in 1997.

As the Chairman pointed out, I have with me a team today who are the folks at GAO who have been most responsible for our work on early childhood education and early child care.

Specifically, I would like to discuss how the Results Act can address congressional oversight, especially where there are multiple programs within and across departments serving similar target groups. Then, I will discuss how two departments, the Department of Education and HHS, which together administer more than 50 percent of the early childhood program funds, address the coordination of these programs in their strategic and performance plans.

In summary, the Congress can use the Results Act to improve oversight of cross-cutting issues. However, based on our review, the Departments' plans fall short of the potential expected from the Results Act. While the plans address coordination, to some extent, they have not described in detail how they will coordinate their efforts. Therefore, the plans' potential for addressing fragmentation and duplication have not been realized, and we cannot assess whether the agencies are effectively working together based on their plans.

I would like to briefly elaborate on each of these points and ask that my written statement be included in the record.

The Results Act can be used to address mission fragmentation and program overlap. The act requires executive agencies, in consultation with the Congress and other stakeholders, to prepare strategic plans that include mission statements and goals and also prepare annual performance plans that link the long-term goals with the day-to-day activities of the program managers and staff.

As the agencies began developing their plans, they were told that the Federal programs contributing to the same or similar outcomes were expected to be closely coordinated, consolidated or streamlined. By doing this, it was expected that goals would be consistent and program efforts mutually reinforcing across agencies.

The Results Act requirements provide opportunities for Congress to intervene to address mission fragmentation. For example, as the agencies develop performance measures, it will be easier to tell whether they are addressing similar goals. Common performance measures also will permit comparison of programs across agencies,

¹The prepared statement of Ms. Shaul appears in the Appendix on page 45.

and that will help decisionmakers sort through competing requests for funds for these programs.

Education and HHS's Administration for Children and Families, which is where their early childhood programs are housed, address the goals and objectives of their early childhood programs in their strategic and performance plans. However, the strategies and activities that relate to coordination are not as well described. The Education plan provides a more detailed description of coordination strategies and activities than the ACF plan, including some performance measures that may cut across programs. For example, the Education performance plan states that the Department will work with HHS and other organizations to align indicators of progress, such as children's school readiness. These common indicators could potentially be used as a basis for identifying how different agencies contribute to goals related to children's cognitive development.

The ACF plan describes in more general terms the Agency's plans to coordinate with external and internal programs dealing with early childhood goals. For example, it identifies the need to coordinate with the Department of Education concerning the Head Start program, along with other internal and external stakeholders in this area. However, it does not define how this coordination will be accomplished or the means by which cross-cutting results will be measured.

Overall, the information presented in both plans does not have the level of detail, definition and identification of common measures that Congress needs to assess results and identify potential inefficiencies in program operations.

GAO reviewed the performance plans in 1999 for all of the agencies who were required to prepare plans, and we observed then that progress in coordinating cross-cutting issues and programs is still in its infancy with regard to these plans, even though the agencies are recognizing the importance of coordination.

We believe that the agency performance plans can provide the building block for recognizing cross-cutting efforts, but that performance plans, at this time, are not sufficiently well developed in order to do that across all of the agencies, especially for early childhood programs. This underscores, I think, the importance of congressional hearings, like this one, to explore ways to identify and resolve program fragmentation and overlap.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement, and I would be happy to answer any questions you or members of the Subcommittee might have for us.

Thank you.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you.

Obviously, this Results Act had some admirable goals. And from your observation plans have been absent of the information that you need to ascertain whether or not there is an effort to coordinate with other agencies and to assess whether or not there are common goals among those agencies.

Ms. SHAUL. I think that, when you read the plans, you can see that agencies mention each other. So there is a recognition that there are agencies that are contributing to a goal like early childhood development. However, it is a question of what do you mean

by coordination. Just talking to another agency or saying you are going to talk to another agency is not really a sufficient level of detail to see exactly how coordination will occur.

What one would want to see, I think, is whether the agencies are developing some shared goals, say, around early childhood or perhaps their performance indicators could be better aligned so that they are measuring similar kinds of things, and you can see how together they are contributing to the same goal.

The performance plans are very detailed plans, but there is more emphasis on individual programs within a particular department, and the cross-cutting issues are not as well developed.

Senator VOINOVICH. The Department of Education has the first national goal, and from our information, HHS does not have that goal as part of their Head Start program. Is it your opinion that, if they both had that goal and then figured out those agencies and programs within the departments, that it would be a much better way of achieving the coordination that we would like to see?

Ms. SHAUL. I believe that is true, Mr. Chairman. When the agencies first started developing their plans, they were asked to, as I said, develop the performance goals and measures, and there was not an explicit requirement for them to demonstrate exactly how they were coordinating. When the plans were developed, the Congress said we believe this is the vehicle that should be able to be used by us to determine whether there are programs that are cross-cutting in nature and whether there are programs that should be consolidated, streamlined or whether they are duplicative. OMB followed that up with some guidance to the agencies indicating that agencies were expected to include this kind of information in the plans.

The agencies are beginning to acknowledge that and beginning to do that. This is the second round of performance plans. In our opinion, the plans are not at a point yet where the cross-cutting issues are as well developed as the things that were originally required in the act.

Senator VOINOVICH. Are they privy to your report and have you had an opportunity to sit down and talk to any of the Secretaries or their deputy secretaries or whoever you get a chance to speak to?

Ms. SHAUL. The GAO has issued some reports about the performance plans, the 1999 series. We are currently in the process of reviewing the year 2000 plans as an agency for all of the agencies that were required to do the performance plans. So we will be briefing members of Congress, their staffs, over the recess period on the results of our findings, and we will make that information available to the agencies as well.

Senator VOINOVICH. Senator Durbin.

Senator DURBIN. Dr. Shaul, you said in your testimony one disadvantaged child could potentially have been eligible for as many as 13 programs. Many programs reported serving only a portion of the target population with long waiting lists. You give an example of the child care programs associated with retraining people to return to work, contrasted with Head Start, which certainly has a child care component to it.

How do we break out of this? I sense that we have here a lot of people who understand their own version of the world, but can't see the big picture. I'm not sure if it was Mark Twain or someone like him who said, if the only tool you have is a hammer, every problem looks like a nail.

And in this situation, we have people who just view children in a narrow category, in a narrow context, instead of looking at the big picture. Have you seen examples where this has been overcome, where people have said let us look at the child instead of the program and try to get a result in terms of that child's life?

Ms. SHAUL. That certainly is the way in which I think one should think about these issues. Actually, on this question, I would like to turn to Ms. Janet Mascia, who has done much of our work on early child care. Because I think one of the issues has been the difference between how the child care system views what it is trying to do with the child, especially in the world where more and more families have both parents working, as contrasted with the developmental role that Head Start has tried to play, and how it is the two groups are beginning to try and think about this problem differently.

Ms. MASCIA. Well, I think at the State level, as you know, Senators, that is where a lot of the overcoming of these barriers happens. And, for example, under the new block grant, with the merging of several of the old AFD funding for child care, States now have a lot more flexibility because they are not dealing with different eligibility requirements to use those funds, for example, at the service delivery level with, for example, merging with a Head Start provider to provide more of a full day, full year kind of child care.

So I think, at the service delivery level in the States and localities, this kind of thing is happening. However, it still is a struggle to bring all of those resources together because, as we all pointed out, you are dealing with different agencies and different funding sources, and there still exists, to some degree, those kinds of barriers in terms of making those funds seem seamless to the child and to the family and to make it work for the child where the impact happens.

Senator DURBIN. So as you are peeling away the layers on the onion to find these barriers, does it start with the legislation that we pass? I mean, does Congress establish standards, eligibility standards, for example, funding cycles that really create conflict so that leadership at the State level, whether it is a governor in Ohio or Illinois, that wants to overcome it, says so the first thing we have to do is figure our way around all of these Federal requirements, this maze of regulations and laws that make it so difficult to get to the bottom line?

Ms. MASCIA. Right. It certainly does start at the Federal level, in terms of the Congress, as well as the Executive Branch. There is certainly legislation out there that does not plan these kinds of barriers. But as we know, all of that gets translated into regulations, and sometimes inadvertently those barriers crop up there. So it does happen.

And even at the State level, there are the State's priorities that goes on at the State level. So it is a chain, so to speak, a chain re-

action all of the way along. So at any point along that continuum, and certainly, obviously, our influence is at the Federal level, where we can lift that or help that, certainly affects it along the way, I believe.

Senator VOINOVICH. I can say this to you: We created these Family and Children First Councils, and it came from indigenous leadership. It is an interesting thing that after our Cabinet Cluster met for a year, they had this great idea, we are going to create these councils on the local level, and I am a former county commissioner, and I said, "If I am a commissioner, and you are going to mandate this, I am going to be very irritated with you."

So we turned it around. We put an RFP, and we challenged the counties to come in with plans on how they would coordinate the public-private for young children and families, and so they came back with their plans. We started out with 13, and today we have one now in every county, and they are all different. But one of the things that ran across all of them was the multiplicity of programs. And if you had a family at risk, and you were mentioning 13 or 14 social workers in the same family to access various programs, and one of the first things they did was to try to eliminate that and have one person that would be kind of the family consultant that would help refer them out to where they needed to get help.

The other thing that we had to do was to take and, quite frankly, were not sure whether it was legal, but we got various agencies to take a portion of their budget and put it into one agency. So that when a family came in, they would be able to administer all of the needs of that family.

When Congress passed Welfare Reform, and we went to the TANF program, and that is one thing that Congress really ought to look into is the flexibility that came about with the use of that money has just been fantastic because it was much easier to find wrap-around programs for families, and you had a lot more flexibility to deal with it and to cut some of the red tape that was associated with the former program. But a lot of this stuff starts in Washington, and then when it hits the local level, they have to figure out ways how they can get out from under it or around it, and that ought not to be the way it is.

I would be interested in your opinion on how do you best approach the agencies—as a member of Congress, how would this Subcommittee, for example, best approach the agencies to get them to fulfill what Congress originally anticipated in the Results Act, in terms of their coordinating their efforts to achieve mutual goals and to maximize their programs and the dollars that we are providing for them? How do you do that? How do we get that done?

Ms. SHAUL. Well, one way, Mr. Chairman, is, under the Results Act, there is supposed to be a consultative process that, when agencies are developing their performance plans, they are supposed to come in and talk with the Congress, as well as other stakeholders, to discuss their goals, and strategies and their performance measures. The agencies are also, from the OMB perspective, supposed to be looking over each other's shoulders at each other's plans to identify the ways in which they share some common goals and some programs that may be very similar.

I do not know the extent to which either one of those processes have been used. We have issued one report that said that the consultative process has had some benefits, but it has not been used, perhaps, as extensively because the whole Results Act process is fairly new, and perhaps more conversations, as the plans are being developed, between the Congress and the agencies would be very helpful, particularly where there are several agencies that may be, for example, working on early childhood issues.

Senator VOINOVICH. In terms of your report, is there enough specificity in the report so they understand your criticisms in terms of lack of coordination and mutual goal setting?

Ms. SHAUL. I believe that GAO has said several things; one, that across agencies the cross-cutting issues have not been as well developed as the other within-agency performance goals and indicators, and we have acknowledged that the agencies are fairly early into doing the Results Act process. This is only their second plan, and we are expecting that they will get better and better at doing their plans and that the cross-cutting issues will become better addressed year-by-year. But this is the second time around, and I am sure that, both from a Governmentwide perspective and on an individual Agency perspective, we will be giving feedback to the agencies that cross-cutting issues need to be better defined in their plans.

Senator VOINOVICH. I would like to welcome Senator Edwards from North Carolina. Senator, we are glad to have you here. He is a member of the Committee and not a member of this Subcommittee, but he is interested enough in children that he was interested in stopping by this morning to find out a little bit about what we are doing with this.

Senator EDWARDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would you like me to proceed? I do not want to interrupt what you all are doing.

Senator VOINOVICH. We are at the questioning stage right now. But if you have some comments that you would like to make, we are happy to have you here with us.

Senator EDWARDS. Thank you very much. Only what you have already said, which this is an area of great interest to me, and I think the efficient use of our Federal education dollars is critical, as you all have already discussed.

I might add I have heard some of the discussion about early childhood programs, particularly Head Start. In our State, in North Carolina, we have a program which you are probably familiar with called Smart Start, which has been started by our governor, Governor Hunt. It has been extraordinarily successful, and the success continues to climb, as time goes on. I think it is interesting to watch, as I have been watching over the course of the last few years. Head Start and Smart Start complement one another. I am just interested in continuing to learn about this subject, Mr. Chairman. I do not have any questions at this point, but I appreciate you allowing me to attend.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you. Senator Durbin.

Senator DURBIN. Let me go into a specific area that relates to this, and I do not know that much about Smart Start. But in Illinois we have had a pre-kindergarten program, and it has been run by the State government through the school system.

I can recall several years ago when someone proposed that the Head Start program move into the school system, the public school system of America. Some Head Start programs are in public schools. But in its creation 35 years ago, I think, intentionally, Congress did not put Head Start into the school system, and the reason I think—and I am just guessing at this—was concerns in that era about whether poor and minority children would receive a fair shake if they went into the public school system, and so they said we will do this separately. And back in the “Great Society” era, they created a mechanism for Head Start where it really is, by its nature, separate.

And yet I think it gets to the heart of this discussion today and your investigation as to what is the most efficient way to deal with this. Certainly, you would want Head Start and the school system to have complementary programs. You would want to know that if a child had a learning disability, discovered at an early age, that you were addressing it with the best professionals. So that by the time the child arrived in kindergarten, they would be ready to learn.

Can you address this, in terms of your perspective, as you have looked at the Head Start program, and this whole question of whether or not integrating that into the school system is really putting a clash between two cultures that have been created over the last 3 decades.

Ms. SHAUL. Dr. Ganson.

Ms. GANSON. In terms of looking at the Head Start program, first, I think one way that Head Start is now reaching out to get involved with school systems, as well as other organizations, child care programs, is through the collaboration grants. And in that way, they are meeting the needs of the community by hooking up with child care programs, getting wraparound care, perhaps some of that in the schools so that the preschool would be in the morning and in the afternoon they would be in the school for child care. So they are doing that through collaboration grants.

In terms of whether it should be in the schools or not, the philosophy of Head Start has always been that the grantee would do a community assessment, community needs and that they are different, and within their community they would take whatever course of action would make sense, be that in a school or through hooking up with other organizations. But I think you are right in terms of there is a trend now to go more toward pre-K programs. I think New York has one now. So you are seeing more of them.

Senator DURBIN. There is another interesting aspect of this, I believe, and that is, if you take a look at where you are going to put the pre-K child, that pre-K child, in a baby-sitting situation may be under the supervision of a person being paid \$2 an hour, in a day care center, a person being paid \$5.50 an hour. I am not sure what the average wage is at Head Start. My guess is it is a little better than \$5.50 an hour. If the child were in a kindergarten in a public school system, the teacher in charge is probably making a fairly decent income, at least in comparison to the other two or three. So there is a real disparity in income of the adult supervision that we are providing for these kids, depending on the setting that they end up in.

Ms. GANSON. Well, I think the other part of it is that, when we think of the school system, we think of the educational system, and I believe what Head Start would say is that the Head Start program is a comprehensive child-development program. And in that sense, it provides health services, nutrition services. It involves parents in ways that school systems would not. So, in that sense, it is different. It also provides educational services.

Senator VOINOVICH. It is interesting that you want to improve the quality of the staff and the teachers. At the same time, you do not want to rule out the participation that we have had over the years in the Head Start program because so often a lot of people are not aware of this, that you cannot participate in Head Start unless the parents are involved, and it is not 100 percent, but it is pretty good. And it is amazing the transformation that occurs when the parents get involved with their children.

I know, 2 years ago—every year I give out Governor's Awards, and I gave one out to a former Head Start mom, who started out there, got her undergraduate degree, went on and got her Ph.D. But it started out as a Head Start mom, and she got into it, and the Head Start program also connects up those families with other social services that exist there. One of the things in this legislation that I am contemplating introducing here one of these days is an expenditure, a modest expenditure, to pay for satellite dishes that we have in Ohio that are bringing in education to child care and Head Start Centers to improve the education of those individuals that are working in those centers and also to educate the parents on how they can better develop their children when they leave their child care for Head Start sitting at home.

So it is a real challenge to improve it, but I think if you just move them into the regular system, I think you might lose a lot of that. And, quite frankly, it would cost a great deal I think more money if that occurred.

I would like to just ask one other question, and then I will send it back to Senator Durbin. If you were sitting in our seats right now, and you wanted to guarantee that the agencies that are involved in early childhood are doing what the Results Act wants them to do; that is, to coordinate and to try to see how they can maximize their resources to make the biggest impact, how would you go about getting them to do that?

Ms. SHAUL. I think if I were in your shoes, I think this hearing is a very good start, as folks are on notice that you are interested in this question, and you are specifically interested in how agencies are going to coordinate, and that is not going to go unnoticed.

I think that letting the departments know about your concern about having the cross-cutting issue of early childhood addressed would be good. You certainly could have people from the departments come in and talk with you about their performance plans and how they are addressing this issue, the cross-cutting aspect of it in their plans. That would be, I think, a good set of first steps.

Senator VOINOVICH. I would like to ask Senator Durbin, because I am new to the Senate, and I am not sure just what we can or cannot do because of the separation between the legislative and the executive branches of Government. But if we asked the departments to review that portion of the GAO report that dealt with

early childhood, and then said to them we would like them to sit down with other departments and to discuss that, and then to come back and report to this Subcommittee about what their response is to the GAO report, and then what they are planning on doing in order to remedy that situation and work together, is that a legitimate request that we can make or do we not get into that kind of thing?

Senator DURBIN. Well, as a seasoned veteran of 24 months in the Senate— [Laughter.]

Senator DURBIN. I think it is a great idea, and I think we ought to just move forward on it. I like that because it really puts some substance to the suggestions from the GAO and their observations and lets the agencies come back and report to us in terms of what they have done and what they will do about it. I like it.

Senator VOINOVICH. Eleanor?

Ms. JOHNSON. I think a series of hearings also provides a forum, just as you said you had seen the value of drawing all of the agencies in the State around a table and talking. Using this forum would also allow the agencies to more clearly communicate to you what coordination they are doing.

I do not want you to leave here thinking that HHS and Education never talk to teach other. They certainly do, and they have joint projects and regularly talk about specific programs. For example, they have been working out mutual indicators for Head Start and Even Start. Head Start is run by HHS and Even Start is run by Education.

So there are a lot of coordination activities going on. However, part of the difficulty that we have had in answering your questions has been that all of these things do not appear in the plans. Just the fact that you have singled out an area or a small handful of areas that are really of critical importance to you from a policy standpoint and alerts the agencies that you are interested in really understanding how they are working together on these issues will start all kinds of things happening.

Senator VOINOVICH. Senator Edwards.

Senator EDWARDS. I was just curious. I know from talking to some of our folks here in North Carolina, that the perception existed that the reason that we needed to do Smart Start, which is the State government program, was that Head Start was not being as effective as we might hope. Have any of you done any sort of look or study at the distinctions between Head Start and Smart Start in North Carolina, any familiarity with that subject?

Ms. SHAUL. No.

Ms. GANSON. I do not.

Ms. SHAUL. No, we have not. But I guess what I might add is that GAO has done some work looking at the research about Head Start. Although that is an enormously popular program that has served millions of children, the research that is available about that program is not clear, in terms of what effect the Head Start program has on the developmental experience of children versus how children just naturally grow up. So getting good information on the effect of programs on final outcomes for small children is a very difficult and sometimes expensive research task.

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, I think that the Smart Start came in—our program in Ohio is called Early Start. What it recognizes is that, if you can immediately identify a youngster in a family that is at risk or the family is at risk, that you have a much better opportunity to make a difference than if you wait until that child is ready for the Head Start program, which is usually when they are 3 or 4 years old.

One of the things that we are doing, and I know that Jim Hunt is—by the way, Jim and I are, in fact, we are like little competitors. He stole ideas, and I—

Senator EDWARDS. But he takes credit for all of them. You know that, do you not? [Laughter.]

Senator VOINOVICH. But that is OK. He is just terrific.

Senator EDWARDS. He is. He is wonderful.

Senator VOINOVICH. He is just one of the most enthusiastic people I have ever met in my life. But the fact is that we are using TANF money for our Early Start program. I think we are spending about \$45 million on it right now.

And the concept of it is that if you—and some of these families, by the way, are not Welfare eligible. They are working poor. They are poor families, but they are not on Welfare yet. So that money is being used for the Early Start program. And one of our problems is, even if they are Welfare eligible, does that trigger the 5-year period that families are eligible or ineligible for Welfare? But those are the kinds of things that it would be interesting to see where Health and Human Services has the TANF program, the money is there. I mean, the States have the money. Is there a way of utilizing that money and folding it in with something that maybe the Department of Education is doing.

Senator EDWARDS. If I could ask one question. I would be also interested in knowing, I know we are talking here about the coordination between Federal agencies, I would be interested in knowing whether we could look at or should look at the coordination with State programs, which are similar, which are complementary, which do, as George says, and he is exactly right, as the Senator says, I think that is exactly what we are trying to do in North Carolina is to identify kids who are at risk as early as possible and get them on the right track developmentally and educationally. At least in the counties we have been able to fully implement it, it has been very successful.

And so I would just be interested in knowing whether—and, Senator Durbin, maybe you can help me the this, too—is that the sort of, are we asking too much or is that something we should be doing or maybe it is already being done?

Ms. SHAUL. We actually have a study underway right now for a committee in the House, where we have been asked to look at what is the array of very early childhood programs serving low-income children, zero to 5, looking at the array of programs, trying to get an assessment from folks at the State and local level about where the need is the most. Is it for infants? Is it for toddlers? Is it for the 4 to 5 year olds? And then also trying to identify what are the barriers that might be faced in coordinating the various early childhood programs. That study is going on right now. We are doing at

least three surveys of State and local folks, as well as some site visits. That report will be ready in November.

Senator EDWARDS. It seems like there is tremendous potential for overlap and, as a result, tremendous potential for inefficiency if we do not do something, a study, and determine what those overlaps and inefficiencies are.

Ms. SHAUL. Dr. Ganson is reminding me that we went to North Carolina as one of our States.

Senator EDWARDS. Good. I am glad to hear that.

Ms. GANSON. And Ohio is one.

Ms. SHAUL. Coincidentally. [Laughter.]

Ms. MASCIA. If I might elaborate on that point, too. You bring up some good points about the two programs you talked about in North Carolina and Ohio. I mean, one of the reasons those were started up is we need to understand that the Welfare Reform law is also driving now the requirements of the very families we are trying to reach with Head Start. As you pointed out, one, it increases their income because they are now working and, therefore, may not be eligible, in some cases, for Head Start, as well as increase the need for younger children getting care and more full-time care.

So the Welfare Reform requirements really intersect now with what is going on with Head Start and just, I think, underscores, as you all point out, the need that these all be very coordinated at all levels of Government.

Ms. GANSON. Again, about the Head Start program, I think recently there has been more of an emphasis on infants and toddlers, as evidenced by the Early Head Start program, which I think now is being evaluated. And the other thing is the recent expansion has moved from expanding just the number of children in Head Start to giving existing programs more money to allow for the full-day option. So I think there is more of a recognition of what are the needs of the families that we are trying to serve.

Senator DURBIN. If I could just comment on that for a minute. I have been a big fan of Head Start, having visited programs all up and down my State. But I thought that my support of it is more intuitive than scientific, intuitive because, as a parent, my wife and I raised three kids, and we felt, whether it was our home or some other place, it was the best for those kids to be in a safe, positive learning environment, even before they went to the first classroom.

I have always been curious, because when you ask the Head Start people about performance standards, they start talking about the Ypsilanti Study which, if I am not mistaken, was in the sixties. I have been curious as to whether or not we have had any real updates. Because if we are going to start talking about performance standards, we have to be honest about what we are looking for.

I think that the three things I mentioned, a safe, positive learning environment for young people, is a great alternative to what other kids might face; sitting in front of a "boob tube" all day with some baby sitter or in a home where a parent has no education, to speak of, and no parental skills and, frankly, is not going to do much for that child unless they get some guidance.

But I guess it gets down to the bottom line, we are more and more focused on outcomes and performance standards. I am not an

educator by training. I do not know what it is we really should be looking for. We all agree that there is such a thing as early childhood development. We all believe that we can help children if we get to them early and get them on the right track. I do not know how much we will be able to test. I do not know if we have to look way down the line to see the results of this, as to whether or not the kids turn out to be good students or whether or not we are trying to establish some measurable standards in an area where it may be tough to do. I do not know if you have run into that.

Senator VOINOVICH. They have done some longitudinal studies on things, and I think that the general criticism of the Head Start program is that, once the kids get in the third and fourth grade, it falls off, and they perform just like any other third or fourth grader, and the debate is they are going into schools that are not stimulating them, and as a result of that, they fall. So it is not enough to have a good Head Start program, but you have got to have good all-day kindergarten, and you have got to have those first 3 years in school. In our State, for example, now, we have reduced the class size to no more than 15, and understand that you have got to have a good place for the children to come into.

I think you should know that we are, because we are so into Head Start, we started a longitudinal study a couple of years ago. So we are going to really have an opportunity to see just how well these youngsters are going to do and have a better idea to evaluate the program. And the fact of the matter is, is that the programs are all over the lot. In some places they are spectacular and others we have had to close them down because they just have not been run the way they are supposed to.

I think, I have said to our Head Start, because I meet with them every year, I said the big light is shining on you, and we are investing a lot of money in you, and we are expecting you to show a return on the investment that we are making.

So I think that more and more people are understanding they are going to be measured in terms of what they are doing, and I think that is another reason why those agencies that are on a Federal level ought to understand that some of these programs are going to be measured, and if they do not get involved with the people that they are working with on the State and local levels, the programs are not doing what they are supposed to be doing, then they may wake up 1 day and find out that those programs are no longer going to be funded.

And that is part of this multiplicity of—I cannot believe that out of all of these education programs that we have got up here, there are not some of them that ought to be closed down or, in the alternative, the money that is being spent could be better allocated into something that is going to provide a better return in terms of our investment, and my cause would be to say take some of that money and put it into zero to 3, where we know that it could really make more of a difference than, say, in some other area.

Ms. SHAUL. If I might just add one thing that the Results Act requires. Early next year, in March, the agencies are going to be required to have an annual progress plan that looks at their fiscal year 1999 performance. It is the first time they are going to be actually talking about their progress toward their goals, their meas-

urements of progress which is meant to be a way to let people see differences in success rates between different approaches, and it is meant to have agencies look at how to improve what they are doing. So that will be another piece of information that will be available in about a year.

Ms. MASCIA. If I may also elaborate on your point earlier about reaching younger children. Again, I think it is very relevant to Head Start. As the research shows, we are beginning now to understand that children, from the time they are born to well before they even had a Head Start Center, let alone a classroom, need a stimulating environment.

And I would just point out that many children are in environments that are not centers, are not Head Start Centers, and the challenge, I guess, as you know in your programs probably in North Carolina, to address that challenge is how do we reach the more informal providers out there who are caring for our very youngest children because, in most cases, that is where our infants and toddlers are. How do we craft programs that help them, and support them and provide care?

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, I will tell you one of the things we are doing, again, in Ohio, is kind of a pilot project for Public Broadcasting. And we know there is a lot of mom-and-pop child care centers. In fact, I think one of the Senators yesterday was talking about child care money. In Ohio, we are finding that child care money is going wanting. In fact, we have increased the eligibility or we have relaxed the eligibility to try and let people with higher incomes take advantage of it because a lot of Welfare people are not taking advantage of the program. So they are somewhere, with a grandmother or grandfather.

What PBS is doing is they have put together a curriculum, and they are meeting particularly with at-risk families in libraries. And they give this material to them, and they go home, and it is coordinated with their programming. And so that, before the program goes on, they can read to the child, and then afterwards they have a curriculum to reinforce it.

As part of this bill that I am putting together, it would increase the amount of money to Public Broadcasting, so that they could put that program on a Web site and make it available to everybody in the country, no matter what their socioeconomic status is, if they have a computer and a printer.

So that, in my case, my son, his wife decided to stay home, and so she can get this stuff off the Internet, plug it into the programming of the television, spend the time with the youngster, reinforce it. And most of our child care centers in Ohio are Head Start. They have got a computer, they have got a printer, and they can do the same thing there; in other words, we can multiply this thing.

And it is really, through technology, a reasonable way to reach a lot of families that do not have any ready-made program for them and, in some instances, cannot afford a real fine child care center and decides I would rather have my child with grandma or somebody else.

We need to find ways that we can work on this matter and do more with less and reach out. And I think we also have to under-

stand, I think, that all kids need this; in other words, it should cut right across the whole socioeconomic study.

On this, you were talking about Early Start. Two years ago, when I did my State of the State, I brought in people who had benefitted from State programs. And this may sound elementary, but we had an Early Start woman from one of our rural areas, and I asked her, "Well, what has the program done for you?"

And she said, "Well," she said, "you know, when I brought my baby home, the baby was in the crib, and I watched TV. And because of the Early Start program, someone from the Welfare agency came out and spent some time with me and explained to me that I ought to read to my baby, and that I ought to hug my baby, and that I ought to rub my baby, and went through a lot of these things. She, frankly, taught me how to take and make materials using these Ziploc bags, making a book out of a Ziploc bag, where you staple them together and then you can stick pictures from magazines."

It is kind of simple stuff, but without that, she might have continued to have the baby in the crib, and she is watching TV, and that child would have lost all of that opportunity to be stimulated during that period that is so important for the development of that child.

Does anybody else have some questions?

Senator EDWARDS. Just very briefly. I wanted to follow up on something that was mentioned earlier.

You mentioned a study that is being done in the House. Are folks actually going to States like Ohio, and North Carolina, and Illinois and looking at, for example, in my State, Smart Start programs, where they are, where they are located, comparing them with where Head Start programs are located, the services provided by the two, the extent to which there is overlap between the two? Because I have to tell you I have been all over North Carolina, and I have been in a bunch of Head Start Centers, and I have been in a lot of Smart Start Centers, and I had this visceral reaction that there is very little coordination. They say there does seem to be overlap, there seems to be huge gaps, which is actually of at least as much concern to me.

Can you tell me a little more about whether those specific issues are being addressed in that study.

Ms. SHAUL. I would like to ask Dr. Ganson to address this because—

Senator EDWARDS. I see her nodding. So she must have—

Ms. SHAUL. That is because she is leading this study.

Ms. GANSON. We are looking at coordination. I think what we found is that there is a lot of variability in terms of coordination at the State and local level. In terms of Head Start, I think it is more recent that they have collaborated more, but I think in some areas it is more than others. I do not know, off the top of my head, what the collaboration grants in North Carolina, if there are grantees that have them and what those would involve, but usually they involve hooking up with other preschool centers, as well as other service providers.

In our study, what we are doing is we are talking to all of the different players who are involved in early childhood, and we are

talking about what does your community do to coordinate these activities, what barriers are you finding to having this coordinated, help provide and form an efficient use of resources, and how is this all coming together?

So that is basically the focus of this study. The three questionnaires are going to give us more of a national perspective on facilitators and barriers as well as what kinds of needs are easier or more difficult to get; for example, preschool, part day, full day, infant, toddler, mildly ill children. So we are asking about also services provided. But a key part is coordination, and the case studies are going to sort of give us some of the meat to fill out the story that we are getting on a national level.

Senator EDWARDS. On an emotional level and a rational level, I think the folks in North Carolina truly believe in these programs. I mean, they do. They just do not want their money spent inefficiently. I think they want to see these things work, and they want to see their tax dollar being spent the way it ought to be spent.

I just want to say one other thing, Mr. Chairman, and there certainly have been problems in Head Start. We all know that. But it can be an incredibly inspirational thing because I have personally experienced it. To go into a Head Start Center, see a good Head Start Center, see it working. And you ask what is the best example of how well this center is working, and they point out the four or five men or women working in that center who started in a Head Start Center who are now 20 years old or 22 years old. It is a moving thing to hear those men and women talk about what effect it had on their lives and why they are so devoted to the program.

So I have to tell you that it can be, while there are certainly problems, there is no doubt about that, and we need to do everything we can to eliminate those problems and be efficient and particularly to coordinate between agencies and, in my opinion, between Federal and State programs, it is a critically important thing, and I just wish more people could go into some of these centers and see what good they are doing.

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, I would just like to say one other thing. You are talking about local collaboration. Progress cannot be made unless you have the indigenous leadership in the local community working together to try to coordinate the use of the resources in the community, and I think that is one thing that we need to stimulate more on the national level and reward communities for creating local collaboratives, where they do get together to try and figure out how they can best serve the needs of the people and their respective communities.

We did that in the State level, but there ought to be more thought given to it, I think, on the Federal level that says, if you get together on the local level and create these collaboratives, we will be able to make some more resources available, as kind of an incentive to do that. It is not easy to make that happen because, in so many instances, there are such turf wars that go on in communities where, even if you find a hole, you know, that it is not there, that you cannot get anybody because it is a question of, well, is that mine or is that yours, and neither one of them are doing anything about it.

Back when I was a county commissioner, we did this great survey of all the social services. We had the School of Social Work at Case Western Reserve, one of the finest in the country, do the thing, and they came back, all of these agencies overlapped. And before the study, they were all excited about it. Well, after it was over with, and there was a lot of duplication, and it meant that maybe a public institution could be closed down and a private institution could be done better or vice versa, it just blew up, and that was the end of it.

So some of this is very difficult to get done. I think what has happened in years since then, and that was back in seventies, is that because of the scarcity of resources, and perhaps a deeper appreciation of how important it is, the need is there, that these agencies seem, today, to be more willing to work together than they did maybe 20 years ago.

Are there any other questions that anyone would like to ask?

[No response.]

Senator VOINOVICH. If there are not, we appreciate your being here today, and we are going to follow up on what you had to say and see if we can get those agencies in here.

One last request I have, and that would be if you could give us the best information that you have available of the agencies across the board that are dealing with zero to 3, I would be grateful because it would then give us a good idea of just what is out there on the smorgasbord.

And maybe once we get through it, these main two agencies, we could see if we could bring in some of these other folks that are doing things. For example, I think the Department of Agriculture is involved in this in a big way.

Thank you very much.

Ms. SHAUL. You are welcome.

Senator VOINOVICH. This hearing is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:14 a.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

**MULTIPLE PROGRAM COORDINATION IN
EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:
THE AGENCY PERSPECTIVE**

TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1999

U.S. SENATE,
OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, RESTRUCTURING,
AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:35 a.m., in room SD-342, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. George V. Voinovich, Chairman of the Subcommittee, presiding.

Present: Senator Voinovich.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR VOINOVICH

Senator VOINOVICH. Good morning. The Subcommittee hearing will come to order. I would like to share with you, first of all, what this Subcommittee is all about in terms of education.

At our first hearing, we talked about the fact that we had a multiplicity of education programs. According to a House study that was done last year, there were some 760 programs in various Federal agencies dealing with education. The Senate Finance Committee had a study done by the Government Accounting Office and they came back and said there were 540 education programs in some 31 different agencies.

What I thought would be fruitful for this Subcommittee is to look at those education programs to determine what they are doing, are they needed, and could the money be better spent in other programs, could they be better coordinated, and perhaps some of the money reallocated into areas where recent studies show that money could be better spent.

The area that I thought we would begin with would be the area of early childhood. According to the GAO, the Federal Government administers approximately 90 early childhood programs through 11 agencies and 20 offices. The programs identified—GAO has identified 34 of them as key—that is, education and child care were key to the mission of the programs out of those 34. The early childhood programs consume most of the Federal dollars and account for approximately 83 percent of all early childhood program dollars, so a big share of the dollars that are being spent are being spent in education or child care.

I began the effort to look at these programs in the prenatal-to-3 area because I think there is a large lack of attention to these

programs in this country today. I recognized that early on as Governor of the State of Ohio, and I tried to recognize that as Chairman of the National Governors' Association, where we made prenatal-to-3—in fact, Bob Miller, the Governor of Nevada and I, teamed up and said we are going to do a 2-year goal of the NGA to get people involved in early childhood and prenatal-to-3 programs.

It is interesting that when I first met Rob Reiner a couple of years ago, and he has been a real big booster of prenatal-to-3, and it is interesting, he is commenting now about all of the response to the Littleton situation. He is going back and saying, hey, this is where it is at. I will never forget, when I first met him, he looked at me and he said, "The most important thing that you did in your life as Governor is to draw a line in the sand and say, this is the last generation of Ohio's children that are going to jail, going on drugs, becoming pregnant while they are teenagers."

In other words, we decided that we would make a difference with that group of people, and as you know, I am very proud of the fact that our State is the first State in the country that has a slot for every child who is eligible in Head Start or public school preschool, where the parents want them to be in the program.

I think that there is no question that all the research work that is out there indicates that prenatal-to-3 is a crucial time in a child's life. There are some learned researchers, educators, and juvenile justice people who say that if we really want to do something about juvenile crime and perhaps avoid the kind of thing we did experience in Littleton, that we need to focus in this area.

It is interesting, a couple of years ago, I had started reading John DiGilio's work at Princeton about the coming predator generation and I got really nervous about it. So we had a juvenile crime summit in 1997. I think a lot of people that came were expecting tough love and, frankly, some of the stuff that is being talked about today with the juvenile crime bill on the floor of the Senate were the things that needed to be done in order to make a difference.

I was a bit surprised when they came back and said, that is not what is needed. What is needed is this prenatal-to-3. It is making a difference in children's lives very early on. If you put your resources in that and your attention there, you would do a whole lot more to deal with the juvenile crime problem than probably anything else that you can do.

So I want to draw the line in the sand at the Federal level, and the way to do that, I think, first, is to look at the programs that the Federal Government is already involved in that support prenatal-to-3 and support those programs, and where appropriate, increase funding for them.

Second, to coordinate the dollars that are being spent to make sure that those dollars really do make a difference in the lives of our families and children.

And third, I think you both know that I am working on some legislation, prenatal-to-3, that I have been working with the National Head Start Association and the Children's Defense Fund that is a modest effort to really encourage collaboration on the local level by

providing incentive funding to them and flexibility so that they can do more for families and children.

So we are here today, and the thought that I wanted to deal with the second part of this, the coordination and making sure the dollars we are spending are appropriately used. I was not familiar with this before, but I am now, and that is the Results Act. It is a valuable tool for the Subcommittee in evaluating overlap and duplication and also the Act requires agencies to set outcome-based goals, measure their performance, and report their accomplishment. I do not know what anybody else is going to do, but I would like to share with you that I am going to pay attention to the Results Act. We are looking at it in several other areas, but this is an area that I am going to look at and see how we are doing in terms of what it is that agencies say that they are going to be doing.

Specifically, the Act requires agencies to develop strategic plans, including mission statements, outcome-based goals, and an explanation of how goals will be achieved and how progress will be measured. The plans were completed in 1997 and the second annual performance plans are now ready for Congressional and for GAO review, so we are going to be watching the progress.

On March 25, which I am sure you are both aware of, we held a hearing where GAO looked at the Departments of Health and Human Services' and Education's 5-year strategic plans and fiscal year 1999 and 2000 annual performance plans and testified on the Departments' coordination efforts. They testified, GAO, that although the annual performance plans addressed the issues of coordination, the plans provide little detail about their intentions to implement such efforts. According to GAO, the plans do not address the challenge of coordinating programs that serve similar populations while having different key objectives.

On April 1, I wrote to Secretary Shalala and Secretary Riley and I asked that they look at that GAO testimony and comment on several items that addressed the issue of overlap and duplication and I asked three questions. Do you agree or disagree with GAO's assessment of your efforts to coordinate with other departments and agencies? If you do agree that your plan could be better, how do you intend to improve your efforts to coordinate with the Departments of Health and Human Services, Education, and other critical agencies?

That is another thing. There are a whole host of other agencies that are really not at the table here, and my thought would be that since your two departments spend most of the money and are more involved, that it would be kind of interesting to see how those other Federal agencies, including the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, could kind of piggyback on what you are doing so that there is an effort made to have a total plan of the agencies that are out there and how we can have a full-court press of the agencies and dollars to really make a difference in the prenatal-to-3 area.

And last but not least, the Department of Education names all children enter school ready to learn as a key objective, but this is not an objective of Health and Human Services. How do you approach program coordination when the programs do not share a similar overall objective? From reading the letters of the Depart-

ments and your testimony, obviously, maybe HHS does not mention that, but it is there. Even though it is not written down, it is a goal.

This morning's hearing is to give you an opportunity to comment on GAO's testimony on March 25, and to share your thoughts on ways that you can better coordinate. I am very pleased that we have two outstanding witnesses here with us this morning. I am pleased you are here, because you really work with these programs, and I would have liked to have both of your secretaries, but it is nice to have people that are closer to the street. In all probability, you would have prepared their testimony anyhow.

Our two witnesses are Olivia Golden of the Department of Health and Human Services, and Judith Johnson of the Department of Education. I hope that you can assist the Subcommittee in our pursuit of a system where Federal education programs yield measurable maximum benefits for our families and children.

We are expecting Senator Durbin, and when he does come in, if you do not mind, I will introduce him and maybe give him a chance to share with you his thoughts, and then we will continue with the testimony.

Our first and only panel represents the Departments of Health and Human Services and Education, Olivia Golden, Assistant Secretary for the Administration for Children and Families, ACF, right, the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services, and Judith Johnson, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education at the Department of Education.

Your full statements, of course, will be entered into the record and we would hope that you would kind of summarize those for us this morning. I would like to call on Ms. Golden first for her testimony. Again, thank you for being here.

**TESTIMONY OF OLIVIA A. GOLDEN,¹ ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

Ms. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the coordination of early childhood programs. I know that early childhood education has been a top priority of yours. I have had a chance to visit Ohio and see some of what you have accomplished, so I particularly welcome the chance to discuss these important issues today.

In partnership with the Congress, the administration has provided leadership in early childhood programs in several different and complementary ways. First, in response to the tremendous need, we have expanded public investment to help low-income families with child care expenses and to provide high-quality, comprehensive early childhood programs to help children enter school ready to learn.

President Clinton has placed a high priority on steady increases in early childhood funding, leading to doubling the level of funding for child care, expansion of Head Start to serve 1 million children annually by 2002, and establishing the early Head Start program

¹The prepared statement of Ms. Golden appears in the Appendix on page 51.

for children under the age of 3. The President has continued this commitment in his fiscal year 2000 budget proposal by requesting an historic increase for Head Start expansion and quality improvements, as well as critically important investments in child care, including a new early learning fund.

The second component of our leadership efforts is improved program quality and accountability for results, described more fully in my written testimony.

Third, and of special interest to this Subcommittee, is the development of outcome standards and measures for Head Start and child care programs. The Government Performance and Results Act set in motion the first national effort to identify specific outcomes for federally-funded early childhood programs and a system to measure and track progress on these performance measures.

Drawing on the work of the National Education Goals Panel, in consultation with early childhood experts, we created a cutting-edge system of 24 outcome measures to track progress towards improving the healthy development and learning readiness of young children. We set up the Family and Child Experiences Survey, or FACES, to assess performance on these measures in a nationally representative sample of local Head Start agencies. Initial findings from the FACES survey already are being used to pinpoint strengths and areas for needed improvement in local Head Start programs.

I would like to turn now to key areas where we are working to improve coordination so that the full spectrum of early childhood programs work together for children.

First, we are working to ensure that funding strategies provide incentives for collaboration. For the past 3 years, the Head Start Bureau placed a priority on partnerships in awarding more than \$340 million in program expansion funding. This policy led to providing full-day, full-year services to more than 50,000 additional children in partnership arrangements with child care and pre-kindergarten agencies and resources.

Second, we are working to ensure that Federal policies support collaboration and to identify and remove obstacles to collaboration that are based on misinterpretation of Federal regulations. For instance, the Child Care Bureau provided guidance to prevent unwarranted problems in auditing agencies that use funding from different Federal programs and issued a memorandum clarifying the flexibility available to States in defining eligibility across child care and early education programs.

Third, we are providing technical assistance to remove barriers to collaboration and to share successful models and strategies. For example, we are supporting training and technical assistance to help child care and Head Start agencies collaborate with Department of Education programs such as the Even Start family literacy effort and programs for infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities.

Finally, we are bringing together early childhood and child care leaders and other partners to solve common problems and plan for the future. For example, the Head Start collaboration initiative links Head Start with State programs in child care, education, and other key services for young children and their families. The

Healthy Child Care America campaign supports collaborative efforts of health professionals, child care providers, and families to improve the health and safety of children in child care settings. And Head Start, Child Care Bureau, and other HHS staff are active members of the Department of Education's Federal Inter-agency Coordinating Council to coordinate programs that serve young children with disabilities.

Community, State, and Federal efforts pay off in partnerships that truly make a difference for children. My written statement describes a project in Philadelphia that was able to combine Federal housing, child care, Head Start, and job training funds to assist a mother and her 5 children in turning their lives around.

Recognizing the positive impact of coordinated early childhood programs, ACF seeks to build on and expand our existing efforts. We will support collaboration and the use of outcome measurement for early childhood programs through the early learning fund, which is part of the President's fiscal year 2000 budget. This is flexible results-focused funding which will assist States and communities in maximizing existing early childhood resources, strengthening partnerships, and improving quality.

In addition, ACF and the Department of Education will co-convene administrators of child care and pre-kindergarten programs and Head Start leaders to explore collaborative approaches to program funding, monitoring, performance outcomes, professional development, and technical assistance, and we will begin a new effort with the Department of Education to review opportunities for further coordination in the areas of performance indicators, funding, service strategies, and research.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to summarize my written testimony, and I would be delighted to answer any questions. Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you very much.

We would now like to hear from the Hon. Judith Johnson.

TESTIMONY OF JUDITH JOHNSON,¹ ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY, OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much, and thank you for the opportunity to testify before your Subcommittee with Assistant Secretary Golden on this very important topic of early childhood education.

As you have noted, I have submitted written testimony and would like to take this opportunity to highlight the major themes in that document.

Recent studies in child development have vastly increased our knowledge about learning development between birth and age 3, and we know what factors enhance early learning experiences. Over the years, the Department has worked in close collaboration with the Department of Health and Human Services to help States and local communities provide high-quality early childhood education, and we are fortunate, Senator, to count you as a committed leader in this field.

¹The prepared statement of Ms. Johnson appears in the Appendix on page 54.

As you know, the Education Department's work is framed by eight national goals, the first of which is every child in America will enter school ready to learn. Secretary Riley has identified the early years of childhood as the period in which we have the most potential to make the greatest gains.

School districts and States across the country are beginning to offer opportunities to participate in early childhood education programs to children from poor families, and as a seasoned educator, I know firsthand that these children face enormous challenges during their first years in school.

As an example, one district that responded to this challenge using Title I funds is the Charlotte-Mecklenberg School District in North Carolina. They use 85 percent of their Title I funding to provide early childhood education for poor 3- and 4-year-olds. Children participating in this program enter kindergarten better prepared than similarly economically-disadvantaged children who do not participate in the program.

I spent 2 days visiting this program and left with a wonderful sense that children were provided with a caring, safe environment, and that their teachers believed all children could become successful students. The school's mission was developed based on this belief.

The Department, in partnership with other Federal agencies, such as HHS, must act as a catalyst to support innovative State and local district programs aimed at increasing opportunities for students to experience high-quality education. The Department's strategic plan includes a school readiness objective as well as strategies to improve services to our young children before they enter formal schooling.

Our 2000 annual plan specifically lays out performance measures and strategies for interagency coordination in the area of early childhood, as recognized by GAO in its assessment of our plan. Our performance indicators are used as monitoring devices.

However, the GAO testimony commented on the need for Education to provide a more complete picture of intended performance. So, in response to that concern, allow me to offer several highlights. I will focus on coordination activities in three areas: Coordinating research, coordinating services, and coordinating performance measurement. They are more fully described in my written testimony.

Coordinating research—the Department has created the Early Childhood Research Working Group. It is coordinated by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), the National Institute on Early Childhood Development and Education (NICHD), known as the Early Childhood Institute, or in our office, ECI. It links with other offices in the Department and approximately eight other Federal departments to support research, data collection, and services for young children and their families. The group's recent meeting was focused on the Children's Research Initiative. This group discussed child care studies and a research competition focusing on improving how young children are taught mathematics and reading.

The Department's Office of Special Education, ECI, and NICHD and Health and Human Services jointly sponsored the "Preventing

Reading Difficulties in Young Children” report produced by the National Research Council. This is another fine example of inter-agency collaboration, and it is a document used across the country.

The study synthesizes the most effective current research on the teaching and learning of reading. A significant section of this report explores how literacy can be fostered at birth, and from birth through kindergarten and the primary grades. It also includes recommendations on effective professional development and instruction for young children.

The National Research Council also produced a customer-friendly guide for parents, teachers, and child care providers entitled “Starting Out Right.” It describes how to promote children’s reading success and prevent reading difficulties.

Now, I will discuss coordinating services across agencies. We understand the importance of ensuring that early childhood education is coordinated across Federal agencies and with State and local entities responsible for providing services. As I said to you just prior to the opening of this hearing, our customers need to see it as a seamless set of services.

The 1994 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires that local districts using Title I funding provide early childhood development services that comply with the Head Start performance standards. This requirement provides for a more careful alignment of performance goals among early childhood programs in the Department of Education and at HHS.

The Even Start family literacy program administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) is based on interagency coordination. Even Start draws on existing service providers to integrate early childhood education, adult education, and parenting education into a unified program. Rather than duplicating preschool services, the collaboration between the Department and HHS works toward improving the quality of services provided to our most vulnerable children.

The recently authorized Reading Excellence Act included several amendments to the Even Start program that further emphasize collaboration. One of these amendments provides \$10 million annually for State-wide family literacy coordination to help States coordinate and integrate literacy services. Ohio is one of the eight States that already receive grants under this program.

As to coordinating performance measurements, as seen in these examples, the Department has made progress in the area of inter-agency coordination, but we know the Department needs to do even more. We are developing a joint coordination plan with HHS, which we will submit to Congress by the end of this year. Areas of coordination that we will address include performance indicators, service strategies for early childhood, and research.

Coordination of indicators among early childhood programs was included in our annual plan and was also a recommendation of the Department’s recently released report to Congress on evaluation of Federal education legislation enacted in 1994. In this report, we point out the lack of consistent expectations for school readiness, which makes it difficult to assess a program’s effectiveness in supporting the learning and development that young children need for school success.

In addition, our Early Childhood Institute and the Office of Special Education Programs are sponsoring a study of early childhood pedagogy with the National Academy of Sciences. The study, which will be completed in early 2000, will tell us what young children need to experience and learn if they are to be successful in kindergarten and what measures will best assess what young children have learned.

In conclusion, across all of the agencies you mentioned or counted, we are all committed to ensuring that goal one, children entering school ready to learn, is achievable, measurable, and a reality for all of our children. We understand that early childhood experiences are critical to the future success of our Nation.

Thank you for providing me with this opportunity to testify, and I, too, would be very happy to answer any questions you may have.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you very much.

One of the things that probably argues against coordination to a degree with prenatal-to-3 or prenatal-to-4 or 5 years is that the education community for many years, at least in our State, looked at kindergarten to 12 as education and did not really consider prior to that as part of their responsibility.

What we did—I chaired the Readiness Task Force for the National Governors' Association when John Ashcroft was actually Chairman. It was obvious that not only is education important in the early years, but also all of the other things that provide that wonderful setting so that children can develop properly, which includes the social services, child care, good health care, maternal care, and the rest of it, and that those types of things are just as important as the education challenges that you give a child at that stage, because if you do not have those, it is very difficult for them to take advantage of it.

You have talked about Even Start, and I think the Department is working on Early Start. Is there an Early Start program?

Ms. GOLDEN. The Early Head Start program serves infants and children, ages 0 to 3, before they enter preschool.

Senator VOINOVICH. Right, that brings them in earlier.

Ms. GOLDEN. That is right.

Senator VOINOVICH. What is Even Start, then?

Ms. JOHNSON. Even Start is a program that focuses on both the family and the child, and there are three goals in Even Start. One, adult literacy, and that is providing parents with the opportunity to improve their literacy skills; two, giving them opportunities to develop and fine-tune their parenting skills; and, three, at the same time providing for early childhood education. And the early childhood education part could be a Head Start provider—in fact, in many of our Even Start programs, they are Head Start providers. What we are looking at in this program is strengthening the family unit at the same time that we are providing early childhood experience for children.

The Even Start program has received very good recognition and very positive evaluations. What we have learned is that children who have gone through the Even Start program continued to demonstrate success when they enter school, and their parents are more involved in their schooling once they enter formal schooling.

Senator VOINOVICH. It is interesting that you say that, because one of the reasons why we made the commitment that we made to Head Start and which a lot of people do not understand is that it is a program that insists that the parents become involved. So often, the social worker that is working with them identify problems at home and begin the parents to take advantage of improving their educational situation, pursuing a GED. Several years ago, I gave out the Governor's Award to a woman who started out as a Head Start mom and received her Ph.D. and her kids have all gone.

So it seems to me that both of these are falling in the same category. Are you really looking at Head Start as the place where you would place these dollars, or doing it differently, and if you do the Even Start program, do you start at the school or where do you initially make the contact?

Ms. JOHNSON. The school community can usually identify the children, because they are not school-age yet, where their families are eligible for services. The identification of who benefits from the program is really done at the local level. But I want to emphasize the fact that this is in collaboration, in almost every instance, with a Head Start provider. They provide the early childhood experience. What we are trying to do is encourage the communities to bring all the providers to the table to provide a comprehensive set of services that will benefit both the adults in the family and the child.

I just want to comment on your observations about the importance of providing these early childhood experiences. I have only been with the Department 2 years, having spent 30 years in New York State as a veteran educator, and the last two positions I held were at the district level, as a district administrator.

We discovered around 1985 that more and more of our children were coming to kindergarten totally unprepared, as defined by the kindergarten teachers. So we had to make some big decisions, bring in health and human services people from the local community, sit around the table and try to decide what we could do for these young children. At that point, we began to expand the Head Start services in one community and the State pre-kindergarten program in the second district that I worked at, and the difference was amazing.

What we were finding with the children who did not have these early childhood experiences, they simply did not have school-readiness skills as a teacher traditionally finds; they were unable to sit for long periods of time. Many of the children did not know what a crayon was, and we would have thought that was something that most teachers would have expected. Well, that is very easy to remedy. The dilemma is, if you do not help these children develop the school-readiness skills, they are sometimes mislabeled when they get to a regular school. That mislabeling does not need to occur if you have a solid early childhood program in place and the parents are involved from the very beginning.

Senator VOINOVICH. The thing is, you say the school district reached out, and we have some public preschools. The real issue is, how do you get these dollars that are all dealing with the same

customer, but there are streams coming in from different departments, and how do you, again, maximize that, then?

I am glad to hear that the Even Start money is going into that, but you have a lot of States, like Ohio, and in this legislation that I am going to be introducing in the next couple of weeks, we are going to allow TANF money to be used for a program that we refer to as Early Start, which really identifies during pregnancy families that could use the benefit of counseling and help when the baby is born, that you are right there and you have somebody working with them and sharing with them what they need to do. It is money coming out of your pot.

Ms. GOLDEN. And you know that under the regulations we have published, TANF funds are now available to States to use for needy families for child care and early childhood services. I think it is really important that you are highlighting that for States, because some are choosing to use that option, but not all of them.

Senator VOINOVICH. I want to compliment you, too, because we were really worried about your regulations coming out and I think you really listened to the customers and, for the most part, the reaction I am getting is that what we originally thought were going to be pretty restrictive and not very flexible have been—they have done a good job on it.

Ms. GOLDEN. Thank you.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you very much.

Ms. GOLDEN. Thank you very much.

Senator VOINOVICH. But you move to Ed-Flex. It is very interesting. You were saying that they are using Title I public preschool money for 3- and 4-year-olds. Now, that is not traditionally a Title I population. I just wonder, in order to do that, were they a State that had Ed-Flex waivers?

Ms. JOHNSON. No. Actually, that is a provision as a result of the most recent legislation. It is just that in many places, historically, the Title I money has been placed in the elementary schools, and to make that major shift to providing pre-kindergarten or early childhood experiences means that the district must secure monies from some other source to support the elementary program. So it has been a difficult decision for many districts to make. But where they have made the decision and moved the money into the early childhood experiences, the benefits are enormous as the youngsters enter school because the need for support services is somewhat diminished and the children are better prepared for school.

Senator VOINOVICH. The thing that hits me, and that is what this hearing is about, is that you now have TANF money going into Early Start, you have Even Start, and then we have Title I money coming in for 3- and 4-year-olds, which is a Head Start population, though I am sure that some of the kids may not be eligible for Head Start that are taking—

Ms. JOHNSON. Actually, in the one place that I mentioned, they were able to combine the Title I funds and the Head Start funds to create a full-day program, an enriched full-day program for students. That is a real savvy use of funds.

You know, with all of the funds that you have identified and the programs that you have mentioned, we have not yet reached every 3- or 4-year-old in this country who could benefit from these serv-

ices. So we still have a ways to go to ensure that there is a place for every 3- and 4-year-old to go to receive an early childhood experience, particularly those whose families could not afford to pay for the private experience. And until we reach that, I would say we need to continue to look at the funds that are available and the programs that are providing services and make sure that they are coordinated.

Senator VOINOVICH. I think that is the key——

Ms. GOLDEN. Right.

Senator VOINOVICH [continuing]. Because you have two departments, that there needs to be that kind of coordination in the communities. I mean, you have your Head Start collaboration, which has been something that we have really emphasized. In fact, one of our people went to Washington and spent some time there——

Ms. GOLDEN. She was wonderful. It was really wonderful that she came to work with us.

Senator VOINOVICH. Yes, to kind of get an idea of how it is. But it would seem to me that in any plan that you are putting together that there be some aspect of it that has a mechanism so that you can sit down with the superintendent of education in Cleveland, for example, and say, you have your Title I monies. You do have an opportunity to utilize those dollars for 3- and 4-year-olds. You do have your Head Start program. What is the status of that? Could you piggyback on that without creating a new mechanism in the community, and then talk about the other money that is available for child care.

One of the things that is the real challenge that we have had, and the Department has encouraged this, is the issue of having child care and Head Start located at the same place so you do not duplicate the physical facilities. One of the biggest problems we had in expanding Head Start in Ohio was we just did not have the physical facilities to do that. Then we started to open our eyes to some of the child care facilities and said, “Gee, why do we not start doing that?”

But it is this effort, this coordinated effort of these programs, that are so doggone important. From an administrative point of view, I do not know how you get that done, whether it is through the Head Start collaboration or not, but it just seems that, from my observation, that too often, you get one group going off over here doing their thing and another group going off over here, and you do not get that kind of—and then there are the difficult things. We have family social service centers now that we are putting into our schools where the teacher that has a problem has it right there in the school and they can deal with this as an elementary, and actually in middle and upper secondary, so that the coordination has got to be much better than it is.

You have to almost ask yourself, if you are going to have all of this money going from prenatal to, say 5 years, does it make sense that you have got all of these streams of money coming in from two departments, and maybe even three or four, and would you be better off if you had one agency administer those programs rather than having two of them do it?

Ms. GOLDEN. Could I speak a little bit to both examples of where collaboration has worked and to your question about how to make collaboration work better in the future? I think they are related.

When you were talking about both the struggles and the successes in Ohio, I was thinking about the chance I had to visit a child care program in Cincinnati, Ohio which had come together with Head Start. I think that this effort was sparked both by your commitment to early childhood education and by our use of Head Start expansion funding, to encourage collaboration by putting dollar incentives behind it. And so in Cincinnati, child care programs that were willing to take on the Head Start performance standards and live up to them could then become Head Start programs and get that funding, if they were willing to do the quality of care that would lead to school readiness.

I visited a program and I asked the child care director—it was wonderful—what she had found most important, and she said that it was partly the training for the staff, but the most important thing for her about becoming a Head Start program was having access to the disability coordinator and the speech therapist and the different people who could come through and help her with the kids' needs. This is really just what you were saying about putting together the resources to address educational needs and other intensive needs. So that was one example where we were able to put all the pieces together at the local level.

But the point you are making, I think, is that having success is putting all the pieces together in one place does not guarantee that you can do it everywhere. So how do you make that possible?

I think that for me, a key element of that is being clear on the outcomes and the measures, because if you can be clear on the goals, then you really can pull people together. I mentioned in my written testimony the work that we have done, with a lot of expertise from the Department of Education and outside educators, on the FACES survey, to develop indicators for school readiness and Head Start. We are going to be using some of those indicators in the Department of Education's early childhood longitudinal study-kindergarten cohort (for which we are also providing some funding) so that some of those measures will be used in a lot of different settings.

In my experience, one of the ways you can help get people to really focus on using their dollars together, is if they understand what the results will be. I do not know if that fits with your experience, but I have found that if you are paying attention to the results so people are sharing that mission, that is often a way of getting the pieces together.

Senator VOINOVICH. That is another thing in the testimony, that you are doing this longitudinal study. That longitudinal study, that is coming out of your shop, out of Education?

Ms. JOHNSON. Yes.

Ms. GOLDEN. There are two things going on, the ECLS and then the FACES study, and we are linking them by using some common measures in both places.

Senator VOINOVICH. But that will be looking at your Head Start preschool programs, that study, or what is it specifically looking at?

Ms. GOLDEN. The study that we are doing is a national survey of Head Start that will follow children from the time they enter Head Start through their completion of the program and entry into kindergarten and first grade. We are already learning some important things in Head Start children about school readiness, about the change from fall to spring, about a range of measures, and about the quality of the program.

At the same time, the Education Department is doing a major, very large national survey that is a sample of all kindergarten children. What we have done is take some of the indicators that we all developed together for Head Start children and we are using the same set of indicators in the Department of Education's national study, so that we will be able to look at comparisons across different groups of children. So it is a really exciting example of our two departments trying to put two pieces together so that we can learn more than we could from either study alone.

Senator VOINOVICH. I do not know whether it is the Carnegie Foundation is doing it or not, maybe you know, but we really do need to have a longitudinal study made of Head Start and pre-school programs to really follow them up, because when you finally get out to defend some of these programs, a lot of it is anecdotal, yes, they do better, and so forth, and then you have people that are really—I ran into it in Ohio—well, they fall down, they lose it after they get to the fourth or fifth grade. Of course, part of the problem there is they go into learning experiences in school where they are not be challenged at all, and so, like everyone else, you can fall back.

That is why, for instance, in our State, we have now in almost all of our urban districts, not in all of them, we have reduced the class size to less than 15 because we realize that for the first 3 years, how important they are to continue the stuff that the kids get.

But I really think that there ought to be collaboration between your two agencies and really start to do this and do it as scientifically as you can, unless there is some private outfit out there that is doing it, so we will have that information. We are going to be putting a lot more money into this, and ultimately, you have to justify why are you putting this money in, and in some instances, people would like to spend it on something else and you have got to say, this is really worthwhile. It is a wonderful investment to do that.

The 24 performance measures, are these being used, then, across the board for all of the programs that are being funded, public school, preschool, Title I?

Ms. JOHNSON. You are talking about—

Ms. GOLDEN. They are not to that point yet. One of the things we have committed to you in the letter is that we are going to talk about how all the pieces fit together. The 24 performance measures are ones that were developed specifically for Head Start, drawing on the works of the education world, the early childhood world, the national goals panel. We developed those measures so that we could look at exactly the kind of questions you are asking, such as what happens from fall to spring? What happens to children's ability to read, to their social skills, all those things? What we have

already found out, based even on pilot results, is that as we would all expect, the quality of the program is related to the achievement of positive outcomes for the child. So, while the quality of Head Start programs is generally good, we need to make sure that we have even more that are truly excellent.

In terms of what we need to do next, we are working with the Department of Education and working with some States that are interested in using the performance measures we have developed more broadly. One of the things that prompted our shared interest in moving ahead with those next steps, in response to your letters, was that we realized that there was lots going on on the research front where we were working together, but where we needed to pull together even more.

Ms. JOHNSON. Let me comment on that, too. We are recognizing more and more the importance of data collection, data analysis, and that is not just at the early childhood level but at the elementary and secondary level as we continue to provide Federal funding for programs. It is collecting data over time to look at how students are performing that we think is really very important, and in addition to that, we are launching a major initiative to try to learn more about how children learn in the early childhood years and how data can be used; that data can be used to inform practice when they enter kindergarten.

We mentioned briefly in the testimony that we are planning to organize a joint coordination team, and we are still in the very early stages of that, but we do plan to have the concept well developed and people assigned to this Subcommittee before the end of the year, and we will get that information back to your office.

Senator VOINOVICH. One of the things, if you look around to the communities that are perhaps getting the job done, it is where you have collaboratives, and part of this legislation that we are going to be introducing encourages the collaboration of public and private agencies. In Ohio, we call them our Children and Family First councils, where you get everybody at the table and, frankly, have the ability, and we were talking about earlier how do you figure out how you can get all your resources and bring them to bear, and that is one of the ways that has been very, very successful for us, is that people come to the table and figure out, how can we take advantage of it.

It should be done—you guys should be doing it on the Federal level to the best of your ability, to figure out how you can work together so that when it gets to the local level, that they can access it in the most effective way. But it also helps if there is a level of sophistication on the local level of the programs to be able to take advantage of that, and I think the more that you can do that, for example, the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services, get the people who are in the social service agencies and the educators at the table.

I remember in Cincinnati several years ago, the superintendent of public schools showed up at this Children and Family First. I mean, they just do not show up at these things, that this is not our area. But it was something to celebrate because it was a recognition by the superintendent of public schools in Cincinnati that this work being done was very important to the future of the education

system. So the more that that can happen, I think, the better off we are.

I think part of your strategy ought to be to figure out, how do we encourage this kind of thing to happen on the local level, where people are encouraged to come together and to perhaps put aside their turf issues, which you run into everywhere.

Ms. JOHNSON. Let me comment on that a bit. To be eligible for Even Start funds, you must come to the table as a team. You must identify all the service providers and bring them to the table and submit a common application. So one is simply by competition. If you want to be eligible for funds, you need to think about who you bring to the table.

The State-wide family literacy initiative in Ohio has received one of those. It also requires that all the service providers come to the table at the State level, and that is a very good way to model for local districts, the conversations, the actions, and the plans that come out of that work.

Now, as a former deputy superintendent, I will tell you that it is really important to be at the table with social service providers around the city because that is the only way you can really ensure that everyone is pulling together to improve upon the quality of education for schools. So you are going to find us at the table all of the time. That is just an essential part of the job.

Ms. GOLDEN. I also share the view that both of you have expressed that it is incredibly important. I thought about collaboration as an academic before I came to this job and was always struck by how, in addition to having the shared mission, the personal relationships really matter in order to get past the turf bottles and the other obstacles. People need to know each other and be able to pick up the phone to talk to each other.

One of the things I have tried to do when I travel is to sit down with that array of people, so I can tell you that in Cincinnati, they are still coming to the table together, at least as of when I was last there.

I think that in terms of what we do at the Federal level, it is partly about modeling, as you have highlighted. It is partly about trying to “run interference” on the funding. It is about providing financial incentives for collaboration, as we did, which is now a theme that you are focusing on, too. It is also about overcoming myths and misinterpretations. I am sure this happened when you were governor, too, but I hear people tell me all kinds of things that they have been told are obstacles—there is a rule, you cannot do that. Then I go and try to track down the rule and discover it is not a rule. It is somebody who was telling them something was more rigid than it was.

So we have been trying to do a lot of work in terms of accurately laying out the flexibility that exists by putting it down on paper. Even when we think something is obvious, we have learned that people sometimes need to see it in writing, so that their auditors or whoever cannot tell them that “there is a rule.”

The third thing that can be a challenge when the Head Start, early education community, and child care communities try to get together is that the child care community is so short on some of the resources that are needed to produce quality and the Head

Start and early childhood programs often are part-day, so they may not be in a position to meet the full-day needs. I'd be eager to see how your proposal deals with this issue.

Getting the resources out there to upgrade child care programs so they can really do school readiness, I think, helps the collaboration process. The Early Learning Fund that the President has proposed as part of the child care initiative would aim to get flexible dollars through States to communities for that 0-to-3 population particularly, but also for preschool, if they needed it, with the idea that it would be flexible. In one community, all the child care for babies may be in family homes and what you really need to do is train, support, dramatically improve what is going on in those homes. Somewhere else care may be mostly center-based so you could do some work strengthening the quality of care in childcare centers in a flexible way. So I guess I think that that is one piece of the puzzle, because that is an obstacle I have run into sometimes in trying to put those pieces together.

Ms. JOHNSON. I know you are puzzled by that, but we have historically lived in traditionally categorical programs and thought in categorical ways at the local level, and it was not always common for service providers in TANF, in health, and in early childhood and child care providers and schools. It was not a common occurrence to bring people together to the table.

But as we began to recognize the growing crisis in providing adequate early childhood educational experiences for children who were being held to much higher standards at the elementary level than they had ever been held to before, and as we modeled it at the Federal level, at the State level, and then put out applications that required that they come to the table, you began to see more and more people recognizing the importance of bringing everyone to the table.

I can recall some of the early meetings I had in my most recent position where there was a lot of discomfort initially. People were feeling they were going to lose their identity and might even lose their funding, until we recognized that only by bringing all of the streams of funding into the room and identifying how together they represented a comprehensive set of services that could only benefit the community as well as the school and the child did people begin to relax and talk about how they could share.

So it is going to come more and more with dissemination of really good practices, with more and more modeling. We are putting out publications that we are developing jointly with HHS, with Justice, and with the Department of Agriculture, all intended to help communities think more deeply and more thoughtfully about how you bring resources together around the table for one common goal: Ensuring that all of our children are entering schools ready to learn.

Senator VOINOVICH. I think that that would be a wonderful area of coordination between your two departments, because part of the incentive package—I know when I got started with this whole concept of how do we bring everyone together, I had seven of my State agencies that spent a year and a half developing our Children and Family First cabinet council. We worked with the National Governors' Association, and I will never forget, they were out in Colorado and they were all together and they came back and they were

all fired up and they were going to impose these councils on all of our 88 counties. I said to them, "No, I could not do that." I am an old county commissioner and mayor, and I said, "I do not like to have somebody mandate something."

So what we did is we put a request for proposal together and made money available and said, if communities will come in with a joint effort, getting together the various social service agencies, they will become pilot projects, and I think we had maybe 54 applications and we awarded about nine of them. Of course, the ones that did not get it were very disappointed and they wanted to know whether or not they could show up for the State-wide quarterly meetings and what was going on.

To make a long story short, today, we have 88 of them in the State, not actually 88 because several counties have gone together, two or three more rural counties. But the fact is, they are all different and they have different leadership and it is not a cookie cutter approach. This legislation I am talking about does allow that, encourages people to do that.

Again, as I say, if you could think about programs and how do we have incentives out there among the ones that you have to get them to get it, that this is the way to really help our community is to come together at the table, I think we certainly would be a whole lot better off.

The other thing that I would be interested in, and I am sure you have done it, but I would like if you could share this with me, would be to put on a piece of paper the various programs that you have and how they deal with the same population, and I am sure that you have it, but I would like to see it and how you are thinking about how you have all these programs and how they best could be coordinated among your agencies. I would just like to see them.

Ms. GOLDEN. And I would be glad to do that. The overview I would give on the early childhood side of the world is that we, essentially, have two big programs. We have the Head Start program and we have the child care and development block grant. As you know, one of the things that the administration and Congress did in the welfare reform legislation was pull together the child care side. It had been four separate programs and they got pulled together. So that, I think, was a big accomplishment.

So now we have on the child care side a single funding stream, essentially, for States, and then Head Start. A lot of our work, as you saw in the testimony, is about how to work with both communities and States in building partnerships across those two pieces. If it would be useful to you, we would be delighted to follow up with further information.

In terms of the President's proposal on child care, that proposal includes both additional dollars that would go as subsidies to parents in the major child care funding stream. It also includes this early learning fund with a special focus on flexible dollars that could be tied to results for very young children. So we would be glad to provide more information, if that is useful.

Ms. JOHNSON. Let me describe some of the programs that we have, because I am hoping this will help clarify what to the outside world seems like so many programs and so few people.

I mentioned Title I and the use of those monies. We also have in the Department of Education a significant allocation in our Office of Special Education Services for pre-K and early childhood and toddler education. And if you think about a day in the life of any normal hospital in a large city, you think about 20 youngsters born in one particular day, and they come to life with a variety of experiences already as prenatal babies. Some come from poor, working poor, some may come from a family where English is not spoken at home, some may come from mothers who are addicted to drugs or alcohol, and some come from relatively healthy families.

When you think about these 20 youngsters born in a day and you recognize you have to have in place an array of community services to ensure that they all are at the same playing field when they enter the first grade. So the trick in the school district community is to figure out how you look at this combination of students who were born on this particular day and ensure that as they move through those early years, or infancy years, we have hooked or linked their families with the appropriate services. At the same time that we are doing that in terms of social services, we are ensuring they receive the appropriate early childhood education experience.

To the degree that we become more proficient in describing this, more creative in helping people to understand the importance of this, to the degree that we are able to help them understand that these 20 children born on this one particular day have very diverse needs—and you are right, no one cookie cutter approach will meet the needs of those 20 children, either—you begin to help people understand why you need an array of services to ensure that when they enter that first grade, they have received the support they need to be successful.

Senator VOINOVICH. I think that is why we are taking our TANF money and putting it into Early Start. The Governor of Vermont—who is the Governor of Vermont?

Ms. GOLDEN. Howard Dean.

Senator VOINOVICH. Yes. Howard Dean, several years ago, put a program in place where each family is visited, and now Ohio is doing that with, “at-risk families and also with first born, anybody, no matter what their socio-economic is, the first-born child.” First of all, I think that maybe you identify that early on during the prenatal period, but certainly when that child is born, to have that mechanism there to make the identification, and once it is made, to be able to have the programs that are available to help that family.

Again, what are those programs? I suspect you can use Early Start and TANF money. It is one of the things that governors liked about TANF, is the flexibility that you got with those dollars, that you can deal with problems. The same way with problems of multi-handicapped families.

We had examples where they had 14 different social workers for them to access programs, and through our Family and Children First groups, they came back and recommended. So what we did in those counties was get a lot of agencies to put money in one pot, and again, I think we probably violated Federal guidelines, but that family then could come to one place and access those resources

and we could help them without forcing them to shop around. In addition to that, we had one person that was kind of their family helper to deal with that.

I think we need to just redouble our efforts to try and make sure that this is all coordinated. I know that you are interested in making sure the money is well spent on the local level. But I can tell you that the more flexibility and the more you partner up with the people who are closest to the customer, I think the better off everyone is going to be, because I think they really know more about how to deliver those services than we do here in Washington.

I think we also have to recognize that there is a variety of urban districts and there is a whole vast different set of circumstances there that vary, say, from a poor Appalachian area. We have 29 counties in Ohio that are Appalachian, and it is a whole different ball game, the same problems, but a different way of how to go about solving them.

Would either of you want to make any other comments?

Ms. GOLDEN. I guess I would just add that I have enormous respect both for what you accomplished in Ohio and for this agenda and would be glad to talk with you and then provide any additional information that would be useful.

My sense of our role at the Federal level is first, as you have described, we need to make the funding support the goals. We need, I think, to provide technical assistance to help people who figure out how to collaborate effectively share with others who are trying to figure it out, so everybody is not starting from scratch. We need to continue to do research. And we need to convene people and make sure that those connections happen. Finally, I very much would want to hear about concerns or problems that you would want me to know about. I would also be pleased to provide any additional information. I care about this issue very much and I really would like to be available to work with you. So thank you for the chance to talk about it.

Senator VOINOVICH. I think if you can do that, and the other thing is to figure out ways that are reasonable to deal with this. In this legislation, one of the things that we are suggesting to do is to fund public broadcasting so that they can replicate a program we have in Ohio and, I think, one other State, where you make available to particularly at-risk parents a curriculum—I do not know whether the Department of Education would be interested and would like to get your reaction to it—in coordination with public broadcasting, “Mr. Rogers” and the other programming they have, so that a stay-at-home mom can sit down and spend time with their baby and watch the program and afterwards reinforce it with questions and their suggestions of things that they do. The materials are very impressive. But to replicate that program, and it is very reasonable and it also is the kind of thing that could be used by a lot of these mom-and-pop child care centers.

I would be interested in getting an answer to this, is that we have found that a lot of our TANF-eligible moms are not taking advantage of our child care. We do not know why. Chris Dodd was trying to put more money for child care—and I went over and said to him that we are not using the money that we have. In fact, we have increased the amount of money an individual can make so

that they can take advantage of child care. I think we are at 185 percent of poverty or something like that because we are finding the money is not being used.

So you have a lot of these youngsters who are somewhere, to try and perhaps make that available to them, and a website that if you have a computer and a printer, you can just print out the stuff. Every month, you get your stuff. But it is easy things that people can use to help them at home or in these mom-and-pop facilities.

The other thing, again, it deals with quality of care. You have your performance standards, but a lot of that has got to do with the quality of the people who are at the Head Start facilities, and how do you upgrade their skills in a reasonable way, and we have this RISE program that we have where we have bought these satellites and where the teachers, child care and Head Start, are able to access information on how to improve their skills. There is even a little part of this where the parents can come in and we help encourage them to do some things at home.

It does not cost a lot of money, but there are some practical things that I think we can do that help get the job done. We also have in our State a video. In fact, it is Rob Reiner's video that Johnson put out. I think it is, "I Am Your Child." We got the hospitals to pay for it so that when mom is there—and, by the way, mom is not in the hospital long enough, as far as I am concerned—but the little, short period they are there, they get a chance to see the videotape and then they are given the videotape to take home with them. Of course, some do not have the equipment at home, but a lot of them do, and it is like a 30-minute how to take care of your child, what you should do, reading and mobiles that you can make. I mean, it is kind of elementary stuff, but it is, again, getting information to people as early as possible so they can do more for themselves. It sounds like simple things, but people—

Ms. JOHNSON. Yes, but it is so reassuring to hear your commitment and your understanding of what needs to be done.

Senator VOINOVICH. It is a lot of stuff, but anyhow, if you could take the report that GAO did and look at that, I would love for you to come back, and maybe you do not even have to come back, maybe you could just in the next couple of months do some brainstorming and come back with maybe some changes that you could make that might reflect some of the things that have been brought up today in your plan. I would be just thrilled to see you do it.

Ms. JOHNSON. I think what we would like to see is the final product that we are talking about, called a joint coordination plan, and we will make sure that when that is completed and it has been reviewed by lots of people, that you have a copy of it.

Senator VOINOVICH. And it would be good, because if we are going to have this results performance issue, which I think really was started by the Vice President, was it not? I think that was his baby. If we are going to have it, it would be very good that what you are doing there is contained in that report so we have one thing that we can look at, because, again, there are so many reports. It would be nice to have one place that you can look at, how are we doing, and then go back and review it to see whether or not we are accomplishing what we want to. It is good for us in Con-

gress in oversight, but, frankly, it is more important to the people that are really getting the job done, like yourselves.

Ms. GOLDEN. It sounds as though you would also like specific reactions to a couple of proposals that you just mentioned, right, so we should get copies of those and be able to react?

Senator VOINOVICH. Yes. There are some areas we have talked about today, and you have already mentioned them in yours, but I think it would be good to take that GAO report and look at what you produced and say, we can do better than this.

For example, one of the things that we discovered, the staff was mentioning that you were doing some coordination that is not in those reports. I mean, it should be there. We are doing this. There may be some other areas where, after you really look at them real carefully together, you can enhance those things.

Ms. JOHNSON. Let me offer some closing comments. Let me try to reassure you—

Senator VOINOVICH. I was corrected. The father of the Results Act is Senator Roth, who at the time was the senior GOP member of this Committee.

Ms. JOHNSON. I thought it was Vice President Gore, also.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you.

Ms. JOHNSON. Let me reassure you that we are going to continue our efforts to learn what works best, that we are not resting on the laurels. We know that, as stewards of public funds, we need to constantly ask ourselves, "Are the monies being used wisely? Are they being used to meet the intent and purpose of the law?" That question fuels the research studies that we put in place as well as helps us to think about whether or not the programs that we are proposing are the best possible programs for our clients and our customers.

We have had a history of working together. We will continue with that history, and we will get back to you with a plan that outlines, maybe in much more specific ways, how our efforts are coordinated to meet the needs of children in this country and how many children are still not being served despite the fact that there are a number of educational programs out and about in this country.

Senator VOINOVICH. That would be great, if you could, and I am going to send a letter out to Secretary Riley and to Secretary Shalala. You made reference to some of the interdepartment coordinating—

Ms. GOLDEN. On disabilities.

Senator VOINOVICH. Yes. In the letter, they have already got it, but I will send it anyhow because GAO did the study. They show these 90 programs dealing with prenatal-to-3 and it would be great if you look a little bit more carefully, look at your coordination. I am going to suggest to them that maybe they look at some of these other areas to see how they could be folded into this effort that you are making in terms of the overall effort to reach this population, because there are some other programs out there that are really important, and the issue is, are they just out there doing their thing without really being aware of what it is that you are doing?

Ms. GOLDEN. I think my testimony speaks particularly about the linkages to health, because, obviously, for the youngest kids—it is

true for all kids, but especially when you are talking about babies and toddlers and the prenatal years—health care is incredibly important. We have done a lot of work in that area as a particularly important additional piece of collaboration.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you very much for being here.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you.

Ms. GOLDEN. Thank you.

Senator VOINOVICH. This is hard for me to get accustomed to, hearings and there is only one person here, and I voted today in proxy on some other committee. Thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:48 a.m., the Subcommittee adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MARNIE S. SHAUL

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: We are pleased to be here today to begin a series of discussions on how the Congress can use the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Results Act) to oversee the work of Federal agencies and, in particular, how the performance plans required under the act can address the issue of multiple early childhood programs.

Almost \$14 billion dollars in Federal funds was available to support early childhood activities in fiscal year 1997, yet the large number of programs through which such funds are made available creates the potential for inefficient service as well as difficulty for those trying to access the most appropriate services and funding sources.¹ In fiscal years 1992 and 1993, 11 Federal agencies administered more than 90 programs that could fund early childhood services, and we determined that education or child care was key to the mission of 34 of the programs.² A disadvantaged child could potentially have been eligible for as many as 13 programs, although many programs reported serving only a portion of their target populations and maintaining long waiting lists. We have reported that programs sometimes overlap in the services they provide, regardless of how their primary mission is described. For example, child care programs designed primarily to meet the needs of parents so that they can work or be trained for work may also have an educational component. At the same time, programs like Head Start that operate as part-day programs to serve the developmental needs of children also allow parents to work during the hours in which children are in the program.

The Results Act is intended to improve the management of Federal programs by shifting the focus of accountability for Federal programs from a preoccupation with staffing and activity levels to outcomes. It can provide a new and structured framework for addressing multiple and overlapping programs. This should lead to new information on multiple programs, including those that cut across agency lines but share common goals.

My testimony today will focus on two main topics: (1) how the Results Act can assist in management and congressional oversight, especially in areas where there are multiple programs, and (2) how the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services (HHS)—which together administer more than half of the Federal early childhood program funds—addressed early childhood programs in their strategic and fiscal year 1999 and 2000 performance plans and the extent to which recent plans show progress in coordinating early childhood programs.

In summary, the Congress can use the Results Act to improve its oversight of crosscutting issues because the act requires agencies to develop strategic and annual performance plans that clearly specify goals, objectives, and measures for their programs. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has issued guidance saying that for crosscutting issues, agencies should describe efforts to coordinate so that goals are consistent and program efforts are mutually reinforcing. When we looked at the plans of Education and HHS, we found that the plans are not, however, living up to their potential as expected from the Results Act. More specifically, while the fiscal year 1999 and 2000 plans to some extent addressed coordination, the departments have not yet described in detail how they will coordinate or consolidate their efforts. Therefore, the potential for addressing fragmentation and duplication has not been realized, and we cannot assess whether the agencies are effectively working together on crosscutting issues.

¹*Child Care: Federal Funding for Fiscal Year 1997* (GAO/HEHS-98-70R, Jan. 23, 1998).

²*Early Childhood Programs: Multiple Programs and Overlapping Target Groups* (GAO/HEHS-95-4FS, Oct. 31, 1994).

BACKGROUND

Early childhood is a key period of development in a child's life and an emphasized age group for which services are likely to have long-term benefits. Recent research has underscored the need to focus on this period to improve children's intellectual development, language development, and school readiness.³

Early childhood programs serve children from infancy through age 5.⁴ The range of services includes education and child development, child care, referral for health care or social services, and speech or hearing assessment as well as many other kinds of services or activities.

Education and HHS's Administration for Children and Families (ACF) administer about 60 percent of the Federal early childhood program funds. The biggest early childhood programs in fiscal year 1997 for these departments were Head Start (approximately \$4 billion), administered by HHS, and Special Education programs (approximately \$1 billion), administered by Education. Head Start provides education and developmental services to young children, and the Special Education-Preschool Grants and Infants and Families program provides preschool education and services to young children with disabilities. Although these programs target different populations, use different eligibility criteria, and provide a different mix of services to children and families, there are many similarities in the services they provide. Figure 1 illustrates the Federal agencies responsible for Federal early childhood funding.

Figure 1: Early Childhood Funding Streams by Federal Agency, 1997

Health and Human Services:	52%	(\$7,231,572,500)
Treasury:	26%	(\$3,535,000,000)
Agriculture:	11%	(\$1,530,000,000)
Education:	9%	(\$1,201,357,864)
Military:	2%	(\$302,062,000)
Labor:	less than 1%	(\$1,691,000)
Appalachian Regional Commission:	less than 1%	(\$380,102)

Note: The Treasury Department's portion consists of the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and the Exclusion of Employer Provided Child Care. These represent estimates of revenue loss prepared by the Department of the Treasury based upon tax law enacted as of December 31, 1996. The Department of Agriculture portion is the Child and Adult Food Care Program.

Early childhood programs were included in the list of more than 30 programs our governmentwide performance and accountability report cited to illustrate the problem of fragmentation and program overlap.⁵ Virtually all the results that the government strives to achieve require the concerted and coordinated efforts of two or more agencies. However, mission fragmentation and program overlap are widespread, and programs are not always well coordinated. This wastes scarce funds, frustrates taxpayers, and limits overall program effectiveness.

THE RESULTS ACT HELPS THE CONGRESS AND AGENCIES OVERSEE PROGRAMS AND ADDRESS CROSSCUTTING ISSUES

The Results Act is intended to improve the management of Federal programs by shifting the focus of decision-making and accountability from activities such as giving some number of grants to the results of Federal programs. The act requires executive agencies, in consultation with the Congress and other stakeholders, to prepare strategic plans that include mission statements and goals. Each strategic plan covers a period of at least 5 years forward from the fiscal year in which the plan is submitted. It must include the following six key elements:

- a comprehensive mission statement covering the major functions and operations of the agency,

³"Brain Research Has Implications for Education" in the Education Commission of the States' *State Education Leader*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Winter 1997).

⁴At least half of the child care for infants and toddlers of working mothers is done through providers caring for children other than their own rather than through organized facilities such as a child care center. When we talk about early childhood programs, we are discussing only these organized facilities.

⁵*Government Management: Addressing High Risks and Improving Performance and Accountability* (GAO/T-OCG-99-23, Feb. 10, 1999).

- a description of general goals and objectives for the major functions and operations of the agency,
- a discussion of how these goals and objectives will be achieved and the resources that will be needed,
- a description of the relationship between performance goals in the annual performance plan and general goals and objectives in the strategic plan,
- a discussion of key factors external to the agency that could affect significantly the achievement of the general goals and objectives, and
- a description of program evaluations used to develop the plan and a schedule for future evaluations.

Agencies must also prepare annual performance plans that establish the connections between the long-term strategic goals outlined in the strategic plans and the day-to-day activities of program managers and staff. While the Results Act does not require a specific format for the annual performance plans, it requires a plan to,

- identify annual goals and measures covering each of its program activities,
- discuss the strategies and resources needed to achieve annual goals, and
- describe the means the agency will use to verify and validate its performance data.

The act also requires that each agency report annually on the extent to which it is meeting its annual performance goals and the actions needed to achieve or modify goals that have not been met. The first report, due by March 31, 2000, will describe the agencies' fiscal year 1999 performance.

The Results Act provides a valuable tool to address mission fragmentation and program overlap. The act's emphasis on results implies that Federal programs contributing to the same or similar outcomes are expected to be closely coordinated, consolidated, or streamlined, as appropriate, to ensure that goals are consistent and that program efforts are mutually reinforcing.⁶ As noted in OMB guidance and in our recent reports on the act, agencies should identify multiple programs within or outside the agency that contribute to the same or similar goals and describe their efforts to coordinate. Just as importantly, the Results Act's requirement that agencies define their mission and desired outcomes, measure performance, and use performance information provides multiple opportunities for the Congress to intervene in ways that could address mission fragmentation.

- As missions and desired outcomes are determined, instances of fragmentation and overlap can be identified and appropriate responses can be defined. For example, by emphasizing the intended outcomes of related Federal programs, the plans might allow identification of legislative changes needed to clarify congressional intent and expectations or to address changing conditions.
- As performance measures are developed, the extent to which agency goals are complementary and the need for common performance measures to allow for crossagency evaluations can be considered. For example, common measures of outcomes from job training programs could permit comparisons of programs' results and the tools used to achieve those results.
- As continued budget pressures prompt decisionmakers to weigh trade-offs inherent in resource allocation and restructuring decisions, the Results Act can provide the framework to integrate and compare the performance of related programs to better inform choices among competing budgetary claims.

The outcome of using the Results Act in these ways might be consolidation that would reduce the number of multiple programs, but it might also be a streamlining of program delivery or improved coordination among existing programs. Where multiple programs remain, coordination and streamlining would be especially important. Multiple programs might be appropriate because a certain amount of redundancy in providing services and targeting recipients is understandable and can be beneficial if it occurs by design as part of a management strategy. Such a strategy might be chosen, for example, because it fosters competition, provides better service delivery to customer groups, or provides emergency backup.

⁶ *Managing for Results: Using the Results Act to Address Mission Fragmentation and Program Overlap* (GAO/AIMD-97-146, Aug. 29, 1997).

**TWO AGENCIES' PLANS ADDRESS EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS BUT
LACK IMPORTANT DETAIL ON COORDINATION**

Education and HHS's ACF—the two agencies that are responsible for the majority of early childhood program funds—addressed early childhood programs in their strategic and 1999 performance plans. Although both agencies' plans generally addressed the required elements for strategic and performance plans, Education's plans provided more detailed information about performance measures and coordination strategies. The agencies in their 2000 plans similarly addressed the required elements for performance plans. However, strategies and activities that relate to coordination were not well defined. Although agencies state that some coordination occurs, they have not yet fully described how they will coordinate their efforts. The Education plan provided a more detailed description of coordination strategies and activities for early childhood programs than the ACF plan, including some performance measures that may cut across programs. The ACF plan described in general terms the agency's plans to coordinate with external and internal programs dealing with early childhood goals. Yet the information presented in the plans did not provide the level of detail, definition, and identification of complementary measures that would facilitate comparisons of early childhood programs.

Department of Education's Plans

Education's strategic plan for 1998–2002 highlighted early childhood programs as a major area of departmental concern. In establishing the importance of early childhood education, the strategic plan said that

- the extent of early learning opportunities for children has consequences for long-term success;
- research on early brain development reveals that if some learning experiences are not introduced to children at an early age, the children will find learning more difficult later;
- children who enter school ready to learn are more likely to achieve high standards than children who are inadequately prepared; and
- high-quality preschool and child care are integral in preparing children adequately for school.

Early childhood issues were discussed in the plan's goal to "Build a solid foundation for learning for all children" and in one objective and two performance indicators (see table 1).

Table 1: Department of Education's Strategic Plan Framework for Early Childhood Programs

Goal	Objective and performance indicators
Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.	All children enter school ready to learn. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The disparity in preschool participation rates between children of high-income families and children of low-income families will become increasingly smaller.</i> • <i>The percentage of 3- to 5-year-olds whose parents read to them or tell them stories regularly will continuously increase.</i>

The 1999 performance plan, Education's first performance plan, followed from the strategic plan. It clearly identified programs contributing to Education's early childhood objective and set individual performance goals for each of its programs. Paralleling the strategic plan, the performance plan specified the core strategies Education intended to use to achieve its early childhood goal and objective. Among these were interagency coordination, particularly with HHS's Head Start program. According to Education's strategic plan, this coordination was intended to ensure that children's needs are met and that the burden on families and schools working with multiple providers is reduced. The performance plan also said that Education would work with HHS and other organizations to incorporate some common indicators of young children's school readiness into their programs. It would also work with HHS more closely to align indicators of progress and quality between HHS's Head Start program and its Even Start Family Literacy program—which has as part of its goal the integration of early childhood education, adult literacy or adult basic education, and parenting education.

In our examination of Education's 1999 performance plan, we reported that one of the plan's strengths was its recognition that coordination with other Federal agencies enables it to better serve program participants and reduce inefficiencies in

service delivery.⁷ We said that although this first plan included a great deal of valuable information, it did not provide sufficient details, such as

These observations apply to the early childhood programs as well. Without this additional detail, policymakers are limited in their ability to make decisions about programs and resource allocation within the department and across agencies. Education's 2000 performance plan continues to demonstrate the department's commitment to the coordination of its early childhood programs. Like the 1999 performance plan, the sections on early childhood programs clearly identified programs contributing to its childhood program objectives. It also contained new material highlighting the importance of the coordination of early childhood programs as a crosscutting issue, particularly with HHS. To facilitate collaboration, the department added a strategy to work with the states to encourage interagency agreements at the state level. It also added using the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council to coordinate strategies for children with disabilities and their families.⁸ At the same time, the department still needs to better define its objectives and performance measures for crosscutting issues. Unless the purpose of coordination activities is clearly defined and results in measurable outcomes, it will be difficult to make progress in the coordination of programs across agencies.

ACF's Plan

In its 1999 performance plan, ACF recognized the importance of investment in sound growth and development for children, particularly those in low-income families. It said that programs such as Early Head Start, Head Start, and quality child care programs are essential to good health, early development, and school readiness. The ACF plan reflected early childhood programs in 2 strategic goals—increase economic independence and productivity for families, and improve healthy development, safety, and well-being of children and youth—and 3 objectives (see table 2).

Table 2: ACF Framework for Early Childhood Programs

Goal	Objectives and selected performance indicators
Increase economic independence and productivity for families.	Increase affordable child care. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of children receiving subsidized child care from the 1997 baseline average of 1.25 million served per month.
Improve healthy development, safety, and well-being of children and youth.	Increase the quality of child care to promote childhood development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children demonstrate emergent literacy, numeracy, and language skills. • Children demonstrate improved general cognitive skills. • Children demonstrate improved gross and fine motor skills. Improve the health status of children. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase from 75% to 81% the percentage of Head Start children who receive necessary treatment for emotional or behavioral problems after being identified as needing such treatment.

The ACF plan, however, did not always give a clear picture of intended performance of its programs and often failed to identify the strategies the agency would use to achieve its performance goals. ACF programs that contribute to each early childhood objective were identified, and several of these programs had individual performance goals. However, without a clear picture of intended program goals and performance measures for crosscutting early childhood programs, it will be difficult to compare programs across agencies and assess the Federal Government's overall efficacy in fostering early childhood development.

In our preliminary review of ACF's plan for fiscal year 2000, we found some mention of the need to encourage collaboration in addressing ACF's crosscutting program goals. It also acknowledged and discussed the key roles of states and localities in administering ACF's programs and achieving performance goals. However, internal and external coordination issues as they relate to early childhood programs were

⁷The Results Act: Observations on the Department of Education's Fiscal Year 1999 Annual Performance Plan (GAO/HEHS-98-172R, June 8, 1998).(1) a more complete picture of intended performance across the department, (2) a fuller portrayal of how its strategies and resources would help achieve the plan's performance goals, and(3) better identification of significant data limitations and their implications for assessing the achievement of performance goals.

⁸ACF has its own performance plan, which is referred to in the HHS performance plan.

not fully addressed. For example, external coordination was discussed, but ACF's discussion of coordination, consultation, and partnerships primarily remained a general description of what has happened in the past. For example, the plan stated as one of its strategic objectives to "increase the quality of childcare to promote childhood development." To support this objective, ACF identified the need to coordinate with the Department of Education concerning the Head Start program along with other internal and external stakeholders in this area. However, it did not define how this coordination will be accomplished or the means by which the crosscutting results will be measured.

Agency officials are able to describe numerous activities that demonstrate collaboration within the agency and with Education. The absence of that discussion in the plan, however, limits the value the Results Act could have to both improving agency management and assisting the Congress in its oversight role.

Progress in coordinating crosscutting programs is still in its infancy, although agencies are recognizing its importance. Agency performance plans provide the building blocks for recognizing crosscutting efforts. Because of the iterative nature of performance-based management, however, more than one cycle of performance plans will probably be required in the difficult process of resolving program fragmentation and overlap.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement. We would be happy to answer any questions that you or Members of the Subcommittee may have.

Related GAO Products

Government Management: Addressing High Risks and Improving Performance and Accountability (GAO/T-OCG-99-23, Feb. 10, 1999).

The Results Act: An Evaluator's Guide to Assessing Agency Annual Performance Plans (GAO/GGD-10.1.20, Apr. 1, 1998).

Managing for Results: Observations on Agencies' Strategic Plans (GAO/T-GGD-98-66, Feb. 12, 1998).

Child Care: Federal Funding for Fiscal Year 1997 (GAO/HEHS-98-70R, Jan. 23, 1998).

Federal Education Funding: Multiple Programs and Lack of Data Raise Efficiency and Effectiveness Concerns (GAO/HEHS-98-77R, Jan. 21, 1998).

Federal Education Funding: Multiple Programs and Lack of Data Raise Efficiency and Effectiveness Concerns (GAO/T-HEHS-98-46, Nov. 6, 1997).

At-Risk and Delinquent Youth: Multiple Programs Lack Coordinated Federal Effort (GAO/T-HEHS-98-38, Nov. 5, 1997).

Head Start: Challenges Faced in Demonstrating Program Results and Responding to Societal Changes (GAO/T-HEHS-98-183, June 9, 1998).

The Results Act: Observations on the Department of Education's Fiscal Year 1999 Annual Performance Plan (GAO/HEHS-98-172R, June 8, 1998).

Managing for Results: Agencies' Annual Performance Plans Can Help Address Strategic Planning Challenges (GAO/GGD-98-44, Jan. 30, 1998).

Managing for Results: Using the Results Act to Address Mission Fragmentation and Program Overlap (GAO/AIMD-97-146, Aug. 29, 1997).

The Results Act: Observations on the Department of Education's June 1997 Draft Strategic Plan (GAO/HEHS-97-176R, July 18, 1997).

The Government Performance and Results Act: 1997 Governmentwide Implementation Will Be Uneven (GAO/GGD-97-109, June 2, 1997).

Early Childhood Programs: Multiple Programs and Overlapping Target Groups (GAO/HEHS-95-4FS, Oct. 31, 1994).

PREPARED STATEMENT OF OLIVIA A. GOLDEN

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the coordination of early childhood programs. Mr. Chairman, I know that early childhood education has been a top priority of yours for many years, and I particularly welcome the chance to discuss these important issues with you because of my deep respect for your accomplishments on behalf of young children during your tenure as Governor of Ohio.

As you know, early childhood education has also been a high priority for the administration. In partnership with the Congress, the administration has provided leadership in three different and complementary ways: By expanding public invest-

ment to serve more needy children and families, by stronger efforts to improve program quality and accountability, and by creative work to support partnerships across different early childhood programs.

There is a tremendous need for public investment to help low income families with child care expenses and to provide high quality, comprehensive early childhood programs to help children enter school ready to learn. Data from 1997 showed that less than 15 percent of the 10 million children who qualify for the Child Care and Development Block Grant were obtaining a subsidy and Head Start still serves less than 50 percent of low-income preschool children. Accordingly, President Clinton has placed a high priority on steady increases in early childhood funding, leading to doubling the level of funding for child care, expansion of Head Start to serve 1 million children annually by 2002, and establishing the Early Head Start program which has grown to more than 500 community-based programs for children under the age of three. The President has continued this commitment to early childhood programs in his FY 2000 budget proposal by requesting an historic increase of \$607 million for Head Start expansion and quality improvements, as well as \$19.3 billion over 5 years for critically important investments in child care, including a new Early Learning Fund to provide States and communities additional resources to enhance the quality of early care and education services for our youngest and most vulnerable children.

We are encouraged to see similar efforts by States and local communities to invest in these same priorities. Since 1987, State funding for pre-kindergarten programs has increased from \$180 million to more than \$1.5 billion and State funding to expand Head Start services has increased from less than \$14 million to more than \$154 million. State funding of child care has also grown significantly. In order to draw down the full amount of funds available under the Child Care and Development Block Grant, States in FY 1998 appropriated \$1.6 billion in maintenance of effort and matching funds, and a number of States report additional appropriations of State resources. Recent initiatives such as the commitment of \$40 million over 3 years to expand and improve early childhood and health programs in Cuyahoga County, Ohio are further exciting evidence of continuing public commitment to support working families with young children and help all children enter school ready to learn.

The second component of Federal leadership in early childhood programs is to improve program quality and hold programs accountable for results. Working hand in hand with the Congress, we have developed new performance standards and program monitoring procedures for Head Start and adopted a tougher stance in enforcing these standards, leading to replacement of more than 125 local programs. At the same time, we have made investments to improve Head Start staff training and compensation and to support other local quality improvement efforts. We are also pleased that last year the Congress made a down payment towards the President's child care initiative by providing an increase of \$183 million for much-needed quality improvements, research and evaluation efforts.

Another critically important aspect of our leadership to enhance early childhood quality is the development of outcome standards and measures for Head Start and child care programs. The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) set in motion the first national effort to identify specific outcomes for federally-funded early childhood programs, and a system to measure and track progress on these performance measures. For example, we have made rapid progress in implementing performance measures for Head Start programs, drawing on the work of the National Education Goals Panel and extensive consultation with early childhood experts, including the Department of Education. We created a comprehensive, cutting-edge system of 24 outcome measures to track progress towards our overall goal of improving the healthy development and learning readiness of young children.

Next, we set up our Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) to assess performance on these measures in a nationally-representative sample of local Head Start agencies. Initial findings from the FACES survey are already being used to pinpoint strengths and areas for needed improvements in Head Start, giving us a powerful new tool to continue to improve the effectiveness of more than 1,400 local programs. For example, we can document that the quality of teaching in Head Start is good, that children are making progress in key learning areas such as vocabulary growth, and that parents are heavily involved in and highly satisfied with Head Start. FACES also allows us to track specific indicators such as the fact that two-thirds of Head Start parents read to their children at least three times per week, and the finding that Head Start programs could be doing more to increase the proportions of parents that read to their children every day. We are convinced that our success in implementing GPRA will form the foundation for continued progress in

improving program quality and outcomes, as well as serve as a model for State and local efforts to upgrade all forms of early childhood programs.

In addition to these achievements in expanding and improving child care and Head Start programs, I am pleased to have the opportunity to highlight for the Subcommittee the many things that we are doing to improve coordination so that the full spectrum of early childhood programs work together for children. As we work to administer each program authorized by Congress, we seek to work with State, local, and community partners to make it easier for them to bring programs together and to use resources from different Federal and State agencies to serve children and their parents with high quality, safe, affordable early care and education.

I will highlight four key areas:

- Ensuring that funding strategies provide incentives for collaboration;
- Ensuring that Federal policy supports collaboration and correcting misinterpretations of Federal rules or regulations that may be barriers to partnerships;
- Providing technical assistance and sharing successful models of coordination; and
- Convening Federal, State and local partners to facilitate collaboration.

Ensuring that Funding Strategies Provide Incentives for Collaboration

For the past 3 years, the Head Start Bureau placed a priority on partnership strategies in awarding more than \$340 million in program expansion funding. This policy led to providing full-day/full-year services to more than 50,000 additional children in partnership arrangements with child care and pre-kindergarten agencies and resources. The Head Start and Child Care Bureaus are working together to help States and communities find effective ways to combine Head Start, child care and pre-kindergarten program funds to provide high quality, full-day/full-year early childhood programs.

For instance, Child Focus, Inc. in Clermont County, Ohio uses resources from State and Federal Head Start, child care, Even Start, mental health, alcohol and substance abuse to offer families a wide array of coordinated services, including early childhood education, family literacy, health care, substance abuse and violence prevention in a single center. The agency also provides on-site training for Head Start and child care staff via a partnership with the University of Cincinnati and collaborates with local child care centers and family child care homes to serve additional children and families.

Supporting Collaboration Through Federal Policies

Our second key strategy is working to ensure that Federal policies support collaboration and to identify and remove obstacles to collaboration that are based on misinterpretations of Federal rules and regulations. For instance, the Child Care Bureau provided guidance to prevent unwarranted problems in auditing agencies that use funding from different Federal programs, and issued a memorandum clarifying the flexibility available to States in addressing issues of defining eligibility across early childhood programs, including subsidized child care. In a similar manner, the Head Start Bureau has issued clarifications of policies on collecting fees, sharing equipment and supplies, and recruiting and enrolling children on a year-around basis to make it easier to partner with child care and pre-kindergarten providers.

We are also working in close partnerships with the 13 States that provide funding to Head Start programs. In States such as Ohio, Minnesota, and Oregon, Federal and State officials are working together in funding, monitoring and providing training and technical assistance to local programs. These leadership efforts support new emerging partnerships such as the City of Chicago's innovative strategy to link more than 150 family child care providers with Head Start resources to provide full-day, full-year Head Start and to enhance the quality of services in family child care homes across the city.

Providing Technical Assistance to Remove Barriers to Collaboration and Sharing Successful Models and Strategies

Another indicator of our sustained commitment to promoting early childhood collaboration is a new initiative by the Head Start and Child Care Bureaus to jointly fund and manage a national training and technical assistance project called "Quality in Linking Together: Early Education Partnerships" (QUILT). The QUILT will work to engage States, communities and Indian tribes in developing a strategic approach to fostering early education partnerships to maximize Federal, State and local early childhood resources. The QUILT will disseminate information on successful partnership models, and provide on-site technical assistance for child care, Head

Start, pre-kindergarten, and other early education providers. The QUILT will draw on the examples and lessons of a wide array of emerging collaborative models including a new effort in Denver, Colorado where Head Start and child care providers have joined with the United Way and a number of public agencies to launch the Ready to Succeed Partnership. This initiative is working to improve the quality of care through toy and resource lending libraries, parent outreach workers, teacher scholarships, professional development opportunities, and linkages to health care providers.

We are also supporting additional partnership efforts in training and technical assistance to assist Head Start and child care agencies in collaborating with Department of Education programs such as the Even Start family literacy effort and programs for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities. For example, in a public-private partnership with the Conrad Hilton Foundation, we are contributing to a \$15 million initiative to train teams of Early Head Start, early intervention program providers, parents, and other community agencies to improve the capacity of Early Head Start programs to serve infants and toddlers with disabilities. In addition, the Head Start Bureau is launching a new \$15 million technical assistance project targeted to enhancing family literacy services and partnerships between Even Start, Head Start and other early childhood programs.

ACF early childhood programs are also working together at the State and local levels to share training resources and develop more effective and inclusive career development systems for teachers of young children. States such as Kansas and Ohio have created innovative distance learning and interactive television systems to offer training to child care, public school and Head Start teachers. Local agencies such as the Macon Program for Progress Head Start in North Carolina have developed regional training sites to offer model demonstration classrooms, on-site college courses, training for the Child Development Associate credential and a variety of other services to staff from all community programs, using funding from a variety of State, Federal, and higher education institutions.

Convening Federal, State and Local Partners to Facilitate Collaboration

Our fourth key strategy in building early childhood collaboration is to sponsor forums and initiatives to bring together early childhood and child care leaders and other partners to solve common problems and plan for the future. Our Head Start State Collaboration Office initiative links Head Start with State programs in child care, education, welfare, disabilities, homeless services, community service, family literacy and health. Maine's Collaboration Office took the lead in creating a unified State proposal to use Head Start expansion funding in partnership with child care centers. In addition, it convened a coalition of Head Start and child care organizations in the Alliance for Children's Care, Education and Supportive Services (ACCESS). With funding from the Head Start Bureau, ACCESS created 11 regional early childhood planning groups to document community needs and the current capacity of early childhood and child care programs and agencies across the State. This effort led to a comprehensive, State-wide data base with enrollment, eligibility, and waiting list information for all child care, family child care, Head Start and pre-school programs and the numbers of children who are eligible but unserved in each region of the State. This data base and the convening process has led to a series of legislative proposals to expand funding for early childhood services in Maine.

In both Head Start and Child Care, collaboration efforts extend to linking with other key services for young children and their families, such as medical, dental and mental health care, nutrition, services to children with disabilities, child support, adult and family literacy, and employment training. These comprehensive services are crucial in helping families progress towards self-sufficiency and in helping parents provide a better future for their young children. For instance, the Healthy Child Care America Campaign, a partnership with the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, supports collaborative efforts of health professionals, child care providers, and families to improve the health and safety of children in child care settings. In Pennsylvania, the Healthy Child Care project works with child care and Head Start programs to establish linkages with health professionals, and provide telephone advice to staff members about health and safety issues.

Head Start, Child Care Bureau and other HHS staff are also active members of the Department of Education's Federal Interagency Coordinating Council to coordinate programs to serve young children with disabilities. These efforts reflect the long history and considerable current efforts to use community-based Head Start and child care programs as inclusive environments for young children with special needs. ACF is also actively involved with ED in joint funding of new national data bases on early childhood experiences and programs, and coordinating efforts to use common outcome measures in studies sponsored by a variety of Federal agencies.

For example, ACF is supplementing funding for the National Center for Education Statistics' Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Birth Cohort to supplement the study's ability to support analyses of Head Start enrollees and eligible children who are not enrolled.

Community, State and Federal efforts are paying off in partnerships that truly make a difference for children and families. The story of one family served by the Drueding Center/Project Rainbow in Philadelphia demonstrates the power of collaboration. Thelma, a recovering drug-addicted mother of five children, was separated from her family and became homeless. Two of her children were physically and cognitively delayed. Through the Drueding Center, a collaborative program receiving Federal and private funding, Thelma received temporary housing with the use of HUD funds, a child care subsidy through the Child Care and Development Block Grant, as well as job training to help her become employed. One of her children enrolled in a residential treatment center, and another participates in the Project Rainbow Head Start/child care collaborative program. With this array of support from Drueding and her own hard work, Thelma is now reunited with her children. She is a full-time student enrolled in Temple University, and is now supporting the Drueding Center as a member of its Board of Directors and in fund-raising activities for its many programs.

Future Directions

Recognizing the positive impact that coordinated early childhood programs have on States, communities, and most importantly, children and families, ACF seeks to build on and expand our existing coordination efforts in three ways. First, we will support collaboration and the use of outcome measurement around early childhood programs through the Early Learning Fund, which is part of the President's Fiscal Year 2000 budget. The Early Learning Fund will, for the first time, specifically devote funding to communities to enhance the quality of care for children, with a focus on promoting school readiness for children through age five. The dollars will be distributed through States and the services under the Fund will be delivered at the local level to enable communities and parents to take action based on their assessment of what is needed and what will work best. We believe that this flexible, results-focused funding will assist States and communities in maximizing existing early childhood resources, strengthening partnerships and improving quality. Second, ACF will be convening State administrators of child care and pre-kindergarten programs and Head Start leaders this fall to explore collaborative approaches to program funding, monitoring, performance outcomes, professional development and technical assistance. Third, we will begin a new effort with the Department of Education to review opportunities for further coordination in the areas of performance indicators, funding, service strategies and research.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee today. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JUDITH JOHNSON

Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Judith Johnson, and I am currently serving as Acting Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education. Until 2 years ago, I was a career educator in New York State, where I worked in urban and suburban school districts as a teacher, guidance counselor, principal, and district administrator.

It is an honor to have the opportunity to testify before this Subcommittee with Assistant Secretary Golden. Over the years, the Department has worked in close collaboration with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to help States and local communities provide high-quality early childhood education.

In his State of Education Address this February in California, Secretary Riley identified the early years of childhood as the period in which "we have the most potential to make the greatest gains." The latest research clearly demonstrates that children's success in school is highly dependent on the quality of the learning environment they experience in childhood. According to a study conducted by the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) in 1998, the quality of the language and literacy environments in early childhood programs and the development of specific linguistic skills predict later language development, reading success, and other academic outcomes for children.

School districts across the country are beginning to offer children from poor families early childhood education before they enter kindergarten. For example, the Charlotte-Mecklenberg school district in North Carolina is using approximately 85 percent of its Title I funding to provide early childhood education for at-risk 3- and

4-year old children within the public schools and in center-based programs. Many of these classrooms operate in collaboration with Head Start. Preliminary evaluation data on this program, known as "Bright Beginnings," are promising. Children participating in this Charlotte-Mecklenberg early childhood education program enter kindergarten better prepared than their at-risk peers who do not participate in the program.

Many States have effectively pooled Federal, State, and local dollars to help ensure that all children enter school ready to learn. Illinois has been providing State funding since 1985 for 3-, 4- and 5-year olds who are at risk for school failure. School districts are responsible for determining if a student is at risk, while the Illinois State Board of Education is responsible for administering the program. In fiscal year 1998, this program served over 50,000 children. In 1990, the Ohio legislature enacted a landmark early childhood education program. This legislation provides many 3- and 4-year olds from low-income families in Ohio with access to a high-quality preschool education in either a public preschool, a Head Start class, or a child care program. A recent survey of State-funded pre-school initiatives, conducted by Yale University, found that Ohio, along with Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Oregon and Washington, is one of six States doing an outstanding job providing preschool education.

The Department, in partnership with other Federal agencies such as HHS, must act as a catalyst to support innovative State programs aimed at increasing opportunity for students to experience high-quality early childhood education. The Department's 6-year strategic plan and fiscal year 2000 Annual Plan both recognize the important role that the early childhood experience plays in future school and life success. Our plan contains coordination strategies to maximize Federal services and also identifies the goal of ensuring that "all children enter school ready to learn." We recognize that interagency coordination is vital in providing high-quality early childhood services that complement, rather than duplicate, each other.

The Department shows its commitment to the education of young children in its strategic plan, which includes a school readiness objective, as well as strategies to improve our services to young children before they enter school. Our 2000 Annual Plan specifically lays out performance measures and strategies for interagency coordination in the area of early childhood, as recognized by the General Accounting Office in its assessment of our plan. In order to help States and local communities better provide early childhood education, improved coordination is needed at the Federal level across agencies.

Although more can be done with our Federal partners, the Department has made some initial progress in the area of coordination. I would like to describe some of our accomplishments to date. I will discuss coordination activities in three general areas: (1) coordinating research; (2) coordinating services; and (3) coordinating performance measurement.

COORDINATING RESEARCH

The Department has created the Early Childhood Research Working Group (ECRWG), coordinated by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's (OERI) National Institute on Early Childhood Development and Education, known as the Early Childhood Institute (ECI). The Working Group links ECI with other offices in the Department and approximately eight other Federal departments that support research, data collection, or services for young children and their families. The chairperson of the Working Group is a staff member from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) in HHS, while the day-to-day activities of the Working Group are conducted by staff in the Early Childhood Institute. The purposes of the Working Group are to allow agency representatives to share information, receive professional development, and begin discussions about a collaborative early childhood research agenda.

The Working Group consists of approximately 100 members representing 30 Federal agencies and meets at least twice a calendar year. The Working Group agenda is developed jointly by the Department and HHS. Frequently, the Departments of Defense, Agriculture, and Justice take part in the planning. The topic of the group's July 1998 meeting was "the Children's Research Initiative." Duane Alexander, M.D., Director of NICHD at HHS, presented the administration's plan for research related to young children's health, safety, learning, and development. The group discussed child care studies, research related to the role of fathers in young children's development, and a research competition focusing on improving how young children are taught mathematics and reading.

Meetings of the Working Group have fostered information sharing and started discussions leading to interagency agreements for research. These kinds of agreements

bring together the interdisciplinary expertise needed to design effective, comprehensive strategies that will improve young children's chances for success. For example, two HHS offices, NICHD and ASPE, collaborated with ECI on a soon-to-be-released report, "Young Children's Education, Health, and Development: The Profile and Synthesis Project." This report focuses on selected, current, large-scale, federally and privately funded initiatives devoted to improving young children's education, health, and development, as well as their parents' ability to support their growth. This study will give us information about program efficacy and implications of the findings for practice.

Another agreement that evolved from discussions begun at Working Group meetings is between ECI and the HHS Substance and Mental Health Services Administration. This activity is a joint investigation of intensive, comprehensive mental health interventions and whether or not they improve the school readiness of young children whose parents have chronic substance abuse or mental health problems.

A second interagency committee, the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council (FICC), was established in 1991 by Congress to coordinate and mobilize all available resources to ensure the effective coordination of Federal early intervention and preschool programs and policies for children with disabilities and their families. Comprised of representatives from 19 Federal offices in the Department, HHS, Agriculture, Interior, Defense, and the Social Security Administration, as well as parents and professionals from State agencies and other related organizations, the FICC meets quarterly and has five active standing committees and various task forces and working groups.

The IDEA Amendments of 1997 broadened the functions of the FICC to include advising and assisting the Secretaries of the agencies mentioned above (in addition to the Secretary of Education) in the performance of their responsibilities related to serving children with disabilities from birth through age five. The first report in this area is presently being prepared, listing the accomplishments and activities of the FICC and laying out recommendations for the future. The FICC has a strategic plan that guides its work and is in the process of implementing a new interagency agreement to replace a memorandum of understanding signed in 1992. The Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services chairs the FICC and provides staff support; however, all agencies are asked to contribute resources and expertise to its work.

The Department's Office of Special Education Programs, ECI, and NICHD in HHS jointly sponsored the *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children* report of the National Research Council (NRC). This report was the culmination of a 2-year effort by a committee of nationally recognized experts in reading, child development, linguistics, and psychology. The study synthesizes the most effective, current research on the learning and teaching of reading. A significant section of this report explores how literacy can be fostered from birth through kindergarten and the primary grades, with recommendations on effective professional development and instruction for young children. The NRC also produced a customer-friendly guide for parents, teachers, and child care providers, entitled *Starting Out Right*, that describes how to promote children's reading success and prevent reading difficulties.

Another example of a major collaborative effort is the Interagency Education Research Initiative (IERI), co-sponsored by OERI, NICHD, and the National Science Foundation. The IERI is a 5-year collaborative research effort that supports large-scale studies on the best approaches to raising student achievement. The purposes of the program are: (1) to foster creative research on basic learning, teaching, and organizational mechanisms; and (2) to identify classroom teaching practices that can be replicated widely and produce positive outcomes that last beyond the third grade. It has a strong focus on school readiness for children when they enter school. When the grants are awarded later this fiscal year, all three agencies will share monitoring responsibilities. The President's Budget proposes \$50 million in fiscal year 2000 to continue and expand IERI.

COORDINATING SERVICES ACROSS AGENCIES

Early childhood education needs to be coordinated across Federal agencies and with State and local entities responsible for providing services. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized in 1994, requires that local educational agencies that use Title I, Part A funds to provide early childhood development services must comply with the Head Start performance standards. This requirement provides for a more careful alignment of performance goals among early childhood programs in the Department and HHS. The Department has worked in partnership with HHS in determining how the performance standards should apply to Title I schools. In a memo to then White House Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, the

Office of Management and Budget cited this agreement as a "classic example of agencies working together effectively." The Department issued guidance on this provision in April of 1996.

"Safe Schools/Healthy Students" is a new initiative by the Department, HHS, and Justice to support coordinated local efforts to provide communities with enhanced comprehensive educational, mental health, social service, law enforcement, and, as appropriate, juvenile justice services to promote healthy childhood development and prevent violence and alcohol and other drug abuse. Early childhood psychosocial and emotional development programs are among the strategies that grantees will address, using an integrated, community-wide approach. As part of this effort, the three agencies are collaborating to conduct an evaluation of the initiative, which will include the development and monitoring of a core set of indicators.

The Even Start Family Literacy program, administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, is based on interagency coordination. Even Start draws on existing service providers to integrate early childhood education, adult education, and parenting education into a unified program. According to the second national evaluation of Even Start, projects are successful at arranging collaborative relationships. Even Start projects collaborate with a variety of agencies and organizations, which either act as the primary provider of services or supplement the services already provided by Even Start. For example, 25 percent of projects reported that Head Start was the primary provider of early childhood services, and 51 percent reported Head Start to be a secondary provider. Rather than duplicating preschool services, the collaboration between the Department and HHS works towards improving the quality of services provided to our most vulnerable children. The recently authorized Reading Excellence Act included several amendments to the Even Start program that further emphasize collaboration. One of these amendments provides \$10 million annually for Statewide Family Literacy coordination to help States coordinate and integrate literacy resources, such as those funded under the Department's Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, Title I, and HHS' Head Start Act.

The Department's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) funds services to young children with disabilities. Because children with disabilities often require a range of services from a variety of agencies, collaboration and coordination are imperative. The annual plan's performance indicators for Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Grants for Infants and Families program, include a number of performance measures that require cross-program coordination. For example, one of the program's performance indicators is, "The number of States accessing all appropriate sources of funding (i.e. Medicaid, Maternal and Child Health Block Grant, State general revenues) will increase." OSERS will be conducting a study in 2002 of State and local implementation of Part C that should provide baseline data on the level of coordination.

COORDINATING PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

As seen in these examples, the Department has made progress in the area of interagency coordination. But we know that the Department needs to do even more. The recent reauthorization of the Head Start program, with its focus on educational performance measures and literacy, provides an excellent opportunity for this collaboration. The HHS plan includes several indicators of educational progress that are consistent with the goal of ensuring that all children enter kindergarten ready to learn. For example, HHS indicators include "Children demonstrate emergent literacy, numeracy, and language skills" and "Children demonstrate improved general cognitive skills." The Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) is explicitly measuring and reporting measures of Head Start children's school readiness. Early findings from this study were released last year.

The Department intends to build on these activities underway between our agency and HHS by creating a joint coordination plan, which we will submit to Congress by the end of this year. Areas of coordination that we will address include performance indicators, service strategies for early childhood, and research. Coordination of indicators among early childhood programs was included in our annual plan and was also a recommendation of the Department's recently released report on evaluation, *Federal Education Legislation Enacted in 1994*. In this report, we point out the lack of consistent expectations for school readiness. This makes it difficult to assess a program's effectiveness in supporting the learning and development that young children need for school success. In addition, the ECI and the Office of Special Education Programs are sponsoring a Study of Early Childhood Pedagogy at the National Academy of Sciences. The study, which will be completed in early 2000, will tell us what young children need to experience and learn if they are to be successful

in kindergarten and what measures will best assess what young people have learned.

In conclusion, we agree that early childhood experiences are critical to the future success of the Nation's children. We also believe that the plans developed under the Government Performance and Results Act can and should facilitate coordination among agencies serving similar populations or that have similar goals. We look forward to a continued dialogue about early childhood issues and coordination. In addition to better coordination of services, the Department also hopes to strengthen the quality of early childhood education nationwide through the elements in our proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to testify. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

