

UNIVERSAL PRE-KINDERGARTEN

The Need

Educational studies again and again have shown that children who enroll in nursery school and other pre-kindergarten programs go onto, by and large, more fruitful academic careers. These students, on average, show higher IQ scores, score higher on standardized tests, have a higher high school graduation rate, and are more likely to go onto college and post-baccalaureate studies.

In fact, the help and life long lessons learned in these pre-K programs go far beyond academic lessons. Currently, the Head Start program makes pre-K available for many children of single parents, 2-child families making under \$22,000, and families of our making less than \$31,000. Of this income group, only 57% of former pre-K students grew up to be single mothers as compared to 83% of those who did not attend pre-K programs. Additionally, less than 13% of males from this income group who attended pre-K went on to be arrested a minimum of five times as compared to the 49% from this same group who did not attend pre-K.

Currently, most federal dollars for pre-K programs originate from Head Start. As the above numbers bear out, this program is a valuable and needed one that addresses the needs of poor and underprivileged children. However, many families are caught in the economic middle; they make too much to qualify for Head Start and yet they make too little to afford to send their children to a pre-K program. This legislation will amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to do address this problem. This bill will authorize the necessary funding for pre-k programs for every local education **agency without undercutting Head Start.**

The Solution

This legislation will lay the ground work for eventual universal prekindergarten programs. It would allow LEA's to apply to the Department of Education for a grant for pre-K education. In order to receive these grants, these LEA's would have to:

1. Show a need for a pre-K program
2. Assure the DOE that each employee will be a teacher or child development specialist certified by that State
3. Provide an adequate teacher/child ratio
4. Provide matching funds
5. Ensure cost containment for parents of enrolling children
6. Any application must not interfere with any existing Head Start program.
7. Ensure funds will not be used for students and not any construction projects.

Once these LEA's have received their grant, they would be required to provide annual reports to the Department of Education. The Secretary would, in turn, submit an annual report to Congress, thus ensuring accountability on all levels.

Technical Assistance Universal Pre-K proposal

For advice about how a federal, school-based pre-K initiative might build on existing pre-K efforts and possible ideas for addressing concerns of the Head Start and early childhood community:

- Call Steve Barnett at Rutgers University – He is working on the implementation of New Jersey’s court-ordered universal pre-K program (Wbarnet@rci.rutgers.edu)
- Call Sue Bredekamp—former head of professional development for the National Association for the Education of Young Children—now a consultant working for Head Start and the folks who issue the child development associate credential. (202-265-9090 or 205-8572)
- Mr. Andrews might want to call Lynn Karoly, author of a RAND Corporation study on pre-K programs issues last fall. The report is “Investing in our Children.” (202-296-5000 Ext. 5359)
- Should also talk to HHS/ACYF—if there is to be an administration position on the proposal, all departments will be consulted.

Issues in the draft bill:

- Legislation either needs to be an amendment to something like the ESEA, or else the term “Secretary” needs to be defined. The current draft does not make clear which Secretary is to administer the program.
- Re-work findings using the recent RAND study on quality pre-K programs—current findings do not really work.
- At an authorization of \$210 million, competitive grants from the Federal government to LEAs is feasible. However, at an authorization of \$1 billion plus, a State formula grant makes more sense. A competitive grant program of \$1 billion administered at the Federal level with 15,000 eligible school districts would be enormously difficult and administratively costly to manage. A State-administered competition would make more sense.
- Pre-K programs should NOT be restricted to existing elementary school facilities. Many schools currently operate pre-K programs in sites other than elementary schools and often schools would not have space for a pre-K program as all classroom are already in use (particularly in light of efforts to reduce class size). It would be better to require LEAs to operate programs instead of requiring the programs to be located at schools.
- Priority would send funds to large school districts because it is purely based on numbers of students—is that the intent? If it is, the population should be of children age 0-5 rather than school-aged children. However, be aware that size of LEA may not be associated with need. The size of LEAs is a function of State law—Fairfax and Montgomery counties are among the largest and wealthiest in the United States.

- Add a provision indicating the type of pre-K program to be funded—might use language from Administration’s Title I reauthorization.
- Provide an assurance that a State-certified early childhood teacher is in each prekindergarten classroom. The child development associate credential is a minimum standard, and many States do not certify early childhood professionals.
- The 1992 Maternal and Child Health Bureau’s Health and Performance Standards call for staff-child ratios of 7:1 for three-year olds and 8:1 for four-year olds.
- A 50 percent non-Federal match will be difficult for many school districts to come up with. Suggest using match language from the Department’s Early Childhood Professional Development proposal, which allows Federal funds and in-kind contributions to be used to meet the match. Also, are the parent payments supposed to count toward the match?
- Need to specify the grant period.
- Some communities run pre-K programs that involve education, Head Start, and child care funds. Rather than prohibiting a mix of money, the application would be stronger if asked for information on “how the pre-K program will coordinate with and build on, and will not supplant or duplicate, early childhood education programs that exist in the community.”
- Suggest replacing local report with language directing the Secretary to develop performance indicators against which local grantees must report their progress.
- Usually, ESEA State formula programs have a set-aside of funds for both BIA schools and for the territories.
- May want to consider a funding trigger based on the Administration’s request for Head Start funding—i.e. this program is not funded unless the Head Start appropriation is the same as the Administration’s request or on Head Start making a certain appropriation gain each year. One could argue that this type of trigger still sends the message that Head Start funding comes first without setting a target (such as full funding) that will never be reached. The downside to a trigger, however, is that the new program could move in and out of authorization depending on the funding level for Head Start.
- Applications need substance against which to be judged.

Another possible option

- Attach outline of PRE-K proposal as an alternative approach. (This would provide funds to schools for pre-K programs they operate themselves, or to expand the capacity of existing pre-K programs such as Head Start or state-funded pre-K programs. (Tom Corwin has specs)
- See other bills introduced in the 106th Congress (S.749, S. 1068, S. 1154)

HR 2865 IH

106th CONGRESS

1st Session

H. R. 2865

To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to encourage the implementation or expansion of pre-kindergarten programs to include students 4 years of age or younger.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

September 14, 1999

Ms. NORTON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce

A BILL

To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to encourage the implementation or expansion of pre-kindergarten programs to include students 4 years of age or younger.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Pre-Kindergarten and Early Childhood Education Act of 1999'.

SEC. 2. USE OF COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER FUNDS FOR PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS.

Section 10905 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8245) is amended--

(1) by striking 'Grants awarded' and inserting '(a) IN GENERAL- Grants awarded';

(2) by inserting after 'may be used' the following: 'to plan, implement, or expand pre-kindergarten programs described in subsection (b) or'; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

'(b) PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS- A pre-kindergarten program described in this subsection is a program of a community learning center that provides pre-kindergarten curriculum and classes for students 4 years of age or younger and is taught by teachers who possess equivalent or similar qualifications to those of teachers of other grades in the school involved.'

END

145 Cong Rec E 1873, *

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- *EXTENSIONS*

Tuesday, September 14, 1999

106th Congress, 1st Session

145 Cong Rec E 1873

REFERENCE: Vol. 145, No. 119

TITLE: INTRODUCTION OF THE **UNIVERSAL PRE-KINDERGARTEN AND EARLY CHILDHOOD**

TEXT:
[*E1873]

EDUCATION ACT OF 1999

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

of the district of columbia

in the house of representatives

Tuesday, September 14, 1999

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce the **Universal Pre-Kindergarten and Early Childhood Education Act of 1999** (Universal Pre-K), a bill to begin the process of introducing **universal pre-kindergarten** into the nation's public schools by adding an additional grade in elementary school as an option for every 4-year-old child, and in some cases under 4, regardless of income. I seek to include my bill in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which is scheduled to be reauthorized during this Congress. The authorization task will be to reshape the federal government's role to fit the challenges of the next century, which parents and school systems are already experiencing. In particular, the new science on brain development, decades of successful experience with high quality Head Start programs, and definitive data from an array of the best experts all indicate that the expansion of **universal pre-kindergarten** is the next frontier in education.

The bill I introduce today adds a section to Title X, Part I of ESEA, entitled the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, aimed at
[*E1874]

using schoolhouses as centers of neighborhoods. Under this new program, any school district in the United States may apply to the Department of Education to fund pre-kindergarten educational classrooms. Grants funded under this Sec. 10905 of the ESEA totaled nearly \$100 million during fiscal year 1999, at an average of \$375,000 per three year grant. Universal Pre-K grants will seek to rapidly encourage school systems to permanently add pre-kindergarten classrooms to the elementary school

grades and to their own school budgets, using the experience they acquire from the federally funded program. The bill will allow school districts throughout the United States to systematically begin organized 4-year-old classes to demonstrate how children respond to earlier child education. Districts will craft models for capitalizing on the elusive window for early brain development, and the pre-kindergartens will provide an alternative for desperate parents who today are left to daycare with little, if any, educational component, or to the homes of people with no background in child development. Because the programs must be in regular school buildings with teachers equivalent to those who teach in other grades, widespread problems with unqualified aids, non-compliant building codes or inadequate facilities will be eliminated automatically. The program in this bill would not displace existing daycare programs as an option. Its purpose is to encourage local school budgets based on demonstrated experience provided by grants under this bill.

The new science shows that brain development determining lifelong learning begins much earlier in infants and children than was previously believed. The bipartisan Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues held hearings during the 105th Congress, which were among the first hearings to explore brain development in children from birth to age 3. Experts testified to new scientific evidence concerning the critical need for early brain stimulation beginning in infancy to assure that the child develops the necessary cognitive, linguistic, emotional and motor skills. During the early years, a child's brain begins to develop the neural connections that lay the foundation for the rest of life. According to experts, the longer the brain grows without sufficient stimulation during these critical first years, the less likely the child is to develop fully the neural connections needed for a wide variety of higher brain functions later in life. To lose the irreplaceable years at the beginning of a child's life when the brain is forming is to miss periods of development that cannot be retrieved.

Early childhood education is not new, of course, but beginning education in the very first years has just begun to be deeply explored. As early as 1647, Massachusetts required that children as young as three years of age learn to read the Bible. German immigrants brought kindergarten, designed to be a "play garden," to the United States in the mid-nineteenth century and often included children younger than 5 years of age. As early childhood education spread in this country in the latter part of that century, states such as Vermont and Connecticut incorporated kindergarten into the public school system. For the most part, however, the kindergartens of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were supported by philanthropists as a way to free low-income mothers to work and to provide education as a way out of poverty. Today kindergarten is a universal option in the United States.

More recently, we have seen great success in many early education programs, including many Head Start programs, which target low-income children beginning at age three through third grade. The success of high quality Head Start and other pre-kindergarten programs combined with the new scientific evidence concerning the importance of brain development in the early years should compel the expansion of early childhood education to all of our children. Traditionally, early learning programs have been available only to the affluent who have the resources to take advantage of preschool opportunities and to poor families in programs such as Head Start, who may need extra help. Research on high quality early learning programs uniformly demonstrates that graduates are less likely to be arrested than other students; are less likely to be held back; are less likely to need special education; and are more likely to achieve a higher level of education attainment.

Parents of children under age 5 who attend daycare pay an average of \$79 weekly, or \$4,000 annually. Yet, undergraduate tuition at the University of Virginia is about \$4,800 annually and about \$6,000 at the University of Michigan. Over 60 percent of mothers with children under age 6 work, a proportion that is increasing as more women pour into the workforce, including welfare-to-work mothers now rapidly moving to jobs. For the average family, the need is palpable and the expense is exorbitant. The vast majority of families cannot afford the cost of childcare, with the result that parents place their children wherever an accessible place can be found, regardless of quality. Even subsidized early childhood education reaches only a small fraction of low-income children.

This bill seeks to demonstrate that we can achieve meaningful and significant gains in preparing American children for a lifetime of learning by taking fuller advantage of the early malleability of their developing brains at an early age. The absence of viable options for working families to educate their

children at the most important stage in life demands our immediate attention. Considering the staggering cost of daycare, the inaccessibility of early education, and the opportunity earlier education offers to improve a child's chances in life, 4-year-old kindergarten is overdue. I urge my colleagues to use the opportunity presented by the reauthorization of ESEA to make up for lost time by incorporating the Universal Pre-Kindergarten Act.

H.R.--

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "**Universal Pre-Kindergarten
and Early Childhood Education Act of 1999**".

**SEC. 2. USE OF COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER FUNDS FOR PRE-
KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS.**

Section 10905 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8245) is amended--

(1) by striking "Grants awarded" and inserting "(a) In
General.--Grants awarded";

(2) by inserting after "may be used" the following: "to
plan, implement, or expand pre-kindergarten programs
described in subsection (b) or"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:
"(b) Pre-Kindergarten Programs.--A pre-kindergarten
program described in this subsection is a program of a
community learning center that provides pre-kindergarten
curriculum and classes for students 4 years of age or younger
and is taught by teachers who possess equivalent or similar
qualifications to those of teachers of other grades in the
school involved."

SUBJECT: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (97%); PRIMARY SCHOOLS (94%); CHILD
CARE (91%);

LOAD-DATE: 09-15-1999

FOCUS™

Search: Congressional Record; Universal Pre-Kindergarten and Early Childhood Education...

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

Example: House of Representatives

[About LEXIS-NEXIS](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#) | [What's New](#)
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

THE FRONT PAGE

Few Riverdale 4-Year-Olds Expected To Be Served By District 10's Not-So-Universal Pre-K Program

By KATYA KAZAKINA

As the Central Board of Education is preparing to take a vote on the implementation of the Universal Pre-Kindergarten Program this week, it seems unlikely that this highly anticipated program will impact any significant number of Riverdale's four-year olds during the upcoming 1998-99 school year.

The New York State Universal Pre-K law mandates all school districts to phase in the entire population of four-year-olds by the academic year of 2001-2002. During its first phase, the program has to serve 16% of all four year-olds in New York City, which some would take to mean that at least some of Riverdale's youngsters should be participating. But regulations adopted by the Community School District 10 would seem to almost preclude even this level of participation, and may result in an almost total exclusion of local kids.

Parents fear that both the location of sites selected by the district and income restrictions that favor children from "poor" families, makes a mockery of the term "universal" in the name of the program.

Community School District 10, like many other school districts in the New York City, has had to turn to the private agencies specializing in early childhood care as a result of the severe overcrowding which leaves virtually no classroom space to accommodate additional students.

Out of nine sites submitted to the Central Board by the School District 10's special Universal Pre-K Evaluation Committee, only one is located in Riverdale. Moreover, these 36 seats, which would be available at the Riverdale Montessori School on Mosholu Avenue, represents just 6% of 596 seats in the entire district. It is considered unlikely that many Riverdale parents would be eager to send their children to other sites in District 10, and the district apparently will not guarantee that even the 36 seats at the Montessori School will be reserved exclusively for Riverdale children. No provision has been made for transportation.

Moreover, criteria worked out by the District will reserve 80% of available seats for children who come from the families with low income; the remaining 20% of the seats will be distributed through a lottery process, the details of which have not been established. As of this writing there is no program in place to select the students for the program slated to begin in September.

"My understanding is that District 10 is searching for the additional providers which would satisfy their requirements," said J.D. La Rock, the spokesman for the Board of Education. "It is likely that the children who live close to the agency will be placed at that agency."

However, he added, until all agencies are determined, the district won't make an official final decision about where the children will be placed.

Following months of discussions, evaluation and selection, each school district in the city had to submit a list of schools or private organizations as sites for the program.

"The fact that we don't have seats for Pre-K leaves us to the necessity of going to the private organizations," said Dr. Marsha Silberman, the District 10 representative of the United Federation of Teachers.

The committee has examined 20 different sites approved by the Central Board of Education, and selected only nine.

"I am surprised that there were not more sites selected," Silber-man said. A member of the Evaluation Committee, she said she participated in many meetings on determining the criteria, visiting the sites, evaluating their parameters.

"The district's initial approach was good," she observed. "In the final analysis, however, things seemed to fall apart. I was not notified which sites were finally selected. I did not receive any final feedback."

She was also surprised that only one site in Riverdale was selected.

The Universal Pre-K program is planned to be phased in during the next four years and serve all four-year-olds by the academic year of 2001-2002.

Dianna Tabacco, a school board member and a member of the Evaluation Committee, said that although the first year is always the most difficult one, she hopes "the Universal Pre-K will benefit our community's children."

She said that because the program does not provide the transportation, children will go to the sites which are near their homes.

District 10 has received \$2,052,308 in State and City money to subsidize the program during its first phase. The Riverdale Montessori School will receive \$117,000 to serve the 36 children assigned there, a rate of \$3250 per child.

Charter Panel Meets Here; For Most Part Gets Bronx Cheer

By ERIK WOLF

The New York City Charter Revision Commission held a public hearing at Manhattan College last Wednesday amid the much-publicized political undertones of what many charge to be the Com-mission's true purpose: to block the City Council's Yankee Stadium referendum. According to New York City law, a vote on the revision of the City Charter must take precedence over all other referenda, therefore banning the Yankee Stadium question and other potential issues from November's ballot.

The controversial Commission held last week's meeting to give Bronxites the opportunity to voice their opinions on issues like land use, procurement, the budget process, campaign finance, nonpartisan elections, and retaining City offices such as that of the Public Advocate.

Former Deputy Mayor Peter J. Powers, the Commission Chair, recently stated his intention to focus on eliminating "soft money" from City elections and changing City Council service from part-time to full-time employment. He feels that, "taken together, proposals in these areas would make the electoral process more open and less subject to the sway of special interests."



Riverdalian Mark Friedlander examined the idea of employing council members full-time in his statement before the commission, saying that it would open up a lot of interesting possibilities. According to Friedlander, however, "There is one important caveat here; you cannot, must not, provide for full time legislators unless you link it to removal of term limits." Friedlander went on to challenge the usefulness of term limits, especially in the office of the Mayor, where New York voters have already imposed a 3-term limit on their mayors. "Neither LaGuardia, nor Wagner, nor even the indestructible Ed Koch could get approval for more than 12 years. Clearly, the voters have spoken."

Despite these obviously important issues, however, there was no avoiding the real reason for the proceedings as the Yankee Stadium issue was raised time and again by those who addressed the committee.

After endorsing the elimination of soft money from city campaigns, Riverdale Assemblyman Jeffrey Dinowitz also addressed the politics that brought about this year's charter revision. "No honest person in New York City questions the fact that the sole reason for setting up this last minute Charter Review Commission is to block the Yankee Stadium Referendum from being on the November Ballot," he said. "Everyone, whether they support the Yankee Stadium Referendum or oppose it, should be outraged by this naked attempt to manipulate the process for the sole purpose of blocking this referendum."

Dinowitz also attacked the Mayor for endorsing the construction of new minor league ballparks in Brooklyn and Staten Island, a new ballpark for the Mets in Queens and a new Yankee Stadium in Manhattan, while saddling the Bronx with a water filtration plant that would destroy the community surrounding the Jerome Park Reservoir. He closed his comments by suggesting that if the Commission were serious about charter reform, that they should take their time and recommend a list of changes on the 1999 ballot.

Congressman Eliot Engel's press aide, Joe O'Brien, speaking for his boss who was in Washington, opened his remarks to the Commission with the Yankee Stadium issue, saying that "We should be discussing the possible move of the Yankees from the Bronx, not appearing before a Commission set up by the mayor's own admission, to keep this matter off the ballot in November. Moving the Yankees could cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, perhaps even a billion dollars, and surely that is worthy of discussion."

Conspicuous by his absence at the meeting was Borough President Fernando Ferrer who refused to appear, calling the Commission a "charade" and blasting Mayor Giuliani for creating it in "a cynical attempt to thwart a proposed referendum on Yankee Stadium." According to Ferrer, moving Yankee Stadium to Manhattan's West Side, as Giuliani so desperately wants, would strip-mine the Bronx community that has been home to the Yankees for the last 75 years and send the historic team to a community that doesn't want it.

Ferrer also believes that the Mayor's use of Charter Revision to block the Stadium referendum may be unconstitutional under the Voting Rights Act and has written the Justice Department, requesting that an inquiry be made into the matter. "Precluding the Yankee Stadium referendum from the ballot will have the effect of decreasing public participation in all issues and elections in the November ballot with concomitant suppression of minority voter participation," Ferrer said in the letter sent last week.

Also participating was the Bronx' most opinionated citizen, veteran letter-writer Alvin Gordon of Norwood, Riverdale civic leader Martin Rollins, and Jerome Park Reservoir advocate Karen Argenti.

A similar hearing took place on Monday in Brooklyn, concluding the Commission's round of meetings in each of the five boroughs. This year's effort will mark the first attempt to change the City's Charter since the current document was adopted in 1989.

[OPINIONS](#) • [NEWS](#) • [COLUMNS](#) • [CALENDAR](#) • [CLASSIFIEDS](#) • [ARCHIVES](#) • [LINKS](#)

riverdale
REVIEW.COM

BRONX PRESS REVIEW

BRONX.COM

[OPINIONS](#) • [NEWS](#) • [COLUMNS](#) • [CALENDAR](#) • [CLASSIFIEDS](#) • [ARCHIVES](#) • [LINKS](#)

[RIVERDALE REVIEW.COM](#) • [BRONX PRESS REVIEW](#) • [BRONX.COM](#)

.....
(Original Signature of Member)

106TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. _____

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ANDREWS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the
Committee on _____

A BILL

To provide grants to local educational agencies to establish
or expand prekindergarten programs for children who
are not yet enrolled in kindergarten.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM.**

4 Title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education
5 Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end the fol-
6 lowing:



1 **“PART L—PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS**

2 **“SEC. 10995A. FINDINGS.**

3 “Congress finds the following:

4 “(1) Countless studies have shown what every
5 parent already knows: High-quality preschool edu-
6 cation programs work. They prepare children to
7 learn when they go to school, and the programs in-
8 crease the success of students throughout their lives.

9 “(2) Children who get a high-quality prekind-
10 ergarten education are more likely to increase their
11 overall IQ, improve their results on achievement
12 tests, and increase their chances of graduating from
13 high school and pursuing some form of higher edu-
14 cation. These same children are less likely to repeat
15 a grade level and have less need for special edu-
16 cation instruction than those with no preschool back-
17 ground, thus saving local educational agencies funds
18 that might otherwise be necessary to provide special
19 education instruction.

20 “(3) Prekindergarten education makes an enor-
21 mous difference in the lives of children from lower-
22 income families. The following specific results were
23 found for children eligible for Head Start services or
24 child care assistance, children who belong to a single
25 parent, 2-child families earning less than \$22,000



1 per year, or families of 4 earning less than \$31,000
2 per year—

3 “(A) 29 percent of the children who at-
4 tended prekindergarten program were employed
5 in jobs paying over \$2,000 by age 27, as op-
6 posed to 7 percent of those from the same in-
7 come group who did not receive prekindergarten
8 education.

9 “(B) Only 57 percent of the children who
10 attended a prekindergarten program grew up to
11 become single mothers, as opposed to 83 per-
12 cent of the same income group who did not at-
13 tend a prekindergarten program.

14 “(C) 36 percent of the children who at-
15 tended a prekindergarten program grew up to
16 own their own homes, as opposed to only 13
17 percent of the same income group who did not
18 attend such a program.

19 “(D) Less than 13 percent of the boys in
20 the group who attended a prekindergarten pro-
21 gram grew up to be arrested 5 or more times,
22 as opposed to 49 percent of the boys from the
23 same income group who did not attend a pre-
24 kindergarten program.



1 **“SEC. 10995B. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**

2 “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to
3 provide grants to local educational agencies with an ap-
4 proved application under section 10995C to allow such
5 agencies to establish or expand prekindergarten early
6 learning programs in to be operated by the local education
7 agency.

8 “(b) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority for
9 grants under this part to local educational agencies with
10 the highest population of children, ages 3 to 5, not en-
11 rolled in a prekindergarten or kindergarten program.

12 **“SEC. 10995C. APPLICATIONS.**

13 “(a) IN GENERAL.—A local educational agency that
14 desires to receive a grant under this part shall submit an
15 application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner,
16 and containing such information as the Secretary may rea-
17 sonably require.

18 “(b) CONTENT.—An application referred to in sub-
19 section (a), at a minimum, shall—

20 “(1) demonstrate a need for the establishment
21 or expansion of a prekindergarten program;

22 “(2) provide an assurance that each individual
23 hired to work with children in the prekindergarten
24 program is a teacher or child development specialist
25 certified by the State;



1 “(3) provide an assurance that the ratio of
2 teacher or child development specialist to children
3 shall not exceed 10–1;

4 “(4) provide an assurance that the local edu-
5 cational agency will provide, either directly or
6 through private contributions, non-Federal matching
7 funds equal to not less than 50 percent of the
8 amount of the grant award, these contributions shall
9 include in kind contributions and parental co-pay-
10 ments;

11 “(5) provide an assurance that the local edu-
12 cational agency will develop a sliding fee schedule to
13 ensure that the parents of a child who attends a pre-
14 kindergarten program established under this part
15 share in the cost of providing the prekindergarten
16 program, but the amount of such contribution shall
17 not exceed \$50 each week that a child attends such
18 program;

19 “(6) provide a description of how funds will be
20 used to coordinate with and build on, but not dupli-
21 cate or supplant, early childhood programs that exist
22 in the community;

23 “(7) describe how the agency will use a collabo-
24 rative process with organizations and members of
25 the community that have an interest and experience



1 in early childhood development and education to es-
2 tablish prekindergarten programs;

3 “(8) describe how the agency will coordinate
4 with and expand, but not duplicate or supplant,
5 early childhood programs that exist in the commu-
6 nity;

7 “(9) review scientifically based research on
8 early childhood education services that focus on lan-
9 guage, literacy, and reading development;

10 “(10) describe how the program will meet the
11 diverse needs of children, ages 3 through 5, in the
12 community who are not enrolled in kindergarten, in-
13 cluding children who have special needs;

14 “(11) describe how to employ methods that en-
15 sure a smooth transition for participating students
16 from early childhood education to kindergarten and
17 early elementary education;

18 “(12) describe the results the programs are in-
19 tended to achieve, and what tools to use to measure
20 the progress in attaining those results;

21 “(13) describe a plan to operate the program
22 without using funds made available under this part;
23 and

24 “(14) provide an assurance that none of the
25 funds received under this part may be used for the



1 construction or renovation of existing or new facili-
2 ties (except for minor remodeling needed to accom-
3 plish the purposes of this part);

4 **“SEC. 10995D. USES OF FUNDS.**

5 “(a) IN GENERAL.—A local educational agency that
6 receives a grant award under this part may use funds re-
7 ceived to establish or expand prekindergarten programs
8 for children, ages 3 through 5, who are not enrolled in
9 kindergarten.

10 “(b) PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS.—Each pre-
11 kindergarten program that is established pursuant to this
12 part shall—

13 “(1) focus on the developmental needs of par-
14 ticipating children, including their social, cognitive,
15 and language-development needs, and use research-
16 based approaches that build on competencies that
17 lead to school success, particularly in language and
18 literacy development and in reading; and

19 “(2) ensure that participating children, at a
20 minimum—

21 “(A) understand and use language to com-
22 municate for various purposes;

23 “(B) understand and use increasingly com-
24 plex and varied vocabulary;



1 “(C) develop and demonstrate an apprecia-
2 tion of books;

3 “(D) develop phonemic, print, and
4 numeracy awareness; and

5 “(E) in the case of children with limited
6 English proficiency, progress toward acquisition
7 of the English language.

8 **“SEC. 10995E. REPORTING.**

9 “(a) LOCAL REPORTS.—Each local educational agen-
10 cy that receives a grant award under this part shall submit
11 to the Secretary annually a report that reviews the effec-
12 tiveness of the prekindergarten program established with
13 funds provided under this part.

14 “(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall
15 submit to Congress annually a report that evaluates the
16 prekindergarten programs established under this part.

17 **“SEC. 10995F. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

18 “‘There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out
19 this part \$210,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$210,000,000
20 for fiscal year 2002, \$1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2003,
21 \$1,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, and \$2,100,000,000
22 for fiscal year 2005.’”.

