

Spring 4-15-1994

# Evaluating Head Start: An Historical Review of Program Goals and Factors Which Impact Program Evaluation

Violet M. Finkelson  
*Augsburg College*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://idun.augsburg.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Finkelson, Violet M., "Evaluating Head Start: An Historical Review of Program Goals and Factors Which Impact Program Evaluation" (1994). *Theses and Graduate Projects*. 636.  
<https://idun.augsburg.edu/etd/636>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Idun. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Graduate Projects by an authorized administrator of Idun. For more information, please contact [bloomber@augsbu.edu](mailto:bloomber@augsbu.edu).

**Evaluating Head Start: an  
historical review of program goals  
and factors which impact program  
evaluation.**

Augsburg College  
George Sverdrup Library  
Minneapolis, MN 55454

**An exploratory historical study.**

**Violet Mather Finkelson MSW**

**April 15, 1994**



MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK  
AUGSBURG COLLEGE  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL**

*This is to certify that the Master's thesis of*

***Violet Mather Finkelson***

*has been approved by the examining committee for the thesis requirements for the Master of Social Work Degree.*

*Date of oral presentation: April 15, 1994.*

*Thesis Committee:*

*Rosemary Link*

*Thesis Advisor*

*Willa Fairman, Ed.D.*

*Thesis Reader*

*Carol F. Kuehler*

*Thesis Reader*

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to acknowledge all of the people who guided me in my research, gave me new directions, and/or helped me to make this project a reality:

### **Ramsey Action Programs Head Start Employees: (Ramsey County, Minnesota)**

Education Coordinator: Becky Beetsch—who provided resource referrals and challenged me to expand my horizons. Director: Bill Fairman, Center Manager, Baker Head Start: Donna Habeebullah, and the co-workers who tolerated the absent mindedness and glazed look of a working student, and supported me on the job: Mary Scarver, Ly Yang, Jeannie Pederson, & Anoma Liayanapathiranaige.

One valuable resource person who offered oral and written material about the beginning of Head Start was the Center Manager at Beaver Lake Head Start—Dorothy Cotton. Dorothy's four children attended Head Start from 1970-1973. She was trained in early childhood education by Head Start's CDA program and has been employed as a Head Start teacher for 24 years.

### **Augsburg College Faculty:**

Rosemary Link, Ph.D., who made me walk on a cold rainy evening to the U of M archives and told me to look up a social work agency that had been in existence for some time. (I think I grumbled something about dust and the smell of mildew and then I discovered the passion of history.) Carol Kuechler, Ph.D., who's instruction helped me put it all together.

### **Personal:**

Daryl Finkelson (Husband, friend, cheerleader, and number one supporter), Martha Field, Sandy Barrett, and Debbie Kannel.

## DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to Anna Moten, the co-worker/team member who supported me, challenged me, pushed me, argued with me and made herself available to me—on and off the job. She was working full time and studying for her CDA credential at the same time I was working and studying for my MSW. We took turns saying "You can do it!" We celebrated her CDA graduation in June 1993. Anna died from an aneurysm in September 1993. Anna taught me about life, friendship, and "soul food." I taught Anna about Lefse, St. Knut's day, and when to say, "uff da."

Ramsey County in Minnesota is a truly multi-cultural community. We didn't just talk about diversity—we lived it. With Head Start children and families in our classroom from Uganda, Ethiopia, Somalia, Namibia, Iran, Egypt, India, Korea, China, Laos, Japan, Mexico, Honduras, Hawaii, and various places in the mainland United States, Anna and I learned to celebrate similarities and differences.

The philosophy of the Head Start program and the involvement of the parents in the daily routine of the classroom complimented our own beliefs in teaching. Anna often quoted the African saying, "It takes a community to raise a child." Head Start supports and strengthens that community. As we taught the children to speak English, they and their families taught us of other places. Together we created a "Head Start Family." This is the essence of Head Start.

**ABSTRACT OF THESIS**

**EVALUATING HEAD START:  
AN HISTORICAL REVIEW OF PROGRAM GOALS  
AND FACTORS WHICH IMPACT PROGRAM EVALUATION**

**VIOLET MATHER FINKELSON MSW  
APRIL 15, 1994.**

This exploratory historical study researches the Head Start program goals and performance standards from the original task force and President Johnson's declaration of the war on poverty, to the present day. The historical research on the Head Start program is presented by decade adjacent to historical information about child development and early childhood education, and the political climate of that decade.

The study will examine major Head Start program evaluations which occurred during each of the past three decades and discuss historical factors which may have impacted the research designs. The ultimate goal of this project is to learn from the past and to offer strategies for planning and implementing future evaluations of the Head Start program.

## Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables & Figures-----	i
I. Introduction-----	1
II. Literature Review-----	5
Head Start Goals-----	7
III. Methodology-----	11
IV. Findings	
A. The Sixties-----	15
1. Child Development Group of Mississippi-----	21
2. The Westinghouse Survey-----	31
B. The Seventies-----	40
1. Panel on Outcome Measurement-----	43
C. The Eighties and beyond...-----	50
1. The Measures Project-----	52
2. Children's Defense Fund-----	53
V. Summary-----	54
Implications for Future Research-----	58
Appendix	
a. The Westinghouse Survey-----	61
b. Summary of Head Start and Related Programs-----	62
References-----	64

## List of Figures and Tables

		<b>Page</b>
Figure 1	Friends of the Children of Mississippi-----	27
Table 1	Head Start Timeline 1961-69 -----	14
Table 2	The Cooke Panel-----	16
Table 3	CDGM Timeline-----	20
Table 4	Summarized Findings from the Westinghouse Survey -----	35
Table 5	Head Start Timeline 1970-78 -----	39
Table 6	Examples of Performance Standards-----	42
Table 7	Head Start Timeline 1981-Present -----	49

## I. Introduction

In the fall of 1963, John F. Kennedy was assassinated and Lyndon B. Johnson became President. But the death of the president was not the end of his dream to create a national anti-poverty program. In December 1964, thirteen men and women gathered together in Washington, D.C. to discuss the idea of a national program to serve children and families with poverty level incomes. These thirteen people, now known as the "Cooke Panel" had not worked together prior to their meeting that fall. (Davens, 1968) Their one common connection was their knowledge of child development and their belief that early intervention in children's lives can make the difference as to whether or not they will succeed in school.

The Cooke Panel was made up of doctors, social workers, nurses, nutritionists, mental health professionals, and educators. They talked, planned, argued, negotiated and came up with the major goals of a national program which would be far more than a preschool education program. The model they created would provide comprehensive services to children and families within communities. The "Cooke Memo" outlining the program plan, was sent to the White House in January 1964, and the "War on Poverty" was declared.

As an educator, President Johnson believed that education was the key to success in life. At the time of President Johnson's speech to the American people announcing Head Start, while he mentioned three of the comprehensive aspects of the program, he emphasized education: "These children will receive preschool training to prepare them for regular school in September. They will get medical and dental attention that they badly need, and parents will receive counseling on improving the

home environment." (Johnson, L.B., 1965) This emphasis on education was the beginning of thirty years of misinterpretation of the Head Start goals.

The theory that poverty is caused by ignorance and a bad home environment, was a belief held by many people in the sixties. However, the Head Start planning committee recognized that education cannot occur unless the most basic human needs are met first. They decided that Head Start would provide children and families with access to nutrition, health care, dental care, parenting education, social services, preventive mental health, and early childhood education. This was the comprehensive model of services which became Head Start. Each component of the Head Start program is like a building block which connects with others to create the foundation of support given to families.

This whole-family approach was and is a unique model of support services. In addition to the multi-faceted program, the delivery of services was different from other government and public programs: The goal was to allow individual communities to plan, organize and implement Head Start in the way that best met the needs of the children and families of that community. Families living in poverty would be given the funds, training, and support necessary to enhance their children's development.

When President Johnson received the proposal in January 1965, he backed it whole-heartedly and pushed to have centers in operation by summer. The members of the task force declared that it wasn't possible, but President Johnson refused to give up. With the president and his advisors behind the program, it quickly became a reality. In less than six months, applications were solicited from low income communities all over the country, grants were awarded, checks mailed, staff hired, locations chosen, equipment purchased, and classrooms opened.



The first orientation for Head Start teachers was six days in length and occurred throughout the U.S., the Virgin Islands, and Guam. The National Universities Extension Association (NUEA) prepared hundreds of universities across the nation to train the staff. Forty thousand teachers and forty-one thousand non-professional aides attended. "By the end of the summer, 580,000 children in 2,600 communities were enrolled in the program. A year-round program was then instituted, and 180,000 children came every day during the winter of 1965 and the spring of 1966." (Johnson, Mrs. L.B., 1979, p.47)

In 1967, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) established the Research Advisory Council For Head Start. The Council included Edward Zigler, Urie Bronfenbrenner, Boyd McCandless, and Edmund Gordon. That same year, the OEO commissioned Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Ohio State University to design a research project which would measure the effects of Head Start. The Research Advisory Council for Head Start studied the proposed research project and informed President Johnson that the research would not measure critical components of the program and the study would not be an accurate assessment of the program. Their objections went unheard and the research was conducted as proposed by Westinghouse and Ohio State.

The fears of the Research Advisory Council were on target. The results of the Westinghouse survey documented that Head Start children showed modest gains in I.Q. scores when entering kindergarten but that these gains were short lived. The researchers concluded that "the effects of Head Start wash out by third grade." (Westinghouse Learning Corp./Ohio University, 1969) This was a major blow to the

creators and supporters of Head Start who had witnessed first hand the changed lives of the children, families and communities.

The findings of the Westinghouse survey were detrimental to the program in many ways, the most significant being that continued government funding of any program depends on its success. For the next few years, funding was precarious and if it hadn't been for the passionate support of the American people, and Head Start parents and staff, funding might have been severely cut or even abolished.

In 1976, Head Start performance standards were written and distributed nationally to ensure quality delivery of service in a more uniform manner. (OCD-HS Head Start Policy Manual July 1975) These performance standards provided clear written guidelines to Head Start staff and to the community agencies administering the programs on how to achieve the goals of Head Start. Any program evaluations done after 1976 should have incorporated these standards into the research design.

This study will examine the goals of Head Start over the course of the past thirty years and analyze several program evaluations and their outcomes. Historical data will be presented indicating a number of factors which may have influenced the design and implementation of the research projects.

The major historical questions are:

1. What were the original goals of the Head Start program, how have they been implemented and are they being measured by program evaluations?
2. In what ways have the research designs for the Head Start program been affected by the following factors: politics and funding, and public knowledge and perception of early childhood development?

## II. Literature Review

The sixties were a time of disequilibrium in this country. Racial tensions were high and the emotions of the American people were stretched to the limit as they witnessed the assassination of President Kennedy (1963), serious race riots in the Watts section of Los Angeles (1965), LBJ sending additional troops to Vietnam (1965), and the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. (1968), and Senator Robert Kennedy (1968). These are a few of the national historical events which affected policy decisions during and after the creation of the Head Start program.

This research study examines books, journal articles, government records, Head Start Legislation, media reports, and archival materials and presents the findings for the purpose of enlightening future research designs which endeavor to evaluate Head Start's comprehensive program. In October 1961, President Kennedy appointed a panel on Mental Retardation. His statement to the panel dated October 11, 1961, reads as follows:

A moonshot is not possible without prior discoveries in aerodynamics, propulsion, physics, astronomy, and other sciences. A successful attack on a complex problem like Mental Retardation also requires a host of prior achievements, trained scientific personnel, tools and techniques, profound understanding of the behavioral sciences, a spirit of devotion to the underprivileged, and a free democratic atmosphere of inquiry. Fortunately, ours is a country in which these ingredients abound. Our leadership in these fields is unchallenged. (Kennedy, President J. F., 1961)

As the "War on Poverty" was being discussed and planned in the White House, some of the key people involved in the panel on mental retardation (Eunice Kennedy-Shriver, Sargent Shriver and others) were asked to participate in planning a national anti-poverty program for children and families. The panel evaluated research on various early intervention projects which measured the effects of different teaching methods on children who were mentally handicapped. One major finding of this panel was that no matter what intervention was used, if the training began between the ages of 0-2, increases in I.Q. would occur.

This finding became a major part of the paradigm under which the Head Start program was designed. Head Start was created to be a comprehensive system of services which would meet the needs of children and families living in poverty. Here is the goal statement from the 1975 Head Start policy manual.

## Head Start Goals

1304.1-3

- a. The Head Start Program is based on the premise that all children share certain needs, and that children of low income families, in particular, can benefit from a comprehensive developmental program to meet those needs. The Head Start program approach is based on the philosophy that:
  1. A child can benefit most from a comprehensive, interdisciplinary program to foster development and remedy problems as expressed in a broad range of services, and that
  2. The child's entire family, as well as the community must be involved. The program should maximize the strengths and unique experiences of each child. The family, which is perceived as the principal influence on the child's development, must be a direct participant in the program. Local communities are allowed latitude in developing creative program designs so long as the basic goals, objectives and standards of a comprehensive program are adhered to.
- b. The overall goal of the Head Start program is to bring about a greater degree of social competence in children of low income families. By social competence is meant the child's everyday effectiveness in dealing with both present environment and later responsibilities in school and life. Social competence takes into account the interrelatedness of cognitive and intellectual development, physical and mental health, nutritional needs, and other factors that enable a developmental approach to helping children achieve social competence. To the accomplishment of this goal, Head Start objectives and performance standards provide for:

1. The improvement of the child's health and physical abilities, including appropriate steps to correct present physical and mental problems and to enhance every child's access to an adequate diet. The improvement of the family's attitude toward future health care and physical abilities.
2. The encouragement of self-confidence, spontaneity, curiosity, and self discipline which will assist in the development of the child's social and emotional health.
3. The enhancement of the child's mental processes and skills with particular attention to conceptual and communication skills.
4. The establishment of patterns and expectations of success for the child, which will create a climate of confidence for present or future learning efforts and overall development.
5. An increase in the ability of the child and family to relate to each other and to others.
6. The enhancement of the sense of dignity and self-worth within the child and his family. (OCD-HS Head Start Policy Manual, 1975, pp. 1-2).

One of the issues which caused disagreement among the creators of Head Start was the age at which services should be provided. Some of the members of the "Cooke Panel" (the thirteen members of the original task force) felt that Head Start should begin serving families and children at birth. Others believed that it would be cost prohibitive to do so. When Head Start began in the summer of 1965, it began as a *pilot project* serving children ages 4-5.

The major source of historical data for this project was the archival material found at the Minnesota Historical Society Research Center in St. Paul, Minnesota. Head Start files were found in two separate listings:

- A. Hubert H. Humphrey - Personal Papers (from his U.S. Vice-Presidency – these papers include all of the correspondence concerning Head Start which were addressed to him during his term in office.) Many of the letters are from Head Start parents.
- B. Governor's Manpower Office - O.E.O. (These papers are from Hubert Humphrey's term as Governor of Minnesota.) These files include program information and files from the early years of Head Start in Minnesota.

Another major source of historical information was the book: Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty. This book is a collection of articles and interviews by the people who were instrumental in creating and administering the Head Start program in the first ten years. Edward Zigler was the first director of the Office of Child Development (OCD), which later became the Administration for Children, Youth, And Families (ACYF). (Zigler, E., and Valentine, J., 1979) Edward Zigler was an active part of the planning and implementation stages of Head Start and has remained actively involved in evaluation and advocacy over the course of the past thirty years.

The next source of information about the roots of Head Start was personal conversations with long time staff employed at Ramsey Action Programs Head Start in Minnesota. They directed me to the region V. office in Chicago, and to the national

Head Start office in Alexandria, Virginia, and shared memories of the early days in Ramsey County, Minn.

A national computer search turned up more than eight hundred professional journal articles on Head Start. In order to narrow the field of research and to focus on program evaluation, only national studies were examined and only those studies which evaluated "the effects of Head Start" by whatever definition was chosen by the researchers. This study will begin to compare some of those studies and their definitions with the goals of Head Start at the time of the study.



### III. Methodology

The research began by examining the files located in the archives at the Minnesota Historical Society Research Center in St. Paul, Minn. Head Start files were found under two listings: Governor's Manpower Office—O.E.O., and Hubert H. Humphrey—personal papers. This was one of the more fascinating parts of the research. It was incredible to read actual letters from Head Start parents to the Vice President of the United States. Some of the letters were glowing tributes to a program that had obviously had tremendous positive impact on their families and/or communities. Others were angry cries for justice in response to government grants being taken away from Head Start centers in Mississippi. Excerpts from some of these letters will be presented in section IV. A.

One unexpected discovery in this research study, took place in March, 1994. The staff at Baker Head Start (Ramsey Co., Minn.) were busy filling out paperwork and preparing for yearly licensing of the center. One of the forms called for staff to list the training and experience which qualified them for their various positions in Head Start. The Center Manager directed staff to use the policy manual if they needed guidance.

The 1994 policy manual was one of many located on a shelf in the classroom. Browsing through the material searching for 1994 guidelines, an original copy of the 1975 Head Start Performance Standards was discovered. This particular document is one of the most significant parts of Head Start history since it enabled people from diverse communities nationwide to better understand and interpret the goals of Head Start. As a result of this research, the document will be offered to the Minnesota Historical Society Research Center Archives to be added to the Head Start files.

This study has been exploratory in design and has used a phenomenological approach to reviewing the literature. The search has included both primary and secondary sources. Each document has been examined with the goal of providing insight into the minds of those people who were instrumental in creating the Head Start program.

Again, the major historical questions are:

1. What were the original goals of the Head Start program, how have they been implemented, and are they being measured by program evaluations?
2. In what ways have the research designs for the Head Start program been affected by the following factors: politics and funding, and public knowledge and perception of early childhood development?

The final informational source explored was the national computer base which listed journal articles and public information such as research studies and government publications. The studies chosen for secondary analysis met the following criteria: they had to be national studies and they needed to evaluate some aspect of Head Start's impact on children and/or families.

A secondary analysis was made of each of the three studies chosen: The Westinghouse Survey (1969), the Panel on Outcome Measurement in Early Childhood Demonstration Programs (1982), and the Measures Project (1974-1981). The findings of each study will be presented in the decade in which it occurred, along with historical information about the Head Start program and the educational and political climate at

that time. A time line will be located at the beginning of each decade outlining important events in the history of Head Start and the country.

The definitions listed in section 1304.1-2 of the OCD-HS Head Start Policy Manual, July 1975, that apply to this paper are:

- (f) The term "goal" means the ultimate purpose or interest toward which Head Start program efforts are directed.
- (g) The term "objective" means the ultimate purpose or interest toward which Head Start program component efforts are directed.
- (h) The term "program performance standards" or "performance standards" means the Head Start program functions, activities, and facilities required and necessary to meet the objectives and goals of the Head Start program as they relate directly to children and their families.

## IV. Findings

**Table 1**

*Head Start timeline*

1961	Panel on Mental Retardation appointed
1961-1963	John F. Kennedy's Presidency
1963	Nov., President Kennedy assassinated
1963-1969	Lyndon B. Johnson's Presidency
1964	The "Cooke" Panel meets to design an anti-poverty program
1965	Jan., Cooke memo to President Johnson re: Project Head Start June, Summer H.S. began with 580,000 children Sept., Full Year H.S. began Watts Riots in Los Angeles L.B.J. sends additional troops to Vietnam
1966-68	Child Development Group of Mississippi struggles to retain Head Start funding
1967	Parent and Child Centers Started Follow Through Projects initiated by the Dept. of Education OEO Research and Advisory Council Organized
1968	Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert Kennedy assassinated
1969	Westinghouse Report Published Head Start Supplementary Training Programs Begin Planned Variations Study of preschool curricula July, Head Start and Parent and Child Centers delegated by OEO to Dept. of Health Education, and Welfare

## A. The Sixties

In 1964 the Office of Economic Opportunity assembled a panel of experts to develop a child development program for families living in poverty. This panel, now known as the "Cooke Panel" after its chairman Robert Cooke, was made up of thirteen people from various professions. Notice how diverse in education and experience this panel was. Head Start was created not as an educational program, but as a comprehensive program to address the needs of children, families and communities who happen to live in poverty. (The information listed below represents the professional backgrounds of each member at the time of their participation on the planning committee.)

Table 2

## The Cooke Panel

### Medical

**Robert E. Cooke** – Chairman of the Department of Pediatrics and Pediatrician in Chief of Johns Hopkins Hospital.

**Edward Davens** – Director of Health, State of Maryland and in 1962 he was a member of President Kennedy's Panel on Mental Retardation.

**Myron E. Wegman** – Pediatrician working in the field of public health. Particularly the areas of maternal and child health.

### Education

**George B. Brain** – Superintendent of Schools in Baltimore, Maryland.

**Jacqueline G. Wexler** – President of Webster College in St. Louis, Missouri and Educator for Peace Corps Volunteers.

### Early Childhood

**Mamie Phipps Clark, Ph.D.** – Executive Director, Northside Center for Child Development, New York.

**James L. Hymes, Jr.** – Active in early childhood education since 1934.

**John H. Niemeyer** – President of Bank Street College of Education 1953 - 1974.

**D. Keith Osborn** – Early Childhood Education Specialist.

### Social Work

**Mitchell I. Ginsberg** – Commissioner of New York City Department of Social Services.

### Mental Health

**Reginald S. Lourie** – Professor of Child Health and Development, Psychiatry, and Behavioral Sciences, George Washington University.

### Other Members

**Edward Perry Crump and Mary Kneedler** (Zigler, E., and Valentine, J., 1979).

These thirteen panel members met in Washington to discuss knowledge of human growth and development, theories about early childhood education, and the needs of children and families living in poverty. Out of these discussions they formulated the comprehensive service plan that came to be known as "Project Head Start."

Project Head Start began in 1965 in an effort to combat poverty with *prevention*. It ultimately became one of the most far reaching and long lived of President Johnson's "War on Poverty" programs. Head Start was truly a groundbreaking and innovative program. In addition to its goal on giving at risk children a "Head Start" in school, the program was designed to give families and communities the support and skills they would need to raise a child successfully.

Head Start was not designed to be controlled by the government or its representatives. The program was designed to be administered by the very clients and communities it was serving. In Head Start, then and now, clients are not passive recipients of money or services. They are active participants and trained advocates in the education and development of their children. The families are encouraged and trained to be decision makers in the program. Parent representatives on the "Policy Council" can review and set policies which will best suit the needs of their family and community.

Edward Davens (one of the members of the original Head Start planning committee), spoke out at the beginning of Head Start, and in the years that followed, about the ways in which the original plans were compromised in an effort to serve as many children as possible. In a 1968 letter to Dr. Robert S. Mendelsohn, he stated:

It should also be noted for the record, that the recommendation of the original planning committee was for a limited program of very high quality covering only 100,000 children. This was to allow manpower, resources and general support so that each of the Child Development Centers funded would incorporate all of the components so well described in the original Head Start description. The original intent was that only if all of the elements of the program were incorporated in each center with attention to quality could the overall concept be given a fair trial. (Davens, E., MD.)

In reality, the program enrolled 580,000 children that first summer.

There were other recommendations that were not implemented as the committee intended:

1. It is essential to improve the environment of the child at an *early* age. Actually, the first year of life is the most critical. The second year is the next most important, and so on.
2. Summer programs and part-time programs are inadequate; to achieve a lasting effect, full-time child-development centers are needed.
3. *Involvement*, not mere "cooperation" of the parents is crucial. Parents must be familiar with the philosophy, planning, and operation of the program so that they will be motivated to modify appropriately the home environment.
4. A concurrent effort must be made to reform and improve the school setting so that the Head Start child's gains will not be promptly extinguished by an obtuse, inflexible, and insensitive classroom situation. This type of follow through must continue for at least the first four grades. (Davens, 1982, p. 90)



The original goals of project Head Start that were agreed upon by the planning committee and were eventually implemented are:

1. Increase social competence in children.
2. Strengthen and support families and communities so that they could raise successful, healthy children.
3. Provide medical, dental, nutritional, mental health, occupational and various other family services to families.

Table 3

Child Development Group of Mississippi (CDGM) Timeline\*

May 21, 1965	\$25,214,000.00 Economic Act Grant awarded to provide 4,470 Head Start centers for 162,300 children in 765 counties in Mississippi
Oct. 15, 1966	CDGM grant terminated Friends of Children of Mississippi (FCM) organized to coordinate political and financial support for the refunding of CDGM centers
Dec. 16, 1966	"Agreement in principle" reached between OEO and CDGM in which CDGM would receive funding to operate centers in nineteen counties in Mississippi
Dec. 28, 1966	OEO reversed its decision to fund CDGM in five of the counties previously agreed to: Clark, Humphreys, Leflore, Neshoba, and Wayne
1967	FCM provided Head Start services for nearly 2000 children on a strictly volunteer basis without any federal grant money
July 20, 1967	Mississippi Action for Progress (MAP) – an organization approved by the OEO to distribute Head Start funding in Mississippi – is challenged by FCM which had operated the CDGM centers since their grants were terminated nearly one year earlier
Aug. 8, 1967	MAP (the power structure approved by OEO for federal grant money) refuses to delegate any of the money to FCM centers
Sept. 21, 1967	FCM and MAP boards meet with Marion Wright and OEO officials
Nov. 6, 1967	Merger Proposed
Dec. 8, 1967	"Disaster meeting" The meeting becomes heated
Jan. 1968	Ad Hoc Committee to Save the Children of Mississippi met with Vice President Humphrey
Feb. 24, 1968	Rally held in Jackson, Mississippi to protest proposed \$25 Million funding cuts to Head Start and to discuss holding a demonstration in Washington D.C.
March 9, 1968	FCM is allotted federal money for the first time
March 26, 1968	Hon. William F. Ryan of N.Y. declares his support for Head Start funding in Mississippi before the House of Representatives
April 19, 1968	Contract agreement between FCM and MAP is signed
Dec. 1968	\$31,662.00 Grant approved for the state of Mississippi Seven million dollars less than what was promised. The OEO budget had been cut by congress and in turn, The national Head Start budget was cut \$25 Million for that year. Mississippi's seven million dollar cut was a disproportionate 1/3 of the funding cuts for the entire country.

\*(Summarized from; Humphrey, H. H., 1963-1969)

### **Child Development Group Of Mississippi (CDGM)**

One example of how public policy affected Head Start and conversely, how Head Start created public policy occurred in Mississippi in the late sixties. The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) was responsible for administering numerous programs developed during the "War on Poverty." The peace corps, the job corps, the neighborhood youth corps, Head Start, upward bound, work study, and other programs were funded through this office. Congress had appropriated a sum of money to be spent on anti-poverty programs without designating which program would receive what amount or how the money was to be spent. (Shriver, S., 1979)

While most people accept the responsibility of paying taxes to care for those less fortunate than themselves, not everyone agrees with the funding of social programs. This was especially true in Mississippi where the majority of the families living in severe poverty were people of color and the majority of taxpayers were white middle and upper class. On May 21, 1965, the OEO approved an Economic Act Grant to provide 4,470 centers for 162,300 children in 765 counties in Mississippi. The total yearly grant awarded was \$25,214,000.00. (CDGM in Hubert Humphrey's personal correspondence 1963-1969.) On Oct. 15, 1966, in a whirlwind of national controversy, that grant was terminated.

The controversy over allocation of government money in Mississippi had consequences for the OEO as well. "Within ninety days after OEO's start, the house of representatives authorized a special Investigations Committee to determine what OEO was doing wrong! This happened even before OEO had time to do much, if anything at all." (Sargent Shriver, 1979, p. 59) Some community leaders saw Head Start as a method of channeling funds directly into communities of color, and their fear was that

the Head Start centers were places where activist groups could gather forces to upset the social order. "Segregationist Politicians, white racists, and the Ku Klux Klan have launched strong attacks against CDGM." (Ad Hoc Committee to Save the Children of Mississippi, 1968)

Another group that opposed the OEO giving money to "poor people" were those who did not believe in giving charity to people. This group took the stand that providing services was equivalent to giving "handouts" and that what was really needed was to empower the poor people by allowing them to "pull themselves up by their bootstraps." Their belief was that this could be accomplished by providing political and economic power to all people. (Shriver, S., 1979)

In the state of Mississippi, initial Head Start funding was granted to the Child-Development Group of Mississippi (CDGM). According to Sargent Shriver, the "CDGM created a successful Head Start program that operated like programs in other locations." But many people in Mississippi (and elsewhere) saw the CDGM "as a way of empowering black people, and of mobilizing them on a statewide basis." (Sargent Shriver, 1979, p 62) To some, CDGM became the symbol of the civil rights movement in Mississippi-an attempt by the government to overthrow white supremacy.

In order to fully understand the impact that Head Start had on the families and the communities those first two years one must read the reports and personal letters sent to Vice President Hubert Humphrey. One such report comes from the Association of Communities of Bolivar County (ACBC) Head Start:

**ACBC HEAD START**  
Educational Department Report 1968  
Mrs. Olevia M. Johnson  
Educational Director

"Through the funds that were allocated previously to ACBC Head Start, we have accomplish [sic] the following things:

1. In August 1966, 450 children were graduated and sent into the public school.
2. In August, 1977, 407 children were graduated and sent into the public school.

These children has [sic] been trained through close supervision of ACBC employees:

1. How to socialize
2. Their personal worth
3. How to live beyond the family cycle
4. How to acquire knowledge by being curious
5. How to paint, draw, use scissors, and play with toys that before Head Start they didn't have the opportunity to enjoy

These children will lighten the teacher load a great deal. They will not be a burden on society as their parents are, because project Head Start gave them a preschool training in order to teach them their worth in life. Surely we will not let these little children down by refusing them the chance they need to become independent citizens of tomorrow." (ACBC Head Start 1968)

She goes on to say: "In approximately 400 homes that were visited...we discovered that we were a great service to these poverty stricken families because:

1. We gave the children supervision, food, clothes, and medical care that they were in desperate need of.
2. We not only served the children and school, but secured aid for sick dependent children and adults in the family
3. We held workshops in order to train the poorly educated mothers to work with the children of their community. This made not only the children proud, but the parents became independent and self confidence [sic]."  
(ACBC Head Start 1968)

Another report came to the attention of Vice President Humphrey in the form of a memo from the Associated Communities of Sunflower County (ACSC) and spoke about the impact of the mandate which required Head Start grants to be administered by Community Action Programs or CAP agencies. For centers that operated independently the first two years, it meant that grants were taken away and they would need to request funds from the newly organized or appointed power structures approved by OEO:

February 26, 1968

ACSC was funded and began as a delegate agency to Sunflower County Progress Inc. ACSC has operated its program through hostility and strain due to the pressure they have endured from the local CAP agency, but they have been able to operate a good Head Start program in spite of the many false reports that has [sic] been leveled against them.

This organization has no intentions of turning its program over to Sunflower County Progress Inc. ACSC has done so much for this program. Employees throughout the county has [sic] spent their money to beautify their centers. They have purchased rugs, curtains, bought shoes, and clothing for children and their parents. The poor has [sic] done all they can to help the

poor, but what has the power structure done to help the poor people of Sunflower County until this day. The OEO did not give enough money to the program (ACSC) to buy for the needy children and their parents, but we have managed to keep them in school throughout the winter.

Why would the Federal Government give to the rich in the name of helping the poor when the poor does [sic] not trust the rich now, and never will as long as they shift our lives to serve and use us as they see fit. But there are a few things that the nation must understand, that we are at the mercy of the CAP agency. They say if CAP does not agree to a Delegate Agency then we will not be refunded again.

We are sure that if we are at the mercy of the CAP agency with the approval of OEO, then OEO does not stand for anything, because everybody in the nation knows...the kind of CAPS we have here in the Southern States and most of all in Mississippi. It took OEO two years to force them into a Delegate Agency and just how do the[y] feel that within the pas[t] few months they are accepting so easy. (ACSC Head Start, 1968)

Archival letters from angry Mississippi residents calling for the end of funding, tell of activist meetings being held in Head Start centers, Head Start vehicles being used to transport people to political rallies, and unfair hiring practices. As pressure was put on Washington, Senator John Stennis put through an amendment that held persons in charge of OEO personally accountable for money allocated to programs. This meant that if local programs misappropriated funds, the administrators of OEO could be sent to prison. (Humphrey, H. H., 1963-1969)

According to Sargent Shriver, the OEO provided accountants and fiscal experts to the CDGM in an effort to account for the expenditures of the program but these communities consisted of unemployed, unskilled, and for the most part, uneducated people who were involved in providing Head Start services in an "on-the-job training"

format. Sargent Shriver's account states that as soon as the funds were cut off, a plan was made to develop an alternative program for Mississippi, and that the OEO worked together with the CDGM to put that plan into action. (Shriver, S., 1979)

The newly created Mississippi Action for Progress (MAP) group was approved by OEO for grant money for the following year. MAP was then supposed to select delegate agencies to provide services. This seemed an acceptable solution to those in Washington, but to the Friends of the Children of Mississippi (FCM) who had operated some of the CDGM centers without federal funding during 1967, this was the final straw. Not only was their funding denied, but they were told to request money from an agency run by the very people they felt were responsible for their oppression. (FCM, 1968)

"What can we do to prevent such a thing from happening [Local Head Start centers being taken over by the 'power structure' (CAP Agency)]. We would rather die first than see this program fall into their hands. We don't want to fight because to fight usually means to destroy, but if fighting is what it takes to keep our communities operating independently, (keeping us from having to go downtown with our 'hats in our hands'), then we will fight until we win or at least die trying." (Mid-Delta Education Association, 1967)

The letters from protesters claimed that Sargent Shriver's only interest was to save himself from criminal prosecution. (Shriver, S., 1979) The CDGM and newly created FCM organized a march in Washington to protest the cancellation of their funding. The FCM sent flyers to officials in Washington telling of their plight (see Figure 1). They included a "fact Sheet" telling Vice President Humphrey about their organization.



Figure 1

# HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT ?



THE U. S. OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY  
INSISTS THAT HEAD START PROGRAMS IN MISSISSIPPI  
AGREE TO SERVE FEWER CHILDREN THIS YEAR. WE  
CANNOT ENTER INTO SUCH AN IMMORAL AGREEMENT.  
CONGRESS NEVER INTENDED ANY CUT-BACKS IN HEAD  
START PROGRAMS. OUR CHILDREN ARE ENTITLED TO  
BETTER TREATMENT FROM THE ADMINISTRATION. OUR  
STRUGGLE IS JUST AND WE SHALL PREVAIL. WE INVITE  
YOU TO JOIN IN A VIGIL AT THE WHITE HOUSE PRO-  
TESTING THE COURSE OF ACTION BEING TAKEN BY OEO.

# SAVE THE CHILDREN OF MISSISSIPPI

(Humphrey, H. H., 1963-69,  
Vice President's File 150.G.7.2F)

The FCM fact sheet reads: (in part) "The real meaning of FCM lies in an impoverished people's commitment to an idea – the idea of self-help through education, training and the opportunity to do for themselves." (FCM 1968)

Some of the facts included on the fact sheet were:

- ... first half of 1967, enrollment in FCM centers was 2,055 children and average daily attendance was 82%
  - ... second half of 1967, enrollment was 1,719 and the average daily attendance was 84%
  - ... in 49 weeks of operation, staff (teachers, cooks, janitors, and administrators) logged 611,520 hours. Total payroll expenditure was \$195,078.00 or an average of 32 cents per hour per employee.
  - ... sixty drivers travel close to 9,460 miles per week on unpaved roads getting children to and from the centers. These roads are muddy when it rains and rutted and bumpy when it's dry. The average route covers 158 miles weekly and drivers received an average of \$15.00 a week in 1967.
  - ... FCM attempts to provide one hot meal and one or two snacks per day. No commodity food was secured in 1967, so FCM relied on donations from foundations and the communities. Central office sent \$26,412.00 for the year, which amounted to thirty cents a week per child or six cents a day. The difference was made up by donations of food and money from the poor people of the communities being served.
  - ... the unemployment rate of the communities being served by FCM is 60-80%.
- (Summarized from: FCM 1968)

By the spring of 1968, it was becoming increasingly clear to all those involved in the controversy that what was happening in Mississippi was not a simple matter of

rules and regulations or the lack of them. It was a matter of people's right to govern themselves and to determine their own destiny. The plight of CDGM was eloquently expressed by Hon. William F. Ryan of N.Y. before the House of Representatives on Tuesday March 26, 1968.

In 1965, the "War On Poverty" came to Mississippi. Thousands and thousands of desperately poor parents were told that something important, something significant was happening. They could bring their children to Head Start centers where hungry, sick children would not only be taught, but fed and given medical attention. And more than that: Head Start centers were not only places where children could play and learn together, they offered work to mothers and they offered the communities a sense of purpose and hope. For the first time in history money, food, medicine and employment reached Mississippi families. People who before had been terribly wounded and unbelieving began, many of them, to stir and take hope. But almost from the beginning, the effectiveness of Mississippi's Head Start programs, not to mention their resources, has been in constant danger. (Ryan, Honorable W. F., Congressional Record E2285, 1968)

The resolution of the CDGM controversy is similar in one respect to the struggles faced by the Head Start program after the Westinghouse/Ohio University research was published in 1969. By 1973, a three year plan had been drawn up by officials in Washington to phase out the Head Start program. But Head Start never has been a place where underprivileged people come to ask for handouts. It has been, from the very beginning, a place where families are celebrated and respected and where they are given the information, referrals, jobs, and education they need to become *self-sufficient*. "It was precisely the effectiveness of Head Start at mobilizing parents...that saved the program when the Westinghouse/Ohio study produced bleak results and a new administration dismantled OEO." (Travers & Light, 1982, p. 13)

Whether it was Sargent Shriver's assistance in restructuring the CDGM or whether it was solely the result of concerned parents, staff, and community leaders marching on Washington that was responsible for the re-funding of programs in Mississippi, the results are the same: It was the unwavering support of those people directly involved in Head Start: those who had witnessed the effects on children and families first-hand, and those who believed in the program mission and goals that kept the program operating in spite of adversity.

## The Westinghouse Survey

Evaluating Head Start was not an easy task. The major problem of evaluating the Head Start program is that its primary goal is social competence. What is considered social competence in one culture may not be important in another culture. Another problem is that the very goals of the program call for communities to choose the kind of educational styles that best fit the needs of the families they serve, and for parents to take an active role in program planning and implementation. Each program in each community is administered individually – to researchers, this means that finding criteria by which to measure the gains of Head Start on a national scale is more difficult.

The Westinghouse Survey measured the cognitive and affective gains of children two to four years after their participation in Head Start and compared them with a control group of children who were eligible for Head Start but did not attend. (Westinghouse Learning Corporation/Ohio University, 1969) A listing of the tests and measures used in that survey can be found in the appendix.

The Westinghouse Survey was an ex post facto study which compared first, second and third grade children who attended Head Start with a control group of children who were eligible for Head Start but did not attend. Selection of subjects was the first of the flaws in the research design: instead of using random selection, the control group was chosen by matching family characteristics with those of the Head Start Graduates. One hundred and four Head Start centers across the country were chosen.

Criteria for selection of control group subjects:

1. Subjects must have lived in the target area from the time of the Head Start program until the time of the study.
2. All subjects must meet the eligibility criteria of Head Start.
3. All subjects must attend the same school system.
4. Subjects must not have had any other Head Start or preschool experience.

The researchers assumed that by matching families from the same communities with families having the same income levels, similar educational achievements and other demographic information, the groups would be equivalent. This is not necessarily so. The goals of the Head Start program have been-from the very beginning-to serve the neediest of the needy. Children are accepted into the program because they need the comprehensive services Head Start can provide.

After the control group was selected,

- ... Cognitive and affective tests were administered to the children
- ... Parents were interviewed to collect attitudinal, social, and economic data
- ... Primary teachers rated children on achievement motivation, and described the intellectual and emotional environment of the school

The conclusions of the Westinghouse researchers were as follows:

1. Summer programs appeared to be ineffective in producing any gains in cognitive and affective development that persist into the early elementary grades.
2. Full year programs appear to be ineffective as measured by the tests of affective development used in the study, but are marginally effective in producing gains in cognitive development that could be detected in grades one, two, and three...

3. Head Start children, whether from summer or full year programs, still appear to be considerably below national norms for the standardized tests of language development and scholastic achievement, while performance on school readiness at grade one approaches the national norm.
4. Parents of Head Start enrollees voiced strong approval of the program and its influence on their children. They reported substantial participation in the activities of the centers. (Westinghouse/Ohio 1969 pp. 7-8)

The researchers concluded: "...the study indicates that Head Start as it is presently constituted has not provided widespread significant cognitive and affective gains which are supported, reinforced, or maintained in conventional education programs in the primary grades." (Westinghouse/Ohio 1969)

While this conclusion was supported in the data collected from cognitive and affective tests of children, it is surprising that the Head Start program has been held accountable for increasing the *cognitive* and *affective* skills of children for up to three years after they are no longer involved in the program. There has never been a Head Start goal aimed at making children smarter. *The Head Start goals were aimed at supporting families who live in poverty: helping them to raise healthy children and giving these children and families the opportunity to participate in the wide range of experiences available to other Americans.*

The research data did show positive gains of the Head Start program, but these gains were minimized by the researchers. The gains were reported in the interviews with parents:

- ... 85-90% (of the interviewees) were the mother of a Head Start graduate
- ... 72-84% were married and living with their spouse

- ... 73-84% (of the interviewees and/or their spouse) reported attending special classes during the past year
  - ... 87-92% stated that Head Start had influenced their child positively
  - ... 85-94% stated that Head Start was good for their child and he/she enjoyed attending
  - ... 50-80% attended meetings at the center
  - ... 27-48.4% reported positive changes in their own life due to Head Start
  - ... 0-1% reported negative changes in their own life as a result of Head Start
  - ... 51-73% reported no change in their own life as a result of Head Start
  - ... 82-91% stated they would send their other children to Head Start
  - ... 2-3.6% stated they would not send their other children to Head Start
  - ... 2-14% didn't know or didn't have other children
  - ... 42-59% spent time visiting the classroom and/or volunteering
  - ... 57-82% reported not being involved in the Head Start program
  - ... 5-15% reported limited involvement
  - ... 12-30% reported being very involved in the Head Start program
- (summarized from: Westinghouse/Ohio, 1969)

There were six categories of subjects displayed in the findings section of the Westinghouse/Ohio research. Children who had attended summer Head Start and were in grades 1, 2, or 3 at the time of the survey, and children who had attended full year Head Start and were in grades 1, 2, or 3, at the time of the survey. The demographic information was reported in percentages for each group of subjects. The criteria for selecting families for Head Start was the same for those attending the summer program and those attending full year. Since there is no significant statistical difference between the groups of subjects, the range of their responses will be given.



Table 4

**Summarized Findings from the Westinghouse Survey  
Parent Interviews**

<u>Ages</u>	<u>Interviewee</u>	<u>Spouse of interviewee</u>
13-20	.4 - .9%	0%
21-25	4 - 12.9%	0%
26-35	45.8 - 54%	42 - 54%
36-45	28 - 37.7%	25 - 38%
46-55	6 - 8.4%	9.4 - 16%
56-65	1 - 3%	2 - 4%
over 65	0 - 1%	0 - 1%

<u>Living in Household</u>	<u>Children of interviewee</u>	<u>Total # of People</u>
1	0 - 4.6%	0 - .8%
2	4 - 15.4%	.7 - 1.1%
3	15 - 20.7%	0 - 6.9%
4	14 - 22.5%	6 - 15.4%
5	13.4 - 22%	14 - 17%
6	9.7 - 22%	14 - 21%
7	2 - 10%	13 - 22%
8	6 - 8.9%	8.9 - 18%
9	5.7- 10%	22 - 26%

<u>Last grade of school completed</u>	<u>Interviewee</u>	<u>Spouse</u>
less than 7	9.3 - 26%	13 - 26%
7 - 9	16 - 25.9%	14 - 20.8%
some H.S.*	16 - 34.8%	26 - 34.4%
H.S. graduate	25.5 - 38%	0 - 19.4%
some college	0 - 8%	2 - 5.3%
College Graduate	0 - 4%	0 - 1.3%

\*High School

<u>Weekly Employment</u>	<u>Interviewee</u>	<u>Spouse</u>
35 hrs. or more	24.3 - 38%	86 - 89%
Less than 35 hrs.	7.5 - 12%	.9 - 4.5%
unemployed	50 - 66.9%	9 - 14%

#### Family Income for Past Year

less than \$2,000	.6 - 22%
\$2,000 - 3,999	39.8 - 50%
\$4,000 - 5,999	24 - 27.2%
\$6,000 - 7,999	4 - 16%
\$8,000 - 9,999	0 - 4.8%
\$10,000 - 14,999	0 - 2.4%
over \$15,000	0 - .8%
Don't know or no response	0

Sargent Shriver said, "If one plants a tree...and gives it lots of nourishment at its beginning and then goes away and leaves it for the next five years, the tree will not grow as well as if the nourishment is continued. Similarly, Head Start could not achieve permanent effects when all its 'nourishment' was stopped after two years." (1982, p. 65)

The researchers made reference to previous research and knowledge in the field of education: specifically that many children from poverty income backgrounds enter school "with sizable intellectual and social-emotional deficiencies, as compared to the average middle-class child, and school records show that they fall further and further behind with each passing year." (Westinghouse/Ohio, 1969, p. 254) If those findings were accepted by the researchers, how is it possible to conclude that Head Start was ineffective in producing "significant gains"?

First of all, their own research showed that Head Start graduates showed cognitive gains as they entered elementary school, and that slight cognitive gains were detected in each of the three grades tested. Secondly, by their own analysis, there was substantial documentation of both parental involvement in their children's education and parent satisfaction with the Head Start program and the services they received (these gains are directly related to the stated Head Start goals). Finally, The Head Start graduates were equal to their peers at third grade. (According to the previous studies, they would have fallen further behind each year.)

The findings of the Westinghouse/Ohio University researchers could have just as easily been combined with the data of services provided to the children and families to demonstrate the success of the program. "Medical tests showed that 30-35% of the children had physical defects ranging from infected tonsils to long term deficiency

diseases. In that first summer, through the medical examinations, eye defects, bone and joint disorders, tuberculosis, and dental problems were discovered and treated. Polio and measles vaccinations were given." (Johnson, Mrs. L.B. p. 47)

When analyzing the Westinghouse/Ohio University research in light of the goals of the Head Start program, it is clear that the testing of the cognitive and affective domains can be considered complimentary to, but not the essence of, what is important in Head Start. A true evaluation of whether or not Head Start is successful should have included information about the goals and objectives of the program with research designed to evaluate the components of service delivery:

1. Social competency
2. Education
3. Health/Nutrition
4. Parent involvement in their child's education
5. Community involvement-both parent involvement in the community and community involvement in Head Start

(Davens, E., M.D., 1968)

**Table 5***Head Start Timeline*

1969-1974	Richard Nixon's Presidency
1971	Health Start began
1972	Most Head Start programs have converted to full year CDA Program began Education for Parenthood Program began Homestart began
1973	Three year plan was initiated to phase out Head Start Head Start Improvement and Innovation Program began Child and Family Resource Program began
1974	Project Developmental Continuity began Nixon resigned his Presidency to Ford Two year Collaboration began between Head Start and the Medicaid Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment Program (EPSDT)
1974-1977	Gerald Ford's Presidency
1975	First Head Start Performance Standards written and implemented
1976	Economic Opportunity and Community Partnership Act ruled that ten percent of Head Start slots be set aside for children with handicaps.
1977	Congressional Appropriations Hearings included research data showing the positive effects of Head Start Head Start budget increased by \$150 million
1977-1981	Jimmy Carter's Presidency
1978	Decreased Welfare Spending \$55 million budget increase for Head Start Campaign to transfer Head Start from HEW to Dept. of Education blocked

## B. The Seventies

In the early seventies, the Vietnam War was still raging, Nixon resigned his Presidency to Ford (1974), and the national guard was sent to Kent State University to control student riots (1971). In 1975 the Alaskan oil pipeline began. The late seventies were a time of peace talks and negotiations. Carter granted full pardons to most Vietnam draft evaders (1977), inflation continues to rise, severe oil shortages occur as a result of OPEC prices (1979), and the U.S. and Soviet union draft a treaty to limit nuclear weapons-SALT II (1979).

In Head Start, funding was precarious as a result of the Westinghouse/Ohio University report (1969). New Head Start programs were created to provide additional services to the community, and a concerted effort was underway to ensure quality Head Start services nationwide. By 1975 there were fifteen different Head Start Programs (See Appendix) in operation, and the policy manual included the first written performance standards. Although the implementation of each program may have been slightly different, the goal of each program was to provide services to families living in poverty. (OCD-HS Head Start Policy Manual, 1975)

The Head Start goals were put into place by each center and community according to the needs of their individual clients. The very essence of Head Start called for parents and individual communities to be involved in the planning and execution of the program. Look first at the criteria for selecting eligible children: The OCD-HS Head Start Policy Manual of July 1975 states:

The design and selection of program options is to be based on an assessment of the child development needs and resources of the broader community as well as the needs of the current enrollees and their families. The assignment of children to programs is to be determined by assessing

such factors as age, developmental level, family situation, handicaps, health or learning problems, and previous school experience. Discussion with all parents about specific needs of their children and how best to meet those needs must be a priority in such an assessment. (OCD-HS Head Start Policy Manual, 1975)

These criteria insured that children and families with special needs would be given priority placement in the program. In 1976, the Economic Opportunity and Community Partnership Act ruled that 10% of Head Start slots be reserved for children with handicaps. The goals of Head Start remained unchanged in the first ten years of the program. (See page 7 for statement of goals.) The only thing lacking was an explanation of the methods with which to accomplish those goals.

The framework of Head Start is one of parent involvement at all levels: from working with children and assisting in the daily delivery of services to evaluating the program and creating future policies. The writers of the 1975 policy manual created performance standards for use in centers nationally, complete with suggestions on how to meet those standards. This was the first systematic attempt to create uniformity in Head Start. The language used was chosen to be free from professional jargon and as easily translated as possible since the primary people implementing the program would be the general public: English speaking and multi-lingual, not professional educators.

The performance standards were written in a two part format. On the left side of the manual the policies were written. (Performance Standards) The right side of the manual gave suggestions or guidance on how to implement the policy. The performance standards covered specific, concrete, tasks in every one of the program areas: Education, Health, Nutrition and Social Services. (For this paper, they will be presented in text fashion rather than side by side.) Here are a few examples:

**Table 6****Examples of Performance Standards****PERFORMANCE STANDARD**

1. **Parent participation in planning the education program, and in center, classroom and home activities;**

**GUIDANCE**

1. Meeting with staff to provide for the overall written education plan (see item 1304.2-2(a) for further guidance).

**PERFORMANCE STANDARD**

2. **Parent training in activities that can be used in the home to reinforce the learning and development of their children in the center;**

**GUIDANCE**

2. Some examples are:
  - ... orientation and training sessions
  - ... designing activities for children at home
  - ... participating in classroom/center activities(OCD-HS Head Start Policy Manual, 1975 p. 12)



## Panel on Outcome Measurement

In 1978, the National Research Council with support from the Carnegie Corporation, established the Panel on Outcome Measurement in Early Childhood Demonstration Programs. (Although the findings of this study were reported in 1982, it will be included in this section of the survey – "the seventies" – because it was an extensive review of *previous* research on demonstration programs.)

The panel's mandate was to, "examine the objectives of contemporary demonstration programs; to appraise the measures currently available for assessing achievement of those objectives, particularly in light of their relevance for public policies; and to recommend new approaches to evaluation and outcome measurement." (Travers & Light, 1982, p. ix.)

The Panel on Outcome Measurement in Early Childhood Demonstration Programs included professionals in the fields of psychology, anthropology, economics, medicine and statistics. The report of this panel discussed the many obstacles to evaluating national demonstration programs. Some of the difficulties mentioned were: (Note that the obstacles listed [*italics*] are from the text edited by Travers and Light, 1982. The explanations [normal print] are a summary of those ideas and application to Head Start Evaluations and to this study.)

## Obstacles to Outcome Measurement in Early Childhood Demonstration Programs

1. Past evaluations – Historically the evaluations of early childhood programs have focused on I.Q. as a reliable, quantifiable measure of a program's effect on a child.
2. Evaluation purpose – There are basically two reasons for evaluating demonstration programs: Summative evaluations are generated in an effort to *"provide definitive information to policy makers about the degree to which the programs are achieving their goals."* (Travers & Light, 1982) Formative evaluations are aimed at providing information to program staff and participants about how the program is functioning in an effort to create higher quality services.
3. Definitions – Each evaluation defines not only its own research terminology, but gives its interpretation of the program goals and objectives as well.
4. Diversity of Target Group – English speaking vs. multi-lingual, differences in cultural values, inclusion of differently-abled clients and employees, etc.
5. Diversity of Services – Head Start, for example, delivers services in accordance with the needs of their clientele and in connection with the services provided by their community and the sponsoring agency. Services provided by the agency as supplemental to those mandated by

federal guidelines include: literacy classes, GED and adult enrichment classes, ESL classes, parent-substitute teacher training classes, cooking and nutrition classes, wellness seminars, etc. In 1992, Ramsey Action Programs Head Start joined the St. Paul YWCA in an innovative program to enroll homeless children in Head Start. The twenty children enrolled in the program lived with their mothers in shelters provided by the YWCA. At the time of enrollment, each family had experienced at least one year of homelessness.

6. Emphasis on the Social Environment – The ecological part of services. Linkages between families and: community organizations, job training services, schools, medical, dental, and health care agencies, and other families.
7. Support vs. Intervention – Interventions are treatments aimed at creating change in a non-functional system. They are planned and evaluated by the administrator/facilitator. Support programs on the other hand, provide services to families who set client initiated goals, and together with mentors, create plans for achieving those goals. Evaluations of these programs need to include client satisfaction surveys and documentation of services provided.
8. Individualization of Services – Special services for children with disabilities, dental and health services, clothing, housing, and nutrition, number of home visits, involvement of family members, special events, etc.

9. Decentralization and Site variation – Type of curriculum chosen and its application, the cultures, values, and agendas of agency staff, families, and parent group, the mission and purpose of the sponsoring agency, linkages between Head Start and the schools and community.
  
10. Time Boundaries – Number of years of participation in Head Start. One of the requirements of the Head Start program is that a parent (or family member over the age of 13) volunteer in the classroom one day a month. In extended families, a grandparent may be involved for several years as a volunteer with different grandchildren, if the parents are in school or working and cannot be involved as a volunteer on a regular basis.
  
11. Integration of Services – In Ramsey County Minnesota, this is currently being called "one stop shopping" (1994). It means having one place to go to register for a number of services provided by Head Start and the Community Action Agency. In addition to those services, families who express needs not accessible within the agencies, will be referred to community resources.

The major finding of this panel was that it is impossible to measure every component and/or outcome of a program. Their suggestion was to create research designs which encompass the full scope of services while paying close attention to the stated goals of the program and method of implementing those goals.

Specifically we call attention to the importance of:

- characterizing the immediate quality of life of children in demonstration programs, particularly day care and preschool education, in which they spend a large part of the day;
- describing how programs interact with and change the broader social environment in which a child grows or a family functions—the web of formal and informal institutions (extended families, schools, child welfare agencies and the like) that can potentially sustain, enhance, or thwart growth and change; and
- documenting the services received by children and families and describing the transactions between clients and program staff. (Travers & Light, 1982, p. xii)

By 1975 Head Start evaluation was becoming increasingly complicated. In addition to the diversity of urban/rural centers, diverse cultures, variations in curriculum, and client based program planning and implementation, Head Start now had fifteen different programs available. Services may have been delivered in client homes or in centers or both. The enrolled child could have been any age from 0-8, the child may have received training from a formal preschool curriculum model, a combination of early education theories, or no structured formal training. These factors made it even more imperative to match evaluation designs to the programs being studied.

One factor which impacts the design of government funded evaluations is its purpose. As stated earlier, summative research is often used by policy makers to justify spending, to appropriate additional funds, and/or to create new policy.

According to Travers and Light, some of the considerations that affect the creation of policy are:

1. Is the program or policy in accordance with the general philosophy of the policy makers and their constituents?
2. Is there tangible public support for the program?
3. Service delivery
  - Access – will it reach the target population?
  - Equity – will it provide services fairly without discrimination?
  - Effectiveness – will it achieve its goals and objectives?
  - Efficiency – will its costs be reasonable without cumbersome administration fees and/or requirements? (Travers and Light, 1982)

The suggestions made by the Panel on Outcome Measurement outlined a sound framework for future evaluations of Head Start and other national demonstration projects. The most important message they had for future researchers was to clearly define the purpose of the evaluation and to create a research design which was broad enough in scope to represent the essence of the program goals and to measure the effects of the variety of services the program offers.

**Table 7***Head Start Timeline*

1981-1989	Ronald Reagan's Presidency
1981	Feb. 9, Reagan announced decision to cut spending to social programs, but stated that Head Start would be placed in his safety net.
1982	Congress approved a \$98.3 billion tax hike Unemployment rate highest it's been in 42 years
1983	Martin Luther King Jr.'s Birthday became a national holiday
1989-1993	George Bush's Presidency
1993-present	Bill Clinton's Presidency

### C. The Eighties and Beyond

The decade of the eighties was a period of relative calm in comparison to the two previous decades. It was a period of economic growth in this country, and the first decade in over forty years that the United States was not actively fighting in a major war.

By this time, Head Start was accepted by the public and by policymakers in Washington as a program that provided valuable services to families and communities. Numerous research projects on the effects of Head Start on local communities had shown measurable positive results. (Educational Testing Service, 1972, Datta, L., 1973, Hertz, T., 1977, ACYF, 1980, Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, 1980, and others.)

Throughout the seventies, researchers struggled to define and quantitatively analyze the effects of Head Start. "In 1973, OCD commissioned the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to construct a comprehensive definition (of social competency) for use in Head Start evaluations." (Raver, C., and Zigler, E., 1991) They came up with 29 variables—too many for a national evaluation. In 1994, Rand Corporation tried and was unable to define social competence in a manner that was appropriate for use in many cultures. (Raizen & Bobrow, 1974)

According to Raver and Zigler, "MediAx Associates was commissioned in 1977 to conduct the Head Start Profiles of Program Effects on Children project, in which they were to develop and field-test a battery of social competence measures...MediAx Associates proposed a four-factor model that included the following domains:



1. health and physical,
2. cognitive,
3. social-emotional, and
4. 'applied strategies' (Raver, C., and Zigler, E., 1991)

This fourth domain was conceptualized as the child's ability to 'devise and implement effective courses of action in specific real life situations' and included such characteristics as motivation, curiosity, initiative, persistence and task orientation." (Taub, 1981, p. 12, in Raver and Zigler, 1991)

For the first time in Head Start history, researchers had created a definition of social competency which encompassed the comprehensive scope of the Head Start program goals. Like the Panel on Outcome Measurement in the seventies, who determined that it is not possible for one research project to measure the total effect of such a diverse and multi-faceted program as Head Start, Mediatrix Associates suggested that the measurement of these four competencies ought to be separate projects, and sub-contracted with other researchers to develop three of the domains.

## The Measures Project

The program designed by Mediix Associates, which later came to be known as "The Measures Project" was like a "breath of fresh air" for Head Start supporters and those people actively involved in the Head Start program who were hoping for a systematic way of looking at the effects of Head Start. But in 1982, the Measures Project was canceled. Among the reasons for ending the project was decreased spending on Head Start research. The Reagan Administration felt that there was little value in spending large amounts of taxpayers dollars to test social skills of children. The only part of the project which continued to receive funding was the cognitive domain.

The University of Arizona had been contracted to develop this area of the Measures project. It was frustrating for everyone involved in past research and analysis that of all the measures proposed, the one that received funding was the area in which tests and measures already existed and it was the only area that had previously been measured in several national evaluations. The University of Arizona created "The Head Start Measures Battery" which focused almost exclusively on measuring cognitive gains in children (it did include one section which tested the children's understanding of social rules).

The Head Start Measures Battery (HSMB) was said to be difficult to administer (Peters, et al., 1988, in Raver and Zigler, 1991) and developmentally inappropriate in addition to being narrowly focused. "All 80 sites refused to use the HSMB after the first year of pilot testing." (Williams, A. K., personal communication, 1990, in Raver and Zigler, 1991). Twenty years of knowledge and theory had gone into the measures project and it ended up telling us what we already knew: Head Start does not make children smarter. Ironically, the creators of the program never claimed it would do so.

## The Children's Defense Fund

For the past thirty years, Head Start has been meeting both the need for education and career development of parents, and the need for quality, developmentally appropriate childcare during those times when the parents are in classes. In 1991, the Children's Defense Fund distributed a booklet to Legislators asking them to unite with the American people in declaring the "War on Poverty." The authors state:

"We are in danger of becoming two nations: one of first world privilege and another of third world deprivation, struggling against increasing odds to peacefully co-exist as a beleaguered middle class barely holds on....If we do not act now to prevent escalating child and family poverty, by the year 2000 one in four U.S. children will be poor." (Children's Defense Fund, 1991) Some of the statistics quoted in that same booklet include:

- ... between 1979 and 1990, child poverty in the U.S. grew by 26% while our real gross national product grew by more than one fourth.
- ... in 1990 more than 840,000 American children fell into poverty.
- ... 100,000 children in America go to sleep homeless each night.
- ... 5,754 children in 1990 lived in households with incomes less than *half* the poverty level.
- ... poor quality child care is a significant threat to the development of poor children, despite the fact that their parents are paying an average of 25% of their income for child care.
- ... every day in America 2,685 babies are born into poverty.

(Children's Defense Fund, 1991)

## V. Summary

Historically, Head Start has operated according to its unique design: an ecological, comprehensive, whole-child, approach, with an emphasis on empowerment of families and communities. People from all walks of life have been positively impacted by the program; children and families, Head Start staff and volunteers, communities and schools, numerous people in the fields of psychology, medicine, social work, and early childhood education, etc., and policy makers. Head Start has become a cornerstone in the foundation of early childhood programs in this country. It is generally accepted that "Head Start Works" yet there is still widespread misperception of the program goals.

**Head Start is not an educational program.** Head Start was—and is—a comprehensive program which provides services, support, and referrals to children and families living in poverty. (Davens, E., MD., 1968) In 1978 there was an attempt to change Head Start from HEW to the Department of Education. This attempt was blocked. In 1994, Head Start supporters are once again testifying before congress to block the transfer of the Head Start program to the Department of Education. For many people, Head Start is a "preschool" program providing half-day classes in socialization and kindergarten readiness. It is difficult to change the perception of Head Start as a "school" when children are picked up each morning by bus and spend their day participating in planned activities. Perhaps it is not nearly as important to change the perception of Head Start as a program of learning readiness, as it is to get across the concept of Head Start's major focus: providing comprehensive services to children and families living in poverty.

In January 1994, The Washington Post reported that a 47 member bipartisan committee had urged quality improvements of the Head Start program. Their recommendations included:

- ... extending the program to 0-3 year olds
- ... making some programs full day and year-round
- ... improving training for teachers and administrators
- ... upgrading salaries (the most experienced teachers average about \$15,000 annually compared to \$40,000-\$50,000 in public schools)
- ... smaller caseloads (some social workers were assigned to as many as 500 families at a time) (Washington Post, in Saint Paul Pioneer Press, 1994)

This list is surprisingly similar to the one written by Edward Davens M.D. regarding the way in which Head Start was implemented that first year (p. 18 of this study). He voiced strong concerns that the quality of the program was compromised by: not limiting the number of children, by serving 4-5 year olds rather than 0-3 year olds, by operating part time programs, and by not providing services beyond Head Start.

As Head Start enters its fourth decade of service to America, it is time to listen to the voices of those who have been there from the beginning. The framework for the Head Start Program has remained virtually unchanged over the course of thirty years. The goals and objectives have been administered as they were intended: by individual communities in response to the particular needs of the community. Head Start is doing what it set out to do: giving a Head Start to children who live in poverty. But in 1995, as we celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of the program, we will still be serving only a third of the children who are eligible.

The past thirty years have not been a linear process of growth and development for Head Start. *Public support, government funding, program evaluations, and public policy*, are four of the factors which wound together in a continual spiral impacting each other and the program. Each of the factors are interwoven and none can be viewed individually without examining the connections of the others. From the historical information presented in this study, one can see how each of the factors have affected funding:

- ... *public support* saved the funding after the Westinghouse survey was published and again after funding was cut to the CDGM
- ... *program evaluations* have been used consistently to lobby legislators and congressmen for funding
- ... *public policy* has determined the amount of funding allocated to Head Start, and Head Start has impacted public policy.

Most of the research done on the Head Start program in the past thirty years has been used to justify funding or to lobby for additional funds. Olevia M. Johnson, the Educational Director of ACBC Head Start stated: "There is no better or substantial justification that you can offer the taxpayer than to give the underprivileged children of America the first foot to an abundant life." (ACBC Head Start, 1968)

Dale Anderson, the executive director of Ramsey Action Programs which administers Head Start in Ramsey County, Minn., was quoted as saying, "Head Start was part of Lyndon Johnson's 'War on Poverty,' but it really wasn't a war at all. It was only a small battle...we have never really declared a war on poverty. It's never been a question of money, it's been a question of will...I would like us to move forward on children's issues and other human service issues the way we moved forward with the war against [Saddam] Hussein — and that is to do what needs to be

done and deal with the cost later. Somehow, we managed to pay for that war, and I suspect if we wanted to, we could find a way to pay for opportunities for children." (Saint Paul Pioneer Press, Feb. 2, 1992)

In 1994, newspapers and magazines are filled with articles about the need for quality child care. Welfare reform is aimed at getting families off welfare and into employment. The sad truth is that there is not enough available quality childcare for those families already working and going to school. Those who are lucky enough to find childcare that suits the needs of their family, often discover that their wages barely cover the cost of childcare.

Rochelle Stanfield suggests that we capitalize on Head Start's ability to empower parents up the career ladder and into jobs which will enable them to decrease their dependence on welfare. She suggests that we connect Welfare reform with increased funding of Head Start. (Summarized from: Stanfield, R., 1994)

## Implications for Future Research

Head Start's success **can** be measured. The model of measuring social competence created by MediAx Associates in 1977 was applauded by supporters and creators of Head Start as it proposed to measure four domains: health and physical, cognitive, social-emotional, and applied strategies. Applied strategies refers to motivation, curiosity, initiative, persistence, and task orientation. (Raver and Zigler, 1991) We need to go back to the plan created by MediAx Associates or create new models which will accurately measure the services provided by the program.

There are many ways to measure Head Start's success. Here are five quantifiable types of measurement which could easily be implemented:

**1. Qualitative and quantitative analysis of the yearly program reviews.**

Each year every Head Start center conducts a program evaluation using a tool called the "Self Assessment Validation Instrument" (SAVI). This checklist is used by clients who walk through the centers and observe the daily operation to see that the performance standards are being met. The clients also review records and files and interview staff, and make recommendations for improvements for the following year. The results of these surveys could be analyzed and published nationally.

**2. Quantitative analyses of services rendered:**

- ... Medical and dental screenings completed
- ... Number of home visits completed per family
- ... Number of hours volunteered by parents and relatives
- ... Value of community resources donated to the program



- a. Community volunteers
- b. In-kind services provided to H.S. families
- c. Donations (food, clothes, toys, classroom space, etc.)

**3. Longitudinal Study of Head Start graduates, measuring:**

- ... Attendance in school
- ... Number who receive a high school diploma
- ... Number who receive a college diploma
- ... Percent of teen-age pregnancies
- ... Involvement in corrections system
- ... Chemical use/abuse

**4. Longitudinal study of Head Start families, measuring:**

- ... Involvement in their child's school after Head Start
- ... Involvement in their community
- ... Training, classes, or additional education sought by parents after their involvement in Head Start
- ... Career advancement during and after Head Start

- 5. Client satisfaction surveys.** The Westinghouse/Ohio research included such a survey, but discounted the findings. It is no small thing that 87-92% of the clients interviewed stated that Head Start had influenced their child positively. In fact, 27-48% of the clients interviewed reported positive changes in their own lives as a result of Head Start. "Forty-four percent of the Minnesota program's paid staff members are current or former Head Start parents." (Saint Paul Pioneer Press, Feb. 2, 1992, p. 3F)

As we celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of Head Start, it is time for us to look long and hard at the way we promote the program to the public, and to policy makers. Year after year, we present the numbers from research that measures cognitive growth in Head Start children. And each year we mourn the fact that Head Start is serving only one third of the families eligible. But it is not the ability to provide services to the largest number of clients that is needed. The funding increases that are needed must be enough to provide *quality* programs to each client in every community.

It is not enough to measure the success or shortcomings of Head Start solely in numbers. Any true evaluation of Head Start must be administered and reported in the same manner as the program itself: *individually* – one voice, one child, one parent, one family, one school, and one community at a time. Head Start's success is watching a four year old cut a waffle with a knife and fork and remembering that less than two months earlier the child was eating peaches with her fingers because she didn't know how to use a fork.

Head Start's success is hearing a four year old child learn to speak intelligibly for the first time and knowing that without Head Start the child would not have received speech services because the public schools require a significant delay in more than one area of functioning. Head Start's success can be measured by the tears of a mom as she receives her Child Development Associate (CDA) credential and begins her first teaching job in Head Start. In 1992, forty four percent of Minnesota Head Start's paid employees were parents of current or former Head Start children. (Saint Paul Pioneer Press, Feb. 2, 1992)

Whatever the future holds for Head Start, it is imperative that researchers begin to measure the true impact of the program: positive changes in the lives of children, families, and communities. That is what Head Start is really all about.

## Appendix

### a. The Westinghouse Survey

The tests used to measure cognitive and affective gains in children:

1. "Metropolitan Readiness Tests (citizens) – a generalized measure of learning readiness containing citizens on word meaning, listening, matching, alphabet, numbers, and copying...This particular measure was used in grade one because it does not require the ability to read." (p. 3)
  
2. "Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) – a general measure of children's academic achievement containing subtests on reading, paragraph meaning, spelling, arithmetic, and so on, used to measure achievement at grades one, two, and three." (p. 3-4)
  
3. "Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA) – a measure of language development containing separate tests on auditory and vocal reception, auditory and visual memory, auditory-vocal association, visual-motor association, etc." (p. 4)
  
4. "Children's Self -Concept Index (CSCI) – a projective measure of the degree to which the child has a positive self-concept." (p. 4)
  
5. "Classroom Behavior Inventory (CBI) – a teacher rating assessment of the children's desire for achievement in school." (p. 4)
  
6. "Children's Attitudinal Range Indicator (CARI) – a picture story projective measure of the child's attitudes toward school, home, peers, and society." (p. 4)



**b. Summary of Head Start and Related Programs**

<u>Dates</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description</u>
1965-present*	Summer Head Start	Comprehensive summer program for preschool children for low-income families, including health, nutritional, social, educational and mental health services.
1966-present	Full-year Head Start	Head Start services offered as a year round program. After 1969 many Head Start programs were converted to full year programs, and by 1972 most Head Start children were in full-year programs.
1967-present	Follow Through	A program administered by the Office of Education, extending Head Start services to Head Start children when they enter kindergarten and elementary school.
1967-present	Parent and Child Centers	Demonstration program for families with children up to age three, offering Head Start-type services to the children and the entire family.
1969	Head Start and Follow Through Planned Variations	A program to provide Head Start centers with a choice of options, allowing each center to select the educational curriculum that best meets the needs of the children and community.
1969	Head Start Supplementary Training Program	Aid to parents of children in Head Start programs to pursue higher education degrees.
1971-1974	Health Start	A demonstration Program designed to provide medical and dental services and health education to Head Start children as well as other children from low-income families.
1972-present	Head Start services to Handicapped Children	A program carrying out the 1972 congressional mandate requiring that at least ten percent of Head Start enrollees be handicapped children and that special Head Start services be provided to meet their needs.

<b>Dates</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Description</b>
1972-present	Child Development Associate Program	A program to train workers in Head Start and day-care centers and to provide them with professional credentials in the child-care field.
1972-1975	Home Start	A three-year demonstration program to provide Head Start health and educational services to children and parents in their own homes. As a result of this experimental program, more than 12,000 children are now receiving home-based services in approximately 280 full-year Head Start programs.
1972-present	Education for Parenthood Program	A program, sponsored by the Office of Child Development and the Office of Education, to help prepare teenagers for parenthood through working with young children in Head Start and other centers. Parenthood curricula are also being developed to train Head Start parents.
1973-present	Child and Family Resources Program	A program that uses Head Start centers as a base to help make community services available to families with children from the prenatal period through age eight.
1973-present	Head Start improvement and Innovation Program	An ongoing effort to evaluate and improve the performance standards of local Head Start Programs and to encourage the development of programs more responsive to the needs of children and the community.
1974-1976	Head Start Collaboration With the Medicaid Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment, Program (EPSDT)	A joint program with the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW to make Early and Periodic Screenings, Diagnosis, and Treatment services available to Medicaid-eligible Head Start and non-Head Start children.
1974-present	Project Development Continuity	A cooperative program with public school systems designed to assure continuity of child-development services for Head Start children as they move from preschool to elementary school.

\*present = 1982 (The year the table was published)  
 (TABLE 4-2, Travers & Light, 1982, pp. 144-145)



## REFERENCES

- ACBC Head Start (1968) Association of Communities of Bolivar County. "Educational Department Report." Located in: personal correspondence from his United States Vice Presidency, 1963-1969. 150.G.7.2F, Box 1201, Folder 2.4, Minnesota Historical Society Research Center Archives, St. Paul, Minn.
- ACSC Head Start (1968) Associated Communities of Sunflower Co. Letter to H. H. Humphrey. Located in: personal correspondence from his United States Vice Presidency, 1963-1969.
- Ad Hoc Committee to Save the Children of Mississippi (1968) Press release dated Feb. 19. Located in personal correspondence from his United States Vice Presidency, 1963-1969. Minnesota Historical Society Research Center Archives, St. Paul, Minn.
- Administration for Children, Youth and Families (1980) "The impact of Head Start: an overview." Washington, D.C., 8 p., H.S.200858.
- Brown, B. (1985) Head Start: how research changed public policy. Young Children, July.
- CDGM (1968) In H. H. Humphrey's personal correspondence from his United States Vice Presidency. 1963-1969. 150.G.6.7B Box 1196, Folder 1.3. Located at the Minnesota Historical Society Research Center Archives, St. Paul, Minn.
- Children's Defense Fund (1991) "Leave no child behind: An opinion maker's guide to children in election year 1992," Children's Defense Fund, 25 E. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001.
- Collins, R. (1983) Head Start research: a new chapter. Children Today, July-August.
- Datta, L. and Gotts, E. E. (1973) "The promise of Head Start" In: Frost, J., Revisiting early childhood education: readings, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 584 p., H.S.200093.
- Davens, E., M.D. (1968) Personal correspondence to R. Mendelsohn M.D., American Academy of Pediatrics, March 26. Minnesota Historical Society Research Center Archives.
- Davens, E., M.D. (1979) In Project Head Start: A legacy of the War on Poverty, Zigler, E., and Valentine, J., Eds, New York Free Press. (pp. 89-91).
- Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency of Greater Los Angeles, California, (1971) Head Start preschool child development program evaluation report for 1970-1971, 199 p., ED061999.
- Educational Testing Service (1972) "Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences" ETS-HS Longitudinal Study, Vigor 2: Technical Report 24, Technical Report Series, Princeton, N.J., included in ED081813.





- Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development. Berkeley, California, (1980) "South Dakota Basic Educational Skills Project Program Description." 66 p. ED191577.
- FCM (1968) Flyer and fact sheet sent to Vice President Humphrey. Located in: personal correspondence from his United States Vice Presidency. 1963-1969 Minnesota Historical Society Research Center Archives. St. Paul, Minn.
- Gallagher, J. (1991) "Longitudinal interventions: virtues and limitations." American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 34, No. 4, March/April, pp. 431-439.
- Hertz, T. W. (1977) "The impact of federal early childhood programs on children." Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. ED142323.
- Holden, C. (1990) "Head Start enters adulthood." Science, Vol. 247, 23 March, pp. 1400-1402.
- Humphrey, H. H. (1963-1969) Personal correspondence from his United States Vice Presidency, located in the Minnesota Historical Society Research Center Archives. St. Paul, Minn.
- Johnson, President L.B. (1965) Remarks on the War on Poverty and Project Head Start. Public speech made on May 18th.
- Johnson, Mrs. L.B. (1979) In Project Head Start: A legacy of the War on Poverty, Zigler, E., and Valentine, J., Eds., New York Free Press. (pp. 43-49).
- Katz, L. (1979) "Current topics in early childhood education," Ablex Publishing Corporation, Norwood, N.J.
- Kennedy, President J. F. (1961) Public speech made to the Panel on Mental Retardation, Washington, D.C., October.
- Lee, V. E., Brooks-Gunn, J., and Schnur, E. (1988) "Does Head Start work?" Developmental Psychology, 24, pp. 210-222.
- Leedy, P., (1993) Practical research: planning and design. Fifth edition. Macmillan, New York.
- Mid-Delta Education Association, Washington County, Mississippi, (1967). Fact sheet sent to H. H. Humphrey. Located in: personal correspondence from his United States Vice Presidency. Minnesota Historical Society Research Center Archives. 150.G.7.2F Box 1201 Folder 2.4.
- OCD-HS Head Start Policy Manual (July 1975) U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Human Development services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau.
- Peters, et. al., (1988) In Raver and Zigler, 1991. Three steps forward and two steps back: Head Start and the measure of social competence. Young Children, May.
- The Presidents (1992) Published by Crescent Books, distributed by Outlet Book Co., Inc., a Random House Company, New Jersey.



- Raizen, S., and Bobrow, S. B. (1974) "Design for a national evaluation of social competence in Head Start children." Prepared for OCD, Dept. of Health Education and Welfare. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation.
- Raver, C. C., and Zigler, E. F. (1991) Three steps forward and two steps back: Head Start and the measure of social competence. Young Children, May, pp. 3-8.
- Ryan, Hon. W. F. (1968) Remarks made to the House of Representatives on Tuesday March 26. Congressional Record E2285.
- Saint Paul Pioneer Press (Feb. 2, 1992) "High Hopes," Article on Head Start.
- Schorr, L. (1988) "Within our reach: breaking the cycle of disadvantage." Anchor Books, Doubleday, New York.
- Schweinhart, L., Weikart, D., and Larner, M. (1986) "Consequences of three curriculum models through Age fifteen" Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 1, pp. 15-45.
- Shriver, S. (1966) Statement in U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, Hearings on S.3164, Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, 89 Congress, 2 sess. (1966).
- Shriver, S. (1979) In Project Head Start: A legacy of the War on Poverty. Zigler, E., and Valentine, J., Eds., New York Free Press. (pp. 49-67).
- Stanfield, R. (1994) Jump Start. National Journal. Feb. 12.
- Stanley, J. (1973) "Compensatory education for children, ages 2-8." The Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore, Md.
- Taub (1981) In Raver and Zigler, Three steps forward and two steps back: Head Start and the measurement of social competence. Young Children, May, p. 12.
- Travers, J., and Light, R. (1982) Learning from experience: evaluating early childhood demonstration programs. Panel on Outcome Measurement in Early Childhood Demonstration Programs. Committee on Child Development Research and Public Policy. Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences. National Research Council. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.
- Washington Post (1994) "Head Start needs boost, panel says" In Saint Paul Pioneer Press, Thursday, January 13, p. 14A.
- Westinghouse Learning Corporation/Ohio University (1969) The impact of Head Start: an evaluation of the effects of Head Start on children's cognitive and affective development. Washington D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce, Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information.
- Williams, A. K. (1990) Personal communication in Raver and Zigler, 1991. Three steps forward and two steps back: Head Start and the measurement of social competence. Young Children, May.

Augsburg College  
George Sverdrup Library  
Minneapolis, MN 55454