

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

March 29, 2006      LB 1256

important, and I think we've already established that we know that that is important. I've got some scientific study here. This is "Early Childhood Intervention Programs: What are the Costs and Benefits?" This was a congressional research briefing summary, and this was done in May of 2000. Jeanne Brooks-Gunn from Columbia University gave some data that talks about, from a comparative perspective, early childhood intervention programs have larger effects by one-half to three-quarters than later interventions. Moreover, the effects of early interventions continue through elementary school, and have greater impact by one-third to one-half than the immediate effects of other later interventions. So it's very obvious here that this is an investment. Rather than spend \$28,000 a year to house these children that grow up to be adults that don't receive a good start and end up in trouble and maybe in prison and, you know, there are children that another person talks about that are from at-risk homes that are usually well-served by these programs. This is Janet Curry from the University of California-Los Angeles. She says, the effects of early intervention have often been found to be larger for more disadvantaged children, which provides a rationale for targeting these children. Third, the most important aspect of quality is likely to be the nature of the interaction between the teacher and the child, because in these early intervention programs, as Senator Heidemann was talking about earlier, they do have small group sizes, better teacher training, other measurable aspects of quality that all make such interactions more likely. As suggested by Curry, it would be good public policy to fully fund our Head Start programs so that all poor children participate, and extend it to full-day, full-year programming. And I think that's what we're attempting to do, at least, with this money, is have a resource in place to use to help these at-risk young children. Might also be a good idea to extend eligibility to groups of children who are not poor, such as those at risk of abuse or neglect, children of high school dropouts, and children with limited English language proficiency. The available evidence sheds less light on the wisdom of establishing a universal public preschool program. Such a program would provide a substantial childcare subsidy many middle class as well as lower income families, rather than targeting the benefits primarily toward the neediest children. And I think