

WRITTEN TESTIMONY
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

July 31, 2001

Deborah A. Phillips, Ph.D.

Professor and Chair, Department of Psychology, Georgetown University

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am delighted to be here this morning to talk with you about “What’s Working in Early Childhood Education”. I had the pleasure of participating in the White House Summit on Early Childhood Cognitive Development last week where the same issues of “What do we know?” and “What works?” in early learning and development were discussed at length. I am especially encouraged that you and the White House are taking scientific knowledge as your departure point for considering the next policy steps.

Before joining the faculty at Georgetown University last September, I spent three years at the National Academy of Sciences as the study director for the report, *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development* (National Research Council/Institute of Medicine, 2000). The executive summary of this report is enclosed with my written testimony. Seventeen of our nation’s most esteemed scientists and informed practitioners including neuroscientists, pediatricians, educators, developmental psychologists, economists, and statisticians worked for 2 ½ years to address the charge to the committee, which was to evaluate and integrate the current science of early childhood development, to disentangle such knowledge from erroneous popular beliefs or misunderstandings or fads, and to discuss the implications of this knowledge base for early childhood policy, practice, professional development, and research.

To address this charge, the committee reviewed over 1,500 peer-reviewed scientific articles (*Neurons to Neighborhoods* is one of the most heavily cited reports ever produced by the National Academies), consulted with dozens of the nation’s experts on topics ranging from early brain development to early intervention, had on-going discussions with early childhood practitioners to ensure that the report would be useful as well as interesting, and held three workshops on precursors of anti-social behavior, home visiting, and early childhood interventions. Some of the research reviewed by the committee consisted of experimental evaluations of intervention projects, others were naturalistic studies of children in a range of typical settings. We need both types of evidence to get a complete picture of early development and the influences that shape its course.

It is essential to note that reports that emanate from the National Academy of Sciences are prepared under extremely tight rules regarding the nature of the evidence that can be reviewed and the accuracy with which the evidence must be portrayed. Before release, Academy reports go through a final review process, which is particularly rigorous with regard to the scrutiny given to the committee's interpretations of the scientific literature and its translation into recommendations for action. In the cast of Neurons to Neighborhoods, this review involved an additional 13 scientists -- several of whom were not familiar with the developmental literature. In effect, we are kept on a very tight leash; all such interpretations and recommendations must flow directly from the scientific knowledge base. As a result, reports from the National Academies are a far cry from advocacy statements; they are scientific documents from start to finish.

My remarks today will draw heavily upon this report, as well as upon evidence that has surfaced in just the last 18 months since the report was completed, with a focus on what we have learned about relations between experiences in early education settings and child competencies. I will emphasize what science tells us, where the boundaries of this knowledge base lie, and what this suggests about the decisions that face you today as you embark on a "new dawn" of decision-making about investments in the early childhood years.

It is a propitious moment for this hearing. There has been a virtual explosion of knowledge in neurobiology and the behavioral and social sciences. What we now know about the factors that start children along promising or worrisome pathways is leaps and bounds ahead of where we were even a decade ago. Yet, all too often, this knowledge is dismissed or ignored by those whose decisions fundamentally affect children's earliest experiences. At the White House Summit, Representative Northup recounted her dismay after sitting in a hearing focused on the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and then in a hearing focused on Head Start and realizing that the knowledge being generated by NICHD-funded research had barely reached the Head Start community. In her words, "...there was no correlation between the two".

It is also noteworthy that this hearing is occurring in the midst of your consideration of HR1, in which you propose adding \$26 billion to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). You are rightly emphasizing the need to improve teacher quality and retention, to ensure that the children are learning, and to better target the funds to low-income children in poor performing schools. This stands in stark contrast to the \$125 million increase that is proposed for the Head Start program, which serves many of the same children in the years immediately prior to entering elementary school.

Why the difference? I would submit that it is linked to the prevailing belief that investments in preschool programs are not really in the same league as are investments in "real" education programs. But today we know better. Indeed, we know that wise investments in early education can actually reduce the problems that teachers are seeing when children enter elementary school. Three interrelated facts about the early years of life provide the rationale for these investments: (1) During these early years, children's

capabilities are growing exponentially, (2) By the age of 2 years, striking differences in what children know and can do begin to distinguish low-income children from their better off peers, and (3) We know a great deal about how to ensure that low-income children arrive at school just as prepared and eager to learn as other children. The decisions facing you today are really no different from those you are debating with regard to HR1: Who do you want to be teaching young children? How will you ensure that they get adequate training and support so that they do a good job and remain in the field? How will you ensure that young children are learning and that the gap between those with meager versus adequate incomes is closed?

I will address these questions in my remarks today, emphasizing five conclusions from *Neurons to Neighborhoods* that are particularly pertinent to debates about early education. I will conclude with three major challenges that need to be addressed before substantial progress can be made.

- **New technologies have revealed that the wiring diagram and neurochemistry of our brains develop at an astonishing pace during the earliest years of life—a pace that far exceeds any other stage of development. The fuel for brain growth is the child’s early experiences.**

Early experiences and their impacts on brain development affect what we learn and don’t learn, as well as how we typically react to the events around us. Baby brains that hear English are different than baby brains that hear Japanese. Baby brains that have received neglectful parenting are different than baby brains that have received supportive parenting. Brains are designed to absorb early experiences and this cuts two ways. If those experiences are positive, normal development proceeds. If they are neglectful and deprive children of stimulation, development is compromised. In this sense, every early environment is an early intervention, whether we call it home or Head Start or child care.

At the same time, the recent focus on the years from zero to three begins too late and ends too soon. Insults to the brain during prenatal development can have extremely damaging and lasting effects. And, the development of the neural systems supporting cognitive, social, and emotional competencies remains open to experience at least through adolescence. Indeed, it is the lifelong capacity for change and reorganization that renders human beings capable of dramatic recovery from early harm and incapable of being inoculated against later adversity. This lifelong plasticity renders us both adaptive and vulnerable.

Four lessons follow: (1) Prenatal development must be protected, (2) Children who are born premature and/or with auditory, visual, or motor impairments that interfere with the environmental inputs that their brains expect (and need) to receive are highly vulnerable and require early detection and intervention, (3) Early interventions, such as Early Head Start or home visiting following the baby’s birth, cannot stand alone because later experiences will either support or

undermine early progress, and (4) Intervention later in the preschool years and beyond can be highly effective. It remains the case, however, that getting off to a good start in life is a sound strategy for increasing the odds of greater adult competence.

- **The rapid pace of early brain development is a direct reflection of the rapid pace of early learning. As a nation, we have seriously underestimated the capacities and the desire of young children to learn about people, things, and themselves.**

This is not just a matter of school readiness. It is also a matter of providing young children with rich and rewarding early lives in the same sense that we care about the quality of life for the aged population. The childhood years have value not only as a preparation time for the later accomplishments in school and beyond that have galvanized public attention; they also have value in their own right as a time of extraordinary growth and change.

Until quite recently, we believed that early learning was primarily maturational and that young children were not ready to learn abstract or sophisticated content, including mathematical and scientific concepts, until they got to school. Many parents still believe that it is in their child's best interest to hold off on encouraging them to read or to understand (not just count) numbers until they get to kindergarten or first grade. New scientific evidence on what children can do and want to learn before they enter school flies in the face of this conventional wisdom.

Consider what young children learn and can do before they enter school. Children as young as 6-8 months can represent numbers by matching the number of objects on a display with the number of drumbeats emanating from a loudspeaker, and they already understand that objects cannot pass through one another and that they will fall if not supported. When 18-month olds are shown an unfamiliar object and told that it is a "dax" just one time, weeks or even months later they will correctly identify the dax. It is at this age that children embark on what has been called a word-learning explosion, acquiring on average 9 new words a day, every day, throughout the preschool years. Children this young will also spontaneously sort objects like toy horses and pencils into two piles, thus illustrating how rapidly conceptual knowledge develops. Two and one-half year olds known for their egocentrism can accurately tell you what someone else is seeing or experiencing when it differs from themselves.

By age 4 or 5, children all over the world have mastered the fundamental grammatical system of their native language, including verb declensions, gender agreement, embedded clauses, and the like. Preschoolers also love BIG numbers and can learn sophisticated number concepts. This knowledge has been translated into a program called Big Math for Little Kids in which low-income preschoolers

(including three-year olds) are taught not only about specific shapes such as triangles and squares but about symmetries, and not about counting to ten but about counting in hundreds. Preschoolers also love scientific experiments and are easily engaged in trying to understand why one toy boat floats and another sinks or why ice takes up more room than the water that was used to make the ice, for example. This knowledge has been translated into a preschool curriculum developed initially in a Head Start program called ScienceStart where children learn about properties of matter, measurement, and simply machinery, for example. These programs and others are described in another report from the National Academies titled, *Eager to Learn: Educating Our Preschoolers* (2001).

Many developmental scientists are now engaged in designing and assessing programs focused on low-income children that demonstrate how universal these capacities to learn truly are given exposure to environments that foster learning, and excitement in learning. A recent, highly readable book about children's early learning is called *The Scientist in the Crib* (Gopnik, Meltzoff, & Kuhl, 1999). I highly recommend it. It is an apt title. They need to write a sequel called *Scientist in the Preschool*. Young children are constantly generating and testing hypotheses about the people and world around them and testing them. Early environments that are not designed with this in mind do children a disservice

- **The development of concepts, language, and reading is inextricably linked to the development of feelings, behavior, and social skills. To address one without the other is short-sighted and will diminish the progress that can be made.**

National attention is now riveted on early literacy skills. These skills are vitally important in their own right and warrant the attention they are receiving. But, we should not lose sight of children's social and emotional development in the process. In addition to their remarkable linguistic and cognitive gains, young children exhibit dramatic progress in their emotional, social, regulatory, and moral capacities. Consider just a few: prior to school entry children learn to persist when presented with new challenges...or not; they learn how to follow directions and work independently on a task...or not; they learn how to enter a group of other children and play successfully....or not; and they learn to resolve conflicts with peers constructively...or not.

All of these competencies are intertwined and each requires focused attention. For example, preschoolers who speak clearly and communicate their ideas more effectively are better able to engage in sustained play episodes with other children. Children from impoverished verbal environments are less capable of understanding others' mental states, which, in turn affects their ability to make and sustain friendships. Even before children enter school, weak academic skills are associated with behavioral and attention problems. Indeed, the largest cost savings from early intervention programs lie in the realm of social behavior –

reduced teen pregnancy, reduced crime – not in the realm of educational attainments.

Research is now quite clear that later anti-social behavior can have its roots in the preschool years, just as learning problems can be traced back to these earliest years of life. When kindergarten teachers are asked about their greatest concerns, they talk about children who are out of control, do not know how to follow directions, and who seem unengaged in classroom activities. Yet, we know less about how to foster early social competence than we do about how to foster early learning. This is an arena that desperately needs dedicated resources for research, including efforts to implement and evaluate promising programmatic strategies with young children. I would hope that the new Task Force To Improve Preschool Programs to be convened by Secretary Paige and Secretary Thompson would consider early reading and math skills in the context of children's abilities to manage their behavior, to get along with others, and to not only learn, but to enjoy learning.

- **Striking disparities in what children know and can do are evident well before they enter kindergarten and are predictive of later school success and life achievements. These disparities are associated with family resources. In fact, low family income during the preschool years appears to be more detrimental to children's ultimate academic attainments than does family income later in childhood. Yet, preschoolers remain the poorest age group in our society today.**

One of the most significant insights about educational attainment in recent years is that educational outcomes in adolescence and young adulthood can be traced back to academic skills at school entry. Academic skills at school entry can, in turn, be traced to capabilities seen during the preschool years and the experiences in and out of the home that foster their development. Preschool cognitive abilities predict high school completion. Reading scores in 10th grade can be predicted with surprising accuracy from knowledge of the alphabet in kindergarten.

By the preschool years, however, the income gap in what children know and can do has already emerged. Social class differences in scores on standardized developmental measures that favor children in better educated, higher-income families emerge between 18-24 months of age. Low-income 5-6 year olds show the same knowledge of numbers as do middle-income 3-4 year olds. Children whose mothers have less than a high school degree test, on average, at the 38th percentile in kindergarten-level letter recognition, while those with college-educated mothers test at the 69th percentile and those whose mothers have a B.A. degree test at the 86th percentile.

Children who start school lagging behind their peers in language and cognitive abilities are not doomed to be school failures. To the contrary, early interventions

can make substantial contributions to the academic skills of young children. Moreover, the associations between early and later achievement, and between socioeconomic status and academic achievement, are far from deterministic. There is plenty of room for children to defy the odds, and many do.

Lower and higher income children are moving along different trajectories well before school entry in large measure because their early environments at home and in child care do not constitute a level playing field. Children living in poverty hear, on average, 300 fewer words per hour than do children in professional families. These early differences in what children are exposed to predict their 3rd grade vocabulary and reading comprehension scores. They also affect children's conceptual development—what they know about the world around them—which plays a central role in school achievement. Research on child care tells the same story. Children whose teachers provide rich language environment through labeling and explaining, ask open-ended questions, and explore the children's ideas with them have higher scores on tests of both verbal and general ability. Unfortunately, low-income children who cannot avail themselves of early intervention programs such as Head Start, are in some of the nation's poorest quality child care settings in which ample and rich language is rare to non-existent.

Fortunately, the development of vocabulary, reading skills, and conceptual knowledge remains widely open to influence throughout the childhood years. In these domains, children can, in principle, catch up given appropriate and sufficient exposure. However, the amount of additional exposure a child needs to catch up increases over time. With each passing year, the gap between children from lower- income and higher-income families widens and thus closing it requires more intensive work.

Unfortunately, we know that wide individual differences at school entry in vocabulary and other early literacy skills are seldom reduced as children move through school, and they can be exacerbated. School entry is appropriately viewed as a critical social transition when social class-linked individual differences can become solidified and amplified or initial gaps can be narrowed. In this sense, what children know and can do at school entry matter, not because development becomes less amenable to environmental influence once the preschool years have passed, but because school entry is, in effect, a manufactured critical moment at which point individual differences become solidified and lead to longer-term patterns of learning and achievement. We don't know why this happens, but speculation has centered on the role of teacher expectations and differential treatment of children with differing initial abilities, the contribution of behavior problems that often accompany low academic skills, and children's own self-defeating views of themselves that can lead them to avoid challenging tasks and succumb to failure.

On a much more positive note, we know a great deal about how to better ensure that all children enter school prepared to master the elementary curriculum. As we learn more about what happens upon school entry, the urgency around implementing this knowledge in our nation's early childhood programs mounts. This is the First Lady's concern and her leadership on this issue could not be more timely.

- **Early interventions that work share a set of common features. The three most critical ingredients are: (1) accessibility and fit with parents' needs and values, (2) curricula directed at specific goals and based on the latest knowledge about how children learn and develop, and (3) qualified and stable staff. Poorly designed and weakly implemented interventions waste national resources and can harm children by failing to prepare them for the next stage of development and the social institutions in which they must perform.**

The overarching question of whether we can intervene successfully in young children's lives has been answered in the affirmative and should be put to rest. However, interventions that work pay a tremendous amount of attention to the needs and interests of families, to the changing developmental needs and capabilities of young children, to the evolving knowledge base about the kinds of specific experiences that foster positive development, and to the skills and resources that are essential to provide these experiences. All too often, successful interventions characterized by these features during their model or demonstration phase are phased up with half the resources, staffed with much less well-trained individuals, and unprepared to meet the demands of serving a wider spectrum of families with differing profiles of risk.

Generally speaking, programs that offer both a parent and a child component appear to be the most successful in promoting long-term developmental gains for children from low-income families. Programs that work directly with young children and explicitly involve parents in the process through parent involvement strategies or complementary programs directed at the parents seem to have greater odds of success than do programs that seek to improve child outcomes indirectly by focusing exclusively on changing parenting behavior, particularly when multi-risk families are involved. Why might this be so?

Accessibility and Fit With Parents' Needs

Many early interventions fail to reach the families for whom they are intended and/or they experience rapid attrition of families from the program. For example, a thorough assessment of home visiting programs -- based primarily on experimental evidence -- supported by the David and Lucile Packard Foundation (Gomby et al., 1999) revealed that 10% to 25% of the families who are invited to enroll choose not to participate and that between 20% and 67% of those enrolled

left the programs before they were scheduled to end. Moreover, enrolled families typically received about half of the intended visits. Only 56% of the families enrolled in the Comprehensive Child Development Programs were actively engaged after three years of participation. This is a formula for failure, just as it would be if children were given $\frac{1}{2}$ of the dosage of an antibiotic.

Why are these programs characterized by such low participation rates? We are only beginning to explore this problem, but significant mental health problems among low-income families, including maternal depression (at rates of 13% to 28% in recent welfare samples), appear to be an important part of the answer. Presenting a bag of toys, a book, and some parenting tips to a chronically depressed mother not only by-passes her needs for mental health services, but my actually undermine the intended benefits of the parenting intervention. The New Chance Demonstration aimed at poorly educated teen-age mothers, for example, had negative effects on the children of depressed participants as compared to non-participants. Program demands appear to have overwhelmed these mothers' capacity to cope and inadvertently undermined their confidence in themselves.

Curricula That Incorporate What We Know About Early Development

Successful interventions also take into account what is known about how young children learn and develop, regularly assess their own progress in meeting their goals, and make appropriate modifications. In short, they take advantage of what is known and they learn as they go. Applications of new research on what it takes to foster early literacy, presented at the White House Summit, are instructive and I would encourage each of you to read the compilation of the five research papers presented at the Summit. In brief, successful literacy interventions provide different types of guidance at different developmental stages (e.g., promoting emotional bonding and pleasure in book interactions during infancy and print knowledge and letter-sound correspondence in preschool), are grounded in supporting interactive styles that enhance children's ability to learn and enjoyment of learning, and focus on the specific kinds of experiences that are known to foster early literacy, namely teaching print and book awareness, phonological awareness, letter knowledge and early word recognition, reading aloud and other forms of verbal communication, and writing their names and understanding how print works. When all of these components are present, children can show substantial gains in language skills, as I will note below.

Now, let me ask how many of you think you could walk into a Head Start classroom and teach children these skills? You also have to maintain civil social behavior, deal with the handful of over-active children that appear in every classroom, help children who have been absent due to illness or a family crisis catch up, adjust what you do for children who do not speak English as their first language, regularly assess each child's performance, and know how to tailor what you are doing to address each child's individual skill level. And, you need to do all of this without dampening the children's love of learning by ignoring their

individual interests, restricting opportunities for individual choice, and becoming overly negative, didactic, or highly rigid. Successful early childhood programs do not look like boot camps, or like 3rd grade classrooms. Research now tells us that highly didactic, rigid programs with an emphasis on right and wrong answers (vs. praise for progress and an understanding of how to improve), while effective for some elementary-age children, do not promote learning among preschool-age children. In fact, these programs undermine the children's motivation to learn.

This is precisely why we require elementary school teachers to have Bachelor's degrees, specialized training, and a teaching credential. Yet, the vast majority of preschool children are in programs and settings with adults who have little more than a high school education. Why do we tolerate for 3- and 4-year olds what we would never tolerate for 5 year olds? National concern has galvanized around teacher shortages, large class sizes, and poor teaching quality at the elementary level. Comparable concern needs to be directed at the preschool level.

Qualified and Stable Staff

If the child is the engine, then qualified and stable staff is the fuel that drives successful early childhood development programs. We know this from successful early interventions that employ highly-educated and trained staff (e.g., the more successful home visiting programs typically employ nurses, the well-known programs such as the High/Scope Perry Preschool and Abecedarian programs employed very well-educated and trained teachers and experienced virtually no teacher turnover). We know this from the literature on more typical child care settings, which consistently reports that children perform better on tests of learning and literacy when their child care providers have college-level education and training in a child-related field.

When you appreciate all that goes into teaching young children to read, to learn about numbers, to learn about the world around them, to learn how to get along with each other, and to *want* to learn, is it clear that early education is a daunting responsibility. But, when we look at *who* is caring for and educating our nation's young children there is a gaping mismatch between what research tells us and what is happening. The vast majority of states allow individuals with a high school diploma and without a criminal record to serve as the so-called teachers in child care programs, where most low-income children spend their days prior to school enrollment. Head Start is working towards the day when half of its staff will have AA degrees. Public pre-kindergarten programs vary widely in their teacher requirements, although several large-scale surveys have found that these programs tend to employ more qualified staff than do Head Start and child care programs.

It is not surprising that as Professor Landry has expanded her exemplary early reading program in Texas to 20 Head Start programs across the state (40% of the teachers had a B.A. degree or higher, but another 45% had only a CDA or a high

school diploma), only half are showing positive gains in the children's language and literacy skills at the mid-point of the program. This is after a full year in which the teachers participated in a four-day small group workshop on teaching early literacy skills, received weekly 1-hour in-class coaching, and attended monthly full-day training meetings with classroom mentors and program coordinators. Success is, however, well within reach. When the program was piloted, the participating children showed gains in language skills of 12-15 months in an 8-month period compared to 7-11 months for the control children.

Three Challenges

The Workforce. The first challenge derives from the previous comments. The genuine teaching crisis that the nation faces for K-12 education pales when compared to the teaching crisis in preschool education. Our college- and university-based schools of early education are at full enrollment and the student-faculty ratio is already substantially higher than in other parts of the curriculum that focus on older children. Moreover, most graduates by-pass jobs in early education to teach at the primary level where they can double their wages, receive health insurance and pensions, and work 9-months a year.

Both Head Start and the military child care program have understood that increased training absent improved compensation constitutes a wasted investment. Consider the child care workforce where turnover rates stand at 30% per year nationally and the only study that has followed child care teachers over time revealed that two-thirds had left their jobs in just four years. This is a very shaky foundation on which to build a solid early education program. It will be essential that major consideration be given to the infrastructure in higher education, to scholarship opportunities, and to narrowing the gap between the wages of well-trained teachers who work with preschool-age versus elementary-age children if we are to mount a successful effort to support the early learning of our nation's young children.

Low-Income Work. The second challenge derives from the nature of work among low-income parents, whose involvement and participation in early education programs is needed. National Labor Statistics data tell us that 40 percent of children under age 5 with an employed mother had mothers whose principal job involved a "nonday" work shift (defined as the majority of work hours being outside the 8 am to 4 pm shift). For children living in poverty this figure is about 60 percent. The National Study of Low-Income Child Care is finding that 78% of the parents in the study work nontraditional hours. Many hold down more than one job.

While some of these families are able to juggle their jobs and child care so as not to rely on nonparental care, many need help during the nontraditional hours of their employment. Center-based programs and early education programs almost universally operate during the traditional 8am-6pm work hours and many 4-year old pre-kindergarten programs operate during typical school hours (e.g., 9am to 12pm or 3pm). While parents of young children tend to get very little sleep, it is hard to imagine how a parent who works from midnight to 7am one week and 4 pm to midnight the next week can

participate consistently in early intervention programs, let alone rely on early education and care that operates from 9 to 3. As a case in point, not long ago it was the case that children of low-income, single working mothers were underrepresented in Head Start; I would not be surprised to learn that this remains the case today. We ask a great deal of parents in our society; the pressures on low-income parents are especially great. I would hope that as part of any effort to support the early education and learning of our nation's children, we will take steps to ensure that parents' need or mandate to work is not a barrier to their children's and their own participation in these initiatives.

Child Care. The majority of low-income children are not in Head Start or Early Head Start or state prekindergarten programs. They are in other programs which we refer to as "child care" and which are designed to support parents' employment, not children's development. As a case in point, 25% of new Head Start monies are set-aside for quality improvement; 4% of the Child Care Development Fund monies are set-aside for quality improvement. The low-income children who attend Head Start share the same needs as do the low-income children who attend CCDF-funded child care programs, and they deserve the same attention to their early learning. But, providing good early learning opportunities for them will be a challenge because they are scattered all over the map, from license-exempt arrangements with a neighbor to community-based, licensed child care programs. I don't have a simple answer here, but we know who these subsidized children are and we know where they are. A notable share of them are with adults who themselves are poorly educated and barely literate. We can't leave them behind in our national effort to improve early learning.

In closing, I want to commend you for your interest in early learning and development and thank you for this opportunity to testify. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have today and to continue to work with you during the important months ahead.

References

- Gopnik, A., Meltzoff, A.N., & Kuhl, P.K. (1999). The Scientist in the Crib. What Early Learning Tells Us About the Mind. New York: Perennial.
- Gomby, D.S., Culross, P.L., Bchrman, R.E. (1999). Home visiting: recent program evaluations—analysis and recommendations. The Future of Children, 9(1), 4-26.
- National Research Council/Institute of Medicine (2000). From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development. J. Shonkoff and D. Phillips (Eds.). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- National Research Council (2001). Eager to Learn: Educating our Preschoolers. B.T. Bowman, M.S. Donovan, and M.S. Burns (Eds.). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement - "Truth in Testimony"

Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: <u>Deborah Phillips</u>		
1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity? (If the answer is yes please contact the Committee).	Yes	No X
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 1998: <u>Who stays? Who leaves? A Study of the Alameda Child Care workforce. Child Care Bureau (Administration for Children, Youth, and Families). Sept 30, 2000 - Sept 30, 2001 # 90YEC016 \$ 300,000</u>		
3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?	Yes	No X
4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing:		
5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4: <u>None</u>		
6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 1998, including the source and amount of each grant or contract: <u>None</u>		
7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list:	Yes	No X

Signature: _____

Deborah Phillips

Date: _____

7/27/01

Please attach this sheet to your written testimony.