Published in final edited form as:

J Educ Stud Placed Risk. 2015 ; 20(4): 281–292. doi:10.1080/10824669.2015.1076341.

Using social impact borrowing to expand preschool through third grade programs in urban public schools

Judy A. Temple and

Humphrey School of Public Affairs and Department of Applied Economics, University of Minnesota

Arthur J. Reynolds

Institute of Child Development and Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota

Arthur J. Reynolds: ajr@umn.edu

Abstract

Budget constraints and difficulty raising taxes limit school districts from expanding education programming even when research shows that additional expenditures would generate economic benefits that are greater than costs. Recently, coalitions of private investors, philanthropists, education practitioners, and government finance analysts have emerged to create opportunities to expand education services that promise high rates of social net benefits without raising taxes or reducing other expenditures. These collaborators have a strong interest in obtaining careful estimates of educational program effectiveness. We describe the use of social-impact borrowing to increase access to the Child-Parent Center preschool-through-third-grade intervention for at-risk students in the Chicago Public School District. The partners include the city, school district, investors, nonprofit organizations, and a university. The key to the feasibility of social-impact borrowing is the ability to document that early intervention can reduce the need for later special-education services. With the help of private investors and nonprofit organizations, it is possible for public school districts to finance services with funds from private sources and use future cost savings to repay this debt. We discuss how social-impact borrowing is being used in Chicago and in Salt Lake County as the nation's first two instances of using pay-for-performance social-impact borrowing to support early education.

INTRODUCTION

Although numerous studies have found that well-focused educational investments in the early years of schooling can generate high returns to society, budgetary constraints limit the ability of individuals, nonprofit organizations, and state and local governments to expand services in order to capitalize on these high returns. Recently, coalitions of private investors, philanthropists, education practitioners, and government finance analysts have emerged to create opportunities to expand education services that promise high rates of social net benefits without raising taxes or reducing other public expenditures. These collaborators have a keen interest in estimates of the effectiveness of education interventions as well as

their associated cost savings and they bring research expertise from the public policy and financial sectors to expand the research capacity of school districts. In this paper, we describe the new use of social-impact borrowing to expand and improve an existing preschool-through-third-grade intervention in a large urban public school district.

We begin with a discussion of the evidence that benefits to society greatly exceed costs for some high-quality early educational interventions. We then provide an overview of social-impact borrowing, which is a special form of pay-for-performance or pay-for- results financing that relies on funds from social-impact investors. We discuss how school districts or states could use cost savings from intervention-induced reductions in special education and other school remediation services to finance social-impact borrowing costs. We review the first developments in the U.S. in use of social-impact borrowing for prevention of recidivism before moving on to discussions of social-impact borrowing to support education interventions. We focus on recent efforts in Utah and Illinois to promote early education programming with a closer look at the current initiative in Chicago to provide funding to the public school district to expand the Child Parent Center model of preschool-to-third-grade intervention.

COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

A significant amount of knowledge exists about the effectiveness of high-quality early-childhood programs targeted towards children from economically disadvantaged families. Much of what researchers and policymakers know about the long-term effects of high-quality investments in preschool-aged children comes from three longitudinal studies that contain information on preschool participants and nonparticipants followed into adulthood (Temple & Reynolds, 2007). Much has been written about the Perry Preschool Program that from 1961–1965 enrolled 123 economically disadvantaged students in a high-quality preschool program, with a recent analysis described in Heckman et al. (2013). Researchers also continue to follow participants in an early education program called the Carolina Abecedarian Program that enrolled students during the 1970s in a high-quality daycare and preschool program from birth to age 5 (Campbell et al., 2012). A third longitudinal study has followed children enrolled in the Child Parent Center early education program offered from preschool through Grades 2 or 3 in Chicago’s poorest neighborhoods (Reynolds et al., 2011b; Reynolds, 2000).

Results from all three studies indicate that high-quality preschool programs targeted towards disadvantaged children have short- and longer-term effects on educational success and adult well-being. Cost-benefit analyses including Heckman et al. (2010), Barnett and Masse (2007), and Reynolds et al. (2011a), on the Perry, Abecedarian, and Chicago CPC programs, respectively, have informed the national debate about the types of benefits (including higher lifetime earnings and reductions in criminal-justice costs) that could be realized from high-quality programs and the desirability of additional investments in early-childhood programs given societal benefits that greatly exceed program costs.

In particular, cost-benefit analyses based on evaluations of the Chicago Child-Parent Center have shown that for each dollar invested in the CPC program, \$6 to \$11 are returned to

schools, governments, and society in cost savings and in monetizable measures of economic well-being (Reynolds et al., 2002, 2011a). These benefits include savings in special-education and child-welfare expenditures, savings in juvenile and adult corrections, and increased earnings and tax revenues in adulthood. This evidence of the cost effectiveness of the Child-Parent Center early-intervention program was cited in President Obama's 2013 State of the Union Address (White House, 2013) along with his recommendation that access to preschool should be expanded.

CHILD-PARENT CENTER PROGRAM

The Child-Parent Center (CPC) Preschool-to-third-grade Program is a school improvement model designed to promote school success for students residing in high-poverty neighborhoods. The program provides comprehensive and continuous education and family support services from prekindergarten to third grade. Under the direction of a leadership team at each site and in collaboration with the principal, the program is designed to enhance school-readiness skills, increase early school attendance, achievement, and performance, and promote parent involvement and engagement. The implementation of the Child-Parent Center model in the Midwest Expansion project is described in greater detail in Hayakawa et al. (this issue).

Unlike the Perry and Abecedarian programs, the Child-Parent Center intervention has continued to exist in low-income neighborhoods serving children and parents since the program's inception in the mid-1960s. As a result of a federal validation grant from the US Department of Education, the Child-Parent Center program recently has been expanded within Chicago and to several Midwestern cities in Minnesota and Illinois. The newly funded project is called the Midwest Expansion of the Child-Parent Center program.

Key CPC Program Elements

The program includes six essential elements. The complete program requirements and guidelines are available at humancapitalrc.org (n.d.). Table 1 shows the key features of the program.

1. *Effective learning experiences* include full-day prekindergarten in classes of no more than 17 children, active and balanced instruction, and use of evidence-based instructional practices. Full-day prekindergarten and small classes have been linked to higher achievement gains and increased economic returns.
2. *Collaborative leadership team* in each site including the head teacher, parent resource teacher, and school-community representative in partnership with the principal.
3. *Curriculum alignment* and integration from prekindergarten to third grade for language, math, science, and socioemotional learning; site-to-site mentoring teams and instructional coaches provide follow-through support. School districts choose their own curriculum based on evidence supporting its effectiveness.

4. *Parent involvement and engagement* led by the parent resource teacher and school-community representative has a menu-based system of activities; a family resource center is in each school.
5. *Professional development system* of coaching, online modules, and quarterly review and feedback on instructional practices.
6. *Continuity and stability* through small classes and teacher aides from kindergarten to third grade (maximum ratio of 25 to 2), instructional support teams, and outreach to families to ensure high rates of program continuation.

Originally developed in 1966 in the Chicago Public Schools by CPS District 8 Superintendent Lorraine Sullivan, the CPC program was refined and expanded in the fall of 2012 by the Human Capital Research Collaborative at the University of Minnesota under an Investing in Innovation (i3) Grant from the U. S. Department of Education. In collaboration with the Chicago school district, the number of CPCs was increased from 10 to 16 sites in 2012–2013 with an increased enrollment in prekindergarten from 923 in 2011–2012 to 1,655 in 2012–2013. In 2013–2014, 1,900 prekindergarten students were enrolled and over 1,200 CPC kindergarten students were being served for the first time in many years, including continuing students and those new in this year. Additional Child-Parent Center programs were created in 2012 in Saint Paul, Minnesota, and in Evanston and Bloomington-Normal in Illinois, and more are in the planning stages in other Midwestern cities including Rochester, MN and Madison, WI.

OVERVIEW OF SOCIAL-IMPACT BORROWING

Social-impact borrowing is a specific way of financing services under a pay-for-performance financing system. In *pay-for-performance* or *pay-for-results* accountability systems, payment to organizations that provide services is made contingent on whether the organizations achieve results that meet or exceed specified performance standards. Some examples of pay for performance often seen in the public sector include payments to contractors for successful completion of infrastructure projects by a specified date and payments made to state and local entities offering job training for successful placement of trainees into the labor market.

Several elements are needed in effective performance-based accountability systems (Heinrich, 2002). These elements include the existence of clear, observable and quantifiable performance indicators that either represent the desired outcomes themselves or are correlated with the desired outcomes. In addition, it is crucial that the provision of incentives for attainment of desired outcomes be targeted to organizations or individuals that actually have control over the process generating the outcomes. Careful evaluation is required to identify and monetize program effects and to make sure that the availability of incentives (or the threat of sanctions) does not induce service providers or other participating organizations to misrepresent program effectiveness.

The phrase *social impact* refers to the intention of private investors to support desirable societal outcomes. This type of investing also is referred to as mission investing. Pay-for-performance, pay-for-success, and pay-for-results financing all represent related concepts

that increasingly are being discussed as ways in which private investors and nonprofit organizations can help promote social innovation while demanding accountability. In this type of financing, a state or local government sets a specific measurable target for a program to address a particular social goal — for example, reducing recidivism among juvenile offenders or providing early childhood education for vulnerable populations — and attracts private investors to pay for program expansion. The investors do so, attracted by the promise of repayment of principal if the program meets the target and possibly a higher return if the program exceeds the target. Investors expect rigorous research efforts to identify program effects to be undertaken, and typically an outside evaluator is required to conduct the program evaluation. Social-impact borrowing initiatives vary in terms of what happens when the program fails to deliver results. Sometimes discussions of initiatives include a charitable third party that may step in and guarantee part of the investor's contribution.

This type of borrowing has great appeal to governmental or nonprofit organizations: the organization offering social or educational services secures a new source of money to expand a program addressing a social challenge; the private investor can earn a return and also promote socially desirable outcomes, and the government pays back the loan only when successful. Payment by the government is intended to come from the savings generated by the program's success so no additional sources of public revenue may be required. Involvement in social-impact borrowing adds valuable research expertise to the organization providing social or educational services. In the case of education interventions, school districts' existing evaluation efforts are augmented by efforts provided by outside evaluators, policy analysts, and financial analysts working together to generate the evidence on program effectiveness and financial returns needed as part of the borrowing process. This collaboration is an example of the important research partnerships that are increasingly being formed between school districts and other education stakeholders (Yakimowski, 2015).

The first U.S. project funded by social-impact borrowing is a program for youthful offenders currently being implemented in Rikers Island in New York (Olson and Phillips, 2013; Rudd et al., 2013). This project involves the financing of an antirecidivism project for youth. Evidence supporting the cost-effectiveness of the intervention existed in advance of the creation of the social-impact borrowing plan. As in the recent education financing examples in Utah and Chicago, the investment bank Goldman Sachs spearheaded the social-impact borrowing initiative. Additional discussion of the use of social-impact borrowing to finance criminal justice programs are discussed by Fox and Albertson (2011).

FEASIBILITY OF SOCIAL-IMPACT BORROWING FOR EARLY EDUCATIONAL INTERVENTIONS

Although significant evidence exists of the social benefits that accrue to society from investments in early childhood education targeted towards disadvantaged children, the existing evidence (e.g., Reynolds et al., 2002; Reynolds et al., 2011a) are based on data from an earlier cohort. Little specific information is known at this time about the cost-effectiveness of the Child-Parent preschool-through-third-grade program for young students *currently* enrolled. A discussion of the nature of cost savings to school districts resulting

from early educational intervention is provided by Chase et al. (2008). A lengthier discussion of the role of cost-benefit analysis in identifying the magnitude and timing of potential cost savings from educational interventions using older findings from the Child-Parent Centers is found in Temple and Reynolds (2015). Reductions in grade-retention and special-education rates both save money for K-12 school districts. Grade retention is assumed to increase the number of years required for high school graduation. The cost savings from reductions in the probability of being made to repeat a grade would be realized around the time that the child is 18 or 19. Reductions in rates or duration of special-education placement, however, could generate cost savings to the school district beginning in the early years of elementary school. The potential for cost savings due to reductions in special education make early education programs a possible candidate for social-impact investors who might prefer a shorter payback window.

Specific to the Chicago Child-Parent Center intervention, a close examination of cost-effectiveness findings from an earlier cohort of children born in 1980 who attended the CPC program in Chicago over 25 years ago can provide some illustrative results (Reynolds et al., 2002; 2011a). Although studies of the effects of participation in the Child-Parent Center suggest that the ratio of benefits to costs is 6 to 1 or greater, the benefits and costs did not occur in the same time periods. Program costs obviously are incurred during ages 3 through 8, but the majority of benefits are not realized until later in adolescence and adulthood. Chronologically, the first monetizable benefits of the early childhood programs that are relevant to school districts occur in the elementary school years as program participants are less likely to be placed in special education and those in special education participate for fewer years.

Previous cost-benefit analyses (Reynolds et al., 2002, 2011a) of the Chicago CPC program report that only approximately 14.4% of students who attended a CPC preschool for at least one year in the mid-1980s were ever placed in special education during the ages 6 to 18. In contrast, 24.6% of comparison group participants received special-education services (Reynolds et al., 2002; $p=.000$). The reported difference in rates of special education between CPC preschool program and comparison group participants translates to a 41% percent reduction in the rate of assignment to special education attributed to CPC preschool attendance. Furthermore, evidence suggests that CPC preschool attendance is associated with a 0.70 reduction in the *mean number of years* of special-education services per student by age 18 years (Reynolds et al., 2011b; 0.73 years vs. 1.43 years, representing a 49% reduction; $p=0.06$). The mean difference in the number of years of assignment to special education between CPC preschool program and comparison group participants is the basis for estimating the reported benefit in terms of reduced special-education expenditures attributed to CPC preschool attendance.

Once it is known that participation in the early intervention program leads to a reduction in special-education duration, calculation of cost savings requires an estimate of the annual per-student cost of special-education services. In calculating the special-education benefit attributed to CPC preschool attendance, Reynolds et al. (2002, 2011a) assume that expenditures for special education are equal to the weighted average annual cost per student in 1994–1995 reported by the Chicago Public Schools for four special education categories:

specific learning disabilities, emotional or behavioral disturbances, speech and language impairments, and mental retardation. In undiscounted 2013 dollars, the annual cost per student for special education services is estimated to be \$11,135 above and beyond the cost for regular education. Therefore, assuming the savings generated from a given reduction in the mean number of years of special-education services is proportional to the weighted average annual cost of special-education services in the Chicago Public Schools during the mid-1990s, the estimated effect of CPC preschool attendance on the mean number of years students receive special-education services (0.70 fewer years) translates to a savings of \$7,794 per student in 2013 dollars.

It is common practice in cost-benefit studies to discount future dollar benefits or costs using a formula to determine the present value of future amounts. Given an assumption of a 3% real discount rate, the present value of the cost of CPC preschool attendance for the observed average of 1.55 years is \$9,564 per student calculated at the time of preschool entry (age 3) for each student. Assuming the average age of assignment to special education in the CLS sample is 12 years and an annual discount rate of 3%, the present value of the reduction in special-education expenditures is \$5,974. Therefore, the prevailing special-education benefit attributed to CPC preschool attendance amounts to approximately 62% of the initial cost of preschool per student. In other words, while the total benefits associated with early intervention greatly exceed program costs, the analysis of results for the older cohort of students currently in their 30s indicates that benefits specifically related to reductions in special-education costs do not by themselves completely cover the costs of the early intervention program.

MIGHT COST SAVINGS FROM REDUCTIONS IN THE NEED FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION BE LARGER THAN PREVIOUSLY THOUGHT?

New studies of the effect of CPC participation on special-education placement are currently underway for the new cohorts of students participating in the CPC intervention. Researchers examining more recent school-district experiences with special-education costs suggest that two possibilities exist that make it more likely that a greater share of intervention costs may be recovered from early special-education savings. First, it may be that early intervention now has a greater effect on special-education placement (the possibility of a larger treatment effect). Second, it may be that the real costs of a year of special education have risen (the possibility of larger cost savings for a given treatment effect). The belief among policymakers, investors, and researchers is that in the current time period, more of the program costs of early educational interventions may be recovered in the early years of the intervention instead of having to wait until adulthood for the benefits to exceed the costs.

SOCIAL-IMPACT BORROWING TO EXPAND PRESCHOOL IN UTAH

The first early childhood social-impact borrowing initiative began in 2013 in Utah's Granite and Park City School Districts. Investors Goldman Sachs and Pritzker Family Foundation loaned United Way of Salt Lake \$7 million to serve five annual cohorts of preschool children in the Utah High Quality Preschool Program. The school districts expect to serve 3,500 children over 5 years in a part-day program for 3- and 4-year-olds that is offered 2–3

days per week. In the first year, it was expected that 450 children on a waiting list for the Utah preschool program would be able to be served with the additional funds.

As the intermediary organization, United Way collaborates with the districts to oversee the implementation of the program and also manages annual success payments from Salt Lake County in the first year and by the state of Utah in subsequent years based on the number of high-risk children who avoid special education each year through sixth grade. For evaluation purposes, students are categorized as high risk if they score 2 standard deviations below the national average on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Dunn and Dunn, 2007) at preschool entry. For each student in this high-risk pool, the success payments that will be used to repay the investors are based on a reimbursement rate of \$2,470 per child per year (2013 dollars), which represents the state's share of special education costs. This collaboration is discussed further in Meehan (2013).

COLLABORATION WITHIN CHICAGO FOR USING SOCIAL-IMPACT BORROWING TO SUPPORT EARLY EDUCATION

The possibility that the Chicago Public Schools might be able to use social-impact borrowing to expand education services from preschool through third grade originated in 2013. In that year, the Rockefeller Foundation and Harvard University's Social Impact Bond (SIB) Technical Assistance Lab awarded pro bono assistance technical assistance to six state and local governments to provide analysts to help develop pay-for-success contracts supported by social-impact borrowing. The six states that were awarded free assistance from the Harvard Lab included Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, New York, Ohio, and South Carolina. In Illinois, the Harvard SIB Technical Assistance Lab provided an analyst to be embedded in the offices of the City of Chicago. This analyst reviewed possible uses of social-impact bonds to fund various social and educational services and quickly focused on the expansion of the Child-Parent Center's Preschool through third-grade program to serve additional students in high-poverty neighborhoods in Chicago.

With assistance from researchers at the University of Minnesota's Human Capital Research Collaborative who had been engaged in analyses of the Child-Parent Center model, meetings were held with school district personnel, city administrators, and representatives from the investors and the nonprofit organization Metropolitan Family Services (serving the same role as The United Way in the Utah project) to discuss the feasibility of using cost savings from reductions in special education and related summer-school costs to pay borrowing costs associated with the expansion of education services.

Based in part of the success of this Utah social-impact bond effort, the City of Chicago collaborated with Harvard's social-impact bond technical-assistance center beginning in the fall of 2013 to develop another early-childhood social-impact bond. The novelty of the CPC social-impact borrowing initiative, which was announced in October 2014, is that not only is the program a national evidence-based intervention but it also provides continuing services beyond third grade. Thus it is the first social-impact borrowing project to finance a public school reform model in the U.S. At an estimated size of approximately \$17 million, the Chicago initiative was the largest social-impact bond to date.

In the Chicago case, the intermediaries IFF and Metropolitan Family services will oversee the project. SRI International has been hired to be the evaluator. Success payments will be based on special-education savings realized to the Chicago Public School District (rather than to the State of Illinois), which is approximately \$9,000 per child per year. Given the higher cost of the CPC program compared to Utah's preschool program-- \$10,000 per child from preschool to third grade—initial discussions pointed toward a loan period expected to be 9 years or through 8th grade. The most recent proposal describes a payback window of 14 years, which includes a child's entire preschool-through-12th-grade school career. With a loan amount of approximately \$17 million, the plan is to serve over 3,200 new children in the next 5 years from preschool to third grade based on the CPC model now in operation in the Midwest Expansion of the Child-Parent Center program. Unlike in the Utah case, a comparison-group design like the one used in the earlier studies of the Chicago CPC program (e.g., Reynolds et al., 2011) will be used to track special-education placement; estimates of the program-induced reductions in special-education placement will be made using propensity score-matching methods. In addition to having success payments based on avoided special-education expenses, success payments from the city used to help repay the private loan will also be based on kindergarten readiness and third-grade achievement. The success payments that will be made by the Chicago Public Schools include \$9,100 for each child who avoids special education each year (relative to the comparison group) after attending a Child-Parent Center program. This represents the school district's portion of special-education cost, estimated to be \$16,000 per child per year including the state and federal portions. Moreover, success payments paid by the City of Chicago will include \$2,900 for each child made ready for kindergarten and \$750 for each child who scores above the national average on standardized tests in third grade. As in Utah, the investors are Goldman Sachs and the Pritzker Foundation, but with the addition of a regional Chicago bank called the Northern Trust Bank.

RISK AND REWARD

In any borrowing initiative of this type and magnitude, issues of risk and reward become very important. One type of risk is called *performance or impact risk*, which refers to the possibility that the education intervention might not have the expected effect on students and consequently may not generate cost savings. Would the investors still need to be paid, making the school districts reallocate scarce funds from other needed uses? In the case of the school districts in Utah and the Chicago Public Schools, there is no downside risk to the school districts or state or local governments. If the interventions fail to generate the expected cost savings, both Goldman Sachs and the guaranteeing philanthropies will assume the risk. In the Utah case, the school district, Goldman Sachs, and Pritzker will share the cost savings that remain after the initial loan has been repaid plus an interest rate of 5%. Once the loan is repaid, the Utah school districts will keep 60% of the savings and the 40% remaining portion will be divided between the investors. In the Chicago case, the projected payments to the investors by the school district are projected to equal \$21.5 million over the duration of the project (from 2015 to 2030) with a cap on the district's maximum payments to investors of \$30 million over that time.

CONCLUSION

Social-impact borrowing is a very new way of financing promising programs in public schools. This type of financing presents opportunities and challenges. The obvious opportunity is the chance for school districts to expand services with proven effectiveness when raising taxes is difficult. With this emphasis on accountability, society benefits and economic efficiency is enhanced when additional funding is allocated to public services that generate positive externalities. The discussion in this paper highlighted the possible use of social-impact borrowing for early-education programming with projected cost savings from reductions in special-education expenditures serving as the means for paying back the loans to the school district. The need for collaboration among governmental organizations, nonprofits, researchers and public finance analysts in this research and financial endeavor is clear and it is likely that more school districts will be considering these collaborations in the future.

A number of difficulties arise when school districts seek to expand services through the use of social-impact borrowing. Administratively, it is costly but important for the district or outside evaluators to track performance indicators and institute rigorous study designs including a comparison group to identify program effects. There may be a need for additional monitoring to assure that incentives to reduce special-education placements do not result in children with educational needs that will not be met.

Although social-impact borrowing holds the twin promises of (1) promoting high-quality rigorous research on program effectiveness and (2) expanding cost-effective services while not increasing taxes, not all observers are enthusiastic. One argument against using social-impact borrowing to expand proven or promising education interventions is that it may create a precedent for requiring that all new educational spending programs be subject to cost-benefit analysis (CBA), even when CBA is difficult to perform and many existing education programs (and government programs more generally) that have public support might not be viewed favorably under a CBA analysis. One public-finance expert has lamented the fact that because so much of the federal budget is committed to mandatory expenditures (largely for the elderly), there are few financial resources left to devote to socially productive investments (Steurlle, 2014). Notably, social and educational investment programs that have the strongest research support ironically are the kinds of programs that may be least likely to be funded by general tax revenues in the future. It seems frustrating to some public policy observers that promising social and educational programs that generate cost savings to taxpayers at all levels of government are left to search for social-impact borrowing opportunities while programs that do not generate obvious social benefits are routinely funded by general taxation.

Despite the challenges of and concerns about social-impact borrowing, the next few years are likely to see a greater interest by school districts and private mission investors in the use of this borrowing to expand social and educational services. Efforts in the Utah school districts and in Chicago will provide useful information for future financial endeavors of this type. The federal government also is likely to continue to be involved in supporting this innovation in public service financing through the newly-created federal Office on Social

Innovation. To become candidates for social-impact loans, school districts will have to demonstrate research capacity needed to help identify proven cost-effective programs, as investors will require evidence of a program's cost effectiveness before agreeing to work with school districts to finance public schooling. Careful impact evaluation is crucial. Outside evaluators and financial analysts can help school districts with these research endeavors. Given what we know about the high rates of return from programs offered in childhood and targeted towards economically disadvantaged families, education programs offered in urban schools from preschool into the elementary grades may turn out to be some of the most suitable education programs for this type of financing.

REFERENCES

- Barnett WS, Masse LN. Early childhood program design and economic returns: Comparative benefit-cost analysis of the Abecedarian program and policy implications. *Economics of Education Review*. 2007; 26:113–125.
- Campbell FA, Pungello EP, Kainz K, Burchinal MR, Pan Y, Wasik BH, Ramey CT. Adult outcomes as a function of an early childhood educational program: An Abecedarian Project follow-up. *Developmental Psychology*. 2012; 48:1033–1043. [PubMed: 22250997]
- Chase, R.; Coffee-Borden, B.; Anton, P.; Moore, C.; Valorose, J. The cost burden to Minnesota K-12 when children are unprepared for kindergarten. St. Paul, MN: Wilder Research; 2008.
- Dunn, LM.; Dunn, DM. PPVT-4: Peabody picture vocabulary test. Minneapolis, MN: Pearson Assessments; 2007.
- Fox C, Albertson K. Payment by results and social impact bonds in the criminal justice sector: New challenges for the concept of evidence-based policy? *Criminology and Criminal Justice*. 2011; 11(5):395–413.
- Hayakawa M, Englund MM, Candee A, Lease E, Sullivan M, Warner-Richter M, Reynolds AJ. Effective partnerships in school reform: Lessons learned from the Midwest Child Parent Center Expansion. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*. 2015; 20(4) (this issue).
- Heckman JJ, Rodrigo P, Savelyev P. Understanding the mechanisms through which an influential early childhood program boosted adult outcomes. *American Economic Review*. 2013; 103:2052–2086. [PubMed: 24634518]
- Heckman JJ, Moon SH, Pinto P, Savelyev P, Yavitz A. The rate of return to the HighScope Perry Preschool Program. *Journal of Public Economics*. 2010; 94:114–128. [PubMed: 21804653]
- Heinrich C. Outcomes-based performance management in the public sector: Implications for government accountability and effectiveness. *Public Administration Review*. 2002; 62:712–725.
- Humancapitalrc.org (n.d.). Midwest CPC Expansion. from <https://humancapitalrc.org/midwest-cpc/midwest-cpc-expansion>.
- Meehan S. Pre-K program attracts investors out for returns. *Education Week*. 2013 Aug 16.
- Olson J, Phillips A. Rikers Island: The first social impact bond in the US. *Community Development Investment Review*. 2013; 9(1):97–101.
- Reynolds AJ, Temple JA, White BAB, Oh S, Robertson DL. Age 26 cost-benefit analysis of the Title 1 Chicago Child- Parent Center Early Education Program. *Child Development*. 2011a; 82:379–404. [PubMed: 21291448]
- Reynolds AJ, Temple JA, Ou S, Arteaga IA, White BAB. School-based early childhood education and age-28 well-being: Effects by timing, dosage, and subgroups. *Science*. 2011b Jun 9.
- Reynolds AJ, Temple JA, Robertson D, Mann EA. Age 21 cost-benefit analysis of the Title 1 Child Parent Centers. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 2002; 24:267–303.
- Reynolds, AJ. *Success in Early Intervention: The Chicago Child Parent Centers*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press; 2000.
- Rudd, T.; Nicoletti, E.; Misner, K.; Bonsu, J. Financing promising evidence-based programs: early lessons from the New York City social impact bond. New York, NY: MDRC; 2013.

- Steurler, CE. Dead men ruling: How to restore fiscal freedom and rescue our future. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; 2014.
- Temple JA, Reynolds AJ. Benefits and costs of investments in preschool education: Evidence from the Child-Parent Centers and related programs. *Economics of Education Review*. 2007; 26:126–144.
- Temple JA, Reynolds AJ. Using cost-benefit analysis to scale-up early childhood programs through pay for success financing. Unpublished manuscript. 2015
- White House. State of the Union Address. 2013. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/state-of-the-union-2013>
- Yakimowski MW. Research collaboration with school districts: The potential for partnerships to facilitate enhanced learning by students and enlighten research stakeholders. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*. 2015; 20:4–11.

Table 1

Key Requirements of CPC

Phase	Maximum child-to-staff ratio	Leadership Team	Curriculum Alignment	PD & Coaching	Site support	Research & Assessment
Prekindergarten (3&4 yrs)	17 to 2	HT, PRT, SCR	Evidence-based	Coordinator	Mentors	On-going
Kindergarten	25 to 2	HT, PRT, SCR	EB	" "	" "	" "
Grades 1 to 3	25 to 2	Liaisons	EB	" "	" "	" "

Note. The head teacher (HT) runs the program at each site. Length of day for preschool is half-day and full-day. Liaisons are for curriculum and parent involvement. Coordinators provide professional development (PD) and teacher support for instruction. Site support mentors help ensure quality of implementation. PRT = parent resource teacher. SCR = school-community representative. Teacher aides include at least 1.0 FTE for 2 classes to provide 50% time in the class each day.