Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on International Law and Legal Policy
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.NS28869

Evaluating Head Start Program for Low-SES Students: Effectiveness, Challenges, and Future Directions

Meiyi Lu

UW Madison, Madison, USA
3270667662@qq.com

Abstract. With the development of social policy in different areas, the existence of childhood education and related programs has been broadly recognized as one of the key factors to support and benefit children's development. Indeed, many developed nations have implemented preschool programs at different levels. This paper mainly examines Head Start as a social policy in compensatory education for children from low socioeconomic status backgrounds. Based on current research and policy analyses, it evaluates the program's theoretical foundations, implementation approaches, and outcomes through social policy management principles. Since its inception in 1965, Head Start has served as America's flagship early childhood intervention program, providing comprehensive services to millions of disadvantaged children. Despite significant federal investment spanning nearly six decades, funding limitations, quality inconsistencies, and evaluation complexities continue to influence the program's impact. This analysis concludes that while Head Start demonstrates significant potential for improving early childhood outcomes, its overall effectiveness is constrained by chronic funding instability and structural implementation challenges—highlighting the need for sustainable investment and consistent quality assurance.

Keywords: Head Start, compensatory education, social policy management, socioeconomic status

1. Introduction

Nowadays, educational inequality is still one of the most challenging issues in contemporary society and most developed nations. More precisely, students from lower socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds consistently demonstrate lower academic achievement compared to their more affluent peers. Importantly, such a gap emerges in early childhood and subsequently widens throughout the entire educational trajectory. Numerous studies have shown that there is a significant gap between children from different SES backgrounds upon entering kindergarten, which underscores the importance of early intervention.

As one of the social policies addressing early academic gaps, Head Start aims to provide comprehensive early childhood services for children from lower-income families. Specifically, this policy was established in 1965 as one of the parts of President Johnson's War on Poverty. At the same time, the establishment of Head Start shows the federal investment in early childhood

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.NS28869

education for marginalized children. To be clear, this program extends its educational services and funding to health, nutrition, and family support, which recognizes the different aspects affecting children's development and academic achievement.

This paper aims to examine the effectiveness of Head Start through the lens of social policy management, focusing on its design, implementation, and evaluation. Social policy management provides a valuable framework for understanding the complexities of implementing and sustaining large-scale early childhood interventions aimed at addressing structural inequalities. This paper argues that while Head Start has good intentions and significant potential, it is ultimately limited in its capacity to eradicate educational inequity due to structural flaws in its funding model and implementation. Overall, this paper aims to identify lessons for improving the effectiveness of early childhood education policies for low-SES children.

2. Policy design and funding

2.1. Policy design and evolution

As part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's "War on Poverty," Head Start was initially conceived as a comprehensive summer program to prepare disadvantaged children for kindergarten. Since its launch in 1965, the original goal was to break the cycle of poverty through the care and education of 561,000 children [1]. Until now, this program has served more than 37 million children and their families [1]. In 1969, Head Start moved to the Office of Child Development in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. And now, this program is in the Administration on Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). In scope, Head Start aimed to provide funds and other related services such as learning, health, nutrition, and family support to children who are aged 3 to 5 who lived in poverty [1]. In 1994, the Head Start program was expanded to include the Early Head Start program (EHS), which serves children from birth to age 3 [2]. However, it should be noted that these two programs are not integrated into one in terms of their implementation. In other words, Head Start is authorized to serve children of any age prior to compulsory school attendance, but the majority of children are 3-4, comparatively, EHS is authorized to serve children under 3 and pregnant women [2].

2.2. Funding mechanisms and resource allocation

When it comes to its funding, the Head Start program is administered by the Office of Head Start (OHS) within the HHS, which provides grants directly from the federal government to local entities [2]. This funding mechanism is opposed to funding through the state government. Currently, there are around 1,600 grantees receiving Head Start grants [1]. Based on its funding mechanisms, it reflects that the program originates from a part of the Community Action Program, which emphasizes the functions of local control and community involvement.

However, despite being the federal government's early childhood program, Head Start funding has consistently fallen short of serving all eligible children [3]. For example, in the 2014-2015 school year, only 41% of 4-year-olds and 16% of 3-year-olds were enrolled in this program nationally [4]. Currently, this program does not cover half of eligible preschool-age children and only about 11 percent of eligible infants and toddlers through Early Head Start [5]. Even such a funding allocation is not always the same, which means that every child's funding allocation usually fluctuates over time, which also raises the concern about its ability to maintain quality for providing enough services to eligible children and their families.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.NS28869

2.3. Evaluation and evidence of effectiveness

2.3.1. The achievements of head start

Notably, the implementation of Head Start has been accompanied by positive outcomes for child development over the years. In methodology, one of the unique components of Head Start is its attention to children's families [6]. Head Start emphasizes the engagement of family and local community in order to ensure that programs meet the unique needs of each community. For children who participate in the Head Start, they can obtain instant benefits in language, literacy, and math, especially for children who are non-English native speakers [7]. By using large-scale measurement and the data from 1965-1980, Bailey et al. found a strong positive relationship between the Head Start and the increase of adult human capital and economic self-sufficiency [8]. In addition, Thompson also found that providing more funding for children aged 3-6 can increase college graduation rates and reduce the incidence of health limitations [9]. Based on such results, they reflect that implementing a stable and long-term preschool program can provide corresponding returns. At the same time, the implementation of Head Start also demonstrates the positive impact of narrowing academic achievements between students who are from low-SES families and their higher SES counterparts.

2.3.2. The limitations of head start

After considering its positive outcomes for measuring its effectiveness, there is evidence to reflect its drawbacks and limitations. One of the main problems is its funding and allocation. For the period January 20, 2025, through April 15, 2025, HHS significantly reduced the rate of funding disbursements for the Head Start grant program compared to disbursements for the same period in FY 2024 [10]. In other words, according to the publicly available evidence, including data from HHS documents on its Government Appropriations System Tracking Accountability (GASSTA), it shows that during the above period, HHS withheld expenditure funds allocated to Head Start, which further indeed violated the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (ICA) [10].

Moreover, based on its theoretical foundation or methodology, it also reflects a negative effect on its implementations. According to a U.S. Government Accountability Office report, the Head Start program faced problems like low student enrollment, unqualified staff, and insecure facilities [11]. Even, GAO also found that around 4000 available classroom seats were not used by eligible students in the academic 2022-2023 year [11]. Additionally, the above findings regarding children from non-English-speaking backgrounds suggest heterogeneity in effects, emphasizing the importance of understanding not just whether Head Start works, but for whom and under what conditions.

2.4. Implementation challenges and social policy management implications

Based on its funding mechanism mentioned above, the direct connection between the federal government and the local grantees, it is important to recognize the challenges of ensuring quality consistency in these 1,600 recipients. Based on Jacoby and Lesaux's research, these local grantees usually show significant variations in class quality, teacher qualifications, and adherence to program standards [4]. In terms of such a variation, it makes a strong impact on the program's effectiveness. In addition, implementing unified standards across different locations is also a challenge. Based on

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.NS28869

Head Start's mission and goal, mitigating such a step is also one of their main steps; however, there is no evidence to demonstrate its success.

Moreover, it is necessary to recognize the role of the federal government and its funding. Different governments and their administrations have different priorities, which are closely related to Head Start's funding. For instance, during the Trump administration, there was consideration of ending the federal government's funding for Head Start, which alarmed providers and parents who rely on childcare and early education programs [6].

Based on evidence and outputs, there are some implications for implementing social policies for Head Start. First of all, further policy reforms should consider strategies for enhancing the consistency of high-quality implementation. Specifically, it is important to implement unified standards while preserving flexibility to meet local needs. Second, it should ensure funding consistency over the years. This would help achieve higher enrollment rates among eligible children and promote greater equity in academic development across socioeconomic backgrounds. Third, when it comes to social policy management and its reform, it should consider ways to balance comprehensive service delivery with focused attention on the most effective program components. While the program's core lies in its comprehensive approach, it can enhance outcomes by prioritizing critical tasks and adopting evidence-based resource allocation.

3. Discussion

After analyzing Head Start as a social policy intervention, it primarily reveals several key contradictions in the United States' early childhood education policies. First, a major contradiction lies between targeted and universal approaches to educational equity. On one hand, Head Start's focus on the most vulnerable children reflects a targeted approach, as resources are concentrated on the groups most in need of assistance. However, on the other hand, this approach may inadvertently create segregation in early learning environments and subject participants to stigma. In this context, it highlights a profound issue: whether targeted programs like Head Start should remain separate or be integrated into a broader universal system. Second, another contradiction is that the project also demonstrates the balance between federal oversight and local autonomy in project implementation. Head Start's hybrid governance model allows for adaptation to local conditions, but also leads to inconsistencies in quality. This situation shows that as early childhood education increasingly becomes a policy priority at the state and local levels, it is necessary to clarify the appropriate distribution of power among federal, state, and local entities to ensure the creation of an early childhood system that maintains quality while respecting community needs.

To date, Head Start has been in operation for decades, yet the achievement gap persists, prompting critical reflection on the limitations of educational interventions in addressing deeply entrenched social inequalities. One key point to clarify is that while high-quality early childhood programs are crucial for addressing this issue, they often operate within broader social and economic contexts that significantly influence children's development and opportunities. In other words, early childhood policies must be integrated with broader social policies addressing poverty, housing instability, access to healthcare, and family economic security to achieve lasting positive impacts on educational equity.

As mentioned earlier, after recognizing some of the limitations of Head Start in its policy development, design, and implementation, there are several policy interventions worth considering. First, policymakers need to establish stronger continuity between early childhood education and K-12 education by coordinating standards and data systems to sustain the outcomes of early intervention. Second, it is necessary to address the challenges faced by early childhood educators,

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.NS28869

such as insufficient funding, through professional development pathways to ensure and enhance the quality of the program. Finally, it is worth focusing on creating a more integrated early childhood system to reduce the fragmentation and lack of coordination between Head Start, state preschool programs, and other childcare subsidy programs, thereby improving the consistency with which these vulnerable families receive assistance.

4. Conclusion

When it comes to recognizing the effectiveness of educational programs as a social policy for addressing education disparities through early childhood intervention, Head Start represents an enduring federal commitment in the United States. Current evidence shows that the program is comprehensively involved in enhancing the self-sufficiency of children's families. Under such circumstances, Head Start's effectiveness in implementation cannot be denied. On the other hand, however, it reflects its limitations from both theoretical foundation and implementation. An important issue is its funding and allocation. The funding fluctuates over periods and is even reduced in some academic years, which would strongly influence its effectiveness. Moreover, the direct funding delivery model between the federal government and local grantees prevents the establishment of unified program standards across different regions. In this regard, this study argues that early childhood interventions like Head Start are essential but must be complemented by broader efforts to address the systemic conditions that create and perpetuate educational inequalities. Moreover, there are some limitations in the current research since this study does not include all the information and evidence about the implementation and fundamental challenges of the Head Start. At the same time, it is also necessary to recognize the relationship between this program and other social policies that address social inequalities since its core is of comprehensive methodology for not only including children but also their families.

References

[1] A brief history and overview of the Head Start program. (2020, October 16). First Five Years Fund. https: //www.ffyf.org/resources/2020/10/a-brief-history-and-overview-of-the-head-start-program/

[2] Congressional Research Service. (2014). Head Start: Background and Funding (pp. 1–58). Congressional Research Service.

[3] Koppelman, J. (2003). Reauthorizing Head Start: The future federal role in preschool programs for the poor. NHPF Issue Brief, 789, 1–22.

[4] Jacoby, J. W., & Lesaux, N. K. (2017). Policy-based instructional reform in early education: How US Head Start teachers perceive instructional mandates. International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy, 11(1), 1–21. https: //doi.org/10.1186/s40723-017-0034-x

[5] Green, B. L., Ayoub, C., Bartlett, J. D., Furrer, C., Chazan-Cohen, R., Buttitta, K., Von Ende, A., Koepp, A., & Regalbuto, E. (2020). Pathways to prevention: Early Head Start outcomes in the first three years lead to long-term reductions in child maltreatment. Children and Youth Services Review, 118, 105403. https: //doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105403

[6] Gunn, E. (2025, April 15). Report that Head Start could end alarm providers for the early childhood education program • Wisconsin Examiner. Wisconsin Examiner. https: //wisconsinexaminer.com/2025/04/15/report-that-head-start-could-end-alarms-providers-for-the-early-childhood-education-program/

[7] Wagner, E. (2022, January 12). Head start works: The facts and the impacts. NHSA. https: //nhsa.org/resource/facts-and-impacts/

[8] Bailey, M. J., Sun, S., & Timpe, B. (2021). Prep school for poor kids: The long-run impacts of Head Start on human capital and economic self-sufficiency. The American Economic Review, 111(12), 3963–4001. https: //doi.org/10.1257/aer.20181801

[9] Thompson, O. (2017). Head Start's long-run impact. Journal of Human Resources, 53(4), 1100–1139. https: //doi.org/10.3368/jhr.53.4.0216.7735r1

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.NS28869

[10] U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2025, July 23). Department of Health and Human Services—application of impoundment control act to availability of head start program funds. U.S. GAO. https: //www.gao.gov/products/b-337202
[11] Arundel, K. (2025, January 24). Head Start programs under interim management struggle with staff and safety issues. K-12 Dive. https: //www.k12dive.com/news/head-start-interim-management-staff-shortages-safety-fiscal-management/737986/