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INTRODUCTION TO THE OVERALL STUDY

THE STUDY

The overall "Child Day Care in an Urban World" Study consists of several interrelated efforts and projects the results of which will be reported in a series of special reports. Hopefully they will collectively converge and suggest a general policy framework necessary in several aspects of child day care planning in an urban society.

The concept of urban society as used in this study transcends the demographic definition of an urban-rural dichotomy. Rather it connotes in this study the existence of a social system generating a distinct life style and technological complexity or a post-industrial organizational pattern which affects societal functions in both rural and urban areas.

THE REPORTS

Report #1: "Social Policy Perspectives and Dilemmas" is concerned with major social policy issues underlying the child day care field and the present national debate. It is designed to provide a conceptual perspective for the study as a whole and for the subsequent reports.

Report #2: "Survey of Day Care Centers in Massachusetts" is concerned with the analysis of the survey and its findings on day care centers. It includes an effort to identify day care centers.

Report #3: "Day Care Facilities in Massachusetts" is concerned with day care services in Massachusetts other than day care centers.

Report #4: "Day Care Facilities in Maine," is concerned with all types of facilities in Maine.

THE SURVEY

One of the major projects of the Study is the preliminary, large-scale, descriptive survey of child day care facilities in Massachusetts and Maine. It is designed as a preliminary step toward an in-depth research project of child day care facilities in Massachusetts and other states in the New England region. Although the Survey does not aim to test specific hypotheses or models - which are the objectives of the next projects - it nevertheless embarks on an effort to identify and distinguish day care centers from other types of day care facilities. The licensing records of the State Department of Public Health, Division of Maternal and Child Health Services, list the licensed day care services in the state and include such general data as name, address, owner, licensed quota of children, ages, daily sessions, type of license, number of days open per week, meals served, sponsorship (Appendix A). But neither the application form for licensing a day care service in Massachusetts (Appendix B) which is filed in the regional office of the State
Public Health Department where the applicant is located, nor the "licensing card data" kept at the central office of the Department indicate the type of the day care service licensed, i.e. whether the service is a day care center, a nursery school or kindergarten (those falling within the provision of Chapter III of the General Laws—Section 58-62 of the Act regulating the licensing of day care services in Massachusetts). Consequently, any state statistics derived from such licensing records do not differentiate between such types of day care facilities, nor do they suggest an operational definition to make a classification system possible. In fact, these terms frequently imply different things to different people.

It was, therefore, one of the objectives of the Survey to identify day care services and classify them into major typological groups, but particularly to identify day care centers and describe them separately from other day care facilities. The identification and classification was based on a set of criteria established by the research team (Appendix E) and administered by a panel of judges. While some criteria for identifying such services are suggested in literature of day care, no one particular criterion was considered sufficient for either inclusion or exclusion of a particular facility from the day care center category. We are not aware of other efforts in Massachusetts to identify and describe day care centers as a distinct type.

Mailing List of the Survey in Massachusetts: The questionnaire in Massachusetts was mailed in the Spring of 1971 by the Office of Planning and Program Coordination, Executive Office for Administration and Finance, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which collaborated in the Survey along with the Governor's Advisory Committee on Child Development through its Executive Secretary, Mrs. Gwen Morgan. It was sent to all licensed child day care services listed with the State Public Health Department. Lists of Headstart program centers and clinical and laboratory schools supplemented the list.

Response to the Survey in Massachusetts: Both the number of questionnaires received and the affirmative responses to the question of willingness to collaborate in the next, in-depth study are gratifying. In fact, more than 50 percent (503) of the almost 1,000 child day care facilities in the mailing list responded to the questionnaire by mail.

Moreover, ninety-four day care centers were identified among the responding facilities. Of these, 88 responded to the question of further participation: 73 affirmatively and fifteen negatively. Only two centers indicated no interest in being informed of the survey results. Our suggestion to inform participating centers of the survey findings is perhaps one of the reasons for the high degree of responses received.

Although more than fifty percent of all licensed child day care facilities in Massachusetts responded to the questionnaire, these responses may not reflect accurately (statistically) the characteristics of the total population in the sense that we do not know the characteristics of those centers which declined to answer. Therefore, statistical
inferences based on the summary findings of this survey should be made with caution. Further, some parts of the analysis of the 94 child day care centers included in this survey were based at times on responses to certain questionnaire items that were insufficient for adequate statistical comparisons.
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I. SYNOPSIS OF MAJOR SOCIAL POLICY ISSUES

National Concern and Controversy

There is wide-spread agreement that today day care emerges as a major national concern and a controversial public social issue.

The activities of the 1970 White House Conference on Children and Youth provide one of the sources for concern. The conference stressed the national importance of positive steps toward the growth of children and the strength of their families in an urban world and, at the same time, it emphasized its fundamental concern with quality day care. For example the Report #15: "Children and Parents: Together in the World" expressed distinct concern with the low priority of children and parents in this country: "The actual patterns of life in America today are such that children and families come last." The Report of Forum 17: "Developmental Day Care Services for Children" demanded that quality day care be made available around the clock throughout the year for all who want it.

The controversial nature of the day care issue in the context of public social policy is reflected in recent legislative battles and mass media accounts:

"I must share the view of those of its supporters who proclaim this to be the most radical piece of legislation to emerge from the 92nd Congress." ("This" refers to the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971 which provided for a large scale day care system).

"I also hold the conviction that such far-reaching national legislation should not, must not, be enacted in the absence of a great national debate upon its merit and broad public acceptance of its principles.

"Few contend that such a national debate has taken place."

President Nixon in the Veto message.

Others have characterized the veto message as false and misleading.1

---

Current Picture

The kind, scope and quality of day care that will prevail, however, is far from clear. While the potential of day care is considerable and its implications for child development and future generations can be significant, both current and projected day care services present a relatively uncoordinated, fragmented, ambivalent and varied picture. A policy framework for planning must consider the basic components of this day care picture presented briefly in this chapter.

For example, relatively little is known about present day care services, their quality and their effectiveness. Even less is known about the role of day care in an emerging "urban" society: a society not just demographically rural or urban, but rather an urban societal structure generating a new life style for the nation as a whole (rural and urban). A cursory glance reveals great variety in scope, objectives, program types, content, quality, licensing, size, "raison d'être," pedagogic theory, public social policy, funding sources and arrangements, administrative procedures, staffing, cost, consumer and market demands.

Day care arrangements range from massive custodial operations to the care of relatively small groups of neighborhood children by a mother at home; from "babysitting" tasks for lower social classes to quality child development care. The Survey of this Study "Report #2: Day Care centers in Massachusetts" indicates that 85 per cent of the centers in the survey provide "early childhood education," health services ranking second with 65 per cent.

Day care operations vary from services chiefly designed to facilitate mainly working mothers to arrangements addressed chiefly to needs of children. According to the Survey of this Study in Massachusetts parents using the facilities of the day care centers in the survey did so because mother needed to work and secondarily because they wanted to enrich the social experience of their children. In fact 27 per cent of the children served by these centers belong to AFDC families the overwhelming majority of which are headed by a woman.

Costs vary from $600 to $4,500 per year for each child depending upon the kind of operation and the age of the child. For example, the annual cost per child in Headstart is $1,000 not including capital construction. The key social policy issue is how

---

much this nation can and how much should spend on children as a matter of national priorities. The Children's Bureau and the 1971 Abt Associates Study in Child Care estimate the cost of desirable day care at about $2,300 - $2,400 per child year. If all American children under six (21.5 million) are provided full-day care in centers ($2,350 per child year) the cost will be about $50.5 billion, not considering capital construction, a figure to be considered in projecting universally available day care services in centers. The comprehensive Child Development Bill of 1971 suggested an appropriation of $2 billion. Even this moderate amount was considered by the Presidential veto as not "justified," given the "limited" resources of the Federal Budget. In Massachusetts the cost is $1,661 per child year for part-day and $2,140 for full-day care centers. The Survey of this Study indicates that 85 per cent of the survey centers charge a tuition fee which ranges from $4 to $52 weekly per child, the median fee being $16 weekly per child.

Staffing includes volunteers, parents, college students, "new careers for lower income" paraprofessionals and professionally trained workers. The present Administration supports the creation of a "development associate" position which can be filled by welfare recipients.

Staff-child ratios range from 1:4 to 1:40. The survey we conducted in Massachusetts as part of this study, "Report #2: Day Care Centers in Massachusetts," indicates that the child/teacher ratio in the day care centers of the survey is 5:1 and the child/staff ratio is 12:1. Studies indicate that staff-child ratios are crucial both for the quality of day care and for the cost of day care. For example the Abt Associates "Study of Child Care" of April, 1971 concluded that child-staff ratios are a key indicator of the "warmth" of the child day care center. Centers with low staff-child ratios, 1:3 - 1:5, seemed to be "warmer" than centers with higher ratios.

Training varies from none to highly sophisticated pre-service and in-service programs. It is usually assumed that formal educational qualifications of day care staff affects the quality of the services given. But there is now beginning evidence that challenges the relationship between formal educational qualifications of the staff and the quality of the center, as for example the 1971 Abt Associates Study of Child Care and the 1971 Child Welfare League of America "Child Care Workers" Study. Considerably more, however, needs to be known before conclusions can be made with finality. We must know particularly what is meant operationally by "quality",

---


3 Gwen Morgan, "Facts on Day Care in Massachusetts," April, 1972, State Executive Office for Administration and Finance.
or day care service "output" and how it is measured. The survey of our study, "Report #2: Day Care Centers in Massachusetts" indicates that 40 percent of the total staff of centers in the survey are teachers - the largest single staff group. The median number of teachers per center is three. The second largest staff group is paraprofessionals, 17 percent, while social workers, psychologists, health staff, psychiatrists are less than 5 percent each.

It therefore appears that training in education-teaching is considered crucial in these day care centers. Depending upon the nature and quality of day care expected and upon research on the relationship between formal education of staff and quality of service given, the central question is what kind of training, in what subjects, and in what kind of institutions is necessary. Paraprofessionals in the survey of our study, for example seem to play an important role, likely to be intensified by guiding federal lines regarding employment of welfare recipients as "development associates". In-service training programs acquire thus, central importance.

The most important single policy question which emerges from this picture concerns the nature and role of day care as a social institution in an urban society. Its proper social focus and its implications for achieving intended or unintended social goals cannot be clearly deduced from this picture or the literature on the subject. Neither is it adequately clear what societal functions and values are directly enhanced or inhibited by such day care arrangements, as, for example, the impact of large scale child day care arrangements upon fertility and population growth or the socialization process of future generations. Yet upon such policy questions depends largely the priority of day care services in the overall allocation of national resources as well as within the human capital sector.

Projected Picture

Projected day care services emerging in legislative proposals reveal similar variety, fragmentation, ambivalence, and controversy, particularly with regard to social policy on goals, coverage, eligibility and quality. For example, the "welfare reform" proposals of the present Administration would provide state and local government supervised day care services to mothers who currently are welfare recipients in an effort to remove them from the relief rolls and into the labor market. This reflects a change in national social policy from endorsing financial subsidies to keep mothers of young children at home to promoting their employment.

1Ibid.
Congressional groups suggest a broader scope of day care services to include varied and larger population segments with broad parents, and community participation and a child development orientation rather than an employment of AFDC mothers emphasis. Local neighborhood decision making is encouraged as opposed to the state government control of the Welfare Reform proposals.

Others opt for a universal system of day care which would provide year round, 24 hour a day, 7 days weekly services to all who need them without regard to income, stressing that day care is a matter of personal and civil right in an urban society and should be completely divorced from public assistance; services directed exclusively toward the poor tend to be poor services and may have the effect of perpetual poverty through incentives of eligibility.

The determination of the system through which universally available day care services will be delivered effectively and economically to all consumers it is designed for, presents major complications and depends largely upon the nature of day care services to prevail; the opposite proposition is also true: the nature of day care and its costs also influences the selection of the service delivery system. Presently two major service systems are mainly involved, national policy channeling public funds for day care through both the Educational and Social Security Acts: the educational and welfare systems. Both present advantages and disadvantages.

Public family and child welfare generally limit day care to poor and working poor or to problem families. While child welfare philosophy and objectives encompass all socioeconomic groups and go frequently beyond the "problem" family, nevertheless major attention has been by necessity focused on those who had the greatest need or problems.

The American School system is plagued with problems of local inadequate funding and socioeconomic polarization, yet it casts day care in the educational context for all children and families. It can be reasonably argued that if the delivery of day care services is incorporated in the educational system and education is provided free to all children, day care should also be free to all.

Considering that the health delivery system is plagued with equally formidable if not more problems, the determination of a system to deliver universally available day care services to a highly differentiated consumer market independently or in conjunction and coordination with an existing delivery system, is a central policy issue. Day care does not completely fit into any human service delivery model, yet it is linked to all. The delivery service system issue involves also cost-benefit
aspects for various population groups as well as methods of payments by the consumer. For example in addition to the more traditional approaches, payment options include vouchers to parents as well as direct payments to those parents who wish to stay home and take care of their children.

Kind of Day Care to prevail

Clearly the nature, scope, quality and delivery of day care services depend essentially on the answers to certain policy questions. Specifically the nature of day care services to prevail in this country depends upon how day care is viewed as a social institution meeting a specific social need, upon the market, costs, and consumer demand, and upon the public appropriations to create the required facilities and services. On all three scores, the present prospect for quality, universal day care services is limited. While the trend for quality day care services and for provision of a balanced mix of protection, health care, child development and education to children of all families will be hard to be denied for long, it is not realistic yet to expect anything approximating quality, universal, publicly-financed system of day care in the United States.

For one thing day care as a social urban institution essential to all families and communities in their everyday, routine tasks, is either little recognized or totally missing in social policy formulation. On the other hand, consumer and market demand is relatively little understood and studied, while costs are high. Public appropriations for day care have been traditionally lacking in spite of congressional authorizations. For example, only $8.8 million was actually appropriated from the $25 million authorized for the first three years under the Amendments of 1962. The present national priorities system does not encourage the kind of investment in human capital formation required for quality day care.

The "state of the art" in day care, on the other hand, requires considerable refinement before an adequate convincing case can be made for realistic maximization of national investment in day care. Perhaps the most central refinement concerns its role as a new social urban institution and the creation of a new day care conceptual framework.

Historically day care programs have been viewed as a way of assisting families and communities facing some sort of family disruption. For example during World War II the Government provided day care for some 1,600,000 children. But after the war, nearly all of the Government day care centers were shut down. Today when the number of working women exceeds the World War II total by 6 million,
licensed day care centers have shrunk to one-sixth their wartime capacity.1 Another example, is the Child welfare service tradition which has also focused sharply on day care to children of families in crisis, or when parents cannot perform adequately child-rearing tasks without supplementary help.2 Consequently day care, in this view, becomes a treatment tool for families in trouble and must be staffed by social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists, particularly when a child is separated from the mother for large portions of the day. This need not be so when day care services are addressed to needs of all children and families.

A contemporary, comprehensive framework is required to view day care as essential urban institution, as a systematic set of interrelated, regular, on-going child-family-community developmental services common to all families. This may represent a strong break with traditional thinking which views day care as residual, temporary services for lower income groups, or for families and communities facing functional disruption. While work-and-crisis-related reasons are still major motivational factors directly affecting day care as a social need and a market demand, a compelling case is increasingly made to provide day care services to consumers with non-work related or residual needs. For example, day care services become increasingly essential to all parents who face family responsibilities and other tasks of an on-going nature. These are common needs in a "time-scarce" complex urban society, consisting of the "family-on-the-move" and creating pressures and constraints for all children.

Opposition Sources

This new day care framework, needed as it is, will probably stimulate considerable opposition from various segments of society and from vested interests in existing institutions or service delivery systems. The reasons vary widely. Efforts to create universal, publicly financed day care services will probably meet opposition triggered by fears of too much community control of child rearing tasks traditionally performed by the family. In spite of parental participation in decision-making and control provided in the "Child Development Act of 1971" which was vetoed by the President, concern

1From the testimony of Hon. Shirley Chisholm, N.Y., at the United States House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings on H.R. 13520, 91st Congress, First and Second Sessions, pp. 792-803.
has been expressed regarding too much federally financed local community control over early childhood development and education in group settings. Social class attitudes may restrain some parents from extensive use of community-wide and community-controlled group day care services that tend to lesser class distinctions. Others may be concerned about the harmful effects all-day care may have on very young children cared for away from their mother. Opposition based on similar fears may be encountered not only by conservative elements of society but also by minority groups if they are not provided with decision-making power and opportunities for participation in the activities of day care centers. Minority cultures and minority groups in this and other countries have at times interpreted early childhood education and all-day care as a strategy to separate children from parents and thus weaken or destroy minority influence upon the child.

In brief, this country has been slow in recognizing group day care and ambivalent about its nature because of three major interrelated set of reasons:

One stems from the prevailing socio-political ideology, particularly the emphasis on individualism and on the family as the acculturation institution responsible to instill prevailing values into the new generation. Group day care can be seen as a danger to both individualism and the traditional role of family in the socialization of the child.

A second set of reasons stems from several long-held assumptions regarding the role of women in society, in general and "at home with her child" in particular, maternal participation in the labor force, and the impact of maternal deprivation upon the psychosocial growth of children.

A third set of reasons stems from a general "urban lag" created today by the slow adaptation of key social institutions to a rapidly evolving urban environment and by their resistance to change; as for example the slow adaptation of child-rearing or family strengthening social institutions to a complex rapidly changing urban world. Our basic approach to organizing and planning in an urban society is still traditionally agrarian based largely on some institutions dominant in the agricultural phase of development. For example the family as a social institution has been adapting to technological and socioeconomic changes and became more nuclear and mobile. But adaptations must be brought about in other institutions as well if the family is to respond adequately to

---

1A. Wolinsky in "Keeping the Poor in their Place" pointed to the resistance of the middle class to a "War on Poverty" in the New Republic, July 4, 1964, pp. 15-18.
new changes and face additional pressures (such as, influences of communication and mass media upon the child) and constraints of an urban society. Economic, educational institutions, institutions in general concerned with human capital development must also adopt to urban realities. As urbanization emerges, the family's two basic functions, socialization of the child and economic security are frequently in conflict.

All three sets of reasons combine to cause the slow recognition of group day care in this country and the ambivalence which surrounds its nature.

Sources of Support

On the other hand support for a broader, comprehensive, quality system of day care services comes increasingly from widely divergent, disparate groups with varied motivations. For example, support from industry and business for day care stems primarily from the need to recruit women in the labor force and to decrease absenteeism. Employees in industry and business support the demand for day care although for different reasons; union leaders view day care as an essential fringe benefit increasingly included in the list of collective bargaining. Some government officials and legislators see day care as a central component to reforming the public welfare system. Behavioral and social scientists as well as educators see day care as an urban society's responsibility to provide children with much needed developmental and educational opportunities as well as to provide families with support in their child-rearing tasks. Thus support comes from professions and experts who recognize the need for children's rights and protection, the need for child welfare or early childhood development and education, all essentially based upon the crucial influence of the early years of life on a person's physical and socioeconomic development. Moreover, social policy planners and urban development experts view day care as a public responsibility and as a mechanism which provides "social equalizers" to economically, socially and culturally deprived families and their children; and a mechanism which enables them to make use of existing community facilities or to participate in improving local neighborhood conditions. Various women's rights organizations see group day care as an essential public service to free women and provide them with equal rights and opportunities in a post-industrial society as well as to enhance their educational, cultural and community participation activities.

The major policy issue here is the conflicting motivations inherent in such demands, the priorities to be established in meeting them and the conversion of these demands into specific programs and appropriate standards of a coherent, comprehensive and yet not too costly day care system. The institutional changes required in
accepting and implementing a comprehensive group day care system are impressive. They range from changing present public funding patterns which fragment day care services to changing zoning ordinances permitting the location of day care centers in residential areas; from creating a rational licensing and regulation system to visualizing day care centers as a central catalytic location servicing simultaneously neighborhood needs of all age groups in inter-relationship.

In brief, four sets of reasons pressure for recognition of group day care and its value in a post-industrial society. First, social survival in a rapidly evolving urban environment requires effective, rapid social change transmitters such as an urban-society-oriented-educational-system as well as early group experiences for young children. Tradition-bound institutions or families with past-oriented social outlooks are not particularly helpful as rapid social change transmitters or effective acculturation. Group day care can play this role in conjunction with the family. Second, the high proportion of female population in the labor market pressures for group day care arrangements. Third, the nuclear type family and the high geographic mobility of families combine to separate the family from relatives and friends, traditionally relied upon to strengthen family tasks. Four, housing shortage, bad housing conditions, overcrowding, social-cultural segregation resulting from residential physical housing patterns, lack of residential community facilities strengthening child-rearing tasks, all usually contribute to pressures for extra-parental group day care resources in this country as well as abroad (Israel, USSR, Sweden, Cuba, Italy, France) where these factors have been associated with increase of group day care arrangements based on a parent-community collaboration.

Meeting Actual Needs

Although the trade-offs between supporting and opposing forces will largely determine the public social policy to prevail and will condition the quantity, cost as well as the quality of day care required, the present need for day care facilities is already significant. While estimates vary widely, the gap between day care services provided (both quantitatively and qualitatively) and those required by American families is already sizable and of public concern because it affects child-rearing of most American families and social classes.

A crucial overall evidence is provided by the statement included in the Report of Forum #15 "Children and Parents: Together in the World" of the 1970 White House Conference on Children: "...The actual patterns of life in America today are such that children and families come last".

The limited day care services available today provide another evidence. A frequently quoted figure provided by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that day care currently is available for 641,000 of the almost 6 million pre-school children with working mothers.

In so far as quality is concerned the problems are formidable because the task of obtaining and monitoring the quality of available day care, particularly in-home day care which is the major type of arrangement (only 2 percent of American women use group home day care facilities) is almost impossible; nevertheless evidence indicates that the quality is highly questionable. However, this figure does not take into account approximately 11 million mothers of pre-school children of all socioeconomic groups that would like to work, nor the rapidly increasing number of women in all social classes to join the labor market in the years ahead (the number of working mothers has increased by 700 percent the last thirty years while the population has increased 50 percent) particularly the number of working mothers with children under age 5 which will increase from 3.7 to 5.3 million by 1980, according to estimates by the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

1 United State House of Representatives, Ibid, Also pp. 767-768, testimony by Dr. M.G. Wagnet, Chairman of the Committee on Early Child Care of the American Health Association, who described the lack of quality day care arrangements for children of working mothers as being inadequate and hazardous: "Over one million children under 10 years of age take care of themselves and their younger brothers and sisters while others are in arrangements hazardous to children." Similar results are reported in several studies such as: "Windows on Day Care," a 90-city survey, just published, by the National Council of Jewish Women; and F.A. Ruderman, "Child Care and Working Mothers: A study of Arrangements Made for Daytime Care of Children," Child Welfare League of America, 1968.

2 According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau Bulletin 296, 1971, as of July 1969 there were 22 million children aged 5 and under in the U.S. The actual number of children needing day care increases rapidly as the number of working mothers increases, as legislation with emphasis on providing child care services for welfare mother is passed.
Clearly, the social policy dilemma is reflected here in the conflict inherent in expanding day care facilities of various types while maintaining high standards and a balanced priorities system for consumers (i.e., age of consumer, reason for need, type of family, socioeconomic group). Adequate public funding of day care and the definition of high quality care are rather well known and documented problems; the determination of what population groups or needs should have priority is equally a formidable and less appreciated social policy problem. For example, if the 'welfare reform' proposals are enacted, the greatest day care need will be care for school-age children, with emphasis on before-and-after school day care; but is this the appropriate priority given the importance of the pre-school age in child development? Or what coefficient do we attach to the fact that only negligible knowledge exists about infant day care which is nevertheless the most formative period of the pre-school age? The problem is further complicated by considering short or long range time horizons as they relate to costs and benefits.

An Ambivalent Profile

These questions assume, of course, that day care is a useful tool in alleviating varied social problems and is applied in several fields such as child welfare and family welfare, mental health, prevention, treatment, protection. However, it is highly debatable whether day care is today only a tool and it can be defined in terms of only the service rendered or on the basis of the problem to be solved. In fact, the nature of day care can be elusive, and inadequately defined only in terms of its usefulness to children with a specific need, to families with specific problems and to communities without resources and many low income residents, or, in general only when applied to current or potential social problems. Evidence points increasingly to the fact that day care can be addressed to needs all children share and all families as well as communities have in common. The socialization of all children and the developmental needs of all families and communities becomes increasingly the appropriate aim of day care as a new urban institution.

The debate suggests that the emerging conceptual profile of day care, still vague, controversial and ambivalent about its own generic nature, will depend for its realization in the foreseeable future upon the successful operational linkages which coordinate day care services with other human service delivery models - as well as community development efforts broadly based on parent-neighborhood-government collaboration.
II. A BROADER PERSPECTIVE: WHOSE NEEDS ARE MET

A Conceptual Problem

While a wide range of day care definitions is readily available in the literature of the subject, most are limited in scope, geared to special legal and administrative situations, and usually lack conceptual and operational clarity. In fact, there is no single, all-purpose widely-accepted definition of day care; neither a definition reflecting a wide-agreement about whose needs are met, or what constitutes the generic nature of day care services. This is in part symptomatic of the lack of broadly based conceptualization of day care services which can bring more meaningfully together under one focus the various day care arrangements. There are legal definitions, used in ordinances, definitions used for public funding, for licensing, for special programs and services to specific age groups of children, and for a variety of other purposes. When these various sets of definitions are brought conceptually together the following generalization can be made: Child day care generally means an extra-parental arrangement on a continuing basis for part of each day or night for child day care outside the home for children from infancy to 18 years who live in their own home with one or two parents or guardians.

Conceptualizations of this kind remain necessarily vague and do little to advance clarity regarding the nature of day care services. Under such broad conceptual strokes day care is any number or all of such services as child welfare, educational, health, family welfare, problem treatment-oriented, preventive, mental health, nutritional, protective, public welfare, community development. Day care so broadly conceived fits any and all of these services, particularly because it is frequently used as a tool in alleviating specific problems in several functional areas. But while day care is linked to all these services, it nevertheless belongs generically or exclusively to none and does not fit into any of the human service delivery models. For example, represented in the membership of the Federal Panel on Early Childhood under the Secretary of HEW and the Director of OEO and assigned the responsibility to devise a common set of standards for day care services, were various government departments, all concerned with child care: Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Health-Welfare-Education, Housing and Urban Development, Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The National Level

Several major day care dilemmas stem precisely from this conceptual inadequacy and ambivalence. At the national level, for example, federal funds for day care are channeled to local communities through different service delivery systems such as education, health, anti-poverty
programs, public assistance, OEO, man power, urban development. While it can be reasonably argued that multi-source funding benefits day care in some ways, it can also be pointed out that the fragmented, uncoordinated, complex, unsystematic and symptomatic pattern of federal financing of day care services dilutes further their nature, increases confusion, and makes rational planning or coordination of day care services almost impossible at any and all geographic or administrative levels. The Day Care Nightmare Study listed the complexity of the fund flow as one of its most significant findings and was in fact inspired by an attempt to "trace out the ebb and flow of child day care funds through a confusing maze of pipelines between federal, state and local levels."

Another example of this ambivalence at the National level in the federal bureaucracy concerns day care's position in the government structure. If day care services are viewed exclusively as child development services, they should be placed under the Office of Child Development, the new unit created in Spring 1969 by this Administration within the Office of the Secretary of the Department of HEW; yet they are not. If day care services are viewed exclusively as child welfare, they should be under the Children's Bureau, which is now under the Office of Child Development; yet they are not. If child day care is viewed exclusively as educational service, it should be placed under education or under Headstart, which is also under the Office of Child Development; yet it is not. If day care services are viewed exclusively as health, they should be under health; yet they are not. Day care program services provided by the Children's Bureau were transferred to the new Community Services Administration of the Social Rehabilitation Services (SRS) which houses programs for public assistance recipients. Clearly this suggests the administration's viewpoint relating day care to the public assistance programs.

At The Local Level

At the local level the confusing and ambivalent nature of day care is also distinctly reflected in several ways. The effort to identify day care with specific delivery systems creates near chaos regarding regulating, licensing, planning and coordination of day care. Moreover, urban planners have not been able to decide what exactly day care is and how it fits in planning and

---

1 A comprehensive debate accompanied by a detailed description of federal funding is included in "Day Care Nightmare" by P. Bourne, E. Medrich, L. Steadwell, D. Barr, Feb., 1971, working paper No. 145, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley, pp. 13-18.

Also, S. Boyer, "The Day Care Jungle," Saturday Review, Vol. LIV, No. 8, 2/70/71, p. 50. See also description of Federal-State funding appended to this report, Appendix H.

2 Ibid.
zoning ordinances. Day care facilities must be located in space and in relationship to the location of the consumers served as well as in conjunction with the location of other urban functions related to. Thus, day care services must be in close proximity to the families using them in the neighborhood, as well as meaningfully scattered throughout the city in order to relate to other consumer groups and urban functions. Yet local zoning restricts day care to areas specifically zoned. Paradoxically, day care is frequently zoned out of residential areas, and is assumed to be a kind of function which should exist with industry rather than residential needs.

In general, zoning ordinances restrict day care facilities in few zoning districts and usually require standards which may not agree with state day care licensing standards (i.e., lot size requirement of an acre). Moreover, while the need for day care facilities may increase with changes in the community, as for example, when more women join the labor force, zoning restrictions may deny the establishment or the appropriate location of new day care facilities. Nuisance factors, such as noise and traffic, that a day care center generates or safety of children factors must also be considered in zoning ordinances by urban planners and compared to day care criteria. The "Day Care Facilities for the Children of Oakland: A Study of Neighbors' Attitudes," project of the City Planning Department of Oakland California, found in 1966 no unfavorable attitudes by immediate neighbors of day care facilities. Nevertheless, it is the nature of zoning and of physical master plans that require the examination of such possible impacts, including traffic congestion. Traffic congestion problems appeared as an issue in the Oakland study.

Zoning ordinances can be changed first, when day care's definition and concept becomes clearer and operational. A review of 30 recently enacted zoning ordinances revealed that the lack of any uniformity regarding day care was due to ambivalence as to what day care is and how its services are classified along meaningful operational criteria. In effect, each ordinance was based on a different idea "of what a day care center is and does."

1 The Child Welfare League recognized this: "Consideration should be given in master city planning in locating day care facilities in areas where they are needed, and to the protective zoning laws which may influence their location Child Welfare League of America, 'Standards for Day Care Services,' N.Y., The League, Revised, 1969, p. 76.

Second, when day care is viewed in urban planning as a regular community facility, for all children, rather than as an industry directed to specific problems of special population groups or functions. Third, when day care experts establish an operational classification and agree on standards of day care services. Almost all zoning ordinances are usually required to specify the conditions that must be met to qualify for a conditional use permit. So for reasons of operational clarity itself, as well as for making possible their inclusion in appropriate zoning ordinances, day care facilities must establish criteria for their operations such as for required square footage of play area per child of different ages, for healthy and safe immediate environment for the children, and for appropriate proximity to consumers and to community functions required for their optimum use. An important step in this direction is made by the study of Day Care Licensing sponsored jointly by the Office of Child Development and the Office of Economic Opportunity with CONSECO as project consultant. The task force paper on "Zoning for Day Care," headed by K. Hapgood recommends model zoning provisions and criteria for day care uses.

**Different Services, Different Variables**

While the purpose, meaning and quality of care remain illusive, day care services are generally provided in licensed or unlicensed homes by families, in day care centers, day nurseries, nursery schools, pre-schools, pre-kindergartens, kindergartens and Headstart programs if open after-school hours. Most of the important variables vary from regulatory definition to definition or from one type of day care service to another. For example, some regulatory and licensing definitions limit the age of the children served to seven years old or less. The presence of the parent at the facility may also be crucial as programs where parents are on the premises (as for example, care of children in church schools while their parents attend church, or children in Sunday schools) are excluded from day care regulations, while for the same reason, drop-in centers are not at present licensed. Also excluded are the lower levels of educational systems which begin with the pre-school and continue through the elementary grades.

Another central variable is "night" care which is usually lacking in practice or standards specification. Private, informal arrangements for day care do not usually require regulation or licensing. In Massachusetts child day care services include, for licensing purposes, "the services of any institution or place, whether known as a day nursery, nursery school, kindergarten, child play school, (except a Sunday School conducted by a church or a summer recreation camp), which receives for temporary custody, with or without stated educational purposes during part or all of
the day apart from their parents, three or more children, seven years of age and not of common parentage.\footnote{Chapter III of the General Laws, Section 58 as amended in 1967}

\textbf{The Consumer Served}

Given the interdependency between children and family or between family and society it is difficult and perhaps limiting to distinguish needs related solely or mainly to the child, family, or society. Yet most of the frequently mentioned rationales for child day care service seem to make this distinction and to imply one or more of the following foci of needs met with each approach providing a different role and rationale for day care and each affecting differently day care policies, programs or legislative proposals:

\textbf{Parent-focused:} The focus of the need here is mainly on needs of parents who are unable to care for their children at some time during the day usually because of work, illness, medical appointments or job training. The motivating factor in this orientation, an old traditional approach in this country, is not the need of the child per se, but rather of the family or a social situation which necessitates the use of an outside, part-time facility for the child in order to enhance family functioning. The policies governing this type of facility are more likely to consider the parents first and children second. A custodial type of care is more likely to prevail when the prime objective is the "baby-sitting" need of the parent. Furthermore, lower income groups are more likely to need such programs on a large scale because work is more vital to them than high income groups. Consequently, programs or legislation inspired by this orientation are more likely to be designed for lower income families and be incorporated into the welfare system, and ignore issues of quality care for children.

\textbf{Child-focused:} However, day care is increasignly coming to mean protective, extra-parental, but parent supplementing child developmental care and educational services for all socio-economic groups to further the child's psychosocial growth and development. In this case legislation, funding and programs are more likely to be designed to meet children's needs first with parental and family needs considered secondarily. The role and quality of such programs, their financing and organizational pattern are sensitive to the life-style and needs of all socioeconomic groups. These programs are more apt to be related to educational and child development
service delivery systems rather than welfare, although, the latter is not overlooked.

Community-focused: A good example of local community-focused day care at the neighborhood level is the model city program or the Headstart program which in addition to education emphasizes community planning, parent-community involvement, community ethnic balance and neighborhood renewal and is geared to lower income groups since it was initiated as part of the anti-poverty program. In this case, policy-making involves the parents, the local neighborhood as well as the school, and necessarily must conform to the regulations of specific public funding. Programs with this orientation reflect not only an educational orientation which is the main thrust of Headstart, but also the potential contribution of child day care services to local neighborhood development. In this context a universally available day care service system may also be related to urban development programs, to the improvement of quality urban life, as well as to the acculturation process of all children in the community.

Another example of a "community focused," but at the national planning level, is the instrumental use of day care for decreasing welfare rolls by forcing AFDC mothers to use day care and join training or the labor market. Legislation or funding motivated by this controversial workfare issue clearly implies that the dominant reason for providing day care is the decrease of public welfare costs rather than meeting needs of children. Another example at the national level is the establishment of day care policies as a means of attaining more options for women in the labor market or to face some crisis. Day care can thus become an instrument for income redistribution, aiding family efforts for independence from public welfare, or for strengthening upward social mobility. Social philosophy objective of various kinds can also be enhanced through universally available, community-guided, group day care services designed for infants as well as pre-school age children; such programs can be designed with parent collaboration to mold as early as possible a desirable future generation or to eradicate undesirable societal conditions, or to promote the socialization of children in all social classes.

Orientations and Roots

Clearly the issue of what day care is, why needed, and who benefits is multifaceted and the three major role orientations of day care described above are interdependent and not necessarily mutually exclusive. On the contrary, they are parts of a broader perspective which reflects more accurately day care's potential and its interdependence with other social institutions. Group day care as a contemporary urban institution is systematically related to major social functions including children, parents,
communities, manpower and human resources development. It is imbeded in society's value system and its transmitters to new generations.

The etiology for the present, ambivalent, fragmented multi-orientation of day care as well as for many of its dilemmas is rooted in the development patterns of day care in this country. Day care services have emerged from philanthropic efforts, from child welfare philosophy based on children's protection, on children's rights as well as from programs to support mainly community and family functions. Since their beginnings these merging efforts have had several ad-hoc orientations which survived over time in various combinations and contributed to the present fragmented, limited in scope day care framework. For example, a philanthropic, custodial care orientation is associated in the U.S. with the early beginnings of day care which focused on the poor and the welfare of parents in need of work. Historically, "the Nursery for Children of the Poor" established in New York city in 1854 is considered the birthplace of day care.  "Day Nurseries" of that period were, in effect, philanthropic, charitable institutions organized by wealthy upper class women to assist poor families, mainly Civil War widows at first, and then in the latter part of the nineteenth century, to help immigrant mothers working in domestic service or in factories. They provided daytime, mainly custodial care, focusing mainly on the need of the parents to work and on protection of the child from environmental hazards, or from undesirable influences.

A Health, Educational Orientation: The addition of medical, nutritional, and health services for the child in 1896 led in 1896 to the establishment of the "National Federation of Day Nurseries." Emphasis in the years that followed was placed upon underprivileged children, educational guidance, health care and nutrition, attracting the interest and support of health and educational institutions and organizations.

The establishment, in 1922, of the Ruggles Street Nursery in Boston became the first nursery training school symbolizing the entrance of professional educators into the day care field. Thus, the early years of the 1900's began to emphasize educational and developmental experiences for young children with nursery maids being replaced by teachers and custodial care being supplemented by educational considerations and emphasis on health standards. For example, as early as 1905 in New York city, the city Department of Health required that a licensed physician give a medical examination to every child cared for in a nursery.

1C. Fleiss, 1902
An Emergency Orientation: Child day care services have almost consistently received impetus from periods when society's "routine" functions were disrupted by major historical events precipitating destitute mothers and women to leave their home to work. The Civil War, World War I, and the Depression, all contributed to growth in the demand of day care services, not unlike the current emphasis in the "Welfare Reform" proposals to decrease AFDC rolls.

As the depression needs were fading away, another emergency, World War II, provided additional impetus to the demand for child day care services. Again the rationale for day care service was related more to national crisis and disruption of community life, as well as to production and labor force requirements than to the necessity of day care as an ongoing regional service required to meet needs of children in urban society. The combination of a flourishing industry and the draft of men into the armed services provided the need and incentive for women to work in factories and families to be crowded into the war production areas. This led to the Congressional passage of the Community Facilities Act of 1941, commonly known as the Lanham Act, under which Federal funds were available to the states on a fifty-fifty matching basis for the establishment and expansion of day care centers and nursery schools in defense areas and for the conversion of WPA facilities to wartime projects.

Clearly the introduction and first period of child day care in this country emerged from ad-hoc responses to community emergency or "crisis" situations focusing sharply on the poor family and the protection of the child. When the Second World War was over, the temporary, ad-hoc, emerging nature of public financial support was again continued. The issue to be decided was then the discontinuance of these programs or their incorporation into the regular service delivery system. Characteristically, the state of New York decided at the end of World War II to discontinue the War-related child day care programs, as did most of the other states. The city of New York, however, at that time converted most of its facilities into permanent programs and continued its financing of child day care facilities.

The debate and arguments reducing day care to an emergency device are also reflected in the Horan Report. Several aspects of this debate are in part appropriate even today. The basic argument was that the emergency need for child day care no longer existed after the Second World War, the implication being that the essence of child day care was to meet the emergency situation of the Wartime. In current terms a parallel argument can be advanced by claiming that day care is necessary, for example, only for as long as needed to reduce welfare rolls, to be discontinued perhaps after this goal is attained. The debate reflected in the Horan Report focused attention also to the relationship
of day care to other public service programs and pointed out the need to view day care services in relationship to other child services such as housing and welfare; otherwise it is difficult to determine resource allocation of limited funds for day care as a regular, on-going service. If child day care were to become a component of a permanent public service delivery system, it should be first evaluated and ranked in importance in the context of other necessary human resources and welfare or educational services. Consequently, the organizational structure of the day care delivery system should be examined from the standpoint of determining whether it is to be administered under the educational, welfare, or some other delivery system of permanent nature.

A National Responsibility Orientation: Even though not entirely designed at first to meet child needs as such, national responsibility for financing and encouraging day care services was recognized early. During the Depression for the first time the federal government assumed financial responsibility for nursery schools, under the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and later WPA, thus accepting the premise that education and guidance of children two to five years of age warrants public responsibility and expenditure of public funds. This federal action intended at the same time to give employment to needy teachers, nurses, nutritionists, clerical workers, cooks, janitors and others as part of the work relief programs designed to counteract unemployment. It stressed the value of nursery education by establishing pre-service training programs for staff, parent education, community interpretation, and by identifying the program as an educational service, usually located in school buildings. At the same time, federal funds were made available to state departments of education while local educational boards operated the nurseries.

Characteristically, responsibility was assigned to two governmental agencies for implementation: The United States Office of Education was given responsibility for the development and extension of nursery schools to be operated in or under the auspices of local schools, and for related school lunch and recreation programs. The U.S. Children's Bureau was given similar responsibility with respect to day care centers and related services sponsored by agencies not a part of the school program. The results of this dichotomized responsibility is prevalent in part even today. The Community Facilities Act of 1941 is another example of national responsibility and grants to aid states for day care. The widespread acceptance of this wartime program was reflected in the fact that by July 1945, about 1,600,000 children were receiving care in nurseries and day care centers financed largely by federal funds.
A Child Welfare-Social Work Emphasis: The broadening scope of child care and protection as well as the assumption that day care is mainly a treatment tool for families in crisis established in the late 1930's the child welfare orientation including the "helping professions" particularly of social work and case work. Social work agencies began also to sponsor child day care nurseries. In some of the better child welfare facilities an integration of health, education and social work began to take place in providing day care services. But social work has frequently viewed day care as a means to help problem families and a remedy for parental failure or inadequacy. While day care can be used as a "remedy" - in which case professional expertise is indeed required - it need not be limited to this use but can be expanded to meet needs all children share.

A Child Development and Early Educational Orientation: Child day care services acquired additional characteristics and the broader orientation toward needs all children have as a result mainly from experiences during and after the Second World War period: For example, the emphasis on custodial care has been steadily declining and was modified to include a distinct emphasis on early childhood and planned pre-school experiences for all children. Day care's "babysitting" component is broadened and day care services include also supportive elements to meet early childhood needs and realize the potential of planned pre-school experiences most families share in common. Thus efforts are made to transform day care services into "comprehensive and coordinated sets of activities providing direct care and protection of infants, pre-school and school-age children outside of their own homes during a portion of a 24-hour day. Such comprehensive services include, but are not limited to, educational, social, health, and nutritional services and parent participation."^3

Moreover, child day care services are conceived in effect as child development programs which promote the child's healthy development, aim at the attainment of the full growth potential of young children, and help all parents to support and strengthen their child-rearing role. Child development programs are, in fact,

---

1F. Ruderman, "Child Care and Working Mothers: A Study of Arrangements Made for Day Care of Children," N.Y., 1968

2Custodial services are defined as those day care services which do not contain educational, social, health, nutritional and similar components.

3Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, 45 C.F.R. 71 (1969)
those programs which...provide the educational, nutritional, social, medical, and physical services needed for children to attain their full potential.1

The educational component of day care is further emphasized, partly overlapping with the child development program as it focuses also on the child's development. 1Educational service means services and related equipment which provide educational and cultural enrichment of the day care center's program, such as the services of art and music teachers, psychologists, and other child development specialists as well as the use of books and audiovisual material and equipment.2 Awareness also increased that the emerging day care services require professional child care staff, educationally-oriented play equipment and appropriate space and location specifically designed and selected for children.

A Community-Wide Development Orientation: In general, the most recent developments emphasize the human welfare concept of day care as also supportive of family and community life. The goal of strengthening the child's socialization and the family, avoiding permanent replacement of children, but at the same time serving the community, has recently grown in importance. Parent and local community participation are increasingly exemplified as central components of child care services combining day care with local community development and delivery of human services. For example, last November 2, an overwhelmingly approved referendum question in Cambridge, Mass. stated that it "Is the policy of the city...to make available child care without charge to all Cambridge residents who feel they have need of this service."3 Supporters of this type of community day care in Cambridge are now seeking appropriations to achieve free, 24-hour, community-controlled, group child care in Cambridge with parent and local community participation and direction. The priority items for implementation include 'pre-school child care facilities for infants whose mothers must work, emergency child care services, after-school care for elementary school children whose parents work full time and 'half-well'infirmaries where children can have medical attention when otherwise their parents might risk losing their jobs to stay home with them.'

---


2Mink Bill, HR 4190, Sec. 11(1).

3Boston Globe, March 5, 1972, reported a majority in every ward with a total of 16,504 votes in favor to 10,851 opposed.
These changes in emphasis and implementation of group day care services over time have created an impressive puzzle - but at the same time have paved the way for broader conceptual group day care perspectives.

A New Perspective

A broader and new conceptual day care perspective is now required to encompass and unify presently scattered orientations, roles and types of day care services. Basic to this broader needed perspective are the notions that day care could now be conceived as an on-going, multi-function, local community service; as a new dynamic social urban institution designed to meet urban needs all children and families share in common:

1. An On-Going Community Service: The sporadic, leap-frogging, crisis-oriented history of day care in the United States suggests that day care facilities were established and expanded only under pressure of ad-hoc needs (usually to recruit a female work force) and survived mainly during periods of crisis or unusual community need. This traditional view provided much of the present conceptual mosaic of day care facilities, their public funding, licensing and structure. To change significantly this "emergency-crisis" approach to day care a radical shift in intellectual posture is required: namely to view group day care as a regular, on-going public-private community service.

2. A Universal Multi-Faceted Service: The "residual," categorical assistance nature of day care services restricting them to a certain kind of children, families and communities, or to certain kinds of problems is no longer effective in contemporary society. All children have common day care needs and all families or community facilities in the urban scene may require on-going day care services. The traditional approach directs day care services frequently to special children and families that have specific social problems. As a community service day care facilities can be organized as multi-function centers servicing all population groups at the local level, thus avoiding age or service delivery dichotomies. A combination pointing to this direction is Headstart, the largest federal day care program, based on the same idea of providing a combination of educational, health, nutritional benefits to pre-school children in a community-oriented approach. Except that instead of being limited to low income families as Headstart's, day care centers should be made available to the entire community, free to lower income families, with differential fees to all others who need and want such services. Complimentary needs of several age groups can be met at the same day care center.

3. A New Social Urban Institution: The universal social need for a new urban multi-function institution can become the dominant criterion for organizing the day care system. Rather than relying
exclusively on social institutions and existing delivery systems which are not adequately urban-oriented or which generate traditional piece-meal programs, and incremental change, the new institution approach may provide a more effective strategy to be explored. It will be difficult for example to place day care services in the proper urban perspective without considering realistic options which transcent existing molds and frameworks. This broader perspective of day care is not only suggested by the limited effectiveness of present efforts, but is also justified by the present complexity of our society, the nature of our economic system and the need to improve the quality of human life through better application of technological advances.

4. Parent-Local Community Collaboration: The conflict between ragged individualism or the family as the central social institution for acculturation - socialization of the new generation on the one hand, with group day care arrangements which may reflect the subordination of the individual to group values and the invasion by the community into the child-rearing prerogatives of the family on the other, can be negotiated and converted into positive outcomes. The key concept is to evolve through research, demonstration and practice, a parent-community collaboration around common needs of children and families. A number of benefits can accrue from this collaboration. First, the family's fears of being replaced as the transmitter of social values will be met because the family will be reinforced rather than replaced or weakened and indeed improve its function whenever family conditions are not adequate; the school system is supplementing in similar ways the family in its socialization tasks. Second, the local community's ability to respond to local needs and to express more accurately the residents' preferences will be enhanced. Third, group day care arrangements can be organized to strengthen the development of the individual rather than submerge him in the group; a case in point is the use of groups in strengthening the individual's personality structure. Fourth, the frequent lack of adequate community services and facilities, such as housing conditions, playgrounds, or health services, can be more realistically met through some kind of universal, group day care system geared to serve several age groups and the local community. Local neighborhood functions and existence are already affected by present urban growth trends, and have lost their traditional tasks.

Recognizing this need and potential, as well as the separation of important human services such as education and health care from each other has proved inefficient, day care services should be developed on a local community-oriented approach and carried out "as part of a comprehensive community plan designed to promote and maintain a stable family environment" for all children.\(^1\)

---

III. CLASSIFICATION PROBLEMS OF DAY CARE SERVICES

The Nature of Classification

In most systematic endeavors, scientific, professional or service-oriented, the existence of a classification system reflects the state-of-the-art of the field and enhances not only research but also understanding and application. In the evolution of science, classification of phenomena is usually considered the second step, after their observation and monitoring.

There is no uniformly accepted classification system of day care services in which concepts and relationships can be sorted according to their similarities and differences and in which the classifications can be given specific names suggesting specific kinds of generalizations. This applies to programs, functions, structure, quality or standards of day care services. Yet day care services are necessarily linked to several human service delivery systems and planning efforts in urban society. Unless their nature is adequately understood they are likely to be abused or their effectiveness reduced.

A classification system of day care services and an operational typology will significantly enhance understanding of what actually day care is and does. The development of a classification system is the same as the formation of a series of interrelated concepts of things under investigation. While there are several systems of classifying, they all have in common the aim to permit the largest amounts of information to be deduced from a given amount of other information. The wide variety and lack of uniformity of day care arrangements as well as the confusion and ambivalence surrounding them, makes some sort of typology and classification imperative.

Day Care Components and Classification

The task, however, is difficult and illusive. Neither the name of the service and the sponsorship nor federal regulatory requirements of funding and state requirements of licensing and accountability contribute presently toward a classification system. On the contrary, they are frequently confusing.

Names of Day Care Facilities: Day care services come under various names and take many forms: child development centers, nursery schools, day care centers, day nurseries, kindergartens, family day care homes, family day care systems, Headstart programs,
before-and-after-school care, group day care and day camp programs; all come for licensing or regulatory purposes under the generic term "day care" which also includes day care centers for handicapped children. The use of these licensing regulatory terms and definitions vary widely from state to state, within a region as well as from city to city:

"Day Nursery: shall mean any type of group day care programs, including nurseries for children of working mothers, nursery schools for children under minimum age for education in public schools, parent cooperative nursery schools, playgroups for pre-school children, programs covering after-school care for school children, provided such establishment is licensed by the State and conducted in accordance with State requirements." (Manhattan Beach, California)

"Day Nursery or Kindergarten: An establishment providing care and maintenance of 10 or more children separated from their parents or guardian during part of the day between 6 a.m. and 7 p.m. except a public school or elementary school having a similar curriculum and at least four grades, including kindergarten." (Norfolk, Virginia)

"Nursery or Day Care Center: A building used for the day care of three or more children whose ages are not less than two or more than 12 years." (Cincinnati)

"Day Care Center: A specifically designated day care facility which may be in a converted private dwelling, a settlement house, a school, a church, a public housing complex, or in a specifically constructed building. A day care center is usually staffed with a variety of people, depending upon the size of the center and the services provided. Day care centers serve more than 12 children."2

---

1Definitions in zoning ordinances of these cities; quoted in Hapgood, Ibid. p. 26.

"Day Care Facility: A day care facility may have as few as one child or may include several hundred. They include child care in one- and two-family dwellings, apartments (including high rise), as well as structures remodeled or built entirely for day care use. Facilities with accommodations for sleeping during some part of the day or night are also included."

"Drop-In Care: Short term day care provided on a transient basis. Drop-in care may be provided on a casual basis in family day care homes, group day care homes, or day care centers, or in special facilities for drop-in care such as college child care centers, or in conjunction with shopping centers, bowling alleys or other recreational facilities."

"Child Care Center: An establishment where five or more children under age six and excluding members of the family occupying the premises, are cared for. The term includes day nurseries and kindergartens." (Honolulu)

"Group Day Care Center: An agency or institution offering or supplying group care to five or more children who have not the same parentage, for a portion or all of a day and on a regular schedule more often than once a week." (Baltimore)

The licensing of day care services for children, in Massachusetts is regulated by Chapter 111 of the General Laws - Section 58-62 as amended by Chapter 719 of the Acts of 1962, Chapter 15 of the Acts of 1967. These licensing provisions in Massachusetts do not distinguish day care services in nursery schools, day care centers, or kindergartens:

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
Section 58. "Day care services for children" as used in sections fifty-eight to sixty-two, inclusive, shall include the services of any institution or place whether known as a day nursery, nursery school, kindergarten, child play school, progressive school or preschool, or under any other name, except a Sunday school conducted by a church or a summer recreation camp, which receives for temporary custody, with or without stated educational purposes during part or all of the day apart from their parents, three or more children under seven years of age and not of common parentage, separate and apart from their parents. The term, "day care services for children," shall not include: (1) services of kindergartens or nursery school operating as part of organized educational systems and; (2) services of kindergartens or nursery schools operated by a state agency, provided such agency certifies annually to the department that its services are in accord with the minimum requirements of the department as specified in section sixty."

The "Models of Day Care Licensing" report follows similar lines, except that it defines "facility" rather than "service" and suggests only two kinds:

"A day care facility is a "Family Day Care Home" or a "Day Care Center" which receives children for care, maintenance and supervision for periods of less than twenty-four hours unattended by a parent or guardian. Facilities operated to care for children during short periods of time while parents or persons in charge of such children are attending religious services are not day care facilities.""

While for regulatory purposes each facility provides "care" outside the home, the specific objective, type, quality, nature of this care as well as the social phenomena associated with

Ibid.
it are widely different and elusive. Conceptually, nursery schools, kindergartens, and Headstart programs are, among other things, "education-oriented;" day nurseries, day care centers, and day camp programs claim to provide a varied mix of custodial care, recreational and education-social experiences. "Day care centers" organized solely to meet needs of handicapped children present even further conceptual complexities.

But clearly the policies, standards and programs can neither be adequately deduced from regulatory or conceptual definitions, nor are they uniform to permit an elementary even typology. Moreover some names and terms add to the confusion because they are used interchangeably, as for example the term "Day Care Center" which is used in two different ways:

One, mainly for licensing purposes, connotes a system of service encompassing any and all child day care services; that is a "place" where child day care functions are performed.

A "Day Care Center" is:
(A) A place which receives children in a setting other than a private residence, or
(B) A place which receives more than twelve children.

This includes "Day Care Centers," "Day Nurseries," "Development Centers," "Nursery Schools," "Kindergartens," "Play Groups," and "Centers or Workshops for Mentally or Physically Handicapped" with or without stated educational purpose.

Some states, like Illinois, exclude from licensing regulations nursery schools, kindergartens or any other daytime programs operated by public or private elementary school system or secondary level school units or institutions of higher learning. In several states, such as Rhode Island, the licensing definition of day care centers conforms to that standardized by child welfare services, social and rehabilitative Services; excluded are those operations, although licensed as day care centers, designed to provide special educational programs to children with severe

---


learning disabilities. In Maine the definition of a child day care center includes any "house or other place conducted or maintained by anyone who advertises himself or holds himself out as providing care and protection for 13 or more children under 16 years of age, who are unattended by parents or guardians for any part of a day, except that any facility the chief purpose of which is to provide education shall not be considered to be a day care center."

The other term denotes conceptually a specific day care facility: the "Child Day Care Center" which is distinguished from other facilities such as nursery schools, kindergartens and other types. When "Day Care Center" is used conceptually as a specific facility it is difficult to differentiate it from a nursery school. Whether or not each of these day care facilities is or should be different and whether or not each has or should have a different structure or program is debatable. It is also debatable, but essential to determine, if each requires differently trained staff, and organizational pattern.

Nevertheless day care literature as well as practitioners in the field suggest that a Child Day Care Center differs conceptually (although not so for licensing purposes) from a Nursery school in that: 1) Its primary purpose is care and protection for longer day periods while a nursery school is concerned primarily with education for shorter day periods and as such is associated with the educational delivery system; 2) It shares with parents child-rearing responsibilities; 3) It may employ some kind of needs test particularly when only children meeting the specifications of public funding are admitted. These conceptual distinctions, however, do not seem significant or helpful in a service classification system. In service shortage they may serve as priorities.

Sponsorship of Services: Organizational sponsorship is also elusive and does not contribute to a classification system of day care services. Child welfare agencies classify day care facilities by sponsorship as:

- **Proprietor or Commercial:** consisting of large franchisers, but the majority being small independent operators who provide the majority of day care services and include mainly nursery schools and day nurseries.

---


2Section 31, "Rules and Standards for the Licensing of Day Care Centers for Children."
Voluntary: sectarian or non-sectarian, which include non-profit facilities usually known as day care centers or nurseries, operate in the setting of the sponsor such as settlement houses or churches, charging a sliding scale based on family's financial ability.

Public: local or state are customarily operated by private non-profit groups or municipal agencies. Relatively few programs are directly operated by public authorities in the United States.

Age of Children Served: No typology can emerge based on the age of children served. Infants, toddlers, pre-school age children up to and including 18 years of age (some authorities claim 14 years of age) are included. Although general clusters of services can be ordinarily associated with a specific age range, this variable does not provide a meaningful classification of services: the specific need to be met rather than age seems to be more central. Needs of infants (up to the age of three) are usually cared for in-home or in a family day care home. The pre-school group is generally served by day care centers which are designed for the three to six years old group. Children aged three to six need a full-time program. Day care for school-age children consists of after-school and vacation-time activities.

Federal requirements distinguish three major types of day care facilities: family day care home; group day care home; day care centers. This comes closer to suggesting a beginning classification system, primarily because some general performance specifications are included.

1 Another system of classification also based on the status of the sponsoring organization: 1) Entrepreneur; 2) Non-profit; 3) Church-related; and 4) Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO)-related. The problem of monitoring and of comparative analysis of data is formidable without a systematic classification system of services. In Massachusetts the State Department of Public Health licensing records classify sponsorship as a) philanthropic, b) proprietary, c) cooperative, d) public, and e) other.

The family day care home serves only as many children as it can integrate into its own physical setting and pattern of living. It is especially suitable for infants, toddlers, and sibling groups and for neighborhood-based day care programs, including those for children needing after-school care. A family day care home usually serves no more than six children in total; no more than 5 when the age range is infancy through 6. The groupings of children by age and number varies. (a) Infancy through 6 years: No more than two children under 2 and no more than five in total. (b) Three through 14 years: No more than six children.

The "Models for Day Care Licensing" Report provides the following definition:

Family Day Care Home: The private home of a person who takes care of children. Such care may be provided by a relative, friend, neighbor, or someone who provides care for children as a business. Family day care homes for 1-6 children, with no more than two children under 2 years of age.

The group day care home offers family-like care, usually to school-age children, in an extended or modified family residence. It utilizes one or several employees and provides care for up to 12 children. It is suitable for children who need before and after-school care, who do not require a great deal of mothering or individual care, and who can profit from considerable association with their peers. Although predominantly for school age children the age varies from three through 14 years. The groups may range up to 12 children but the child staff ratio should never exceed 6 to 1. Federal requirements stipulate that no child under 3 should be in this type of care. When pre-school children are cared for, the child staff ratio should not exceed 5 to 1.

The "Models for Day Care Licensing" Report provides the following definition:

---

Ibid.
Group Day Care Home: An extended or modified family residence usually having a section of the residence especially reserved for day care activities. One or several employees working under the direction of the principle caregiver assist in the day care activities. Group day care homes are limited to the care of 7-12 children.1

The day care center serves groups of 12 to 15 children. It utilizes subgroupings on the basis of age and special need but provides opportunity for the experience and learning that accompanies mixing of ages. Day care centers usually do not accept children under 3 years of age unless the care available approximates the mothering in the family home. Centers do not usually attempt to simulate family living and may be established in a variety of places such as private dwellings, settlement houses, schools, churches, social centers, public housing units, or specially constructed facilities.

The groupings of children vary with age: (a) In the three-to-four years group no more than 15 per group with an adult and sufficient assistants, supplemented by volunteers, so that the total ratio of children to adults is normally not greater than 5 to 1. (b) In the four-to-six years group no more than 20 in a group with an adult and sufficient assistants, supplemented by volunteers, so that the total ratio of children to adults is normally not greater than 7 to 1. (c) In the six through 14 years group no more than 25 in a group with an adult and sufficient assistants, supplemented by volunteers, so that the total ratio of children to adults is normally not greater than 10 to 1.

However, the federal requirements do not include all types of day care services or for

1ibid.
example Headstart or in-home care or the "family day care system" which is basically a coalition of family day care homes operating around a central administrative core to provide recruitment of homes, training of family day care mothers, central intake, supervision-consultation, shared equipment, and a central meeting place.\textsuperscript{2}

The "Model for Day Care Licensing" Report provides the following definition:

Family Day Care System: A family day care system is a number of family day care homes which operate as part of an organized system with the autonomy and accountability lodged in the central administrative corporation offering on-going training and supervision, a career ladder for family day care mothers, a focal point for parents to become involved in the system, and shared group activities for children on occasion.\textsuperscript{3}

Moreover the federal interagency requirements, general as they are, reflect a shifting orientation in quality and purpose from one type of facility to another, while gaps exist in the performance specifications. Requirements for children under three years of age in child day care centers is one example.\textsuperscript{4} In the absence of such specifications the type and quality of services varies from locality to locality as do minimum standards.

\textsuperscript{1} The aim is to improve the health and physical ability of children of poor families to develop self-confidence and ability to relate to others, to increase perceptive skills, to involve parents in activities with their children and to provide social services for the family in order that the child might begin his school on more equal terms with his classmates from other socioeconomic groups. Their performance characteristics differ from other day care facilities.


\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{4} The American Academy of Pediatrics is working with other national agencies to develop basic standards of licensing for the care of the child under three.
Funding: Conceptually and operationally public funding can be an effective instrument for the promotion of classification of day care services and quality standards. Yet the present complex, fragmented federal funding of day care services achieves the opposite.

Public funds appropriated for day care through various Acts relate day care services simultaneously to the educational, health, housing, model cities, welfare OEO programs, or programs for military families, for American Indians, for migrants and surplus food. Yet the size, scope and investment made possible by federal legislation is significant enough to contribute in systematizing day care services. For example:

The Social Security Act (as amended in 1967) provided in 1970 $109.5 million for child care through three major programs: Through Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Title IV-A Section 402 (a) 14: day care services were provided at a cost of $94 million, to 51,800 children.2 The Work Incentive Program (WIN): Title IV, Section 402 (a) 15: provided 60,887 children

1 For federal funding channels and programs see: Appendix G. Also "Day Care Jungle," and "Day Care Nightmare," Ibid.

2 The law authorizes grants to state welfare departments (matching on a 75% federal, 25% state basis: private funds can make up the 25% if channeled through the state public welfare department) to provide day care services to AFDC families, directly by State or County welfare departments, through contracts with other government agencies or private non-profit organizations, or through direct assistance to individuals. The program is administered by the Community Services Administration (created in 1969 of the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW.)

3 Operative since 1968, this program requires the states to place all appropriate adult welfare recipients in jobs or in training leading to jobs; and consequently requires child care arrangements for women in WIN. HEW makes available funds (85% of the child care cost for the first year and 75% thereafter) to state and local welfare departments which may then operate programs, contract for services, or give direct assistance to individuals for privately arranged services.
with day care services at a cost of $15.5 million (projected for 1971: 117,162 children at a cost of $40.3 million) through two different departments: Labor oversees job training and employment, while the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW coordinates the social service aspects. 3) Title IV-A: Funding is open-ended. 4) Child Welfare Services, Title IV-B: Section 422(a): At a cost of $1.5 million 15,000 received day care as part of child welfare services which were available to all children (demonstration of need not required), with priority given to those from low-income families and to geographic areas with the greatest relative need for the services.

The Economic Opportunity Act (As amended): 3 provided approximately $111 million: Head Start: 4 Title II-A, Section 222(a): 89,200 poverty level children received full-day care benefits at cost of $99,453,000 and its adjunct program, Parent and Child Centers: 8,853 children at a cost of $3 million.

1 The federal government reimburses states and private sources (on a 3 to 1 basis) for expenses for child services including day care.

2 Enacted in 1964 as part of the War on Poverty, the Act provides funds for several federal agencies including Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and HEW.

3 The program funded through federal grants (1/3 to 2/3 of cost) to state welfare departments is administered by the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW.

4 Formerly part of OEO and now administered by the Office of Child Development (organized in 1969) of HEW, this early childhood remedial program provides full-day, full-year day care benefits to children of "hard core" poor families.

5 Provides day care including physical examinations, vaccinations and compensatory educational instruction. The centers concentrate on children under three, but offer comprehensive services to their siblings and parents, training adults in the cognitive development and growth needs of young children. These child care and pre-school programs can be considered as part of Community Action Agency programs. Federal funds (80%) flow directly to the local level to local Community Action Agencies, (20% share usually in kind) which may run programs directly or contract for services with public or private non-profit agencies.
2) Concentrated Employment Program (Title L-B, Section 123 (A&B)): Under the Department of Labor, state employment services and local community action agencies, 9,000 children received day care at a cost of $7,466,000. Flexibility to transfer funds from one program to another or to combine aspects of various programs is impossible due to rigid regulations and procedures.

Licensing: Although child day care services are licensed in all states and territories except North Carolina and Guam, requirements for licensing are typically general, limited to essential components. Consequently they provide little, if any, clarity among the plethora of types, forms and programs. In fact in some states the day care operator may change his program once licensed.

Yet the potential of licensing and accountability as a mechanism to promote a classification and standards system is also considerable. Various forms of regulatory mechanisms (federal funding, state licensing, administrative accountability, building code licensing, accreditation, as well as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI) can provide leverage for uniformity and quality standards. But licensing presents limitations. A great percentage of family day care homes in Massachusetts and other regions are currently unlicensed.

1Day care funds are authorized in conjunction with a manpower training program for the low-income and unemployed in areas with serious unemployment problems.

2For detailed, comprehensive material on licensing, its potential and limitations:
   - Gwen G. Morgan "Regulation on Early Childhood Programs," publication forthcoming by Battelle Memorial Institute. Several ideas in this section were stimulated by this mimeo draft.
   - Edna Hughes, "Elements Essential to an Effective Licensing Statute," mimeo. Several ideas in this section have their roots in this work.

3By a public welfare department or a public health department or both, if the operators meet government standards.
Licensing family day care in Massachusetts has been the dual responsibility of the Department of Health and Welfare and the Department of Public Safety which uses group day care requirements to license family day care homes. It is not effectively established who should do the licensing, what are they licensing, and by which guide lines and under what authority they function.

Licensing in some states still pertains mainly to physical facilities and health protection, and only rarely are educational standards required by state law.

There is a distinct discrepancy between guidelines or desirable standards and actual field conditions due to lack of proper administration, adequate funds or trained licensing and program operation personnel. In fact, the Child Welfare League standards are rarely met due to lack of support funds and available personnel. The National Model Standards are attacked by some as too lenient and by others as unrealistically high. As a result, even the poorly established licensing standards are seldom met.

A recent report indicated that 69 out of 108 child day care centers in Boston for children 5 years old or younger fail to meet licensing standards. The same report pointed out that there is no "real commitment to delivery of child day care services from anyone in the city department"; this report also identified the labyrinth of licensing requirements from various city departments or agencies which act frequently without coordination with each other:

"We found lack of communication between the Fire Department and health departments requirements...It is time for the licensing procedure to be overhauled because the need for day care in Boston is so great."

Licensing authorities should "look at programs once in a while to make sure that places which keep children all day are giving more than custodial care."

---


Reflecting a situation typical in several cities regarding the need for city-wide coordination of licensing and requirements, the Commission recommended strongly that the Mayor establish an Office of Child Care to help private groups wind their way through the maze of zoning, fire, sanitary, building and public safety regulations. Above all, quality child day care should be part of the criteria for license renewal, the report urged. Current traditional means of licensing cannot be maintained without a drastically larger commitment to the regulation system. Alternative licensing procedures should be geared towards quality control, with emphasis on utilizing existing health and welfare components, through a central administrative core, acting as an umbrella for a network of facilities.

Toward a Classifications System

Clearly no classification system can emerge based solely on current names of day care facilities, their sponsorship, funding, general characteristics of clientele served, or licensing. Research efforts focusing on this problem will be helpful in clarifying the nature of day care services and enhancing its proper use and linkages with other delivery systems.

While there are several ways that this classification issue can be approached, a critical, empirical analysis of key variables associated with each major type of day care facility is likely to produce meaningful results.

For example day care facilities can be grouped into categories according to the suggestions of their operators who will also specify objectives and program characteristics. The data collected can then be analyzed to identify variables which distinguish one group from another, unravel empirically several intertwined characteristics and regroup the facilities accordingly.

The survey data of our study is analyzed in this manner with slight adaptations and inputs. We have already classified six facility types based on, among other variables, specific statements of facility operators regarding: organizational objectives, services offered, staffing composition, and enrollment. Testing for significant differences among the means (or variances) of the major specific characteristics of the pre-classified facility

---

1 D. Iatridis and L. Ware, Report #2: Day Care Centers in Massachusetts; in "Child Day Care in Our Urban World" Study, D. Iatridis, April 1972, Institute of Human Sciences, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts.
types will provide empirical grounding for a classification typology: significant differences among specific characteristics may suggest different orientations, and areas of no difference can be explicated more clearly. Even simple cross-tabulation and factor techniques may provide a powerful insight into how the characteristic variables associate themselves into major areas of concentration. Testing for significant differences and respecification based on specific characteristic concentrations may lead to a reasonable, broad-based empirical typology.
IV. IMPLICATIONS OF DAY CARE RELATED LEGISLATIVE TRENDS

Enacting Day Care Legislation

A combination of at least four major factors might prove critical for enacting legislation and securing adequate appropriations for quality, universal services for all children and families:

1) The costs for quality child day care on a nationwide basis far exceeds public funding tradition in this country. While reliance on the private sector for quality day care is problematic.

2) Present allocation of national resources and budget priorities do not favor human development as compared to military and defense objectives. Reshuffling of national priorities and skillful political and legislative interventions will therefore be required to change national investment patterns and appropriate funds for a quality child day care program.

3) There is abundant evidence already that several legislators and administrators perceive and support child day care services as merely instrumental for solving welfare issues. This favors investment limitations and in turn custodial child day care on a nationwide basis.

4) There is a need for systematic research both interdisciplinary and long range, to clarify child day care and its implementation in ways that enhance sizable national investment.

Nevertheless, in the early 1970's legislation of child day care will probably supply a broad-based authorization for some kind of universally available, nationwide network of day care services primarily federally supported.

Controversial Policy Issues

The fundamental question concerns the nature and quality of day care to prevail. If present legislative proposals are any indication of what is likely to prevail and what the mood of the country is, then there are several controversial issues which will by and large determine the answer to this question.

One of these issues is the social policy implications of the requirement that AFDC mothers get off welfare and join the labor market. This does not only represent a distinct federal social policy shift in the late 1960's from the earlier explicit social objective which was to keep mothers out of the labor force and in the home to raise their children, but is also punitive and can affect the quality of day care services while limiting their scope to low income families.
Another issue concerns the reliance of child rearing upon extra parental, community-wide institutions: in this case, a federally supported, universally-available group day care service system. Community-wide and local community-directed day care services may provide a distinct shift of child rearing from traditional patterns. Its effect, positive or negative, upon social organization, upon the family social institution and upon future generations should be a research target of both behavioral and social scientists who are concerned with national social policy analysis and formulation. Community-wide group day care can become not only an effective instrument of income redistribution through service subsidy to lower income families, but also a social institution which may serve to enhance or inhibit child rearing practices and value-orientations of future citizens and leaders.

The third policy issue concerns the nature of the delivery system to provide day care services and particularly its focus of control and direction.

All three policy issues are interrelated. A brief, critical review of central legislative efforts provides helpful insights in this context.

A. Day Care in Welfare-Workfare

Almost all recent day care related legislative proposals can be grouped into two fundamental orientations.

One attempts to cast day care services in the child development context designed to meet primarily needs all children share in a local community development frame work.

The other casts day care services in the mold of welfare designed primarily to achieve reduction of welfare expenses with state and local governments assuming major control of the operation.

Recently the House, as part of the two-year continuation of the Anti-Poverty Bill, passed new legislation on child-develop ment programs (the Child Development Act of 1971)\(^1\) co-sponsored by Representatives Brademas and Reid, designed to make good President Nixon's commitment on April 19, 1969:

"So critical is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity to healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life."\(^2\)


\(^2\)Ibid.
This Child Development Act, the result of the resolution judged most essential by delegates to the 1970 White House Conference on Children, was passed by the Senate, approved by the House, and vetoed by the President. It would have created a vast new program of child day care and other services for children of all income levels in all communities with a population of 5,000 or more. It constituted a coordinated network of universally available, publicly financed, locally controlled quality child care programs with decisive parental policy involvement.

Patterned largely after the Headstart Program for the poor, this Child Development legislation which was supported by a broad coalition and formulated in consultation with over 20 child development organizations, would have created a far broader preschool program of child day care, medical, nutritional and social services for children from all walks of life in locally run centers. Services were to be given free to the poor, that is, children of families with incomes of up to $4,320 a year for a family of four. Those above that income level were to be charged fees based on ability to pay. Those from families with incomes of up to $6,600 would have paid 10% of their income over $4,320. There would have been an additional levy of 5% of income for families earning from $5,910 to $6,960. Above that income level fees would be set by HEW.

Child Development Centers would be operated by states, cities, frequently in combinations of local communities, Indian tribal councils or private non-profit organizations. Priority would be given to working mothers. Child Development Councils, in which parents would be heavily represented, would have an important part in supervising the child development centers. The federal government would have paid up to 80% of the costs. While only $2 billion would be authorized for the first full year of operation to have started July 1, 1973, the ultimate cost would have been far greater. The Brademas-Reid bill cast day care in the child development mold and provided voluntary day care for parents in equal partnership with professionals in integrated centers with comprehensive services. 1

In his veto of the Child Development Act of 1971 the President stated: "Neither the immediate needs nor the desirability of a national child development program of this character has been demonstrated." 2

---

1 Senators W. Mondale and G. Nelson have introduced a new bill similar to this vetoed last year. Senator Javitz is also introducing a new day care bill.

2 Ibid.
The validity of this statement has been challenged by several child development organizations and professional conferences. Little, however, was said about the fact that while the Child Development Act of 1971 cast day care in the child development mold, the Administration's "Welfare Reform" bill (H.R.1) cast child day care in the welfare mold limited to a very special category, namely, children of mothers of the lowest income levels. If and when the mother succeeds in escaping the poverty classification, there is no further assistance for child care.

Yet the President's veto message pointed out that the needs of children would be more adequately met by certain provisions in the "Welfare Reform" bill. The Brademas-Reid bill would have improved the "day-care-in-the-welfare-mold" feature of the President's "Welfare Reform" bill which was passed last June by the House and is now pending in the Senate. Clearly the "Welfare Reform" (H.R.1) bill is designed mainly to reduce public assistance expenditure rather than help children. Its motivation was mainly to reduce the public welfare bill, not to provide for child welfare. In fact, it provides little, if any, choice to the mother regarding day care while the Child Development Act proposed a system of totally voluntary day care for parents.

The Administration's initial "Welfare Reform" legislation, which provided $750 million a year and increased child day care facilities for welfare recipients and the working poor, would replace the present AFDC program with two new family programs: The "Opportunities for Families Program," and "Family Assistance Plan." Because the lack of child care facilities is often reported as an important barrier to employment of many AFDC mothers, the two new family programs provide a major expansion of present child care services. About half of the $750 million (including $50 million for the construction of new facilities) in the initial "Welfare Reform" proposal is already being spent under scattered federal efforts ($300 million is appropriated for this purpose under the present AFDC program.) Free child day care will be provided to working parents with less than $4,300 income. A welfare mother could be eligible for care only by taking a job or entering training for one. The President has also proposed in his tax bill that families between $4,300 and $6,300 income can take tax deductions for certain amounts they spend on day care; if both parents are working all of what they spend on day care can be deducted.

A bill almost identical to this administration's proposal passed the House last year. Early in December 1971, Congress passed and sent to the President a bill requiring most able-bodied welfare recipients to sign up for work or training so as to continue
receiving benefits. The "must work" requirement would become
effective next July 1.

It was sponsored by Senator Herman Talmadge, Democrat
from Georgia, and was added to a routine bill dealing with lump-
sum death benefits for Social Security beneficiaries. It requires
all AFDC recipients to register for work or training unless they
are children under 16, are ill or elderly, are mothers with children
under 6 years of age, or are required to care for an incapacitated
member of the household. The federal government would finance
100% of the cost of public service jobs for employable adults in
local or state government agencies (75% in the second year and 50%
in the third year). It would also pay 90% of the costs of child
day care or other "babysitting services" for children of working
mothers.

This language of the bill confirms what child day care
frequently means when cast in the welfare mold, and when federal
legislation does not provide for quality standards. The language
of the bill assures that all and any custodial day care arrange-
ments are accepted, without concern for educational and social
development components. Clearly the objective of this bill, which
will affect mostly AFDC recipients (more than 10 million, mostly
children) in financing universally available child day care is
again to reduce expenditure of public assistance, to serve the
work ethic, rather than provide family welfare and child day care
services.

In February 1972 the Senate Finance Committee went
behind closed doors to draft a bill of its own. In spite of
the weird legislative history of the recent "welfare reform"
proposals, the administration's objective in 1972 as opposed to
the initial proposals seems:

1) to emphasize more work requirements as opposed to
the earlier emphasis on work incentives, and therefore to place
more emphasis on available day care services as an instrument
of workfare;

2) to place less money directly to poor families, the
earlier 68 percent of the total is now decreased to 18 percent;

3) to allocate more money to services like job training
and day care, from 14 percent earlier to 28 percent now;

4) to increase payments to states from 2 percent to 18
percent of the new money under the current version of "welfare
reform."

1 For analysis of recent changes in the Administration's "Welfare
Reform:" J. T. Allen Study, Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.
This increases the potential control of state and local governments over day care. Implicit in this controversy are some central assumptions regarding the "mother-at-home" principle, and the workfare-welfare interface.

I. The Mother-at-Home Principle

Most existing and recently proposed legislation is based on a distinct assumption that mothers of pre-school age children (0-6 years) are critically needed at home; and therefore society's interests are presumably best served by national social policies and programs which enable her to remain off the labor market and at home to take care of her young children rather than seek employment. Even the recently proposed "welfare reform" legislation excludes AFDC mothers of pre-school age children from the "no work - no welfare" requirement. However, H.R. 1 "Welfare Reform" as passed by the Senate provides for gradual escalation of this requirement to include in a few years mothers of 3-6 year olds.

This represents a significant shift from the initial conception of child care legislation in this country. Behavioral and social scientists as well as social welfare administrators in federal agencies have long supported the "mother-at-home" proposition based on the harmful effects maternal deprivation has upon the mental health of children.

By the end of the Second World War the attitude of the Children's Bureau and of the "helping professions" (psychology, psychiatry, social work) was that mothers of young children in general, but particularly of pre-school age children, should take care of their children at home and not be encouraged to seek outside employment. This was also reflected in several stated federal social policy objectives including the enactment of the 1935 Social Security Act and the initial program of Mothers' Pensions and later Aid to Dependent Children, (now AFDC) which were explicitly designed to keep the mother off the labor market and in the home to care for her children. Those rare instances in which mothers of young children were compelled to work voluntarily (for example, national crisis, and war) the community felt an obligation to provide services to help parents care for their children with federal funds and state and local governments assuming the responsibility for supervising and maintaining adequate standards.

This was aimed at strengthening the child rearing responsibilities of the family and keeping the child with the family even though mother and father were absent during the day. It was the exception to this "mother-at-home" rule which was tolerated by society and then only under unusual, critical conditions. Likewise
maternal separation was considered advisable only under exceptional circumstances and only after professional judgment of child welfare experts.

The debate of the mother-at-home issue is nevertheless complex. It is difficult to discuss the implications of the mother-at-home tradition in broad undifferentiated generalities because the answer varies for different situations and depends largely upon social class, the kind of family, the child, his relationship to parents, his age, the problems involved, the length of separation each day, the time horizons chosen regarding socialization-acclimation, the options open, the substitutes available. Then the question is: "Their implications for whom?" the child - the mother - the family - society - or the father? Conceivably the implications and impact may be different in each case.

Hard facts and research findings are sparse particularly studies which, in assessing the impact of mother's absence from home for part of the day, include alternative substitutes.

From the child's developmental viewpoint and mental health, psychological studies of the effects of early childhood separation from the mother conclude generally that separation is harmful. On the other hand, studies on day care report benefits for the child and the family. The two conclusions are not contradictory, although they appear superficially to be, or have been considered antithetical by some. Parenthetically such assumptions may have slowed down wide acceptance of day care for all children and limited services to problem families; that is those who cannot cope with pressures. This discourages use of day care services for all families and focuses day care on social work or child welfare interventions.

The initial research which concluded that maternal separation is harmful has focused more on maternal deprivation during infancy and preschool age rather than on partial maternal separation during part of the day. Frequently in interpreting such results maternal separation was not differentiated from maternal deprivation. Day care is not related to maternal deprivation. In fact, day care is extra-parental support while the child lives with the mother; it provides additional, supplementary mother-family care in an appropriate environment in the same neighborhood; is only partial separation of brief duration, and is the result of a mutually agreed upon arrangement with parental participation, subject to modification when mother wishes.

The early research findings on effects of maternal deprivation and institutionalization contributed valuable child mental health
In the late 1950's and early 1960's it became evident that maternal separation is different from maternal deprivation and that brief separation during the day provides benefits under certain conditions. For example, Yarrow\(^6\) pointed out the basic difference between deprivation and separation as well as the intermittent separation, as for example day care or maternal employment, may not have a harmful impact on the child. Siegel, Haas\(^7\) and Caldwell\(^8\) found relatively few behavioral differences between a group of babies reared by one mother figure and those reared by several.


Caldwell and Richmond\(^1\) suggested that carefully designed group day care for young children can incorporate all the advantages of the school model and at the same time preserve and enhance the child's primary social relationships with his family, decreasing parental strain. In order to test this observation they set up an experimental 25-children day care unit within the Department of Pediatrics of the Upstate Medical Center, State University of New York in Syracuse (HEW Grant D-156). Such demonstration studies indicate that parents of all social classes may need and want day care centers for infants and young children and that such centers contribute considerably to cognitive, social and emotional development.\(^2\)

In brief, the findings that day care arrangements, particularly those made in conjunction with parents, can give children attention, developmental stimulation, education, cultural enrichment for the child and relief for the mother,\(^3\) do not necessarily challenge the conclusion about the harmful effects of permanent separation and maternal deprivation.

In day care arrangements the issue is not where, but how the child is cared for, and the quality of the environment. Both in this and other cultures the mother-child relationship seems to be more important than where the child spends most of his day or whether mother works. For example, a recently published sociological survey of Soviet working women shows that those with professional skills appear to make the best mothers and the most efficient housewives.\(^4\) In brief, the results contrast with the view that career women often become so engrossed in professional life that they neglect home and children. Women with education and occupational skills, the study suggests, can combine harmoniously careers and family life. Interestingly enough, the survey also indicated that unskilled workers made extensive use of day care centers, while more educated women were found to derive greater satisfaction from rearing their children, and, consequently, tried to find time to do so.


\(^2\)Several research undertakings are now focusing on the components in a child's daily experience that are essential for high quality day care, such as the one conducted by Dr. Reginald Lourie at Children's Hospital, Washington, D.C. See also Marion Howard, "Group Infant Care Programs: A Survey," The Research Utilization and Information Sharing Project, the George Wash. Univ., Feb. 1971, Washington, D.C.


Quality, extra-parental day care can enrich the child's and family's life rather than harm it, particularly when the family lives in economic and socio-cultural deprivation. Then, the quality of extra-parental day care can become a "social equalizer" by providing the child with wider socio-cultural exposure, opportunities and challenges. In such cases day care arrangements are fundamentally needed and can produce amplifying beneficial effects on the child when provided in collaboration with the family.

While in general there is no contradiction between the harmful effects of separation and the benefits derived from day care arrangements, the problem should be formulated in more specific terms namely the impact employment has upon the welfare mother and her family.

The WIN program aims to move men, women and out-of-work youth 16 or older off the welfare rolls and into productive employment. The primary objectives are in the area of employment and finances, but the impact of this and similar programs on the family is also a matter of profound concern particularly when AFDC mothers are involved. Research findings focusing directly on the impact employment has on the welfare mother and her family are generally limited.

Moreover, these studies are based usually on one discipline or are narrowly directed to part of the problem, or make use of survey methods alone, or do not differentiate adequately between poor and poor in welfare, or between effects due to the absence of father and those due to mother's employment. Gordon's study of the poor of Harlem compared public assistance cases to families not on welfare and found marked differences between the two groups in attitudes toward employment, integration into the community and adequacy role performance.1 Unless these complex variables are differentiated, it is difficult to deal with the central question: when the welfare mother works, how does this affect the operation of her home, the care of children, her mobilization of community resources and her self-perception.

Nevertheless, several studies have contributed insights in this debate. Sociological surveys of welfare women (Podell)\(^1\) psychologically oriented studies of working women (Roy, Petersen)\(^2\) and of maternal employment and personality of the child (Nye)\(^3\) and studies by economists with emphasis on women's entry into the labor force.\(^4\)

Tentative conclusions from literature on the effects of maternal employment on children within different groups indicate that maternal employment increases juvenile delinquency in middle class homes, but not in lower-class homes;\(^5\) part-time employment is more beneficial than either no employment at all or full-time work; the effects of maternal employment differ for boys and girls and that there are different effects on different age children; the mother's attitude toward employment seems to be more important although the research in this area is sketchy. There is more speculation and less research about working women and their families; particularly how the mother's working affects positively some families and has a negative effect on others.

The absence of a male head of household encountered so frequently in low-income families is another methodological problem. Almost 75% of the families on welfare had no husband in residence in New York City in 1967 (Podell)\(^1\) and the effects on the mother and children have not been entirely sorted out. Combining the two roles of breadwinner-disciplinarian and mother-homemaker seems to create distinct strain (Buck)\(^6\).

---


Monihan identifies father absence as one major contributing factor to the high instability of the lower-class negro family. Other studies (Davis and Havighurst and Frazier) all indicate that some inadequacies and problems of children in low-income families may stem from alternately indulgent and repressive patterns of upbringing found in these families. There is abundant evidence that children and mothers in father-absent homes (most frequently encountered among AFDC families) suffer from special problems, although the nature of these problems and the solutions need to be more clearly delineated.

In brief, a national social policy which forces mothers of poor families to work is not based on research findings and facts. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence that society's interests may best be served when AFDC mothers are provided with (a) day care services of several kinds and (b) with a wide-range of options to select among alternatives (i.e. stay home, work, etc.) rather than be forced to use day care services and work or otherwise lose public benefits.

A le Chaterlier - strategy of making available a wide range of free community-wide day care service options but not forcing AFDC mothers to work, will enable a particular family to choose on an individual basis what is best at the time, taking into account all special family conditions. While there is no evidence that separation is necessarily harmful, neither is there evidence that separation is necessarily so beneficial as to justify forcing it on all mothers and children. It will also permit individual preferences and choice regarding other societal values emerging in urban society, such as child-rearing, joining the labor force, training, education, cultural and other opportunities, family organizational patterns. Availability of options and availability of community-wide group day care facilities for all children as an extra-parental urban service with parental participation are appropriate in a pluralistic society where conflicting values are the rule rather than the exception. In this sense child day care services rather than being viewed as an ad hoc welfare device for emergency situations, or a program which "undermines traditional American values," can emerge as a necessary social urban institution serving contemporary realities.


Another central conclusion emerges from this debate: the quality of day care services to be provided to AFDC children whose mothers are now forced to work is of fundamental importance and may really determine the actual outcome of separation. Lack of quality day care arrangements will tend to either create or increase harmful separation effects on the AFDC family. Given the stresses usually faced by AFDC families and their problems, such effects are likely to have more amplifying results, and this makes it even more necessary that day care arrangements be of high quality.

2. The H.R. 1 Proposals and the Problems of Working Mothers

It has been argued that the day care provisions in the Welfare Reform proposals will contribute to the solution of day care problems faced by working mothers in general. But the day care provisions are limited to welfare recipients and are likely to increase the gap between day care supply and demand rather than help all working mothers.

Public attitudes appear to have been gradually changing from the mother-at-home tradition in favor of greater women's emancipation and work expectations. As urbanization increases and the importance of work grows, the number of women, and particularly mothers in the labor force has risen dramatically from 4.3 million mothers of children under 18 in 1949 to about 5.3 million in 1952, doubling in 1967 to 10.6 million.¹ In 1970 the number increased to 12.2 million. The participation rate increased in this 20-year span from 23 to 41 percent² or a growth rate of nearly 3.5 percent.

This change has had direct effect upon the kind and quality of child care provided by the family as a social institution. It also accentuates the role and need of community-wide day care services in an urban society which must provide innovative mechanisms for needs created by societal changes. Without these innovations the quality of child care is affected.

¹American Society of Planning Officials, Nurseries and Day Care Centers, Planning Advisory Service Report No. 55 (Chicago: ASPO, October, 1953, p.3)

For example, the 1968 publication of the Children's Bureau of HEW reported that 12.3 million children, under 14, of working mothers were cared for in various ways, but basically 72 percent of these children were not cared for by their mothers: 1) the largest number (5.6 million or 46 percent) were cared for in their own homes by someone other than the mother; this included a father, an older sibling under the age of 16, an elderly grandparent over 65, or some relative or non-relative. 2) Sixteen percent of the children were cared for away from home by someone other than the mother. 3) The mother was responsible for the care of 28 percent of the children; but thirteen percent of these children were looked after by the mother while she was working, and the mothers of the other 15 percent worked only during their children's school hours. 4) Group day care arrangements were made for only two percent of the children. 5) Eight percent received no care whatsoever as they were left alone to look after themselves.

This and other studies suggest that high quality service of early childhood programs and care of children is scarce and community day care facilities lacking. But the work requirement for AFDC mothers designed to reduce public expenditure will not provide day care services to the increasing number of women in the labor force in urban society, nor will it improve significantly the present conditions of child rearing in this country.

The day care arrangements in the 'Welfare Reform' proposals are limited to the very poor, do not assure quality standards for day care and give state and local governments prominent control over the day care services it will support. Moreover, the legislation gives the welfare mother no freedom of choice, a fundamental prerequisite in a democratic society.

The restriction to lower income groups is also bound to create child day care centers segregated by income and color, undermining one of the most critical social objectives in this country. There is already evidence that such segregation takes place in day care centers. The 'Welfare Reform' plan is likely to increase segregation of the poor in day care centers and suggests wide use of proprietory day care operations.

---


3Report by M. Keyserling for the National Council of Jewish Women based on visits to 450 centers reveals that most centers are "amazingly segregated by income and color." April 1972.
3. Community Related Group Day Care and Child Rearing Tradition

Child-Rearing Responsibilities

The creation of universally available, publicly financed, completely voluntary, comprehensive group day care services for all children seems a most appropriate societal response.

Yet in increasing reliance of child rearing on community-wide, extra-parental group day care arrangements may represent a shift from the family approach to socialization and acculturation in this country. When the Brademas-Reid Bill (Child Development Act of 1971) was vetoed by the President on December 9, 1971, he stated that it was:

"the most radical piece of legislation to emerge from the 92nd Congress," and that it would put the "... National Government on the side of communal approaches to child rearing over against the family-centered approach." The President called the measure fraught with "fiscal irresponsibility, administrative unworkability, and family-weakening implications."

Senator James Buckley stated that universal child day care "undermines the role of the parent and the institution of the family."

The prevailing socioeconomic and political ideology in this country centers around rugged individualism and depends heavily upon the family for the socialization or acculturation of the young child. Both pillars of this ideology-individualism and family-tend to view group day care as contrary to the social outlook they foster. The former is concerned with the possibility the individual may be submerged in the group (the relationship between individual and state rights). The latter views community control of group day care as an invasion in the traditional family tasks.

National social policies of several countries point clearly to the potential impact of group day care in attaining social objectives particularly in societies where effective, rapid

---

social change is required. Israel, USSR, Cuba, Sweden, and France have relied heavily on rapid, extra-family social change transmitters, such as group day care, to adjust to the environment as well as to implement ideological objectives. Whether for ideological reasons or because of the need to adjust to a new environment, traditional social institutions or past-oriented socialization mechanisms are not always best suited for inducing rapid, deliberate, future-oriented social change of the type usually required in a post-industrial society. Whether rapid or slow, social change depends largely upon innovative institutions to counteract powerful old ones, a fact advocated even in ancient Greece by Plato who in his "Republic" advocated control of the future society through special socialization-child-rearing approaches.

Social class values and attitudes may also trigger resistance to group day care systems. Parents of a given social class may become constrained by their class ideology on child rearing to use those group day care facilities which do not reflect their views about child-rearing and acculturation-socialization of the child. Moreover class attitudes may cause resistance to public group day care which tends to reduce class distinction and foster socioeconomic integration.

In brief, resistance to social change and the conflict inherent in arriving at a consensus on social objectives in a pluralistic society may be deeply rooted in the slow recognition of group day care in this country and may have produced distinct ambivalence about its nature.

An example of this ambivalence is the reaction of some government officials to the Child Development Act of 1971. Fears were expressed that it "undermines the role of the parent and the institution of family;" that the proposal would "sovietize" American children, brainwash young minds, or undermine mother-child relationship and traditional American values.2

---


2 Presidential Veto message, New York Times, Dec. 12, 1971: "Good public policy requires that we enhance rather than diminish both parental authority and parental involvement with children - particularly in those decisive early years when social attitudes and a conscience are formed and religious and moral principles are first inculcated."
These fears were expressed in spite of the explicit fact that the Act aims to strengthen rather than weaken family life; that it fosters quality day care which is designed to support family life, not to replace it; and it provides day care on a voluntary basis for the parents and children in an integrated, not separate, program.

It would be reasonable to assume that these fears would also include the risks generated for young children when the mother is forced to work and be absent from the problem-home she heads. Paradoxically, however, those who voiced this anxiety about the family-weakening potential of the Act - which provided voluntary participation in day care - supported at the same time legislation which forces the AFDC mother to use day care and work without considering her own family centered concern, her own relationship with the child and her responsibility as a parent head of the family for child-rearing.

The debate, however, does not only concern social ideology, but also the ability of society to plan and organize a rapidly changing urban environment. Ideologies do not only affect the organization of the environment, but are also affected by it, and by technological innovations.

Several environmental conditions have already affected the original tradition of individualism and family in this country and now exercise strong pressure for environmental adjustments and for expanded day care systems.

First, day care is now widely supported by a wide spectrum of interests and population groups and support mounts as urbanization increases.

Second, the high proportion of female population in the labor market.

Third, the changing role of women in society and of attitudes toward marriage, family or courtship.

Fourth, the evolution of nuclear type family and the weakening of family ties with relatives or friends, intensified by higher rates of geographic mobility, and the "man-on-the-move" syndrome of urban society.

Fifth, housing shortage, inadequate housing conditions, lack of or insufficient community facilities at the local neighborhood level, overcrowding, all generate an acute need for
extra-parental child rearing support through high quality group
day care.

Sixth, social human survival largely depends upon adapta-
tion to rapid social change and a future-oriented predisposition
which, in turn may well require adequate preparation and accultur-
ation of new generations through the school system and extra-parental,
supportive group programs.

In brief, group day care is not antithetical to the pre-
vailing urban environment or way of life. It is the outcome rather
than its cause. Moreover, group day care can be designed to strength-
en and supplement social development tasks of the family and pre-
serve individualism rather than destroy it.

The central issue is how day care can best accomplish it; how can parent-community collaboration at the local residential
level be achieved, and how day care can be coordinated with other human service delivery systems.

Community Control

Inherent in this debate is basically the problem of
a) who determines the nature of the impact day care services will have upon American children; and b) who controls a universally available day care service system. The dilemma is similar to that experienced earlier in the educational system.

Who should decide the nature of the day care service? The parents, the community, the experts (and, if so, from what field?), the local government, the state, the politicians and legislators? The federal bureaucracy? It is frequently suggested that all should play a role; this seems a reasonable proposition which, however, is difficult to be implemented. The key issue is who decides what, when and how. Then the coordination problem can be both formidable and crucial. A few brief observations are useful.

First, local community and parent control of day care services emerges clearly as a dynamic necessary, (although not sufficient) ingredient of the control formula. However, the way to achieve it is less clear in a complex urban environment and its implications for various population groups and constituencies can be both conflicting and elusive. Neither the concept of "community" not of "parents" or of "control" are sufficiently explicit. In fact, their meaning is elusive in practice. For example, who is the local community? The elected representatives? A large neighborhood group? A council of as-
sociations? Then how big territorially should an area be to be
considered "the community" qualifying for control? Would a small, neighborhood qualify for control? If so, why? And how would this neighborhood exercise such control? Moreover, there can clearly be several neighborhoods in close proximity of different population mixes (economic, racial, ethnic, religious) which may advocate different hidden or open agendas for a day care service orientation. Which one prevails?

Therefore what is the local community and who represents it at a given geographic level and time is a complex issue to be resolved even before the more general question of local community control is settled.

The concept of "parents" requires similar clarification. Parents residing in the community? Parents whose children receive day care services? Both group of parents? Moreover, at the local community level it is conceivable that parents may be black, chicanos, white, in general they may belong to different minority groups. Should then this be taken into account in defining "parents"? How? There are also poor and rich families; should they both be represented?

The concept of "control" can be equally complex. What is precisely meant? A wide range of things are usually implied. On the one end of the spectrum control may mean absolute power by parents to make all decisions and on the other end of the spectrum it may mean a token consultation or prior notice of decisions to be made. In-between these two ends there are several variations as for example veto power, participation in the decision-making on all aspects; participation in the decision-making in only certain issues, approval (rather than participation) of decisions already made, or various forms of consultation or ratification.

Second, the concept of control relates to the nature of the day care influence and the means through which it can be exercised. For example does control by parents mean no national social policy objectives? Where is the dividing line between private-public responsibility for child rearing?

Does parent control mean that they have the majority in a board of directors of a day care service operated by public funds? Does such a board have authority to hire and fire the director and the staff or formulate the "curriculum"?

At the 1970 White House Conference on Children and Youth, the Task Force on Delivery of Developmental Child Day Care
Services recommended that parents of enrolled children in publicly financed day care facilities should: 1) control the programs, b) occupy half of the places on the governing body, c) should have the power to hire and fire the director and participate in the selection of other staff, d) should control local distribution of all funds, community planning and coordination, e) play a role in the flexible administration of standards, licensing and monitoring of programs.

Opposition to local and parent control may come from two broad sources: One is the professional day care staff; and the other may come from those concerned with ethnic, racial and economic integration.

Some professional staff fear "excessive" parent or community control and argue that parents and non-experts should "participate" and "collaborate" in day care planning but cannot and should not make decisions which require higher formal education and expertise in such areas as child development, education, learning, social adjustment, or health planning. Parenthetically a major, as yet unsettled problem concerns the diversity of disciplines involved in day care. For example there is no wide agreement regarding the nature of day care and the role of these disciplines can and should play in day care.²

Others fear that local community control in urban neighborhoods may mean inevitably segregation and increased class-conflict. Minorities in urban ghettos have demanded local control to pursue their cultural and value system orientation; they view it as a matter of their culture's survival in a social system which they consider basically hostile to their existence and growth. Local control, then, may well mean the dominance of one minority group or culture rather than integration.

Minorities and militant representatives in urban ghettos counter integration propositions by pointing out that their children must know and be proud of their heritage and culture before they can collaborate on equal terms in a more integrated broader system. Black creativity and vitality cannot be nurtured, ²

¹Report to the President, Ibid p. 288.
²Psychologists, educators, social workers, mental health, health experts, teachers, psychiatrists, recreational staff, counsellors of various kinds, paraprofessionals, all are usually involved in one way or another in day care services.
they claim, in white social institutions. Consequently, control must rest locally with minority parents rather than with the representatives of an economic and social system which oppresses the minority and destroys its group-cultural identity. The Black Child Development Institute¹ as well as organizations representing minority groups oppose government involvement in the administration of public funded day care programs.

Others, use paradoxically the same or similar arguments to suggest that only federal control can meet the needs of all children in an integrated manner and can avoid local conflicts. They point to the local conflicts experienced in some Community Action Programs based on maximum feasible participation of minorities in inner cities.

4. AFDC The Target of Day Care-Workfare

A combination of factors made AFDC mothers and day care a combined focus of administrative concern and of a legislative day-care-workfare partnership. Literature on the subject is extensive. Two regional Social Welfare Research Institutes established by SRS of HEW have recently published comprehensive, state-of-the-art reports, one on Work-Welfare and the other on Research in Public Welfare;² both summarize conceptually major projects and related findings on AFDC workfare.


The concern stems mainly from the size of the AFDC program, combined with the work ethic\(^1\) and certain assumptions about the behavior of AFDC families.

AFDC is the fastest growing income support program: from 2 million in 1950 to 3 million in 1960 to over 10 million in April, 1971.\(^2\) At the same time it is the most expensive ($5.3 billion of the total, $9 billion for all programs) and most widely criticized of the present income support programs. Almost all elements of American society have criticized it for various reasons: Benefit levels vary widely from state to state and are insufficient everywhere; as structured in many states, the program encourages family breakups; the program structure contains little incentive for recipients to work; most of its recipients are viewed as "lazy loafers" who could be employed if they wished to be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number of Recipients (millions)</th>
<th>Benefits Total (millions)</th>
<th>Federal (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Age Assistance (OAA)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>1,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to Blind (AB)</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to the Permanently and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally Disabled (APTD)</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to Families with Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (AFDC)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5,343</td>
<td>3,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9,028</td>
<td>5,243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)"It is the sweat and labor of generations past and present that have brought us to where we are today, that have piled high the wealth that enables us to be among the most generous nations in history" said the President when he signed the "No Work - No Welfare" bill; New York Times, December 29, 1971, p.14, cl. 4.


AFDC is also the program which includes the greatest number of families with psychosocial problems such as desertion, alcoholism, divorce, prostitution, emotional problems; all of which do little to enhance employment potential while at the same time provoke negative responses toward these heads of households.

5. Limitations of AFDC - Workfare Strategy

Workfare as a general strategy has fundamental value given a market economy; but it has also real limitations when misplaced or exclusively relied upon to reduce welfare expenditures.

First, work as a solution to poverty is more effective when it increases job opportunities at the right time, place and wages, rather than when it is enforced as a punitive reaction to assumed behavior of the poor. It is far less effective and limited for example when it is employed as a mechanism to reduce AFDC expenses or as a punitive instrument against individuals in poverty, or when it is generated by blame and concern with the morality of the poor, focusing on their behavioral characteristics. The "No Work-No Welfare" bill focuses major attention on the morality of the AFDC mothers and has the objective of instilling in them the work ethic, rather than addressing the problem of societal structure and market mechanisms which generate unemployment.

National social policy formulation pays more dividends when it is focused on the etiology of poverty and the inadequacies of the public welfare system which is in urgent need of reform. Parenthetically, the public assistance programs were initially instituted as an emergency measure designed only for temporary use. Since then almost all elements of American society have criticized the welfare system recognizing that poverty is a national problem requiring a national solution and that the present system is anachronistic and inadequate for either preventing or alleviating poverty in an urban society.

Second, workfare as a strategy to reduce welfare rolls is based on certain popular myths about poverty, the poor and their characteristics or attitudes. Recent legislative measures like the "No Work - No Welfare" bill, as well as recent political strategies, reflect such traditional attitudes toward the poor and workfare. For example, the "No Work-No Welfare" bill was praised as promoting the work ethic and punishing "lazy loafers" welfare recipients:
"To those who divide the work ethic, Americans must respond that any job for an able-bodied man is preferable to life on the public dole..."

"We are a nation that pays tribute to the working man and rightly scorns the freeloader who voluntarily opts to be a ward of the state... they (the provisions of the bill) reflect the national interest."1

But is the objective of the Bill to instill the work ethic in the AFDC family? Or should the objective rather be to increase family income and to offer a choice to the AFDC mother? Clearly the workfare strategy focuses mainly on the effects of poverty and on the victims as individuals with behavioral deficiencies ("freeloaders," "lazy," "inadequate deviants").

Blaming the victim and rehabilitating non-existing deficiency rather than eradicating the causes of poverty in the market economy is a traditional approach. But it now differs in at least one way from the old fashioned conservative ideology which attributed genetic effects to the poor: the new approach accepts environmental causation, as Ryan2 points out, making the victim's

1 New York Times and Boston Globe, December 29, 1971: remarks by the President upon signing the Bill.

2 W. Ryan, "Blaming the Victim," Pantheon, Pantheon, New York, 1971, p.7: "The old-fashioned conservative could hold firmly to the belief that the oppressed and the victimized were born that way - "that way" being defective or of inadequate character or ability. The new ideology attributes defect and inadequacy to the malignant nature of poverty, injustice, slum life, and racial difficulties. The stigma that marks the victim and accounts for his victimization is an acquired stigma, a stigma of social, rather than genetic origin. But the stigma, the defect, the fatal difference - though derived in the past from environmental forces - is still located within the victim, inside his skin. With such an elegant formulation, the humanitarian can have it both ways. He can, all at the same time, concentrate his charitable interest on the defects of the victim, condemn the vague social and environmental stresses that produced the defect (some time ago), and ignore the continuing effect of victimizing social forces (right now). It is a brilliant ideology for justifying a perverse form of social action designed to change, not society, as one might expect, but rather society's victim."
stigma acquired rather than genetic, but nevertheless a stigma.

In instilling the work ethic in AFDC mothers, work and earned income become the passport to survival, superior to other values: for example, any kind of work (even underpaid or unwanted or detrimental) is preferable to public assistance and the national interest is served best when the poor receive less and are penalized for their weaknesses; or the socialization of the child by the AFDC mother is less important than the mother's working.

Third, the AFDC workfare strategy is limited because a significant number of welfare recipients is not employable while available wages and jobs are insufficient to move AFDC mothers out of the poverty level or compelling conditions interrupt their employment. Whereas lack of work can create poverty, availability of work does not necessarily eliminate it.

For example, according to the 1970 census, of the 25.5 million poor in 1970 (two thirds of which were white and one third black):

1) More than half were children and old people (a third of them were under 14 and a fifth were 65 and over) and therefore not employable.

2) A significant number already worked, many full-time and year-round, and only about a third of their families were on welfare; they account for about half of all the welfare families in the country.

3) A disproportionate number of poor families - 1.9 million, almost two out of every five - had women as their heads (most of these families were white). About 7.6 million of all poor people in 1970 (almost one third) were members of such families; half of the 10.5 million poor children under 18 were in these family units.

Ample evidence points to the fact that only a limited number of persons in welfare are capable of working. It was estimated for example that out of the 7.3 million Americans on welfare, only 50,000 males may be capable of getting off, "even if every program, public and private, were adequately staffed and efficiently run!"

As more information about the participation of AFDC mothers in the labor force becomes available, it is more apparent that:

1) The personal motivation characteristics of AFDC mothers are less relevant than the cause-effect relationship inherent in job training and job work setting (Carter).

2) Contrary to popular belief, AFDC mothers do work, even though irregularly;2 marginally skilled women do find employment on their own and have a considerable amount of employment in their background as evidenced in Podell's 1967 New York study which indicated that 85 percent had employment exposure.3

3) Motivating AFDC mothers to work is irrelevant to those mothers whose histories point to years of hard work; hence identifying the best potentials in those mothers who want to work and a long term investment is indicated, will be more advisable.

4) The majority of AFDC women want work; their employment is frequently interrupted mainly because of pregnancy, illness, child-care problems and the end of a job; the welfare system becomes by necessity the source of economic support when the job ends in an irregular economy.

5) The potential for job development in the work environment open to AFDC mothers with marginal skill and children to care for, is almost non-existent; and support programs to sustain their participation on the labor force are either lacking or ineffective. Studies indicate that AFDC mothers seldom have high hopes for steady jobs with employment benefits, although they have strong aspirations for employment.


6) If the AFDC mother has the sole burden of earning income, her chances to reach a satisfactory level of living are dim, unless supplemented by public assistance or substantial upgrading by work training. Part-time work has been frequently suggested as a means to increase insufficient income and life satisfaction.

7) Many AFDC families are families in psychosocial crisis, a fact which also enhances irregular employment.

Consequently employment is not likely to increase or reduce welfare dependency.

Fourth, a central question is the cost involved and the number of AFDC mothers to become employable through training. It is not easy to answer these questions although indirect evidence suggests strongly that the provision of expanded quality day care services will result in the employment of a small number of AFDC mothers, reducing by very little the AFDC numbers over and above that which would have occurred by continuing present policies. Naturally the provision of expanded day care services will directly benefit AFDC children and families and will greatly contribute to the solution of problems: but it will not necessarily or significantly increase employment or decrease the welfare rolls. The employment dependency relationship is at times unclear. For example in recent years the unemployment rate has fallen while the dependency rate has increased.

The economic investment in training AFDC mothers for work if they wish is also highly desirable when on a voluntary basis. But again the costs of work training and expanded day care services combined is likely to be higher than the cost of continuing present, inadequate policies. Research studies indicate that:

1) Employment among adults in the welfare population in New York City in 1967 "would appear to be realistic for only nine percent".

2) The Advisory Committee to the U.S. Department of Welfare estimated in 1967 that 1/3 of AFDC families could become self-supporting if job training and child day care services were made


available.1

3) AFDC mothers wish the opportunity to choose between welfare and employment and would choose employment if their children could be cared for appropriately; lack of day care services was identified as the strongest obstacle to employment by AFDC mothers.2 Actually, however, there is no hard evidence on the number of AFDC mothers who will choose to use day care services, be trained and then employed for a reasonable period of time.

4) One study, using WIN experience, suggests that only 18 percent of AFDC mothers are likely to end up working after training and expanded day care facilities (Anderson-Miraglio)3.

In assessing cost and benefits a fundamental consideration should include (1) the economic costs to the Federal Government for providing training and child day care services to all AFDC mothers and their children; (2) the economic benefits obtained by the Federal Government through savings in direct assistance costs, savings in food stamps costs, and direct income tax received; and (3) the estimation of non-economic benefits based on known social, psychological, intellectual and other non-economic benefits likely to accrue to the child, the family and the community as a direct result of providing child day care. Costs-benefits can be at this point calculated solely on the basis of economic considerations for varied time horizons and AFDC populations (i.e., separately for mothers of pre-school age children and school-age children) arriving at different financial savings or increased costs as compared to present or other policies.


The Miraglio Study concluded that the costs exceed savings to the Federal government: Cumulatively over ten years the government will pay out $1.9 billion more than it would under present policy. Fundamentally the major cost is for child day care services for children under six which is expensive and is usually accentuated by the training cost for a large number of trainees who do not end up getting jobs.

If only AFDC mothers of school-age children were provided with training, work and child day care services, the costs would be slightly less than the investment over a ten year period.

The study assumes, however, that all AFDC mothers who wish to work or who could be referred to training and work, but haven't been because of the lack of child day care services, will now be able to participate in work or training. Another assumption is that a ten-year time horizon is appropriate for this issue. The study also assumes that the effectiveness of training programs will remain the same.

Several other explicit or implicit assumptions inherent in cost-benefit studies may affect the outcome as, for example, the number of AFDC families and their characteristics (number of children, age of mother, etc.); the labor force characteristics and availability of jobs; the nature of day care to prevail and the supportive services to be provided, as for example, meals, health care, or transportation; the effectiveness of training programs; the attitudes of AFDC mothers toward day care - workfare; the staff-child ratio; the proportion of child population to be included in public programs; the national priorities given to children, mothers and families.

B. Research Related Preludes to A Nationwide Day Care System

Research in child day care should fundamentally focus on central policy questions and contribute to the development of an adequate level of day care conceptualization as a prelude to a nationwide universally available day care service system for all American children. The nature and quality of most public programs is to a large extent determined by policy postulates and by answers to policy questions. Research can have the most amplifying results when focused on fundamental basic policy questions. Although it is difficult to provide quick and simple answers to policy making questions are essential because:

First, nation-wide programs must stem from basic tested and demonstrated postulates. This is particularly true of a nation-wide day care system which may have considerable effect upon child

---

1 Miraglio, Ibid.: (a) Training costs estimated to be $3,000 per person accepted for training. (b) Child day care cost: $2,000/child (0-6) and $600/child (6-12). (c) Earnings of mother estimated from the 1969 AFDC study conducted by the HEW National Center for Social Statistics.
development and upon the life-style of present or future generations. Second, the implementation of a nationally financed program depends upon sizable investment of competing public funds, the allocation of which requires a certain degree of demonstrable facts. Third, public investment in a national day care system for various consumer groups requires broad public support and must be responsive to their needs and preferences. Several specific issues for research have been outlined in Report #2 of this study. In brief, they can be grouped into several broad interrelated categories:

Nature and classification of day care services: Hard, reliable research findings are needed both on what the present nature of day care services is and what they ought to be. The development of an operational classification system of day care services will be instrumental in raising the level of day care conceptualization.

Identification and analysis of consumer needs and preferences: We need to know considerably more about the kinds of care several groups of consumers need and prefer; separately for children, parents, and neighborhoods. Various population groups and different social classes have distinct ideology regarding child rearing and acculturation of young children. Consumer preferences should be identified for a wide variety of day care systems and program mixes.

The expected impact and benefits of alternate day care systems: There seems to be inadequate national evidence as to what impact and benefits accrue from alternate types of child day care for various consumers as, for example, effect upon children of various ages; upon families of different socioeconomic status, particularly AFDC (Talmadge Act); upon different types of communities; upon major societal functions. Evaluation of current programs and demonstration projects are critically needed.

Assessment of future day care demand and need: Methods and research assessing future demand and needs are lacking. Little is known on what resources are currently available by type of day care services in geographic regions and what future needs will be if alternate types of legislation is enacted. The Talmadge Amendment is a case in point. Demand and need include not only aggregate slots in a region (as for example the State) but also geographic-specific location.

The day care service delivery system: Little, if any, comparative research findings exist regarding the most effective and efficient way to deliver universally available day care services.

---

1 Iatridis, N. L. Ware, "Report #2: Day Care Center in Massachusetts," in "Child Day Care in our Urban World" Study, D. Iatridis, 1972, Institute of Human Sciences, Boston College.
Should day care have its own delivery system? If so, what will the nature of this system be?

Should day care services be channeled through one or more existing human service delivery systems? If so, which one? Should they be mainly incorporated to the educational system? What is the likely outcome and cost in each alternative?

Cost-benefit considerations for establishing and maintaining day care services have not been explored. Little is also known about the cost of administering various types of day care facilities or their coordination as a system. Various cost alternatives for less expensive but high quality day care facilities and a delivery system can be explored. Experiments should be conducted on the advantages and disadvantages of alternate methods of payment by the consumer (voucher, vendor, contracting or paying mother to stay home and take care of child, if they wish) and the use of day care as service subsidy and in relationship to the present tax system.

Funding and regulatory mechanisms of the system: More effective and coordinated methods of federal and state funding should be explored. A distinct break from the tradition that each federal legislation is addressed separately to the needs of specific interest groups will enable day care federal funding to be consolidated. Perhaps they will enhance the emergence of the delivery system for day care services. The types of control at various administrative levels and the licensing system require careful investigation and study.

Staff: The qualifications and training of day care staff for different types of day care facilities and consumers is a central, complex issue. What training and characteristics are child care workers to have and what professional standards should they meet? What kind of educational institutions and what departments or professional schools can and should train day care professional staff? Are existing curricula appropriate?

The training of paraprofessionals in day care as well as their role requires also research and experimentation. The role of untrained or relatively untrained paraprofessionals has major implications upon quality, costs, employment of welfare mothers or the representation of parents from minority groups in local community.

The nature of research is also important. While traditional patterns and scope of research is essential, several day care issues call for long-term, highly specialized and more than one discipline based effort addressed to complex questions which cut across disciplines or functional domains. Considerable research should be comical but in context of local community structure and development. A system analysis approach to day care research is likely to prove more effective than traditional survey methods.
APPENDIX A

MASSACHUSETTS DAY CARE SERVICE REGISTRY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
**MASSACHUSETTS DAY CARE SERVICE REGISTRY**

**City or Town**

Name of Day Care Service ________________________________
Address ________________________________ Tel. No. ________________________________

Name of owner ______________________________________
Name of director ______________________________________

Licensed quota: ______ children, ages ______ to ______ years

Daily sessions:
- Full day program
  - Hours: From ______ to ______
- Half day program
  - Operated in: AM ______ PM ______

Number of days open per week ______

Type of license:
- Temporary ______ Regular ______

Date of license: ______

If operated for child with special needs (specify): ______

Are lunches brought from home? Yes ______ No ______
Meals served daily: None ______ Breakfast ______ Lunch ______ Supper ______

Type of service:
- Philanthropic ______
- Cooperative ______
- Proprietary ______
- Public (specify) ______
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APPENDIX B

APPLICATION FOR LICENSE TO CONDUCT A DAY CARE SERVICE

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
APPLICATION FOR LICENSE TO CONDUCT A DAY CARE SERVICE

The undersigned hereby applies for a license to conduct the following day care service for ___ children, ages ___ to ___ years:

Name of day care service

Street address of premises

City or town

Tel. No.

Street address of premises

City or town

Zip Code

1. Owner of premises wherein service is located:
   Print name(s) - no initials
   Home address (street, city or town)

2. Specify floor location and kinds of rooms to be used for children:

3. Category of Service: ( ) Philanthropic
   ( ) Cooperative
   ( ) Proprietary
   ( ) Other (specify)

4. Check whether applicant is: ( ) Individual
   ( ) Partnership
   ( ) Incorporated organization
   ( ) Unincorporated organization
   If individual or partnership, fill in Item 5 and sign 7. If incorporated or unincorporated organization, fill in Item 6 and sign 7. (Attach copy of charter)

5. If applicant is INDIVIDUAL OR PARTNERSHIP: (Married woman: include maiden name.)
   Print name(s) - no initials
   Home address, street, city or town, & tel. no.

TRADE NAME

Date filed

City or town

6. If applicant is INCORPORATED OR UNINCORPORATED ORGANIZATION:
   Print complete name of organization
   Address of main office (street, city or town & tel. no.)

Where incorporated

Date incorporated

Date filed

Operating name of day care service

OFFICERS OF THE ORGANIZATION: (If married woman, include maiden name.)
   Print name - no initials
   Title
   Home address and Tel. No.

7. I agree to assume complete responsibility for all business to be carried on in the premises for which I am making this application for a license and I further agree that all of said business conducted in said premises will be carried on at all times in full compliance with all Federal, Commonwealth, and city or town laws, rules, and ordinances pertaining to licensing of day care services.

Signature of applicant or authorized officer(s)

Title

Date
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Title

Date
K. Sample Budget: give complete breakdown of costs for 1 year's operation, detailing and justifying each expense. (If a line item is not applicable to your program it need not be included.)

Expenses

1. Administrative staff
2. Professional & para-professional staff
3. Non-professional staff, i.e., cooks, drivers
4. Fringe benefits & substitutes
5. Consultants
6. Space costs (rent, heat, elec, gas, tel, and minor repairs)
7. Equipment; fixed, consumable, rental, and special
8. Office supplies-equipment, stationary and postage
9. Food
   a. Food costs
   b. Kitchen equipment
   c. Kitchen consumables, i.e., paper plates
10. Transportation
    a. Vehicle costs
    b. Gas
    c. Insurance
    d. Garage
    e. Maintenance
    f. Field trips
11. Other operating costs
    a. Maintenance supplies
    b. Snow removal
    c. Advertising
    d. Parent activities, i.e., babysitting costs
12. Staff Training
13. Miscellaneous

Total

Receipts

1. Dept. of Public Welfare
2. Tuition Fees
3. Gifts and Donations (specify)
4. School Lunch Program
5. In-Kind Goods & Services (specify)
6. Other (specify)

Total

Cost per week/child
INDOOR AND OUTDOOR PROGRAM FOR THE CHILDREN

15. Is there a planned daily schedule of activity? Yes  No

16. Is this schedule planned in advance for a Year  Month  Other (specify)

17. Describe schedule of indoor activity

18. Describe schedule of outdoor activity

HEALTH PROGRAM

19. Give name and home address of service's medical consultant (physician), if any, licensed to practice medicine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street address</th>
<th>City or town</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. List the physician's duties to this service:

21. Do you use a health record form? Yes  No   If YES, please attach a copy

22. Attach a copy of your plan for handling medical emergencies. Where is it posted?

23. Do you have physician's written orders for emergency first aid? Yes  No

24. Do you have an organized plan for evacuating premises in case of fire or other emergency? Yes  No

25. Describe provision made for isolating ill children

26. Do the children eat at the day care service? No  Yes  Snacks  Meal
MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

27. Location of telephone (floor and room)

28. Equipment for children's use:
   Number of: Cots_____ Sleeping pads_____ Sheets or blankets_____
   Number of chairs (specify height)_________________________
   Number of tables (specify height)_________________________

29. Upholstery and curtains: type(s) of materials (specify)

30. List major play equipment by type and number of each article:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDOOR</th>
<th>OUTDOOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SANITATION

31. Water supply: Public_____ Private_____ Drilled____ Dug__ Other (specify)________
   If private, is well Driven____ Dug____ Other (specify)________
   Is hot water available? Yes____ No____

32. Sewage disposal: Public sewer____ Septic tank____ Other (specify)________

33. Number of toilets for children: Flush____ Other (specify)________
   Number of toilets for adults: Flush____ Other (specify)________
   Number of washbasins for children: Fixed lavatory____ Other (specify)________
   Number of washbasins for adults: Fixed lavatory____ Other (specify)________

34. Refuse disposal: Public_____ Private (specify)________

35. Food storage of perishables: Mechanical refrigeration____ Other________

36. Drinking utensils: Single service____ Other (specify)________

37. Eating utensils: Single service____ Other (specify)________

38. Dishwashing facilities: Machine____ Hand____

39. Ventilation: Mechanical____ Windows____
40. Provide the following information on all educational personnel employed by this agency. List below all directors, teachers, teacher's aides, or other educational personnel. (See over for other personnel.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF POSITION</th>
<th>EDUCATION (give dates)</th>
<th>EXPERIENCE (give dates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss) and Title</td>
<td>Date employed</td>
<td>Age group cared for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FLOOR PLAN AND DESCRIPTION OF INDOOR PREMISES

44. Number of square feet of usable floor space in playroom(s)____________________

45. Number of square feet of window space in playroom(s)____________________

46. Draw a floor plan for each floor of the premises used by the day care service. Show all rooms, including those for staff use, their dimensions (length and width) in feet, and uses. Indicate entrances, exits, windows, corridors, room used for isolation of sick children, and the location, description, and use of storage areas. A scaled drawing is not necessary.
APPENDIX C

OUTLINE FOR AGENCIES PROVIDING DAY CARE SPACES FOR THE
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
Dear ____________________:

In reply to your inquiry concerning payment of day care services under a contract with this Department, the following procedures apply:

1. Prepare a detailed proposal using the outline attached to this letter. (This outline is extracted from the Federal Inter-cency Day Care Requirements, copy enclosed.)

   Be sure to include in description of staff all non-paid staff, i.e., volunteers, trainees, or students. Note that these persons may be included when computing staff-child ratio. Include in the budget the dollar value of these donated services as "In-Kind Goods and Services."

2. Obtain a letter from the local Public Welfare Director screening to the need for the number of spaces proposed by your agency.

3. Provide a copy of your license from the Department of Public Health, or a letter stating the present status of your application for license.

4. In those cases where a 4C's Committee is operating, obtain a letter of concurrence from this Committee.

   It should be noted that the Department does not pay for the costs of construction, renovation, or major repairs to facilities being used for day care. Most food costs and some kitchen equipment for day care services are reimbursed by the State Department of Education under the school lunch program, at 182 Tremont Street, Boston.

   If further information is needed, please contact us in Boston at 787-512, 6104, 6019, or in Worcester 791-6281.

   Sincerely yours,

   Morton F. Albert
   Chief Coordinator of Day Care Services
   Division of Child and Family Services
I. OUTLINE FOR AGENCIES PROVIDING DAY CARE SPACES
FOR THE MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE UNDER
TITLE IV-A (See Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements
for details)

A. Definition of need in the community or neighborhood in which the
agency is located. Coordination with local U.S.O. would be helpful
in determining need.

B. Description of day care center; number of children in a group; staff
ratio; center location; safety and sanitation; suitability of facility
space footage; outdoor play area; transportation. (Floor plan if
available)

C. Early Childhood Education Program; state philosophy, concepts, goals,
and provide sample of daily activities.

D. The total number of children you will service; the number of AFDC
children under title IV-A according to the department priorities, age
range, hours, any other information deemed pertinent in describing
your program.

E. Social service as specified in Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements.

F. Health and Nutritional service as specified in Federal Interagency
Day Care Requirements.

G. Training of staff as specified in Federal Interagency Day Care
Requirements.

H. Parent Involvement (parent participation an advisory board) as specified in Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements.

I. Administration and Coordination of Program (qualification of Directors,
Teachers and other staff; specific salaries and salary ranges as they
relate to qualification, community involvement including participation
in 4-C planning.)

J. Self evaluation: use this outline
K. Sample Budget: give complete breakdown of costs for a year's operation, detailing and justifying each expense. (If a line item is not applicable to your program it need not be included.)

**Expenses**

1. Administrative staff
2. Professional & para-professional staff
3. Non-professional staff, i.e., cooks, drivers
4. Fringe benefits & substitutes
5. Consultants
6. Space costs (rent, heat, electric, gas, tel, and minor repairs)
7. Equipment: fixed, consumable, rental, and special
8. Office supplies-equipment, stationary and postage
9. Food
   a. Food costs
   b. Kitchen equipment
   c. Kitchen consumables, i.e., paper plates
10. Transportation
    a. Vehicle costs
    b. Gas
    c. Insurance
    d. Garage
    e. Maintenance
    f. Field trips
11. Other operating costs
    a. Maintenance supplies
    b. Snow removal
    c. Advertising
    d. Parent activities, i.e., babysitting costs
12. Staff Training
13. Miscellaneous

**Total**

**Receipts**

1. Dept. of Public Welfare
2. Tuition Fees
3. Gifts and Donations (specify)
4. School Lunch Program
5. In-kind Goods & Services (specify)
6. Other (specify)

**Total**

Cost per week/child
APPENDIX D

ENROLLMENT FORM
## ENROLLMENT FORM FOR DAY CARE SERVICE

### NAME OF SERVICE

### NAME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ADDRESS (Street and Town)

### HOME TEL. NO.

### FAMILY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>HRS. OF WORK</th>
<th>TEL. NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>HRS. OF WORK</td>
<td>TEL. NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUARDIAN IS: Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Other (Name and address)</td>
<td>TEL. NO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Any Other Person Who Will Care for Child in Emergency

### TEL. NO.

### Name of Other Members of Household with Whom Child Resides. If Children, Give Ages

### FAMILY PHYSICIAN OR SOURCE OF MEDICAL CARE (Name and address)

### IMMUNIZATIONS AND SPECIAL TESTS (Give Dates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smallpox (Results)</th>
<th>DPT</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>Polio: Salk</th>
<th>Sabin: Type I</th>
<th>Type II</th>
<th>Type III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tuberculin (Results)

### Other (Specify)

### MEDICAL HISTORY (Give Dates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accidents</th>
<th>Diabetes</th>
<th>Kidney Disease</th>
<th>Rheumatic Fever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allergy</td>
<td>Ear Infections</td>
<td>Measles</td>
<td>Scarlet Fever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken Pox</td>
<td>Encephalitis</td>
<td>Meningitis</td>
<td>Tonsillitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorea</td>
<td>German Measles</td>
<td>Mumps</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congenital Anomaly</td>
<td>Heart Disease</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Whooping Cough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convulsions</td>
<td>Horna</td>
<td>Poliomyelitis</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REMARKS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PHYSICIAN'S EXAMINATION (Positive Findings)</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>NOTES (State necessary modification of program)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL DATA (Optional)
APPENDIX E

CLASSIFICATION OF DAY CARE FACILITIES (SURVEY CRITERIA)
APPENDIX E

CLASSIFICATION OF CHILD DAY CARE FACILITIES

A. Criteria used to identify and separate child day care facilities among questionnaire responses

In view of the general nature of the term "child day care facility" used by the Massachusetts licensing office and the corresponding lack of identification of the child day care facilities in the state into categories of day care centers, nursery schools, kindergartens, family day care centers, etc., at the time of licensing, we were obliged to identify and classify the questionnaire returns before proceeding with data analysis. The criteria used to separate facilities into typological groups are the following (all and in combination):

1. Name of facility
2. Length of time the facility is open each day
3. Acceptance of children for full-day registration
4. Age of children
5. Existence of single-day session
6. Nature of services listed by facility
7. Comments at end of questionnaire response
8. Telephone calls to respondents whenever in doubt; also general spot checks.
9. Judgment by three researchers in panel

B. Brief Comments

This report focuses on day care centers. They were selected from all facility responses by establishing "acceptable" limits on various quantifiable responses related to the criteria listed (length of time open each day, number of full-day children, existence of single-day sessions, kinds of services offered, etc.). Criteria such as name of
APPENDIX F

SURVEY FACILITY CLASSIFICATION
APPENDIX F

SUMMARY OF FACILITY CLASSIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Day Care Centers</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nursery Schools</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kindergartens</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Special Nurseries*</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Combination Nursery School and Kindergartens</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Family Day Care Facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Miscellaneous**</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special nurseries are facilities designed for the children with particular handicaps, such as mental retardation, physical and emotional problems, etc.

**Miscellaneous facilities include returns with no identification other than possibly a name; those facilities specifying "inappropriate"--the questionnaire did not apply to the facility; and facilities that could not be classified under any of the general facility groups.
facility and comments by administrators aided greatly in this process.

The general "rules of thumb" employed by the research team in selecting
the day care center universe for this report are as follows:

1. Name of the facility: this was used most generally as a
tie-breaker; that is, where the contents of the responses overall
fit the day care center criteria, a name that also fit would
enforce the opinion to include the facility in the universe. We
were trying to list day care centers whether the centers saw
themselves explicitly in this way or not--if they already did
consider themselves such, all the better.

2. Length of time the facility is open each day: centers open
over six hours daily met the general criteria. Headstart programs
and a few other centers open fewer hours are included because
their scheduling practices met acceptable standards. Here criteria
three and five were weighted more heavily.

3. Full-day children: when full-day enrollment was present the
fact that the facility had half-day children also did not interfere
with a decision to include the facility. Here, full-day would
be taken in conjunction with scheduling and number of hours open.

4. Age of children: this criteria, by the nature of the facility
as a child day care institution, presented few problems. Only
the specialized centers (not included in the day care universe)
generally had children much older than the typical three to six
year group in child day care centers. Some centers did, however,
have older and younger children in their programs, but this was
the exception and not the rule.

5. Single day session: along with the full-day enrollment, single-
day session ranked among the most important criteria; where single-
day session was offered, the fact that a double-day was also offered
did not interfere with the decision to include the facility in the
universe.

6. Services offered: in addition to the preceeding criteria that
generally must have been met for inclusion of a facility in the
day care center universe, the responses related to services and
special functions (protective child care, early childhood education,
social worker and psychiatric consultation, etc.) served to separate
specialized centers from the general day care centers. For example,
those centers who worked primarily with mentally retarded children and
the physically handicapped were placed in a "Special" group for
later analysis.

93
7. Comments at end of questionnaire: as mentioned above, where doubts occurred concerning the first five criteria, comments proved extremely useful; this was especially true where incomplete information in the response columns or fill-in parts of the questionnaire existed. Comments sometimes answered the questions arising from these doubts.

8. Telephone calls and spot checks: where ambiguity existed as to the classification of a facility (with most all criteria satisfied generally), the facility was called and asked: "What do you consider yourself: Nursery school? Kindergarten? Day Care Center?" Based on facility response to this single question, respondents were included or excluded from the universe. In addition, where certain questionnaire items were incomplete, especially for the particular responses on which classification was based, phone calls were made to complete missing data.

9. Panel of judges: those researchers most familiar with all returns and the implementation of criteria for separating facilities would decide the especially ambiguous responses, where all other measures proved unfruitful.

Appendix F presents the final tabulation of child day care facility classifications. Only four per cent of all questionnaires returned could not be placed in a facility type using the criteria outlined for use in this study. Ninety-four facilities were placed in the day care center classification.
APPENDIX G

FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES
Federal funds can be received from one or more of the following programs:

**Title IV of the Social Security Act, A: Aid to Families With Dependent Children; B: Child Welfare Services; C: Work Incentive Program.**

**Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act — Youth Programs**

**Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act — Urban and Rural Community Action Programs — Headstart (Title II A, Section 27a, Concentrated Employment Program (Title II B, Section 123)**

**Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act, B: Assistance for migrant, and other seasonally employed, farmworkers and their families.**

**Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act, B: Assistance for Manpower Development and Training Act**

**Title V-B: This law authorizes 50% federal grants to industry and labor for day care programs. Congress has appropriated no funds for this plan and there is no administrative apparatus to implement it.**

**Section 522d: Coordination of Day Care Programs:** Under a 1967 amendment of the Economic Opportunity Act, Congress ordered the coordination of day care programs at the federal, state and local levels. An Interagency Federal Panel on Early Childhood was established in 1968 which developed federal day care standards and launched the Community Coordinated Child Care Program (4C): It tries to coordinate the various child care programs within the community to provide maximum use of available day care funds, staffing and facilities. Administered through the Office of Child Development, 4C receives only limited grants to cover regional administrative costs; it emphasizes voluntary local efforts and encourages formation of local 4C committees composed of public and private day care agency representatives and interested citizens which act as clearinghouses for day care information (clearly designed to eliminate some of the confusion created by the numerous federal funding sources, often with conflicting program standards and eligibility criteria).

**Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965: Title I Compensatory education pre-school programs for low-income children may be included under this section which provides 100% funding from the U.S. Office of Education to state departments of education and then to school districts and other public agencies.**
Miscellaneous Funds: The Department of Defense provides pre-school programs for military families; the Department of the Interior provides funds for American Indians and HEW for Cuban immigrants.

PHS Neighborhood Health Center funds may be used for construction which can include space for child care; Urban Renewal funds may be utilized to acquire land. Neighborhood Centers developed under the Economic Opportunity Act may include child care and also Community Mental Health Centers under NIMH. Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act funds may also be directed to Model Cities Agency to fund child day care or to be used as local matching funds for other federal programs.

The October 1970 publication of the Federal-State Appalachian Regional Commission, "Federal Programs for Young Children," and the forthcoming May issue of "Congressional Digest" describe thirteen federal child care and early education programs, in part as follows:

"Child Care Services - Title IV-A: Authorized by Title IV, part A of the Social Security Act, as amended, the program is administered by the Community Services Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of HEW. It authorizes and in some circumstances requires - child care as a service for families and children receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children. ...Grants are made to the public welfare departments of each State, which may extend services from the program to present, past, or potential AFDC recipients. Grants may be used for up to 75 per cent of total cost of child care services. They may not be used for construction.

Child Development - Headstart: Established by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, Headstart is administered by the Office of Child Development, Department of HEW; it is a comprehensive early childhood education program for disadvantaged preschool children and their families. Each program includes health, nutrition, parent involvement, and education components, as well as a career development program for teachers and non-professional aides who serve in the centers. There is also active volunteer participation from all age groups.

Preschool children whose families meet HEW poverty guidelines are accepted into Headstart, as also are up to ten per cent nonpoor children. Federal grants of up to 80 per cent of the total program cost are made directly to local community action agencies or other public and private non-profit agencies. Average assistance (as of October 1970) is $1,050 per child over the full year, $210 per child for the summer. Since its inception, an estimated 3.3 million children have participated in Headstart programs.
Followthrough — Authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act and administered by the Office of Education, HEW. It provides a program of comprehensive services — instruction, health, nutrition, social and psychological, teacher training, and parent and community involvement to help children from low-income families sustain in the primary grades the educational gains made in Headstart or similar preschool program.

Federal grants, authorized under several statutes, and ranging generally from 75 to 85 per cent of program costs, are provided. Eligible children come from low-income families as defined by OEO poverty line indexes, with at least half of the children required to be graduates of a full-year Headstart or similar preschool program. To give these children the opportunity to associate with children from other social and economic backgrounds, a relatively small number of nonpoor pupils participate in Followthrough classes.

Work Incentive Program — Child Care: Authorized by Social Security Act amendments and administered by the Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, HEW. It aims to provide child care services to all work incentive participants, aid to families with dependent children, mothers, or other adults needing child care engaged in training or employment. State welfare departments may include day care as a service to other families receiving AFDC payments and optionally may extend it to former and potential applicants and recipients of AFDC.

Foster Grandparents Program: Authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act and administered by the Administration on Aging, Social and Rehabilitation Service, HEW. It recruits, trains, and utilizes persons with low incomes, 60 years of age and older, to serve neglected and deprived children in institutional and community settings who can benefit from a close personal relationship with a mature adult.

Foster grandparents receive the equivalent of the Federal minimum wage per hour for an average of four hours per day, five days per week, plus a transportation allowance. Eligible children are those who are neglected, deprived, physically or mentally handicapped, from infancy through 16 years of age.

Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers Assistance: Authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act, and OEO-administered, it is designed to assist migrant seasonal farm workers and their families to improve their living conditions and to develop the skills necessary to lead a productive and self-sufficient life. Projects and activities designed to meet immediate needs include day care for children, education and rehabilitative programs, health services, improved housing and sanitation, consumer training, and counseling.
Federally funded up to 100 per cent of program costs through State and local public and private nonprofit agencies, the program limits assistance to education, housing, and child development activities appropriate to farm worker family members.

**Educationally Deprived Children:**

a) **State Administration:** This program, authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and administered through the Office of Education, HEW, channels Federal funds (averaging in 1970 some $220,000 per State educational agency) to agencies at the State level to provide administrative assistance to local educational agencies. Purpose of such assistance is to develop projects of compensatory education to children classified as educationally deprived.

b) **In institutions for the Neglected or Delinquent:** Authorized and administered as above, this program makes Federal funds available to local or State institutions (approximately 270 in 1970) operated primarily for neglected or adjudicated delinquents. Funds are used to establish, expand, and improve programs designed to meet the special educational needs of children residing in such institutions.

c) **Local Educational Agencies:** Statutorily based and administered as above, the program provides funds to supplement local and State funds normally spent on education of children residing in a school district, and must be utilized to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children in low income areas. Programs are administered through local educational agencies, and are designed to give special educational assistance to children whose level of educational achievement is below normal for their age and to help them overcome barriers to learning.

d) **Indian Children:** Authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, and administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of Interior, the program authorizes funds to implement programs to meet the special needs of educationally deprived Indian children in BIA schools.

e) **Migratory Children:** Authorized as above and administered by the U.S. Office of Education, it provides payments to State educational agencies for developing and carrying out programs (including food and health services in most instances) for educating the educationally deprived children of migratory agricultural workers.

**Handicapped Preschool and School Programs:** Authorized as above and administered by the Office of Education, HEW, this program activity aims to assist the States in the provision of special educational and related services for handicapped children at the preschool, elementary, and secondary schools levels. A nonmatching, State-formula grant
program projects carried out with its funds must have child-centered objectives restricted to those handicapped children within the specific categories listed in the statute. They may not apply to children in State-supported or State-operated institutions for the handicapped.

Child Development — Technical Assistance: A program authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and administered by HEW, this Federal activity provides technical assistance, coordination, and advocacy in the areas of: children's services related to health; programs for handicapped and retarded children; social services to children in their own homes; foster care for children; services to unmarried mothers; and community programs for youth development.
APPENDIX H

ACT REGULATING LICENSING OF DAY CARE IN MASSACHUSETTS
THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

AN ACT FURTHER REGULATING THE LICENSING OF DAY CARE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN.

Chapter 111 of the General Laws - Section 58 - 62

As amended by Chapter 719 of the Acts of 1962
Chapter 15 of the Acts of 1967

Section 58. "Day care services for children" as used in sections fifty-eight to sixty-two, inclusive, shall include the services of any institution or place whether known as a day nursery, nursery school, kindergarten, child play school, progressive school or preschool, or under any other name, except a Sunday school conducted by a church or a summer recreation camp, which receives for temporary custody, with or without stated educational purposes during part or all of the day apart from their parents, three or more children under seven years of age and not of common parentage, separate and apart from their parents. The term, "day care services for children," shall not include: (1) services of kindergartens or nursery school operating as part of organized educational systems and; (2) services of kindergartens or nursery schools operated by a state agency, provided such agency certifies annually to the department that its services are in accord with the minimum requirements of the department as specified in section sixty.

Section 59. No person shall conduct day care services for children without obtaining a license from the department. The department may delegate this responsibility to a local health department or board of health in certain designated localities provided such local health department or board of health thereof meets the requirements of the department for satisfactory standards, adequate staff and program for the carrying out of this activity, and consents to such delegation. A person wishing to conduct a day care service for children within such designated localities shall obtain a license from the designated local health department or board of health. The department shall determine a reasonable fee to be charged by it or by the designated local health department or board of health. All licenses shall expire twelve months from the date of issuance and shall be renewed annually. A temporary license may be issued to a day care service for children, which service has not previously operated. Such temporary license shall be valid for six months, and may be renewed once for a six-month period. No license shall be transferable. No license shall be issued or renewed unless the day care service for children obtains a certificate issued under section forty-nine of chapter one hundred and forty-three, stating that the building to be occupied by such service has safe means of egress, adequate means of preventing the spread of fire, and necessary equipment for extinguishing fire.
Section 2. A provisional license may be issued to any day care service for children which is operating on the effective date of this act, and which is temporarily unable to conform with the requirements for the issuance of a license. Such provisional license shall be effective for one year following its issuance and may be renewed for one additional year only; provided, however, that such license may be revoked for cause.

Section 3. The department of public health shall take any and all steps necessary from time to time to secure any benefits to which it may be entitled under any existing or future legislation of the Federal Government and any federal funds received by the commonwealth for day care services for children shall be used by said department in carrying out the provisions of sections fifty-eight to sixty-two, inclusive, of chapter one hundred and eleven of the General Laws, including the administration thereof.
APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER
Dear Friend:

We would greatly appreciate it if you would help in our work for children in Massachusetts by returning the enclosed brief questionnaire before May 1.

As you may know, Governor Sargent has given top priority to planning for daytime services to children. He has appointed an Advisory Committee on Child Development which includes representatives of Head Start, private proprietary day care programs, voluntary day care programs, and nursery schools as well as parents, professionals, and thirteen state agencies. This committee believes that planning should be closely tied to those programs which already exist. We do not believe that the state should by-pass or duplicate what is already being done. Your comments, and the facts about your program are of critical importance as a base for state planning.

This questionnaire is a joint venture by the Office of Planning and Program Coordination and the Social Welfare Regional Research Institute at Boston College. The Massachusetts Early Education Project at Harvard University is also cooperating in some aspects of mutual research effort. The information gathered and the conclusions will therefore be useful to several groups and will help those concerned with policy making for children at the state and federal levels.

The information on the questionnaire will be compiled statistically. If you prefer to return the questionnaire anonymously, you need not fill in questions 1, 2, 4 and 5 although we would prefer to have that information. In any case, please fill in question 3, the name of your city, as this is indispensable to our study. The questionnaire has been pretested in several Massachusetts day care centers and it should take about 30 minutes to complete. Prompt return of the questionnaire will be appreciated.

Any ideas or recommendations which you have for us will be very welcome. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Demetrios S. Iatrídís, Ph.D.
Research Professor and Director
Social Welfare Regional Research Institute

Mrs. Gwen Morgan
Executive Secretary
Governor's Advisory Committee on Child Development
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