

**REPORT OF THE
JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE STUDYING**

**Early Childhood
and Public School
Day-Care Programs**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



House Document No. 43

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1988**

MEMBERS OF THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE

Dorothy S. McDiarmid, Chairman
Stanley C. Walker, Vice Chairman
John C. Brown
Alan A. Diamonstein
Mary A. Marshall
Joan H. Munford
Frank W. Nolen
John W. Russell
Mitchell Van Yahres

CITIZEN MEMBERS

Catherine Belter
Alice M. Pieper, Ph.D.

STAFF
LEGAL AND RESEARCH

Division of Legislative Services
Brenda H. Edwards, Research Associate
Norma E. Szakal, Staff Attorney
Joyce Crone, Secretary

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL

Office of the Clerk, House of Delegates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Legislative History	1
Early Childhood Developmental Programs	5
Day Care Programs	8
Policy and Legal Issues	12
Activities of the Joint Subcommittee	17
Findings of the Joint Subcommittee	18
Recommendations	26
Conclusion	28
Bibliography	30
Appendix A	33
Appendix B	35
Appendix C	36

**Report of the
Joint Subcommittee Studying Early Childhood and
Public School Day Care Programs
Pursuant to HJR 299 and SJR 167
To
The Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia
Richmond, Virginia
January, 1988**

**To: Honorable Gerald L. Baliles, Governor of Virginia
and
The General Assembly of Virginia**

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The Kindergarten Bill of 1985

In 1985, House Bill 1753 amended §22.1-199 of the Code of Virginia to provide:

1. A rollback of the birth date for compulsory kindergarten attendance from December 31 of the year in which children reach their fifth birthday to September 30 of such year.

2. An allowance for the parents of children who reach their fifth birthday after September 30 and on or before December 31 of the school year to petition the division superintendent for kindergarten attendance. These young children are required to take a test chosen by the Board of Education to predict readiness. Because the division superintendent is provided the discretion to allow these young children to attend kindergarten regardless of the test results, he is the final judge of the child's ability to cope with the local kindergarten program.

3. A requirement that the local school division's plan for kindergarten include, along with the previous requirements of a stated purpose, objectives, organization, scheduling, staffing, etc., and a process for notifying parents of these young children of the option to take the test for readiness.

This bill contained an enactment clause which states: "That school boards shall phase in the rollback of the mandatory eligibility age for kindergarten over a three-year period by rolling back the date by which children shall have reached their fifth birthday one month each year as follows: November 30, 1986, October 31, 1987 and September 30, 1988."

Although this bill originally rolled back the age, it was the subject of considerable controversy. During the hearings on this bill, much testimony was presented concerning the increasingly academic orientation of kindergarten programs and increased complexity of program content and expectations. A number of speakers stated that a few months of age difference often makes a considerable difference in developmental stages in young children. Some speakers testified that many very young children, particularly those from lower socioeconomic families, are not ready for this level of instruction. Others stated that many very young children do not yet have the discipline to sit still and listen or to cope with the structured environment. These children, it was stated, frequently fall behind in kindergarten, never catch up with their peers, and are at risk of becoming drop-outs because of their early failure.

There was also much testimony about the need for the very children who would be excluded from school by the original bill to attend school in order to become better conditioned to the school environment and exposed to learning as early as possible. Some individuals who agreed that a few months of age difference can be quite important at this young age argued that the programs for kindergarten should be differentiated to provide for the needs of children in various stages of normal early childhood development. It should be noted that special education was not an issue in this bill as Virginia law requires services to handicapped children from the ages of two to twenty-one. There was also concern that children from lower socioeconomic families who might not have the advantage of exposure to books and other learning stimuli in the home might be excluded from school attendance by a change in the date for compulsory school attendance. It was questioned whether it was better to provide "some education" to young children who are at risk than to exclude them. Studies were cited that indicate the benefits of both early and delayed school entrance of young children. Some school divisions were mildly concerned about the impact on the Average Daily Membership, but the primary concern of all parties was the welfare of the children.

The result of this discussion and testimony was a compromise. There was much discussion of the use of testing for determining readiness for kindergarten, whether such tests were available and which of them were accurate predictors of "readiness." The Board of Education was given the responsibility of selecting an appropriate test(s). As there is no requirement for a certain score on the test for readiness, the division superintendent has complete discretion to admit all children who turn five between September 30 and December 31 upon application of the parents, if he so desires, which appears to be the usual practice. The purpose of the inclusion of the testing requirement in the bill was to highlight the need to recognize the developmental differences among young children and to stimulate school divisions to provide more differentiated instruction (such as prekindergarten programs or the "junior" and "senior" kindergarten programs) for kindergarten children. Some school divisions were already providing such innovative programs, while others agreed that it would be beneficial to offer such programs. Some people pointedly noted that the Commonwealth needs to appropriate more money in order to enable school divisions to implement such programs.

The 1986 Day Care Bill

To some degree, the central issues in this study are also related to public school involvement with day care. In 1987, the House Committee on Education considered a carry-over bill which would have provided school boards with the authority to establish day-care programs for school age children. Throughout the nation, there is concern about the plight of "latch-key" children, especially the very young ones. Some people have noted that many mothers with young children must work and cannot afford the costs of day care for their children. In many cases, this results in children, even very young children, being left alone for long periods of the work day. Many in the education community in Virginia and the nation are advocating public school day care programs, with some educational emphasis, for all ages, including programs for four-year olds such as prekindergarten or some broader version of the Head Start concept. These individuals support the implementation of such programs in order to close the gap among socioeconomic classes, prevent school drop-outs through the early teaching of the readiness concepts for basic skills and prevent illiteracy and delinquency through early intervention.

Recommendation of the Governor's Commission on Excellence

In March of 1986, Governor Gerald L. Baliles established the Virginia Commission on Excellence in Education and directed the Commission to develop recommendations focused on making Virginia's educational system one of the most outstanding systems in the country. One of the most controversial recommendations of the Commission was "that Virginia's school divisions provide voluntary developmental preschool programs for four-year-old children." The Commission also stated that "as part of programs for four-year-olds we must encourage parents to help with their young children's education at home. Programs for at-risk four-year-olds should be available by September 1, 1988, and for all four-year-olds by September 1, 1992" (Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education, October, 1986).

Genesis of the Study

During the 1987 Session of the General Assembly, several measures were introduced in response to the recommendations of the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education regarding the educational needs of young children and at-risk four-year-olds, and the critical need for day care programs. As a result, the Legislature appointed a joint subcommittee, via House Joint Resolution No. 299, to study the need for early childhood developmental programs, the administration and regulation of child day camp programs and child care centers, and the need for public school day care programs, as directed by Senate Joint Resolution No. 167.

The joint subcommittee was charged to:

- review the literature on early childhood programs;
- survey the research of experts and governmental entities and the views of the public on the issues;

- review existing programs, recommend ways to promote state and local, and public-private sector cooperation;
- determine the appropriate mechanism for the development of a resource inventory and referral system;
- recommend a mechanism for the phased integration of and funding for quality early childhood developmental programs which recognizes the factors that contribute to quality such as the availability of qualified early childhood teachers and caregivers and a system for monitoring and evaluation;
- determine the number of at-risk four-year-olds, and the number of such children who are not enrolled in developmental day care programs;
- determine the appropriate mechanism for and level of funding necessary to implement developmental day care programs;
- examine the definition and regulation of day camps and the corresponding duties of the Departments of Health and Social Services with respect to day camps and child care centers;
- determine the number of school age children in the Commonwealth, and the extent of the need for public school day care programs;
- review the pertinent constitutional and statutory provisions regarding the governance of the public schools and the administration of school programs relative to the Attorney General's opinion on public school day care programs;
- upon the determination of the need for public school day care programs, ascertain the availability of federal, state, local and private funds for the development and operation of such programs;
- recommend eligibility criteria for participation in and appropriate ways by which such programs may be provided which minimize the potentiality for competition between the Commonwealth and private day care providers.

Members appointed to the joint subcommittee were Delegates John C. Brown of Bristol; Alan A. Diamonstein of Newport News; Dorothy S. McDiarmid of Vienna; Mary A. Marshall of Arlington; Joan H. Munford of Blacksburg; and Mitchell Van Yahres of Charlottesville; and Senators Frank W. Nolen of New Hope; John W. Russell of Fairfax; and Stanley C. Walker of Norfolk. The citizen members are Mrs. Catherine Belter of Springfield and Alice M. Pieper, Ph.D., of Richmond.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS

History

It is recognized that the early years of a child's life are crucial to what he will become, and the style in which he will face learning and life itself, is directly influenced by the quality of his early childhood. Although it is the consensus in this nation that each child has the right to a sound beginning, and we have begun to value the learning potential of children in their early years, it was not until after World War II that a climate favorable for early childhood education emerged. Events that proved to be catalytic for the change in knowledge and attitude included the maturing of the systematic study of children, the 1954 Supreme Court decision mandating the integration of public schools, the launching of Sputnik, and the resulting national concern about the quality of American education (Cryan and Surbeck, 1979). Programs for young children are not new to the educational scene, as "kindergartens, nursery schools and day care centers have existed in the United States for more than a hundred years." The first English-speaking kindergarten was opened in Boston in 1860 by Elizabeth Peabody who was an ardent proponent of Froebelian philosophy, (Friedrich Froebel, founder of kindergartens in Germany), and an advocate for early childhood education. Peabody was instrumental in establishing the first public school kindergarten in St. Louis public schools in 1873 (Cryan and Surbeck, 1979). Private kindergartens have existed since 1855 with the first being established in Wisconsin (Hymes, 1977). The first nursery school in this country, established in 1861, was a parent cooperative nursery. Such schools commonly associated with university home economic departments were established in 1922, with the Ruggles Street Nursery School of Boston (now a part of Tufts University), the Harriet Johnson Nursery School in New York City (now a part of the Bank Street College of Education), and the Merrill-Palmer Nursery School in Detroit (Cryan and Surbeck, 1979; Hymes, 1977). The establishment of day care centers predates kindergartens and nursery schools, being offered as early as 1822, and provided custodial care for children of all ages who were orphans, abandoned or whose parents were unable to care for them (Cryan and Surbeck, 1979). In the Depression of the 1930s, the federal government allocated funds for what were called the Emergency Nursery Schools and later, the Works Progress Administration Nursery Schools. There were 2,393 such nursery schools in all parts of the country, financed with federal money during this era. Local communities, through the public schools, contributed space, heat, light, administration and supervision (Hymes, 1977). Historically, nursery schools were more family life and child development oriented, while kindergartens were more school and education oriented. Day care centers were primarily custodial.

Current Trends

Today, the changing patterns in our social fabric, class and family structures, the immigration flow, the work force and social support systems have resulted in a reconceptualization of early childhood programs.

It is estimated that "more than 3.6 million children will begin their formal schooling in this country. Of this number:

- 14 percent will be the children of teenage mothers;
- 15 percent will be physically or mentally handicapped;
- 15 percent will be immigrants who speak English;
- 14 percent will be children of unmarried parents;
- 40 percent will live in a broken home before they reach 18;
- 10 percent will have poorly educated, even illiterate parents;
- 25 to 33 percent will be latchkey children with no one to greet them when they come home from school;
- 25 percent or more of them will not finish school.

These children, the early wave of the baby boomlet that will enter the schools over the next five years, will in these ways clearly reflect the forces at work in our society. That many will bring with them baggage of familial, racial, ethnic and socioeconomic stress is well known to educators. What is less well understood is that if current trends persist, the proportion of children 'at risk' for school failure for these reasons will grow with each passing year" (Education Week, May 14, 1986).

The rearing of young children has changed dramatically and the parental roles are shifting as unprecedented numbers of mothers are joining the work force. Single-parent families and poverty among this population have both increased, and numerous early childhood developmental programs have emerged as a response to immediate family needs and as a potential investment that can improve the quality of life for the next generation of children (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1986). However, the complexion of our schools is so changing that by the "year 2000, one of every three public school pupils will be nonwhite, a sizable group will be poorer and more ethnically and linguistically diverse, and more will have handicaps that will affect their schooling" (Boyer, 1987). "Of the four- and five-year-olds in America today, the potential students and workers in the year 2000:

- One in four is poor;
- One in three is nonwhite or Hispanic, of whom two in five are poor;
- One in five is at risk of becoming a teen parent;
- One in six has no health insurance;
- One in six lives in a family where neither parent has a job;
- One in two has a mother working outside the home, but only a minority receive quality child care; and
- One in seven is at risk of dropping out of school.

Their nurturing unit, the family, is imperiled by extraordinary change and economic instability. Of every 100 children born today:

- Twenty will be born out-of-wedlock;
- Twelve will be born to parents who divorce before the children reach eighteen;

- Six will be born to parents who separate before the children reach eighteen;
- Four will be born to families in which one parent will die before the children reach eighteen; and
- Forty will live in a female-headed household before adulthood.

Poverty and related ills also affect millions of families. Of every 100 children born today:

- Thirteen will be born to a teenage mother;
- Fifteen will be born into a household where no parent is employed;
- Fifteen will be born into a household with a working parent earning a below-poverty wage; and
- Twenty-five will be on welfare at some point prior to adulthood" (CDF, 1987).

Consequently, the proliferation of kindergartens, nursery schools and day care centers has been closely tied to the concern for at-risk children and to the great number of mothers of children under age eighteen who have entered the labor force. Attention now centers on the causes of poverty and the remediation of its adverse consequences as "many at-risk students place society at risk of becoming a 'Third World' inhabited by individuals who are dependent, underdeveloped, uncompetitive, and unreactive to market forces" (Pellicano, 1987). Following the civil rights struggle of the 1960s, certain initiatives were taken to identify "disadvantaged or minority students" and to provide remediative and interventive programs to address the deficits created by a caste system which unjustly penalized and alienated numbers of minority students. One such initiative was the federally funded Head Start program whose "original goal in 1965 was chiefly to help provide disadvantaged children with as much a chance to reach their full potential as their more advantaged peers" (CDF, 1987). Recent renewed interest in the public's role and investment in preschool programs has encouraged Congress and many states to make significant contributions to early childhood programs.

"Between 1970 and 1984, the percentage of three - and four-year-olds enrolled in programs identified as nursery schools or kindergartens increased from twenty-one to thirty-six percent, serving 2.6 million of the nation's 7.2 million three - and four-year-olds in 1984. Between 1950 and 1985, the percentage of mothers in the labor force with children under eighteen years of age increased from fourteen to sixty-two percent, with similar rates for mothers of three - and four-year-olds. Thus, 4.3 million three - and four-year-olds today require supplemental child care arrangements while their mothers and fathers are working. Nursery schools and kindergartens serve about one-third of these children, providing some or all of the supplemental care that they need. Public schools serve eighty-five percent of kindergarten children and ninety-one percent of students in grades 1-12.

In contrast, only one out of every three nursery school enrollments is in a publicly funded program. The primary source of public funding for programs for three - and four-year-olds is the federal government, which provides at

least eighty-five percent of the total public funds for these programs while spending only about seven percent of the total public funds for elementary and secondary schools. Federal spending includes about \$1 billion a year for Project Head Start and about \$1 billion a year for various other education and supplemental care programs for young children. The federal dependent care tax credit leaves parents with about \$2 billion a year to cover expenses of supplemental care for young children" (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1986).

Latch-Key Children

Considerable attention has been focused on the plight of latch-key children. The National Commission on Working Women has stated that by "conservative estimates there are seven million children aged thirteen and under who care for themselves for at least part of the day while their parents work. Often brothers and sisters are responsible for younger siblings." "The plight of latch-key children is not new, for at the turn of the century the concern was for the "door-key child" as many parents were forced to work hours that separated them from their children. What is new is the enormous number of children who have no supervision just before school and when they return from school. As expected, this change in the day-to-day pattern of family life does raise serious issues and causes grave concern" (Clark, 1982). "There is rising concern that the message being given to parents is 'it is acceptable, even desirable, for children to be regularly unsupervised after school if they have learned some basic skills.' Some professionals view the terms self-care and survival skills as verbal smoke screens, obscuring a serious evasion of social responsibility, and a legitimization of neglect" (NAEYC Resource Guide, 1985). Evidence of the potential for disaster of unsupervised child care are as follows:

Accidental deaths are reported by the U.S. Census as the leading cause of death among children at the elementary school age;

Extensive research with unsupervised children has revealed that many of them experience feelings of overwhelming loneliness and fear. Many such children live in socially impoverished neighborhoods, and many more are victims of sexual exploitation and abuse;

Studies also warn of delinquency among latch-key children, as law-enforcement officials report an increase in problems with latch-key children and have asserted that the increasing delinquency is a direct result of changes in the family structure. In the short-run, the effect of these changes has proven disruptive and traumatizing for families and society. Increasing numbers of children are being socialized in a context for which tradition provides little direction and control;

There are developmental risks for latch-key children. While home, children are asked to take on chores that parents previously performed. This may encourage a sense of responsibility in older children, but it is inappropriate for younger ones. This arrangement also deprives some children of the playtime with peers that is necessary for the development of social skills and may hurt school performance.

Child psychologists assert that essential developmental tasks can only be completed in a relationship of consistent, frequent and healthy interaction between caregiver and child. The child's development progresses from dependence to independence in learning individual and social tasks and relies heavily on the presence of an affirming adult to learn new behaviors and then to reinforce those behaviors. Children who do not have frequent access to such an adult may not learn behaviors that are necessary for healthy development. The stress involved in leaving children unsupervised hurts the job performance of working parents (Clark, 1982).

DAY CARE PROGRAMS

Affordable, quality child care is a vital concern to numerous families due to shifting demographics and the need for both parents to work to survive economically. With the increase in single-parent families and employed parents in two-parent families, it was estimated in 1984 that "60.5 % of all women with children under eighteen years old worked outside the home, that one in every four mothers in the work force was maintaining her own home" (NCWW, undated), and that by "1995 14.6 million children under age six will have mothers in the labor force" (CDF, 1987). "In 1980, fifty percent of Virginia mothers of children under age six worked outside their home and 200,000 families were headed by women without husbands present" (Governor's Conference on Child Care, 1987). The altering of the social structure has resulted in millions of young children in need of quality supplemental care and nearly seven million school age children who lack adult supervision during part of the day. To address this problem, several alternative care programs have been implemented. Nevertheless, many still voice the concern of how will children cared for by "nannies and day care centers turn out?" This issue was at the heart of the Nixon veto of the 1971 Comprehensive Child Care Act in which he stated that "good public policy requires that we enhance rather than diminish both parental authority and parental involvement with children - particularly in those decisive years when social attitudes and a conscience are formed and religious and moral principles are first inculcated" (Norgren, 1981). However, the federal government today subsidizes child care directly through social service programs aimed at welfare recipients and families living below the federal poverty level, or indirectly through the child care tax credit under the Internal Revenue Code. Although there has been tremendous growth in the child care industry, there is a dearth of quality, affordable child care programs for low-income families. Some program models are:

A. School-based programs

Many communities provide extended school day care in the public schools as a means of caring for latch-key children. Such programs are either operated by the school or by an outside agency, i.e. recreation department, child care center or group. Schools which provide such services customarily limit participation in their programs to the children enrolled at that school.

Fees for the service may be fixed, based on a sliding scale, or in some instances free of charge. Private schools have begun to offer these services more frequently and some such schools view extended day care as an innovative marketing technique which enhances the attractiveness of the school. "School-based programs that are school operated or collaborative efforts are effective and popular forms of school age child care. The benefits are:

They bring schools, communities and families closer together and build support for schools;

They often result in reduction of school vandalism;

They can help build enrollment or help with desegregation efforts;

They are housed in facilities designed to meet the needs of school age children;

They are convenient for parents and children and usually do not require transportation; and

They allow close communication between school staff and child care staff, providing continuity for children" (Newman, 1987).

B. Home-based programs

Family day care is a prime source of day care for many children. "It provides a home-like atmosphere and it is well suited to the school age child's growing independence and need to actively participate in neighborhood and community activities. This program type offers children who need supervision, yet have strong needs for informality, flexibility, independence and access to neighborhood friends and activities, opportunities to maintain their normal routine as if their parents were home" (Newman, 1987). Although the licensure of family day care programs continues to be an unresolved issue and "transportation may be an obstacle in some localities, such as rural areas, such programs may offer an effective solution to the need for child care in communities where other modes of child care are not available or are limited" (Newman, 1987).

C. Community-based programs

Community-based child care programs occur in a variety of settings. These settings may include non-profit and proprietary child care centers which may serve infants through school age children, independent community agencies, churches, employer-sponsored and check-in and self-care programs. Parents often select child care centers because they would rather not have the child in a school setting before and after school, and such centers usually provide transportation for school age children to and from school to the center. Other child care programs for school age children are offered by the YMCA, YWCA, community recreation centers, etc. Local churches also offer child care

programs, usually as an extension of their ministry or as a service to the community (Newman, 1987). It is estimated that more than three million children in this country are cared for in church-housed child care programs, representing 70% of all child care centers. Half of these programs receive free space, (NCWW, 1987), e.g. run by outside community groups, and many are provided on a sliding fee scale or are free of charge. "These programs represent multi-million dollar subsidies by congregations" (NCWW, 1987).

D. Employer-sponsored programs

In response to the needs of working parents, operating a day care center on site is becoming widespread among employers. The employer provides the facility at the work site for his employees and provides both start-up and operating expenses for the center. While this is expensive, it has been a successful venture in the private sector.

Employees pay for the use of the company day care center. This innovation in child care programs has been beneficial even to Fortune 500 companies and their top executives, many of whom have embarked on the "social experiment of dual-career parenting. Corporations have begun to discover that more and more of their most valued employees are willing to sacrifice work, time, productivity and careers to devote themselves to their families. Even those parents who can afford the best child care worry and are guilt-ridden that their personal sacrifice of quality time with their children for larger salaries and titles and professional recognition will not provide the warmth and nurture of a caring parent. A result of employer-sponsored child care programs has been an increase in productivity and employee morale, a decrease in employee absenteeism, stress and job turnover, and enhancement of the company's image" (Chapman, 1987; Kearney, 1984).

One variation on the employer-provided child care programs is the vendor method and resource and referral. Under the vendor method, the employer purchases enrollment in a licensed day care center and offers the slots to employees at a reduced cost. In some cases the employer offers assistance, monetary or technical, to the existing day care centers in exchange for preferential treatment of their employees. In a voucher program, employees are either given coupons to redeem for day care services or increased pay to cover the cost of services. Since the employee is responsible for selecting the day care provider, administrative involvement is minimal for the employer. Many companies have adopted more flexible personnel policies including flextime, job sharing and extended maternity, paternity and family leave. By allowing employees flexibility in scheduling their work hours, the need for outside day care is reduced. (Kearney, 1984)

E. Check-In and Self-Care Programs

Other types of community-based programs are the check-in and self-care programs. These programs may be useful in areas where child care services

have not been developed; however, to be effective in terms of child safety, children must be taught survival skills and how to handle emergencies. As adults frequently are not able to cope with an emergency, children are even less likely to be able to apply what they have learned, notwithstanding self-care training. Often, their judgment is not sufficiently mature to distinguish what individual or activity may be risky or life-threatening. Consequently, this program type may present more disadvantages than others.

POLICY AND LEGAL ISSUES RELATED TO EARLY CHILDHOOD AND PUBLIC SCHOOL DAY CARE PROGRAMS

The policy and legal issues related to early childhood education and day care programs are many and varied. The following analysis of these issues was prepared by staff for the Joint Subcommittee to assist it in its deliberations concerning policy considerations which it was required to address. The analysis is intended to be comprehensive; however, it may not be inclusive due to the complicated nature of the issues.

Early Childhood Education

A. Should the Commonwealth pursue the implementation of preschool programs for four-year-old children? If so, should these programs be mandated? If the programs are mandated, should the program content be optional, or should the Commonwealth establish detailed curriculum guidelines? If the programs are required, should attendance be voluntary or should the compulsory school attendance law be revised? Should programs be targeted to "at-risk" children with attendance voluntary?

If the programs are mandated and attendance is made voluntary, would a de facto decrease in the compulsory school attendance age occur? If the programs are mandated and content is left to the discretion of the local school board, will the quality and effectiveness of the programs vary to an unacceptable degree? If the programs are required and targeted to "at-risk" children, how will "at-risk" be defined? Should it be defined in terms of income and resources, or in terms of behavioral predictors of school success and failure or both? Will limiting these programs to "at-risk" children result in an increase in "tracking" because these children will start school as an identifiable group that shares the same early experiences?

Will implementation of these programs increase the academic trends in kindergarten? By reinforcing the concept of "readiness," will this approach result in isolating poor children from children of other socioeconomic groups? Would all groups benefit from interaction? Will this result in a kind of de facto segregation? Is there a constitutional question in Virginia in view of the General Assembly's duty to provide quality education for all children of school age? Can an argument be made that establishing programs for four-year-olds redefines school age as four and that providing such programs for a target population is inconsistent with the mandate of the Virginia Constitution?

B. If preschool programs for four-year-olds are established, what focus should the program content take? Should these programs be school-based, home-based, or community-based or a combination of these approaches? Should the instruction be teacher-directed, child-initiated, or an appropriate combination of both approaches? Which programs are most effective for which children? Are there specific disadvantages to early intervention programs which should be examined? What kind of parent component should be included? Should parent training be a significant element? How should teacher training and certification be revised? Should one requirement for these programs be a training program for administrators? What steps can be taken to alleviate teacher prejudices and the effects of these prejudices?

Merely determining that developmental programs rather than academically oriented programs are appropriate for preschool programs does not begin to address the complicated questions related to program content. There is the danger that the preschool programs will become kindergartens, the kindergartens continue to increase in academic orientation and that the expectations in first grade will become higher. There is the danger that the expectations for these programs will be unrealistic. As school is just one part of a child's environment, it alone cannot change the circumstances with which he lives each day. There is also the danger that subtle prejudices will denigrate the possible positive effects. If children who are "at-risk" are not expected to perform as well as those who are not, then regardless of the success shown by the data, there may be negative psychosocial effects which are not revealed by the data. In addition, because of the positive perceptions of the programs for "at-risk" children, there may be a tendency to overrate the results.

The implementation of developmental early childhood programs requires individuals who are specifically trained to provide developmental learning experiences and not academic education. Therefore, the requirements for training and certification should be examined carefully and the efficacy of recommending that the Board of Education require these teachers to have child development and early childhood education course work and teaching experience in their professional preparation should be considered.

C. How should the cost of such programs be allocated if they are implemented? What kind of formula should be developed for funding? Should the basic aid formula be used or should some other basis for funding be provided? Can an integrated approach be developed which utilizes both the public and the private sectors and allows the implementation of day care programs with a developmental emphasis as well as preschool programs for four-year-olds? How can interaction and cooperation between the public and private sectors be promoted in order to assure effective, needed services? What kind of assessment should be required? Should the Department of Education be required to develop assessment criteria prior to the implementation of any pilot programs?

The questions on funding and assessment become more and more important as efforts are made to formulate positions on these issues.

Public School Day Care Programs

A. Should the public schools be authorized to conduct day care programs? Is day care an appropriate role for the public schools? What is the extent of the "latch-key" problem in the Commonwealth? Is cost the only factor that determines whether a parent will allow a child to be alone in the home? Are there available programs which are affordable and also beneficial to the school age child between the ages of 5 and 12 years?

The need for affordable day care alternatives has prompted the school divisions and other public agencies to initiate day care programs. These programs primarily serve school age children who are without adult supervision either before or after school, i.e. "latch-key" children. Authority for the Falls Church and Arlington programs was provided several years ago through a special act of the Legislature. During the 1987 Session, the school board of the City of Virginia Beach was also authorized to conduct such programs through a special act. No blanket authorization exists in the Code of Virginia for school boards to operate day care programs. However, school boards are authorized to permit the use of school property by other organizations as long as such use does not interfere with the educational programs (§22.1-131 of the Code of Virginia). Using this authority, a number of school divisions have authorized other agencies of local government to conduct these programs.

In recent years, several bills have been introduced which would have provided all school divisions with the option of implementing such programs. These bills have met with strong opposition from the private for-profit day care providers who generally view public day care as unfair competition because the costs are lower and local tax money is used to maintain these lower costs. Advocates of the public school day care programs have argued that the people in their jurisdictions support such day care programs, that private for-profit day care programs do not meet the needs of all children because the costs are prohibitive and that there is educational value to the public school day care programs which is not generally present in the private programs.

In addition to the unfair competition issue, licensure is also controversial. Although there are exceptions, most private for-profit day care facilities are required to be licensed by the Department of Social Services. Public agencies engaged in day care are not required to be licensed, but may obtain voluntary certification. Department of Social Services officials state that the criteria for licensure of private facilities and certification of public agencies are the same. However, the private for-profit day care providers view certification of public agencies as more flexible and easier to obtain. The private for-profit providers also appear to feel that mandatory licensure for all child care centers would be desirable.

At this time, there are no program components to the requirements for licensure. However, public programs may include educational or enrichment components more frequently than the private programs. It is also necessary to determine which providers offer latch-key programs to assess the extent to which such service needs are being provided, the type of activities in existence, and the availability of affordable, beneficial programs.

An underlying issue in this area is whether cost is the only factor which determines that a parent will allow his child to stay at home without supervision. Are many children between the ages of 10 and 12 reluctant to attend child care centers because they view these programs as "for babies"? Is it possible that some children prefer the company and supervision of the television set to that of adults? Are there parents with concerns related to outside influences on their children who would rather supervise the child by telephone? Do some parents get tired of the hassles of day care, i.e. transportation, costs, discipline, dissatisfaction on the part of the children?

B. How can corporate involvement in providing day care be encouraged? Are there legal incentives which will promote corporate involvement? How profoundly does the availability of quality day care influence the average employee's job performance? Can corporate Virginia be persuaded to examine the needs of employees? Does the availability of day care have a direct correlation to economic development?

The availability of quality day care appears to have profound effects on the economic development of an area. Corporations are using this availability as one of the criteria for evaluating an area for relocation. In addition to the importance of getting and keeping good employees, recent reports have indicated an acceptance on the part of the corporate structure in many areas of the United States of the importance of preschool programs in the development of children. Many have come to believe that quality preschool programs can do much to prevent delinquency and school drop outs. There is evidence that the business community believes that these programs are a good investment.

C. Should there be some modification of the licensure laws and regulations for child care agencies to address qualifications and training of personnel, the need for parental involvement and the exchange of information? In the event that a voucher system or other reimbursement method would be implemented for any group of recipients, should standards for program content be established for participating agencies? Should programs be differentiated for licensure purposes according to program content, i.e. academic programs, developmental programs, custodial care, instruction-based, teacher-directed, child-initiated?

There are some who believe that the licensure laws and regulations for day care centers are too lax. At present, the standards relate to the fire and health codes, limits on the numbers of children, staff/child ratios, etc. As far as it could be determined, no standards are set for program content or staff training. Although it appears that few day care workers have four-year degrees, bachelors degrees may not be valid requirements as experts appear to agree that only job-related training in early childhood education is an important predictor of quality and effectiveness of preschool programs. With respect to program content, many day care programs may not use curriculum or activity planning or any recognized approach to providing quality early childhood programs. However, activities may be and frequently are scheduled and organized. Although parental involvement may be used, there may be only minimal attempts to provide contact between the parents and the children and little effort to provide meaningful training to the parents. Information exchange does not appear to be very sophisticated at this time, but it is increasing.

Program validity and accountability become increasingly important for these programs if public funds are likely to be channeled to the private for-profit programs for any target population.

D. How can the need for day care be assessed? How can the affordability of day care be evaluated? What funding alternatives are feasible? Who should pay for the cost of child care? For those who can not afford it?

It is difficult to determine accurately what is or is not affordable. Affordability may depend on many variables - consistency of support payments, family expenses, number of children, transportation, etc. There are many proposals for alternative funding, such as government subsidies, corporate contributions, tax incentives, and vouchers for target populations. Some individuals feel that public funding for day care is an inappropriate use of tax dollars to pay for "baby sitting." The question is: What responsibility does the Commonwealth have? If the state would establish a new program, what should be the income and resource criteria? In 1964, the costs of Medicaid were grossly underestimated. Does a danger exist that such a program would be in effect an entitlement program with much the same potential for growth in costs as the Medicaid program has demonstrated? Would the Commonwealth be running the risk of institutionalizing child care in much the same way as care of the elderly has been institutionalized? Will any action or lack of action on the part of the Commonwealth change the growing trend to seek child care outside the home for very young children? What is the parent's responsibility for the child?

In addition to concerns about who should pay for child care, there are considerations related to the costs of the programs. Quality programs such as the Perry Preschool Project are costly. However, evaluations of this program claim that the savings to the taxpayer outweigh the costs which must be expended as a result of crime and delinquency. Virginia does not have any data to substantiate savings from presently available programs.

ACTIVITIES OF THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE

In carrying out the directives of House Joint Resolution No. 299 and Senate Joint Resolution No. 167, the Joint Subcommittee held meetings throughout the Commonwealth to solicit the views of state agency heads, day care providers, educators, child development specialists, business and industry, local school divisions, parents and all persons who had an interest in the issues before the subcommittee. The Joint Subcommittee visited numerous and varied day care settings across the state. It formatted its meetings to accommodate extensive site visitations of day care facilities in the morning and a work session in the afternoon. The Joint Subcommittee found that there was great diversity in the programs that already exist in the Commonwealth. It received testimony which revealed a need for day care services across the state, the need for the increased involvement of business and industry as some Virginia-based companies have proceeded to develop and offer on-site or have contracted for day care services for their employees.

There was also expressed the need for affordable and accessible day care services for low to moderate income families, the need to provide early developmental learning experiences for children at-risk, public school day care programs for school age children, standardized licensing requirements for all providers and a mechanism for the centralized dissemination of pertinent information and assistance to businesses and corporations in Virginia which desire to provide day care services for their employees. Representatives of for-profit day care providers noted the need for the state to provide day care services in a manner that did not unfairly compete with them. The Joint Subcommittee discussed at length how best to determine which children were at-risk, whether to require the implementation of early developmental programs for all four-year-old children or just for those who may be at-risk, how best to sequence the implementation of such programs and for which children, and how best to fund needed day care services, particularly for low income families.

The Joint Subcommittee held a public hearing in Richmond in which many people attested to the findings of the subcommittee during its travels. A recurring theme was the need for day care services, expansion of Head Start programs, subsidized day care services for low income families, flexible day care hours, increased standards and compensation for day care personnel, developmental programs, standardized licensing requirements, and the elimination of unfair competition between the State, nonprofit day care providers and the for-profit day care providers. Given the considerable testimony and other data received by the Joint Subcommittee, a special subcommittee was appointed by the Chairman to develop recommendations for the Joint Subcommittee's consideration.

FINDINGS OF THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE

The Need for Early Childhood and Day Care Programs

The Joint Subcommittee acknowledges the great diversity in the programs that already exist in the Commonwealth and it is strongly committed to the maintenance and enhancement of this variety in the delivery of services while strengthening the quality and availability of services.

Data provided by the Governor's Conference on Child Care, June 1987, indicate that "Virginia has experience an increase in the number of working mothers and single-parent families. It was noted that fifty percent of Virginia mothers of children under age six worked outside their home in 1980 and that this number has increased steadily since 1980. Also in 1980, it was determined that 200,000, one in seven, families in Virginia were headed by women without husbands, a rise of fifty-one percent in a decade. The Department for Children, in its annual Day Care Plan, noted that the demand for child day care exceeds the the supply of licensed day care services. There are more than seventy thousand licensed day care spaces for nearly 300,000 children in need of such services. In fiscal year 1986, licensed child care facilities increased eleven percent and ten percent in capacity. There is also a need for special day care services to provide sick child care, infant care and care of handicapped children.

At present, no licensed sick child care facilities exist in Virginia. Infant care, birth to age sixteen months, is offered in 149 licensed child care centers, 189 day care homes and five licensed child care systems. Child care for the physically handicapped child is available only in fifty licensed child care centers, two licensed family day care homes and one licensed day care system. Child care for the developmentally disabled child is available in thirteen licensed child care centers, one licensed family day care home and one licensed day care system and care for emotionally disturbed children is provided by only three licensed child care systems" (Governor's Conference on Child Care: Everybody's Business, June, 1987).

The Governor's Conference stated further that "most children in Virginia are cared for in unregulated environments and many care for themselves. It was estimated that as many as 130,000 children in Virginia are being cared for in unregulated day care settings and that large numbers of school age children are caring for themselves or are in the care of siblings. Parents of school age children in the Commonwealth indicated that their greatest child day care needs are related to policies in the workplace. Thirty-five percent of such parents survey by the Department for Children for its 1987 State Plan for Child Care want a more liberal leave policy that includes leave for sick children and twenty-eight percent of such parents want flexible work hours. Of those needing flexible work hours and liberal sick leave, sixty-seven percent and fifty-nine percent, respectively, were married, working parents" (Governor's Conference on Child Care: Everybody's Business, June, 1987).

With respect to corporate involvement in day care and given the assessment of the great need for day care services of employees, the Joint Subcommittee consulted with the Honorable Richard M. Bagley, Secretary of Economic Development concerning these issues. Secretary Bagley's comments that were delivered on his behalf to the Joint Subcommittee have been incorporated herein:

Secretary Bagley maintains a keen interest over any item that directly or indirectly impacts on the economic climate of the Commonwealth. Clearly, child care is one of those issues that has a direct impact on the Commonwealth's economic well-being as it can clearly be tied to the productivity of the work force.

In today's society, employers must realize that a large percentage of the people in the work force are single parents and that those parents must be certain that their children are well cared for while they are at work.

In today's society, educators must realize that they too have a responsibility to ensure that today's "latch key" children are sufficiently cared for while the parents are away.

In today's society, we must all realize that child care is no longer an issue which is of vital interest only to less fortunate Virginians, and it is no longer an issue of interest only to single parent Virginians, it is clearly an issue that impacts on the profit sheets of companies as well as the determination of families.

A company can have a more productive work force when that work force can concentrate on the task at hand and not the child at home. The Governor's Advisory Commission on Employers' Initiatives for Child Day Care clearly recognizes the importance of corporate day care and awareness in the business community concerning the day care issue.

We believe their recommendations will reflect what we feel is an increased awareness in the business community for child care. Also, currently, at the request of Secretary Bagley, the Virginia Employment Commission is formulating a plan for a one-stop information operation. This center will enable an interested business to obtain all the information to set up a child care facility or about child care by contacting one office. However, child care is not an issue which can be solved on one front. It is an issue we must address with a broad range of awareness. Clearly, not every business in the Commonwealth will be able to afford, or will want to start a child care facility within their operation. But it is our responsibility to make them aware of the issue and aware of the role they play in addressing this issue.

Not all businesses, especially the small will decide to establish their own centers. I do, however, believe that the wise ones will. The wise ones will realize that in today's marketplace in some areas of the state, employment opportunities are abundant and skilled workers, capable workers, experienced workers will work for those companies which provide the best benefits, and clearly child care is an important benefit to a working parent.

But, we must not believe that this situation can be addressed at this level alone. We are aware of the discussion concerning the impact of public day care on private enterprise.

I realize that there is some concern about public and private competition. It is a concern the Commonwealth faces on many fronts. We must always be diligent in our efforts not to produce situations where the potential for public and private competition exists. I, however, believe that we can fulfill our responsibility while still allowing the market to impact on the system. In this instance, our concern has got to be to ensure that the need is being met. We must operate based on the theories of supply and demand. I would submit to you all that right now the demand far exceeds the supply.

Perhaps public day care facilities may affect potential market size for some private care facilities, and private care facilities may be forced to adjust their programs -- to offer unique services, to extend their hours, to expand age limits, or to market their services better.

However, even if public day care becomes available on a widespread basis, the market will continue to dictate the need for private facilities and private facilities will continue to prosper. People will continue to want special services, special educational emphasis, and special treatment -- these are the characteristics that drive a market.

The Commonwealth must dictate the certainty of public facilities for those Virginians who do not have the means to procure private care. Secretary Bagley often talks about "quality of life" as the main selling point we have about Virginia. Clearly, child care programs are an enhancement of life, one which we must pursue with a realization of its growing importance into today's society.

As you work to continue to formulate your recommendations, you have the full support of the Secretary and his office. We realize that the task before you is one of great consequence.

Child care in the eighties can no longer be ignored. As the demographics of society changes, we must be prepared to act to control the impact of those changes.

Determinants of Risk

Early childhood programs exist and are designed to counter the adverse effects of socioeconomic deprivation. The children of such environments are considered to be at risk for future school failure (Illinois State Board of Education, January, 1985). As school failure may begin the momentum for failure throughout one's adult life and "since it is at the root of many of our social problems, preventing it can benefit both the individual and society" (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1986). Children who are at risk traditionally have been described as those "who live in poverty, whose parents have low educational attainment, whose parents have low occupational and income status, who have initially low cognitive ability and whose parents have relatively low achievement expectations for their children. The families of these children cannot purchase the early childhood education services available to children from socioeconomically advantaged families. To some extent, depending on child and family characteristics, financial resources translate into developmental outcomes. Children from disadvantaged families are therefore most at risk for special education placement, comparatively less academic achievement and attainment, school drop-out, unemployment, welfare and delinquency" (Illinois State Board of Education, January, 1985).

It should be noted that determining which children may be at risk solely by socioeconomic indicators, particularly income level, may result in the exclusion of numbers of children at risk, given the fact that many single mothers (e.g. separated or divorced) have professional backgrounds, but may be actually living in poverty. Likewise, in determining who is at risk by educational or cognitive indicators, I.Q. is not an effective gauge, and teachers of young children are advised to observe for these "more effective warning signs: in-class attention/memory span and distractibility; in-class verbal fluency; in-class interest and participation; letter or number identification skills and printing errors" (Simner, 1983).

Benefits of Early Intervention

It is widely accepted that children who have participated in "quality preschool programs, especially disadvantaged children, perform substantially better in their school work than those who have not participated in such programs.

Such children are also found to better adapt socially and emotionally, have fewer school failures and higher rates of school completion and later employment" (NAEYC Resource Guide, 1985). "Their noncognitive development and social responsibility are promoted, while rates of teenage pregnancy and delinquency are decreased. The achievement expectations of parents, both for their children and for their own continuing education, are raised. Attitudinal and motivational changes occur with improvements in cognitive development" (Illinois State Board of Education, January, 1985). The debate, however, centers on 'when' children are ready for formal schooling" (NAEYC Resource Guide, 1985).

Characteristics of Quality Early Childhood Programs

Young children learn differently from adults. They learn by doing. Consequently, quality early childhood programs should be developmentally oriented and based on knowledge of how young children learn. According to Day and Drake, "quality developmental programs provide children opportunities to gain appropriate dependence-independence patterns, to establish healthy patterns of giving and receiving affection, to develop a conscience, encourage physical growth, create communication opportunities that enhance the child's use and understanding of symbols.

Quality programs also include qualified teachers and staff who possess knowledge of the developmental stages of children and appropriate physical settings designed to promote independence and hands-on learning experiences" (Day and Drake, 1986). Research findings from the High/Scope studies note that preschools with considerable child-initiated activity appear to be doing the best job of preparing young children for productive adult roles.

Obstacles to Quality Day Care

"Regardless of the age of the child, the available child care often does not accommodate the working schedules of parents. The low wages paid to child care providers threatens quality care. In 1984, ninety percent of private household child care workers and fifty-eight percent of all other child care workers earned less than poverty-level wages. Low salaries make it increasingly difficult to attract qualified personnel, resulting in a lowering of the standards which affect quality of care and puts children at risk. Low salaries also contribute to the extremely high rate of turnover among child care professionals, forcing children to adjust to several new providers in the course of a year;

The costs of child care are prohibitive for many families;

Inadequate government assistance to help low-income families pay for child care" (CDF, 1987).

Benefits of Quality Day Care

The benefits of quality day care programs are primarily centered on the effects it has on both families and children. The Children's Defense Fund, in its publications, "Child Care: An Investment in Virginia's Future" and "A Children's Defense Budget, 1987," noted the following benefits:

Provides ADC mothers with opportunities to become and remain gainfully employed and get off public assistance;

Enables low-income family members to take advantage of job training and community college programs so they may become self-sufficient;

Allows parents in low-income working families to continue work;

Provides care to your children who otherwise would return to an empty home at the end of the school day or remain alone during school vacations;

Offers an opportunity for children to develop their skills and abilities under the guidance of trained and caring adults;

Prepares children to take advantage of kindergarten and elementary school by equipping them to work in groups and follow instructions;

Helps parents of handicapped children meet their special responsibilities; and treats the victims of child abuse by helping these children develop relationships with other children and teaching them to trust adults.

Need for Qualified Personnel

Although the media have riveted the nation's attention on poorly run day care centers and scandals involving child care personnel and the need for ethical and conscientious child care workers, there is an equal need for such personnel to be well trained, have the ability to guide and direct, support and encourage curiosity and explorations without dominating or interfering. Such persons must have knowledge of child development and realize the importance of a healthy self-image to children. It is imperative that such persons recognize their own functions as role models in the formation of attitudes and values and that they know what parents require and expect (NAEYC Resource Guide, 1985).

Elements of a Quality Day Care Program

A quality day care program provides an environment of warmth and security in which children can grow, one which nurtures and is responsive to them. Such programs include the following features:

Capitalize on the interests of the children;

Consider the range the experiences on activity can provide;

Use the community as much as possible;

Capitalize on the myriad of opportunities that present themselves for informal, social learning;

Build upon the special talents and interests of staff;

Allow for spontaneity and serendipity;

Agree upon and communicate clear, consistent expectations and limits to children;

Take an integrated, total approach to planning and carrying out the program; and

Balance the day's activities so that there are structured and unstructured times, teacher-directed and child-initiated experiences, and a range of activity options as well (NAEYC Resource Guide, 1985).

To remain viable, quality day care programs must aggressively and sincerely encourage the involvement of parents in the program. Ways in which parental involvement may be included are the utilization of parents as resource persons, the provision of parenting training and parent/child interaction activities on-site.

The Feasibility of Expanding the Head Start Program

The Joint Subcommittee received the following written testimony regarding Head Start programs from Mr. Richard Spitzborg, Regional Administrator, Region III, of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Project Head Start was established by the Economic Opportunity Act as part of an effort to reduce the impact of poverty on our nation's families. It began as an eight week summer program in June, 1965, and has grown into a nine month comprehensive child and family development program aimed at meeting the educational, social, emotional, nutritional, health and psychological needs of enrolled children. Since its inception, Head Start has required programs to involve parents in all aspects of program planning, implementation, decision-making and evaluation. In 1987, over 460,000 children were enrolled in Head Start in the nation. In Virginia, thirty-two grantees provide comprehensive services to more than 5,600 children annually. The actual enrollment of children in Head Start in Virginia is higher as such programs usually serve additional children with general revenue funds provided by local governments. The head Start cost per child ranges from \$1,290 to \$3,798. The average cost per child for all Head Start programs in Virginia is approximately \$2,750. Programs exhibiting a higher cost per child tend to be those offering services for six or more hours daily. Cost per child tends to be lower for grantees which are school districts as classroom facilities and equipment are generally contributed by local school boards.

The goal of Head Start is to bring about a greater degree of social competence in children. To accomplish this, Head Start has established the following major objectives:

- Improve the child's health and physical abilities;
- Enhance each child's social and emotional well being, encourage self-confidence, spontaneity, and self-discipline;
- Enhance each child's cognitive ability and language skills;

- Increase the ability of the child and family to positively relate to each other and to others in their environment; and
- Enhance the child and family's dignity and feeling of self worth.

Eligibility requirements for Head Start state that at least ninety percent of enrolled children must be from families whose income is below the Federal poverty index, or whose families receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children. The requirements also state that ten percent of the program's enrollment must be reserved for children who have been professionally diagnosed as having special educational or other handicapping conditions. Age eligibility for enrollment in the program is based on each state's compulsory school attendance requirements. Children who have reached the compulsory school attendance age are not eligible for Head Start.

The majority of children enrolled in Head Start in Virginia are served in center-based or home-based programs. Center-based programs serve children in a classroom setting while home-based programs operate by sending home visitors once each week to every child's home.

Several longitudinal studies document the benefits and cost-effectiveness of the Head Start program. One major research finding is that for every \$1,000 invested in a year of preschool education, at least \$4,000 in public expenditures is saved in reduced costs for welfare and criminal justice expenses. Some significant research findings of the benefits of Head Start are:

- The arrest rate among twenty-year olds with preschool education is twenty percent lower than those without preschool;
- The incidence of dependency on welfare and unemployment benefits for nineteen-year olds with preschool education was twenty-one percent less than those who did not have such educational experiences;
- The employment rate at age nineteen is eighteen percent higher for youngsters who had the benefit of preschool;
- Preschool reduces the costs of continuing public education;
- Children who attended Head Start were less likely to be assigned to expensive special education classes, and even those who were spent one and a half fewer years in special education classes, compared to children who did not attend preschool. Similarly, children who had the benefit of Head Start were less likely to repeat a grade level;
- The high school drop out rate among economically disadvantaged children who had a preschool experience is eighteen percent lower than those who did not; and
- Children who have had a Head Start experience have a lower rate of absence from school for health and medical reasons.

Based on 1980 Census figures, approximately 37,000 children in Virginia are eligible for Head Start. However, data indicate the feasibility of expansion of the Head Start programs in Virginia. At present, Head Start is serving only fifteen percent of the eligible population. The need for Head Start programs is expected to be greater in Virginia as well given recent national statistics on the increase in the need for such programs. The need is especially high along the I-95 corridor and the larger municipalities along the Eastern Shore. Areas such as Norfolk, Newport News, Virginia Beach, Hampton, Chesapeake, Portsmouth, Fairfax and Alexandria all have populations of unserved children sufficient to support new Head Start programs, as well as expansion of existing programs. The overriding determination for the expansion of programs in Virginia is the availability of additional funds as the amount of funds available for expansion in any given year also determines the limits of distribution. Hindrances to participation in the program, where services exist, are primarily geographic, thus emphasis must be placed on transportation and site location in rural counties to assure that children are not required to travel long distances and also to minimize transportation costs.

Emphasis on the expansion of Head Start must combine an aggressive search for suitable facilities and cooperation with licensing authorities to assure that standards are consistently applied and that state and local requirements provide a basis for assuring the health and safety of children.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE

The Joint Subcommittee recommends that:

1. Additional state funds in the amount of \$5.8 million in the first year of the biennium and \$6.1 million in the second year of the biennium be provided to support day care for approximately 3,000 children of the working poor.

RATIONALE:

"Available, affordable, quality child care is of vital importance to a growing number of families today. Due to increases in the number of single-parent families and of two-parent families in which both adults work, each year child care becomes a more critical issue for parents, children, society and the economy. For many families, child care is key to the parents' ability to earn enough income to meet basic expenses. In low-income families, women must have child care to help earn the income that keeps the family out of poverty. Even for slightly more well-off families, child care is necessary to maintain the basis of middle-class existence. However, low and moderate income families face prohibitively high costs in their search for quality child care as today's economy requires two incomes to remain above the poverty level. In single-parent families the parent's income, although full-time, is not enough or barely enough to sustain the family. Poor and near-poor families cannot bear the expense of child care without help.

With two children, a family of four with poverty-level wages would have to spend more than half of its income on child care -- an expenditure that would mean going without housing, food, or other necessities for survival. In the next decade, the need for child care will continue its sharp ascent as will such families' inability to afford child care. Consequently, a public investment in child care can save money by preventing the much larger costs associated with unemployment and welfare dependency" (Children's Defense Fund, 1987).

It is the Joint Subcommittee's position that as the Commonwealth works toward being a leader among states in the future, "a vision for the future has to continue to combine the policy objectives of support for working parents, on whom we rely for our state and national productivity and economic development, with education and quality child care for those who will be the citizens and workers of tomorrow" (Morgan, 1987).

2. An Office of Child Care and Child Development be established in the Department for Children. The Office shall act as coordinator for a core advisory group which shall consist of the Directors or the Deputy Directors of the Departments of Health, Economic Development and the Virginia Employment Commission, the Superintendent or a Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Commissioner or a Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Social Services. The advisory group shall also include liaisons with the business and corporate community and input from the proprietary day care industry. To maintain diversity of programs, all constituencies of the day care industry shall be granted equal opportunity to participate in any state child care programs, including programs for at-risk young children.

The core advisory group shall submit its proposals and recommendations regarding the following concerns to the Joint Subcommittee Studying Early Childhood and Day Care Programs by January 1, 1989.

- Children who should be served;
- Administration of programs;
- Timetable for program implementation;
- Qualifications and training required of providers;
- Mechanism for providing training;
- Regulatory and licensing requirements;
- Utilization of existing public, private and nonprofit facilities;
- Program promotion;
- Provision of information and assistance to the business and corporate community regarding day care services;
- Alternative funding mechanisms;
- Identification of jurisdictions with a critical need for day care services;
- Transportation; and
- Provision of health care services

RATIONALE:

This decade has witnessed an increased interest in the welfare and education of children. Many actions have been taken to ensure and to provide adequate protection for them.

Increased attention is also focused on the need for quality early childhood programs and day care services as significant numbers of single parent and working two-parent families have created a demand for such programs. In this regard, state efforts have proliferated to meet the growing demand. There is and will continue to be a need for multiple agency responsibility and involvement in the delivery of services and programs to children and their families. This is necessary due to legislative mandates and the delegation of authority for the administration of state policies, levels of expertise and diversification of programs. Nevertheless, as agency responsibilities increase and are diffused into several agencies, it is necessary to improve the administration of such services and programs to ensure that the State's goals and the needs of citizens are met.

As the administration of children's programs are the responsibility of several state agencies, the Joint Subcommittee reasoned that the establishment of a centralized office of child care and child development would facilitate coordination of services, promote articulation between the relevant agencies, and ensure participation from the corporate community and the public and private sectors. A centralized office with liaisons in the relevant agencies and interested communities provides a one-stop resource for information that businesses require in considering and providing day care services for employees, allows input from public and private day care providers, assists parents in determining the availability of programs and establishes linkages between the departments and the Office to ensure consistency and uniformity in the administration of policies.

3. At present, plans to develop statewide programs in the public schools for four-year-old children be held in abeyance pending the information gathered by the pilot programs and the findings of this study.

RATIONALE:

The research documents the need for and the benefits to be derived from quality early developmental childhood programs for at-risk youth, however, the provision of such programs requires deliberate and careful planning, the establishment of state policy respecting the delivery of the programs, and sufficient funds to implement quality programs. Therefore, it is the consensus of the Joint Subcommittee that plans to implement such programs be held in abeyance pending further exploration and resolution of the relevant issues regarding early childhood programs.

4. The study of the need for early childhood and day care programs conducted pursuant to House Joint Resolution No. 299 and Senate Joint Resolution No. 167 be continued for two more years.

RATIONALE:

The Joint Subcommittee has determined that it has not had sufficient time to study all the issues and implications of the charge to it in HJR 299 and SJR 167 to submit appropriate recommendations to the 1988 General Assembly. It therefore recommends that the study be continued for two additional years.

CONCLUSION

The Joint Subcommittee notes the findings in Child Care: An Investment in Virginia's Future, that "child care is important for at least two reasons. First, parents with young children must have child care in order to work and achieve or maintain economic self-sufficiency. Second, when parents are at work, high quality child care is essential to ensure that young children are provided with the foundation to become productive adults. However, low-income families have a difficult time meeting their child care needs. Without help in meeting their child care costs, families that cannot afford to pay for child care as well as their other basic needs face untenable choices: they can quit work to stay at home to care for their children, leave their children alone for long periods of time, place their children in inadequate child care arrangements, or if ADC families, choose to stay on ADC to maintain child care benefits. None of these choices are good for the families involved or good for the economy of the Commonwealth."

As a corollary to quality child day care, there is an increased need for quality early childhood developmental programs. Such programs have demonstrated their success in reducing the social, intellectual and economic deficits that educationally and economically disadvantaged children suffer. Such programs have also demonstrated their success in addressing the problems of school drop out, substance abuse, delinquency, teenage pregnancy, and unemployment, all problems into which billions of dollars are being spoured on remediative efforts. The future social dysfunctioning of many of our youth and the resulting high public costs, can be ameliorated with appropriate interventions. The Committee for Economic Development, in its report, Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged, stated "if the present trends continue, the scarcity of well-educated and well-qualified people in the work force will seriously damage this country's competitive position in an increasingly challenging global marketplace. It is clearly a superior investment for both society and individuals to prevent later failure by working with at-risk parents and their children from prenatal care through age five. We call for early and sustained intervention into the lives of at-risk children as the only way to ensure that they embark and stay on the road to successful learning."

The Joint Subcommittee believes that considerable work remains to determine the most appropriate and cost-effective means of providing quality early childhood and day care programs in the Commonwealth. A careful review of the issues related to the development and implementation of such programs will be examined during the second phase of the subcommittee's study.

The Joint Subcommittee extends its appreciation to the Secretaries of Education, Human Resources and Economic Development, and to all of the state agencies, institutions of higher education, day care providers, professionals in the fields of early childhood education and child development, parents and others who assisted it during the course of its study.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy S. McDiarmid, Chairman

Stanley C. Walker, Vice Chairman

John C. Brown

Alan A. Diamonstein

Mary A. Marshall

Joan H. Munford

Frank W. Nolen

John W. Russell

Mitchell Van Yahres

Citizen Members

Mrs. Catherine Belter

Alice M. Pieper, Ph.D.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boyer, Ernest L. "Early Schooling and the Nation's Future," Educational Leadership, March, 1987.
- Bredenkamp, Sue, ed. Developmentally Appropriate Practice. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1986.
- Chapman, Fern Schumer. "Executive Guilt: Who's Taking Care of the Children?" Fortune, February 16, 1987.
- Children's Defense Fund. A Children's Defense Budget, 1987. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund, 1987.
- Clark, Jim. "When Nobody's Home: Programs to Help the Latch Key Child," CSG Backgrounder, October, 1982.
- Cryan, John R. and Elaine Surbeck. "Early Childhood Education: Foundations for Lifelong Learning," Phi Delta Kappan Fastback No. 133. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1979.
- Day, Barbara and Kay N. Drake. "Developmental and Experiential Programs: The Key to Quality Education and Care of Young Children," Educational Leadership, November, 1986.
- Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education. "Excellence in Education: A Plan for Virginia's Future," October, 1986.
- "Here They Come, Ready or Not," Education Week, May 14, 1986.
- Howard, A. Eugene. The American Family: Myth and Reality. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, March, 1984.
- Hymes, James L., Jr. Early Childhood Education: An Introduction to the Profession. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1977.
- Hymes, James L., Jr. Teaching the Child Under Six. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1974.
- Illinois. "Effectiveness of Early Childhood Education Programs: A Review of the Literature." Illinois: State Board of Education, January, 1985.
- Illinois. "The Effectiveness of Preschool for Children from Low-Income Families: A Review of the Literature." Illinois: State Board of Education, January, 1985.
- Kearney, Shery S. "Caring for Our Children: Day Care Issues Facing the States," CSG Backgrounder, December, 1984.

- Morado, Carolyn. "Prekindergarten Programs for Four-Year-Olds: State Education Agency Initiatives." Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1985.
- NAEYC. Early Childhood Teacher Education Guidelines. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1982.
- NAEYC. Resource Guide. Programs for Four-Year- Olds. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1985.
- NAEYC. Resource Guide. School-Age Child Care. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1985.
- National Commission on Working Women. "Child Care Fact Sheet: National Outlook, Who Supports Child Care?", undated.
- National Commission on Working Women. "Child Care Fact Sheet: Working Mothers and Children," undated.
- Newman, Roberta. "School-Age Child Care: Developing Quality Programs," Child Care: Everybody's Business. Virginia: Governor's Conference on Child Day Care, June, 1987.
- Norgren, Jill. "In Search of a National Child Care Policy: Background and Prospects," The Western Political Quarterly, March, 1981.
- Pellicano, Roy R. "At Risk: A View of Social Advantage," Educational Leadership, March, 1987.
- Penrose, William O. "A Primer on Piaget," Phi Delta Kappan Fastback No. 128. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1979.
- Schweinhart, Lawrence J. and David P. Weikart. "Early Childhood Development Programs: A Public Investment Opportunity," Educational Leadership, November, 1986.
- Simner, Marvin L. "The Warning Signs of School Failure: An Updated Profile of the At-Risk Kindergarten Child," Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, October, 1983.
- Virginia. "An Overview of the Need for Child Day Care in Virginia," Child Care: Everybody's Business. Virginia: Governor's Conference on Child Day Care, 1987.

APPENDIX

- A. House Joint Resolution No. 299**
- B. Senate Joint Resolution No. 167**
- C. Proposed Legislation**

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA -- 1987 SESSION**HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 299**

Requesting the House Committees on Education, on Health, Welfare and Institutions and on Appropriations and the Senate Committees on Education and Health, on Rehabilitation and Social Services and on Finance to establish a joint subcommittee to study the need for early childhood programs.

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, February 8, 1987

Agreed to by the Senate, February 19, 1987

WHEREAS, the mothers of two-thirds of Virginia's preschool-age children currently are in the labor force, and the proportion of working mothers is projected to rise dramatically by the year 2000; and

WHEREAS, Virginia ranks nineteenth nationally in the number of preschool-age children living in poverty; and

WHEREAS, the preschool-age child has developmental needs that are different from those of the school-age child; and

WHEREAS, as a result, many at-risk four-year-olds are not receiving adequate developmental opportunities, and the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education has recommended voluntary developmental early childhood education programs for at-risk four-year-olds; and

WHEREAS, many Virginia children are currently being cared for outside the homes for part of the day in various settings from child-care facilities, to schools, to summer day camps; and

WHEREAS, an expanding body of research, such as the longitudinal study conducted by the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, shows that quality early childhood developmental programs for at-risk children help prevent school failure and increase the rates of postsecondary enrollment, reduce the need for special and remedial classes, reduce the need to repeat grade levels, and substantially decrease the rate of delinquency, arrests, teenage pregnancy, dependency on welfare and high school dropouts; and

WHEREAS, good early childhood programs provide experiences that promote sound intellectual, social and physical development that is the foundation for lifetime achievement; and

WHEREAS, early childhood programs support the economic vitality of a state by enabling employers to recruit and retain a stable workforce and by enabling working parents to become more productive through lowered rates of absenteeism and tardiness; and

WHEREAS, the needs of young children are met not by a single institution but by multiple institutions working collaboratively to provide quality early childhood programs; and

WHEREAS, early childhood developmental programs currently are available to varying degrees in Virginia through public and private organizations, and the potential for expansion can be achieved through several avenues; and

WHEREAS, an expansion of early childhood developmental programs must recognize and fit into a state's overall child-care needs; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the House Committees on Education, on Health, Welfare and Institutions and on Appropriations and the Senate Committees on Education and Health, on Rehabilitation and Social Services, and on Finance are requested to establish a joint subcommittee to study early childhood needs in the Commonwealth.

The joint subcommittee shall consist of eleven members: two members each of the House Committees on Education, on Health, Welfare and Institutions, and on Appropriations to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, one member each of the Senate Committees on Education and Health, on Rehabilitation and Social Services, and on Finance to be appointed by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, and two citizen members to be appointed by the Governor.

The joint subcommittee shall in its deliberations: (i) review the literature on early childhood programs; (ii) survey the research of experts and governmental entities and the views of the public on the issues; (iii) review existing programs, recommend ways to promote state and local, and public-private sector cooperation, and determine the appropriate mechanism for the development of a resource inventory and referral system; (iv) recommend a mechanism for the phased integration of and funding for quality early childhood developmental programs which recognizes the factors that contribute to quality such as the availability of qualified early childhood teachers or caregivers and a system for

monitoring and evaluation; (v) determine the number of at-risk four-year-olds, the number not licensed in developmental care programs and the level of funding necessary to implement such; and (vi) examine the definition of and regulation of day camps and the corresponding duties of the Departments of Health and Social Services with respect to day camps and child-care centers.

All agencies of the Commonwealth shall provide assistance upon request as the joint subcommittee deems appropriate.

The joint subcommittee shall complete its work in time to submit its findings and recommendations to the Governor and to the 1988 Session of the General Assembly.

The indirect costs of this study are estimated to be \$18,255; the direct costs of this study shall not exceed \$15,860.

LD4074512

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 27

Offered January 19, 1988

Continuing the joint subcommittee studying early childhood and day care programs.

Patrons—McDiarmid, Marshall, Van Yahres, Munford, Brown and Diamonstein

Referred to the Committee on Rules

WHEREAS, in 1980, it was estimated that fifty percent of mothers in Virginia work outside of their homes, and that nearly 200,000 families in Virginia were headed by women without husbands; and

WHEREAS, Virginia ranks nineteenth nationally in the number of preschool aged children living in poverty, an environment which exacerbates their social, intellectual, emotional, health and physical needs; and

WHEREAS, many at-risk young children in Virginia are without adequate development opportunities which could help ameliorate the intellectual, social, health and physical deficits from which they suffer; and

WHEREAS, good early developmental childhood programs offer experiences that provide a foundation for lifetime achievements; and

WHEREAS, many children in Virginia are being cared for outside their homes in various child care settings from child day care facilities, to schools, to summer day camps and

WHEREAS, special child day care services to provide sick child care, infant care and care of handicapped children are virtually nonexistent in Virginia; and

WHEREAS, many school age children are without adequate adult supervision during part of the day, and children who must provide self-care are more vulnerable to accidental abduction, sexual abuse, and experimentation with alcohol, tobacco, drugs and preadolescents are at high risk for the early initiation of sexual activity; and

WHEREAS, due to the increasing number of single parent families, working mothers and dual-career families, additional child day care services are required to meet the growing demand of families for quality, affordable and accessible day care; and

WHEREAS, quality affordable programs support the vitality of a state by enabling employers to recruit and retain a stable workforce, help working parents to become more productive through lowered rates of absenteeism and tardiness, allow low income families to access needed day care services, and provide supplemental enrichment experiences and supervision for latch-key children; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Subcommittee Studying Early Childhood and Public School Day Care Programs, pursuant to HJR 299 and SJR 167, (1987), examined many of these issues during the interim, but has determined that it lacked sufficient time to resolve the issues in order to make appropriate and cogent recommendations in these areas; and

WHEREAS, it is the consensus of the Joint Subcommittee that the need for and the development and implementation of quality early childhood and day care programs deserves careful and judicious planning and consideration; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the joint subcommittee studying early childhood and day care programs be continued. The current membership of the joint subcommittee shall continue to serve. The joint subcommittee shall:

1. Assess the need for additional child care services and the types of program options desired by families, and recommend ways to promote state and local, public-private sector and corporate involvement;

2. Review the status of agency efforts to promote the coordination and dissemination of child care information and day care services;

3. Determine the need for early developmental childhood programs, the factors which place young children at risk, and recommend a mechanism for the phased integration of

1 and funding for such programs;

2 4. Determine the feasibility of expanding Head Start programs in the Commonwealth
3 and recommend means for funding such expansion;

4 5. Review the factors which contribute to quality early childhood and day care
5 programs, such as qualified teachers, and caregivers, parental involvement, and a system
6 for monitoring and evaluation, and recommend appropriate modifications to enhance
7 quality; and

8 6. Examine the definition and regulation of day camps and the corresponding duties of
9 the Departments of Health and Social Services with respect to day camps and child care
10 centers;

11 7. Determine the needs and availability of programs to serve latch-key children and
12 recommend appropriate ways to address such needs; and

13 8. Analyze the several policy and legal issues related to early childhood and day care
14 programs, e.g. establishment of entitlement programs, effect on the compulsory school
15 attendance laws, modifications in licensing requirements, and program content, and assess
16 the need for the development of or changes in state policy and laws relevant to such
17 issues;

18 9. Determine the appropriate mechanism for and level of funding necessary to assist
19 low income families and the working poor in obtaining quality, affordable child day care
20 services; and

21 10. Recommend eligibility criteria for participation in and appropriate ways by which
22 such programs may be provided which minimize the potential for competition between the
23 Commonwealth and private day care providers.

24 All agencies of the Commonwealth shall provide assistance upon request as the joint
25 subcommittee deems appropriate.

26 The joint subcommittee shall complete its work in time to submit its findings and
27 recommendations to the Governor and the 1990 Session of the General Assembly.

28 The indirect costs of this study are estimated to be \$15,860; the direct costs of this
29 study shall not exceed \$13,380.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

Official Use By Clerks	
<p style="text-align: center;">Agreed to By</p> <p>The House of Delegates</p> <p>without amendment <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>with amendment <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>substitute <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>substitute w/amdt <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Agreed to By The Senate</p> <p>without amendment <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>with amendment <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>substitute <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>substitute w/amdt <input type="checkbox"/></p>
Date: _____	Date: _____
Clerk of the House of Delegates	Clerk of the Senate

1988 SESSION

LD2447512

HOUSE BILL NO. 860

Offered January 26, 1988

A BILL to amend the Code of Virginia by adding a section numbered 2.1-552.1, relating to the Office of Child Day Care and Child Development.

Patrons—McDiarmid, Marshall, Diamonstein, Van Yahres, Munford, Brown, Almand and Plum

Referred to the Committee on General Laws

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia is amended by adding a section numbered 2.1-552.1 as follows:

§ 2.1-552.1. Office of Child Day Care and Child Development.—The Office of Child Day Care and Child Development is established within the Department to act as coordinator of the Child Day Care Advisory Group consisting of the following agency administrators or their deputies: the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Commissioner of Social Services, the Commissioner of Health, the Director of the Department of Economic Development and the Commissioner of the Virginia Employment Commission. In no case shall any member of the Advisory Group be of any less authority than the second in command.

The following agencies shall appoint a child day care liaison officer: (i) the Department of Education for the purpose of providing information on the pilot programs for four-year old children to the Advisory Group and to coordinate the implementation of developmental programs with day care providers; (ii) the Virginia Employment Commission for the purpose of providing information and technical assistance on the requirements for establishing day care facilities and information on the availability of day care to the business community; and (iii) the Department of Economic Development for the purpose of providing information and technical assistance on the requirements for establishing day care facilities and information on the availability of day care to the corporate community.

The Office of Child Day Care and Child Development shall encourage diversity in child day care and development programs by ensuring that all constituencies of the day care industry are equitably treated and that all private, proprietary and nonprofit day care providers are given equal opportunity to participate in any state-supported programs including programs for at-risk children.

The Advisory Group shall report its recommendations annually by July 1, including: (i) services to at-risk children, including a definition of "at-risk"; (ii) appropriate administration of programs; (iii) the appropriate initiation of programs; (iv) qualifications and training for providers and how training should be implemented; (v) regulatory and licensure requirements; (vi) methods to utilize available resources; (vii) ways to increase the availability of services; (viii) procedures for information and technical assistance for the business and corporate sectors; (ix) sources of funding; (x) identification of areas with critical need; and (xi) ways to ensure that related services such as health care and transportation are available. The Advisory Group shall issue an interim report by July 1, 1988, and the first annual report on July 1, 1989.

