5-1992

A Profile of Child Care Services Offered at Land-Grant Institutions

Mary E. Bissonette
Utah State University

A PROFILE OF CHILD CARE SERVICES OFFERED AT LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

by

Mary E. Bissonette

A non-thesis project submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family and Human Development

(Plan B)

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1992

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I dedicate this paper to the following people:

- my children, Nicole and Gabriel, who by now know the meaning of persistence;
- my father, who never finished high school;
- Terri Steele, a friend and fellow graduate student in the College of Natural Resources, who died prematurely at age 25;
- older women everywhere who attempt to go to school, work, take care of and guide their families, and be supportive of their husband's professional life;
- and, finally, the many children and their families with whom I have had the good fortune to work during the years.

I thank God that this learning experience is over and feel blessed that I was able to persevere to the end. I am grateful that I still have a family to come home to and that none of them has disowned or divorced me because of this time-consuming challenge.

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Shelley Lindauer for her many professional thoughts and afterthoughts; to Dr. Joan Kleinke, whose door was always open to discuss an issue; to Dr. Jay Schvaneveldt for his support; to Maria Norton for statistical expertise; to Dr. Lawrence Piette for his support and advice; and to Dr. Carol Windham for her continued support. Thank you all so very much.

Additionally, I thank Dean Bonita Wyse, the Women and Gender Institute, and the Office of Student Services for partially funding this project. I am grateful to Utah State University and the Departments of Family and Human Development and Elementary Education for providing me with an opportunity to work with children and their families during my graduate tenure.

To my parents, in-laws, many friends, and acquaintances who were always supportive of me, I thank you and express my appreciation for your concern. A heartfelt thanks is extended for the patient and enduring spirit which emanated from my husband John and my children, Nicole and Gabriel.

Finally, a special thank you to all the little people I have worked with for letting me be a part of their lives.

Mary E. Bissonette

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Page

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

A survey was created and distributed to land-grant institutions to determine the availability and description of child care services at those institutions. Participants were 70 directors of child care centers or central administrators at land-grant institutions. Thirty-nine questions provided general demographic information, general information regarding child care programs at each institution, and specific information regarding administrative concerns and quality issues in child care (based on the components of quality from the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984) in both full- and half-day programs. The results yielded information that all of us in a university setting may find compelling. Most institutions are experiencing increased child care needs. The least serviced children are in the infant and after-school age groups. Very little child care is available at night and on weekends. Most child care programs are subsidized by the institution. Additionally, much of the ongoing maintenance is provided by the institution or individual college or department. Morale among staff is high. Finally, the least amount of support for child care programs came from boards of trustees, central administration, and some academic deans and department heads. Implications for land-grant institutions as we approach the 21st century are discussed.

(124 pages)

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Child care by non-custodial adults is not new to the American culture. Moreover, it is not new to a university setting (Gulley, Taylor, & Muldoon, 1985). Historically, child care services became available in the United States based on three factors. The first factor, meeting the needs of the poor, is illustrated by the infant school movement which developed during the 1820s and 1830s, the passage of the Mother's Pension Act of 1911, the Works Progress Administration (WPA) nurseries which commenced operation during the Depression, and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965. It was this act which established Head Start as well as day care for children of migrant workers and for children whose parents were involved in a variety of manpower projects. A second factor which has influenced the availability of child care services in this country is the occurrence of economic hard times. Programs such as the WPA nurseries of the Depression were created in part to provide jobs for unemployed cooks, teachers, janitors, and nurses (Clarke-Stewart, 1982). A final factor, as illustrated by passage of the Lanham Act of 1942, is that of meeting the needs of working mothers.

In the past 20 years America has witnessed major social change in the ways in which its children are cared for (Clarke-Stewart, 1982). Mothers have entered the work force in record numbers. Presently there is no indication that this situation will be reversed. The percentage of mothers in the work force with children under 18 years of age has gone from 39% in 1970 to 58% in 1985. By 1995 it is predicted that

73% of mothers will be in the labor force (Hofferth & Phillips, 1987). In other words, by 1995 it is estimated that 34.4 million school-aged children and 14.6 million preschool-aged children will have mothers who are employed outside the home (Hofferth & Phillips, 1987).

Mothers have impacted university and college campuses by returning to school to become better educated and to secure more marketable skills (Adelstein, Sedlacek, & Martinez, 1983). These women may or may not be single parents. Between 1974-1984 the enrollment of women at institutions of higher learning increased nine times faster than for men (Shirah, 1988). Non-traditional students (generally over 22 years of age, often married, and often with children), male and female, have returned to college campuses in increasing numbers across the country, and their needs are different (Corrigan, 1984).

A primary need for many returning students, male or female, is that of child care services. Bickimer (1988) states that "campus child care is a significant phenomena on our college campuses" (p. VIII). If this is so, to what extent are universities and colleges meeting these specific child care needs? What have land-grant institutions done to help meet the increasing child care needs of faculty, staff and students?

The current project addresses this issue by surveying child care facilities at land-grant institutions across the United States. It seeks to develop a profile of child care services offered to faculty, staff, and students.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review will begin with a history and an examination of the current needs for child care services in the United States. This is followed by a discussion about issues of quality in child care and what constitutes the criteria of quality from the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs (NAECP). The next section will encompass a history of land-grant universities and colleges and a history of campus child care services. Following this will be a discussion on the current needs for campus child care. A section is then included on the attitudes of institution administrators towards campus child care services. In conclusion, there is a brief discussion of previous "profile" research on campus child care.

History of Child Care in the United States

In order to fully appreciate the dilemma that child care services present to institutions of higher learning (i.e., need, funding, maintenance), it is important to understand the historical significance of child care, not only to colleges and universities, but to our country as well. Early childhood education and child care services provided by individuals other than parents have been part of the American culture for over 150 years. The response given to non-parental child care services by our country has been and is based upon social (Beck, 1982; Clarke-Stewart, 1982; Morrison, 1988; Schiller, 1980), economic (Clarke-Stewart, 1982; Morrison 1988), and political (Clarke-Stewart, 1982) issues. Support of child care services has increased

during such times as the Depression, World War II, periods of heavy immigration, and in the interest of improving the lives of at-risk children.

In its formative years non-parental care was viewed as servicing the "needy," an attitude which prevailed for many years. The infant schools, which were established by "charitable sponsors" (Kahn & Kamerman, 1987) in the early nineteenth century, served children of the poor and those children living in neglectful circumstances (Clarke-Stewart & Fein, 1983; Kahn & Kamerman, 1987).

Urbanization, industrialization, and immigration were the catalysts for the establishment of day nurseries by service organizations and rich women in the mid-1800s (Clarke-Stewart, 1982). Women's labor force participation by this time had risen to approximately 20%; many of the women were immigrants, poor, and had children (Clarke-Stewart & Fein, 1983). Day nurseries were the "original social welfare day care centers" (Kahn & Kamerman, 1987, p. 121). Although day nurseries were considered a "last resort for children" and received no public support, their existence increased substantially from 1838 into the twentieth century (Clarke-Stewart, 1982). Day nurseries met in homes that were adapted to meet their needs and were open six days a week (12 hours per day), and many were custodial in nature. There were some nurseries which went beyond care and offered 1) training in hygiene and manners to children; 2) educational programs, taught by kindergarten teachers, for a few hours daily; and 3) classes for the working mother dealing with family and employment issues (Clarke-Stewart, 1982). Generally speaking, these services met the needs of working women. However, in 1893 a "model day nursery"

was established at the Chicago World's Fair to accommodate children of visitors (Clarke-Stewart, 1982).

In the early twentieth century increased emphasis was placed on the importance of a two-parent family with an at-home mother (Kahn & Kamerman, 1987)--so much so, in fact, that financial support for widows with children became available under the Mother's Pension Act of 1911 so that mothers could remain home (Schiller, 1980). However, children of mothers employed outside the home did participate in day care services. Day care was viewed "as a form of substitute care and public relief" (Schiller, 1980, p. 3) and as "a form of charitable relief . . . and treatment" (Kahn & Kamerman, 1987, p. 122).

It wasn't until 1933, through the WPA, that the federal government began to fund day care for children of working mothers in a significant way (Kahn & Kamerman, 1987). These day care facilities provided jobs for unemployed nurses, janitors, teachers, and cooks (Clarke-Stewart, 1982), and services were available to low income families (Schiller, 1980). These child care programs were, for the most part, designed to be educational in nature, incorporating elements of kindergartens, nursery schools, and day care centers (Kahn & Kamerman, 1987). However, in the late 1930s, with the termination of the WPA, there was a decline in these programs (Clarke-Stewart, 1982).

Another effort involving federal funding for child care services came about through the passage of the Lanham Act of 1941. Labor force participation by women, especially in war-related industries, had escalated. Child welfare specialists viewed mothers in the work force negatively but, even so, the federal government felt

that each mother should choose for herself (Schiller, 1980). The Lanham Act programs officially recognized the fact that the work force might need many mothers who had young children and "that child care provision could therefore become an ongoing public responsibility" (Kahn & Kamerman, 1987, p. 123). This act established day care centers and began subsidizing day care at industrialized centers during World War II (Schiller, 1980). Under the auspices of the Lanham Act, approximately one-half to one and one-half million children (Clarke-Stewart, 1982; Schiller, 1980) received services. The cost from state and federal funds was estimated at $104 million for the program's two and one-half years (Schiller, 1980).

"Historically, the United States has been ambivalent toward maternal employment" (Schiller, 1980, p. 2). However, at this point in history, it could be said that working mothers and their need for child care services was tolerated reasonably well. With the ending of the war and the ending of the Lanham Act funds, the availability of child care quickly decreased (Clarke-Stewart, 1982), thereby making it difficult for working mothers to find services for their children. The rightful place of mothers was to be in the home with their children (Clarke-Stewart, 1982; Kahn & Kamerman, 1987). However, the reality was that many mothers did not remove themselves from the labor force (Clarke-Stewart, 1982). For about the next 15 years it was a particularly bleak time for those in need of child care services. The federal government had become less interested in public policy involving child care (Schiller, 1980), in funding, and in verbal support for the working mother.

Even so, mothers found child care for their children. If a family was poor enough, it could qualify for public-supported child care services (Clarke-Stewart,

1982). Not qualifying for that, families had the options for child care similar to those of today: relative care; in-home care (with housekeeper); neighbors; or private child care centers, which were few (Clarke-Stewart, 1982). During this time proprietary care expanded, but not without concern for its quality. The Child Welfare League, by 1958, had collected statistics involving inadequate care in private day care centers (Schiller, 1980).

The 1960s have been considered tumultuous times for the United States. There was an enormous movement for social change. Issues concerning child care services began to emerge again. Federal interest in day care services resurfaced in the 1960s because of increased labor force participation by mothers with children and, again, because of interest in servicing children of the poor. By federally supporting day care services, it was felt that women would be able to remove themselves from the "welfare rolls" (Clarke-Stewart, 1982).

By the mid-1960s day care for disadvantaged children had ebbed and flowed for over 100 years. However, another issue, the children of the many "normal" working women who needed child care services, came to the forefront. Kahn and Kamerman (1987) posed the question, "Should there not be an institutional response defined as serving typical-untroubled-families, a 'social utility?'" (p. 124). Also at this time there was what Almy (1982) refers to as "the 'rediscovery of early childhood education' . . . and its heavy emphasis on cognition" (p. 481).

As a result of the federal government's War on Poverty and the intense interest in early childhood education, Project Head Start was born. For the third time the federal government supported child care services with significant funding.

Greenberg's (1990) comment about the WPA, Lanham Act, and the Head Start Program sheds light on how the federal government viewed child care up to the mid-1960s: "All three major federally funded early childhood education programs to date have been launched for economic and political reasons" (p. 46).

Project Head Start has greatly contributed to the quality of life for many children and their families (National Research Council, 1990b). More than 11 million children have received comprehensive services (including social, educational, and health services). Moreover, parents and families have been given extensive opportunities to be involved in their child's education (Lombardi, 1990). Morrison (1988) contends that the Head Start Program "more than any other has educated the public and the early childhood profession about the need for comprehensive care and education for young children" (p. 188). Even so, during the past 25 years the number of children who live in poverty has increased "at an alarming rate" (Lombardi, 1990, p. 22).

Between 1967-1970 there was a considerable increase in enrollment of children in licensed day care centers, voluntary kindergartens, and nursery schools which emphasized academic and developmental issues (Clarke-Stewart, 1982). Clarke-Stewart maintains that the end of the 1960s marked another important event--a merger between day care and nursery school education.

Issues involving child care services became more apparent during the 1970s. Women were still seeking employment in record numbers. Therefore, it could be concluded that a continued increase in child care services would also be warranted. Interestingly, the White House Conference on Children in 1970 chose day care as the

issue which most seriously affected children and families in America (Clarke-Stewart, 1982). The Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971, which recommended comprehensive day care services for all children regardless of economic status, passed the Senate and the House but was vetoed by President Richard Nixon (Clarke-Stewart, 1982; Schiller, 1980)--his rationale: the bill was viewed "as a threat to the fabric of American family life" (Schiller, 1980, p. 5). It took another 20 years before the United States government could agree upon and support, in a major way, a course of action for its children.

Despite the facts that the number of working mothers increased eight-fold from 1940 to 1975 (Schiller, 1980) and there was an intense interest in early childhood education, attitudes toward day care were still divided (Clarke-Stewart & Fein, 1983). Those who did enroll their children in child care services could not necessarily be guaranteed quality.

In the 1980s the debate about whether or not there should be day care became a moot point. Millions of children were in non-parental, non-sibling care while their mothers worked full- or part-time. Women, and especially mothers of children, were fully integrated into the economy by their labor force participation. In 1988 13,259,000 children ages five and under were being cared for in some kind of child care setting. Eighty-three percent of those children had employed mothers (Dawson & Cain, 1990). A major concern at this time was that of after-school care for the school-aged child (Kahn & Kamerman, 1987). In 1985 62% of children between the ages of 6 and 17 had mothers in the labor force (Hofferth & Phillips,

1987). "With the 1980s, day care has become an important facet of the ecology of childhood" (Clarke-Stewart & Fein, 1983, p. 933).

Current Needs for Child Care Services

The need for child care services shows no signs of diminishing. By 1995 it is expected that two-thirds of all preschool children and approximately three-fourths of all school-aged children will have mothers in the work force. This translates into 34.4 million school-age children with mothers in the work force, approximately one-third more than in 1985. Preschool children with mothers in the work force would total 14.6 million, again an increase of about one-third since 1985 (Hofferth & Phillips, 1987). Not all preschool children of working mothers need out-of-home child care services. However, between 1965 and 1985 there was a continual decline in relative and sitter care and an increased use of family day care and particularly center-based care. Even so, approximately 50% of preschool children in 1985 received alternative care from relatives (Hofferth, 1989).

In addition to the parents who need and must find child care services, there are those parents who want to augment their preschool-age child's life with an educational and/or social experience in a preschool. Do these millions of children who need out-of-home care get it? Yes, parents do find care for their children. But for many one or more concerns exist: 1) more than one source is needed (Kamerman, 1983); 2) there are concerns about quality care (Hofferth, 1989); 3) the price may be unaffordable (Clarke-Stewart, 1982); 4) the match between child and service may be inappropriate (Clarke-Stewart, 1988; Hofferth, 1989); and 5) infant

care is at a premium (Hofferth & Phillips, 1987; Kamerman, 1983). For those parents who must seek and secure quality child care for their children, it can be an overwhelming task. Some are unable to select an appropriate situation for their child (Hofferth, 1989).

Working mothers have an enormous impact on the economy of the American society. They cannot be home to care for their children as in the past. Even though, theoretically, they are their child's first teacher and primary caregiver, in reality millions of children spend many hours every day in the care of someone else. "There is growing recognition that if parents are to manage productive roles in the labor force and at the same time fulfill their roles within the family, a substantial social response is required" (National Research Council, 1990a, p. 3). The National Research Council (1990a), in their Executive Summary, made five recommendations for state and federal involvement which would improve the system of child care in the United States, including expanding subsidies, expanding compensatory preschool programs and Head Start, providing leadership in developing national standards in the area of child care, mandating "unpaid, job-protected leave for employed parents of infants up to 1 year of age" (p. XVII) and, finally, suggesting that "governments at all levels, along with employees and other private-sector groups, should make investments to strengthen the infrastructure of the child care system" (p. XV). Likewise, the Children's Defense Fund (1991) takes the "partners" approach to 1) improving our child care system, and 2) meeting the needs of parents and children. These "partners" include the federal, state, and local governments and the private sector.

Willer (1990) also maintains that the cost of early childhood programs cannot be absorbed by parents only and that all of society now and in the future benefits from early childhood programs which are considered high quality. She states, "It is time that the costs of their provision be borne more equitably by all segments of society" (p. 7). And so, still, in the 1990s the debate goes on as to who is responsible for the education and care of the young in our country.

Quality Issues in Child Care

It has become a reality that many children in the United States are spending a significant amount of their waking hours in non-parental child care. For some children the experience is limited, but for others it can be a full-day experience. As a result, the issue of quality in child care becomes a vital concern for families and child care advocates. This section will examine how professionals address the issue of quality in child care services and will discuss the National Academy of Early Childhood Program's "Criteria for High Quality."

> Child care is now and will continue to be a necessity for America's economy, its families, and its children. (Winget, 1982, pp. 351-352)
>
> Child care in the United States involves and must meet the needs of diverse populations. (Kagan & Glennon, 1982, p. 409)
>
> Ensuring a high quality of care - regardless of the setting - should be a primary objective. (Hatch, 1982, p. 257)
>
> As a society, we can no longer ignore questions about the quality of their child care environments. (Phillips, 1987, p. 11)

> Children are learning about their environment and people in every situation. (Honig, 1980, p. 8)
>
> A strong case can be made that the most fundamental aspect of quality in day care is its effects on the immediate experience and long-term development of the individual child. (Ruopp & Travers, 1982, p. 79)
>
> The first five or six years of life are the most critical for human development. A child who is neglected during this formative period is far more likely than others to suffer from health, psychological, social, and learning disabilities, and to be an early school dropout. (Schiller, 1980, p. 1)
>
> The problem is that much of the day care available in this country is not high quality. (Vandell, 1990, p. 87)

All of these statements in one way or another, directly or indirectly, deal with the issue of quality. At first glance it would appear that the "quality" aspect of child care would be easily defined. Taking a closer look we discover that, as we move into the 1990s, quality in child care is one of the main concerns along with infant care, after-school care, and the correct matching of child to caregiver. Even social scientists have had a difficult time defining quality (Phillips & Howes, 1987). These same authors maintain that "quality, by its nature, is a fuzzy concept" (p. 3).

Quality was an important issue in 1973 when Caldwell asked the question, "Can young children have a quality life in day care?" (Caldwell, 1973, p. 197). In

1984 Caldwell posed the question, "What is quality child care?" (Caldwell, 1984, p. 3).

The definitive answer regarding quality has yet to be written. Many of the studies of quality child care have been done in university settings--hardly applicable to day care arrangements made by most people. In fact, many child care arrangements are unregulated (Phillips, 1987); that is, there is no state supervision. Phillips (1987) also suggests that perhaps it is not possible to identify the "key ingredients" of high quality care. In their review on early childhood programs, Clarke-Stewart and Fein (1983) concluded that there is much we do not know.

Regardless of where children are cared for--center-based care, family home day care, in-home care by relative or non-relative, or preschool settings--the highest quality possible should be the right of every child whether parents have the money to pay for it or not. For we do know that ". . . good quality care is good for children" (Phillips, McCartney, & Scarr, 1987, p. 54).

In order to pursue any discussion involving quality in child care services, a working definition of child care is in order. Caldwell (1984), after years of research and service in the field of early childhood, presents this definition:

> Professional child care is a comprehensive service to children and families which functions as a subsystem of the childrearing system and which supplements the care children receive from their families. Professional child care is not a substitute or a competition for parental care. To some extent, professional child care represents a version of

> the extended family which has adapted to the social realities of the modern world. (p. 4)

This definition presents child care services in all of its forms as part of the total family system which participates in the growth and development of children. Families may be considered nuclear families, but they do not operate in isolation. What happens to children at home impacts what happens to children in child care arrangements and vice versa. This idea is expanded by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the NAECP, a division of NAEYC, in their definitions of "high quality." The position statement of the NAEYC maintains "that a high quality early childhood program provides a safe and nurturing environment that promotes the physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development of young children while responding to the needs of families" (Bredekamp, 1986, p. 1). The position statement of the NAECP as it evaluates center-based child care programs throughout the United States defines a high quality program "as one which meets the needs of and promotes the physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development of the children and adults--parents, staff, and administrators--who are involved in the program" (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 7).

On the one hand there are social scientists who maintain that it is difficult to define quality; yet, on the other hand, there are the NAEYC and the NAECP who have provided child care professionals with general working definitions of high quality child care programs. The NAECP has identified "Criteria for High Quality." Their criteria include 10 components which will be used in the following discussion.

Components of Quality

I. Interactions Among Staff and Children

Although all 10 components are important for an overall positive experience for children in child care services, the importance of the child/caregiver relationship cannot be overemphasized. Klass (1987) maintains that "the adult-child relationship is a crucial component of quality child care" (p. 10). If what Schiller (1980) says is true, that "the first five or six years of life are the most critical for human development" (p. 1), then emphasis must be placed not only on early childhood experiences but on caregivers as they mediate these experiences. All child care services as experienced by children will affect their development. "It is likely to be the experiences the child has, not the type of program she or he is in, that will exert an influence on development" (Belsky, Steinberg, & Walker, 1982, p. 80).

From the time a child is born he/she endears him-/herself to his/her parent(s), eliciting certain behaviors from them. "The baby's appearance stimulates parenting responses" (Brazelton & Cramer, 1990, p. 47). This, ideally, makes possible interactions which support the child's optimal development. Brazelton and Cramer (1990) maintain that "profound individual differences" exist between newborns, and it is these differences which will affect infant participation and parental response in the earliest interactions. This participation by infants and parents is not always developed without effort. "The most fortunate families are those who enjoy a fit between the baby's individuality and the family's capacity to nurture" (Brazelton & Cramer, 1990, p. 75).

In seeking non-parental caregiving situations, it is equally important to find caregivers who can approximate the "fit" which exists between parent and child. For optimal growth and development of small infants and children in child care settings, there needs to be that proper "fit." Not every caregiver and/or child care service would be a good environment for every child.

What are some of the characteristics to look for in alternate caregivers which would promote this "fit?" Klass (1987) suggests there are three levels of adult involvement in "competent" child care: 1) a stabilizing presence, 2) a facilitative intervention, and 3) a shared participation. Within these three levels of involvement she categorizes six "distinct patterns" of adult-child interaction: 1) spontaneous conversation, 2) physical intimacy, 3) assistance, 4) praise, 5) understanding and following rules, and 6) structured turn-taking. Weber-Schwartz (1987) stresses the understanding of developmental issues in children as important for those working with young children. In helping children to meet their needs, she encourages conversation, risk-taking, freedom, spontaneity, sharing, and movement.

In conclusion, the goal of positive interactions between children and their caregivers is best summarized in the following way.

> Interactions between children and staff provide opportunities for children to develop an understanding of self and others and are characterized by warmth, personal respect, individuality, positive support, and responsiveness. Staff facilitate interactions among children to provide opportunities for development of social skills and

intellectual growth. (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 8)

II. Curriculum

All caregivers, whether they be in center-based care or family home day care, bring a certain philosophy and value system to the child care experience. In order for children's needs to be addressed, the caregivers must have a knowledge of child development (National Research Council, 1990b). This knowledge, to a greater extent, would insure that the program or home setting would provide "developmentally appropriate practice" (Bredekamp, 1986).

According to the NAEYC, "developmental appropriateness" includes both age appropriateness and individual appropriateness. Age appropriateness recognizes that children have distinct sequential and developmental growth patterns in the areas of cognitive, physical, and social-emotional development. Individual appropriateness recognizes that all children have a unique growth pattern, family background, learning style, and personality (Bredekamp, 1986). By being sensitive to individual differences, it is possible to implement developmentally appropriate activities and supply children with developmentally appropriate equipment and materials.

Clarke-Stewart (1982), in discussing the variety of educational programs for children in preschool centers, maintains that programs which provide exploration, some structure, and free choice in educational settings enhance children's problem-solving skills, persistence, constructive activity, positive motivation, social skills, later achievement, and intelligence.

Elkind (1987) maintains that professionals in the field of child development must advocate programs for young children that provide a "rich and stimulating environment" that is also "warm, loving, and supportive of the child's own learning priorities and pacing" (p. 8). Within this context, infants and young children can "acquire a social sense of security, positive self-esteem, and a long-term enthusiasm for learning" (p. 9). In summary, the goal of curriculum is to encourage "children to be actively involved in the learning process, to experience a variety of developmentally appropriate activities and materials, and to pursue their own interests in the context of life in the community and the world" (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 11).

III. Staff-Parent Interactions

If child care experiences with adults other than parents are part of the family system or are part of the "ecology of day care" (Belsky et al., 1982), then staff-parent interactions must be viewed as important. In order for teachers to effectively work with and be more sensitive to the needs of children and their families, they need to know significant information about the child as he/she arrives in the child care setting each day and, in turn, teachers need to provide for the parent(s) similar information on departure. Although Clarke-Stewart (1982) believes that communication between parents and caregivers is important, she also maintains that it is difficult and "rarely occurs." Parents need to know that the caregiver loves their child and has the interests of their child always in the forefront.

In addition to sharing information at the beginning and end of each day, there is any number of avenues where communication between parent and caregiver can continue. These might include weekly newsletters and lesson plans, a daily "what happened" note, telephone calls, parent-teacher conferences, or a parent visitation when possible.

Many positive results occur in families where effective communication is ongoing. Some of the benefits to families include 1) alleviating fears and concerns about child care, 2) understanding of child development issues, 3) support and encouragement of parents, and 4) options for advocacy. Some benefits experienced by caregivers include 1) an understanding of each family's specific dynamics, philosophy, and values; 2) involvement by parents in center-based care; and 3) advocacy by parents.

In positive child care arrangements with ongoing, open communication, parents become more fully aware that they are their child's first teachers and that outside caregivers are only facilitators who help and guide children in their learning experiences, "and without such open communication quality care is jeopardized" (Belsky et al., 1982, p. 110). In summary, the goal of staff-parent interaction is that "parents are well informed about and welcome observers and contributors to the program" (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 15).

IV. Staff Qualifications and Development

"The caregiver is a pivotal figure" (Clarke-Stewart, 1982, p. 94). What are some of the major forces which influence high quality programs? At the onset, it is

important that all child care employees, whether in family care or center-based care, be educated in child development and/or early childhood education. In addition to caring about children, one must understand how children develop and learn in order to be sensitive to the needs of children and their families (National Research Council, 1990b). Howes (1983) maintained that caregiving of high quality resulted when caregivers had more education in child development and child care and had more experience. Feeney and Chun (1985) suggest that effective teaching may be influenced by the beliefs and attitudes held by each teacher. Tyler and Dittman (1980) observed that in-home caregivers who belonged to a group which provided child care information, answered questions, and was considered a support system felt confident in dealing with children, interacted more with children, and "showed a greater readiness to provide support" to the children they cared for (p. 45). Additionally, the authors maintained that the child care observed in center care and in home care was not "optimal" and recommended "more and better training programs" be made available to adults who care for children (p. 45).

Research supports the relationship between caregiver education and training in early childhood education and child development. Specifically, higher levels of education and training in early childhood education have positive outcomes for children: the development of prosocial behaviors, increased social interactions with adults, and improved cognitive and language development (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984). Further stressed by the NAECP is the importance of business experience for the chief administrator, orientation of new staff, training opportunities for employees, and accurate recordkeeping of all staff.

Clarke-Stewart (1987) maintains that one of the best "indexes" of quality child care is one in which the caregiver has been employed in a specific program for some time, has professional experience in taking care of children, and has "balanced" training in the issues of child development (p. 118).

Morrison (1988) maintains that the chances of getting high quality care increase when caregivers receive training. He also outlines five important characteristics of quality caregivers. They need to 1) be nurturant, 2) be interested in professional growth, 3) understand child development and growth issues, 4) care about themselves both mentally and physically, and 5) care about the children and their families (p. 196).

Travers and Goodson (1980), in their National Day Care Study findings, indicate that caregivers who were trained or educated in special education, day care, child psychology, or early childhood education "provided more social and intellectual stimulation to children in their care than did other caregivers, and the children scored higher on standardized tests" (p. XXVII). Results of the National Child Care Staffing Study reveal that higher quality caregiver situations were available to children where the staff was better educated (Whitebook, Howes, Phillips, & Pemberton, 1989). In conclusion, the goal of staff qualifications and development is one in which "the program is staffed by adults who understand child development and who recognize and provide for children's needs" (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 18).

V. Administration

Child care services which provide positive outcomes for children and their families have strong positive administrators who possess business/administrative and interpersonal skills and a knowledge of child development and family life issues. Additionally, those in administration are responsible for recordkeeping, policymaking, budgetary concerns, and many housekeeping activities. They need to be sensitive and supportive of the needs of parents, children, and staff; provide leadership; maintain morale; be a liaison to the community and an advocate for child and family concerns. Yet, the requirements for child care directors vary widely from state to state, ranging from no experience or training to college preparation.

Those in administration need to be forward-thinking and deeply knowledgeable about human and child development. Lorton and Walley (1987), interestingly, note that "administrators need to be on top of societal shifts so they can be leaders in pointing out how social change affects the quality of attention, or lack of it, that children receive" (p. X). Additionally, Almy (1982) refers to an administrator/director as the "early childhood educator." She maintains that this person should have a deep knowledge of child development and special skills and personal characteristics for working with adults" (p. 494). The goal of administration is that "the program is efficiently and effectively administered with attention to the needs and desires of children, parents and staff" (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 21).

VI. Staffing

One of the most crucial aspects of any child care service concerns the staffing: group size, adult-child ratio, and turnover. Inherent and underlying these three areas are working conditions and salary.

Group size, child-to-caregiver ratio, and staff turnover are three areas in staffing which impact quality. "Small group sizes and manageable child-to-staff ratios are essential for adequate adult supervision and good adult-child interactions" (Children's Defense Fund, 1990, p. 45). The National Day Care Study reported that children in smaller groups tended to become more involved in verbal/intellectual, creative, and cooperative activity; displayed less aimless wandering; were more involved in the group activity; and made "more rapid gains on certain standardized tests" (Travers & Goodson, 1980, p. XXV). Centers that were considered of better quality by the National Child Care Staffing Study were "more likely" to meet the 1980 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements in the areas of group size and adult-child ratios (Whitebook et al., 1989).

Meeting state guidelines, requirements, or regulations may or may not yield quality in child care services. State guidelines concern themselves with minimum standards of care. In the state of Utah the purpose of Center Child and Family Day Care Standards is the same: to "set a minimum level of care which must be maintained by caregivers to assure the health, safety, welfare, and education of children" (Division of Family Services, 1987, June, p. 1; Division of Family Services, 1987, October, p. 1). Class and Orton (1980) believe that "licensing center care is . . . the keystone to safeguarding children" (p. 15). A major area of concern is

regulations for infant-toddler day care. "The existing state day care regulations clearly are deficient in mandating a safe and healthy day care environment for infants and toddlers" (Young & Zigler, 1986, p. 52). The NAECP (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984) accreditation criteria, on the other hand, aim at developing the highest quality possible in child care services and helping parents recognize and locate these kinds of programs.

In the area of caregiver-child ratios, Morrison (1988) maintains that meeting state guidelines does not necessarily guarantee quality child care services. Additionally, Morrison states, "Low ratios . . . make quality care more likely" (p. 197). Kontos and Fiene (1987) report that group size and quality are positively related. Phillips and Howes (1987) maintain that smaller group size is correlated with "developmental outcomes" for children that are positive and caregiver behavior that is more constructive. The development of children was enhanced by stable caregivers and appropriate adult-child ratios in community-based child care centers (Howes, 1987).

The turnover rate among those working in child care services is of concern among all people who care about what happens to children. Children need consistent, stable caregivers/teachers in order to form relationships which will enhance their development (Whitebook & Granger, 1989). The rate of turnover in a study of center-based care in 1988 was 41% (Whitebook et al., 1989). These same authors report that in centers where the turnover rate was higher, children experienced lower levels of social and linguistic competence. For infants and

toddlers to develop a sense of security, it is important to have caregivers who offer stability or continuity of care (Howes, 1987).

"Continuity permits a baby to relax into the certainty of a sustained relationship she or he can count on" (Honig, 1985, p. 41). In addition to having a low turnover rate among staff, Belsky et al. (1982) refer to the importance of stability in "children's placements" by parents in child care. They "believe that stability enables the young child to develop a sense of control over the world" (p. 108).

High staff turnover rates are the result of poor working conditions, few benefits, and low salaries (National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1990). In order to attract and retain staff to work with young children, there must be appropriate compensation. In conclusion, the goal of staffing is to provide a program which "is sufficiently staffed to meet the needs of and promote the physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development of children" (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 23).

VII. Physical Environment

The physical environment, both indoors and outdoors, is an important aspect of implementing developmentally appropriate practices. The indoor space needs to be large enough to accommodate the numbers of children and adults involved and to allow for the various learning centers and activities (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984). The outdoor space also needs to be large enough to meet the needs of large motor activities, safety, and other outdoor activities. "Children learn best when their physical needs are met and they feel psychologically

safe and secure" (National Association for the Education of Young Children and National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education, 1991, p. 25). All activities, equipment, and supplies, whether indoors or outdoors, should provide positive situations for children to interact with adults and their peers and to develop in the cognitive, social-emotional, physical, and language areas. Children need to feel good about where they spend so much of their time. High quality physical environments in child care services offer positive experiences for both children and staff. Through these positive experiences, children are able to master skills and receive approval from significant caregivers.

"Providing opportunities for children to strive toward independence and to develop a sense of personal control is likely to have a positive effect on children's perceptions of competence and self-esteem" (Marshall, 1989, p. 49). Play, after all, is how children learn. These developmental experiences need to be individual- and age-appropriate. In conclusion, the goal of the physical environment is that "the indoor and outdoor physical environment fosters optimal growth and development through opportunities for exploration and learning" (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 25).

VIII. Health and Safety

To encourage quality child care programs, it may be desirable or even necessary to have some type of regulation and licensing (Lorton & Walley, 1987). Licensing or accreditation takes place through a state or local agency in order to protect the safety and health of children in a group setting (National Academy of

Early Childhood Programs, 1984). This indicates that minimum standards are being maintained. It does not mean, however, that the setting will be of high quality. (See Section VI, Staffing, for a more in-depth evaluation.) Programs can voluntarily participate in the accreditation procedure through the NAECP, which seeks to identify high quality in early childhood programs. When a program receives accreditation from this organization, it assures the public that they have met the standards for high quality in early childhood programs.

Health issues involve both children and staff. Caregivers need to be in good physical and mental health because of the demands and needs of children. Besides being healthy themselves, they need to be acutely aware of the health status of the children in their care, know first-aid techniques, and be aware of and practice good health habits in working with children. "Of all concerns surrounding early surrogate care, none is more troubling than possible health risks" (Maynard, 1985, pp. 164-165). Two of the major concerns shared by parents, caregivers, physicians, and child care advocates alike are the spread of infectious diseases (Caldwell, 1973; Kendall, 1984; Maynard, 1985; Wingert & Kantrowitz, 1990) and general health issues of young children, such as how caregivers can communicate with the child's physician (Dixon, 1990), stress (Morrison, 1988), injuries (Aronson, 1984), and allergies (Voignier & Bridgewater, 1984). When children and staff are healthy, their subsequent interactions will have a greater chance of providing optimal development for children and facilitating the handling of stressful events in child care. In order for children to get the full benefit in any kind of child care experience, they must feel good physically and be alert mentally.

Health and safety often overlap. Safety issues in child care settings deal with adult decision-making regarding equipment, space, supervision, housekeeping, recordkeeping, and emergency situations. An environment which is safe for children means there will be fewer accidents, less stress, and more positive outcomes for children. In conclusion, the goal of health and safety is that "the health and safety of children and adults are protected and enhanced" (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 28).

IX. Nutrition and Food Service

Although nutrition is treated separately, it certainly impacts a child's health (Morrison, 1988) and safety. Children who are not adequately nourished are sick more often, play more by themselves, have less energy, communicate less, and have problems with concentration, attention, and irritability (Cosgrove, 1991). "Children who are well fed and well cared for early in life stand a much better chance of success in later life" (Lorton & Walley, 1987, p. IX).

In group care if food is served, it must meet the nutritional requirements as set forth by the Child Care Food Program of the United States Department of Agriculture (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984). Additionally, food should be stored, prepared, and served according to the recommended state safety standards. Parents need to know what foods are being offered to their children and about eating policies, such as: Where do children eat?; Must children 'clean their plate'?; Is there a friendly atmosphere?; and Do caregivers practice proper health habits?

"Eating habits are established when children are very young" (Wishon, Bower, & Eller, 1984, p. 120). Therefore, it is important that children be exposed to the highest nutritional standards and to a positive eating environment. Additionally, implementation of food activities by children is another way to establish sound nutritional habits (Cosgrove, 1991). In conclusion, the goal of nutrition and food service is that "the nutritional needs of children and adults are met in a manner that promotes physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development" (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 35).

X. Evaluation

In order to maintain high standards and professional growth in child care services, it is vital that evaluation play an integral part of the program. Evaluations need to be completed 1) on the program by staff, parents and appropriate others if necessary; 2) on the staff by director and parents; and 3) on the children by staff and possibly the director.

The success of the evaluation process depends heavily on the leadership of the director and the communication which exists between the director, staff, parents, and children. "The management of adult relationships requires special skills from the administrator" (Catron & Kendall, 1984, p. 39). Catron and Kendall (1984) point out that in dealing with staff, the techniques of evaluation need to be non-threatening and "promote growth, provide feedback to both administrator and staff, and aid in the creation of an optimum program environment" (p. 39).

Standardized testing of young children should be taken very seriously (Bredekamp & Shepard, 1989) and used only when the tests are reliable and valid, "only for the purpose for which they were designed," and only to benefit children (p.15). However, all staff/caregivers need to be well grounded in developmental issues of children in order to recognize advances or delays. Written reports by observant staff need to be confidentially kept in children's files. The goal of evaluation is "systematic assessment of the effectiveness of the program in meeting its goals for children, parents, and staff conducted to ensure that good quality care and education are provided and maintained" (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, p. 37).

In conclusion, parents need to feel secure in the knowledge that their children are being cared for in a high quality environment. What is quality and how to maintain it will be debated for years to come. At the same time parents will continue to ask, "How do I know if my child is in a good child care situation?" We do know that the criteria of quality just presented do promote optimal development for children. This should not only be available to certain children in society, but quality child care services should be the right of all children whose families need it. High quality early childhood experiences in the long term benefit not only the individual child but society as well.

History of Land-Grant Institutions

As with many pieces of important federal legislation during periods of social change, the future of land-grant universities and colleges endured many struggling

years before the passage into law of the Morrill Act by President Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862. Deighton (1971) presents the following description of some of the events which preceded the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862. Education, prior to the Morrill Act of 1862, was only available to small numbers of men in the areas of teaching, medicine, law, and theology, what was called classical education. As a result, the needs of the majority of men, the industrial class, were left unmet. In the late 1700s classical education began to be questioned, and "demands for change" were initiated by 1800. As commerce and science became more important, so did the desire and need for trained people who knew what to do with the natural resources. Classical education offered nothing. For this and other reasons, people became disenchanted with classical education. Land began to be set aside for educational purposes beginning with the Continental Congress in 1785. At the start of the Civil War the federal land grants given to states for universities amounted to four million acres. However, it was the Morrill Act of 1862 which specifically detailed "what type of institutions" would be created.

The concept of land-grant institutions is reputed to have been the brain child of Jonathan Baldwin Turner (1805-1899), an Illinois professor. James (1910) refers to him as "the real father of the so-called Morrill Act" (p. 7). In 1851 he not only presented a plan for a university for the "industrial classes" of Illinois but "for a university for the industrial classes in each state in the union" (James, 1910, pp. 20-21). Turner's "common man's educational bill of rights" included 1) the ability of the working man to be higher educated, 2) practical education, 3) the ability of

students to choose what they wanted to study, and 4) research and experimentation by the institution to benefit the community (Deighton, 1971).

In any event, it was Rep. Justin Morrill of Vermont who first introduced the College Land Bill in 1857. His own records (1874) reveal the following: "The idea of obtaining a land grant for the foundation of colleges I think I had formed as early as 1856 . . . Where I obtained the first hint of such a measure, I am wholly unable to say" (Parker, 1924, p. 262). President Buchanan vetoed the bill in 1859. With the election of Abraham Lincoln as President, Morrill reintroduced the College Land Bill in 1861 in the House and, at the request of Morrill, Senator Wade of Ohio introduced it in the Senate in 1862. Within seven months following its introduction in the House, President Lincoln had signed the bill. Why is the Morrill Act considered such an important piece of legislation? What did it offer the American citizenry that was new or different?

With the passage of the Morrill Act 30,000 acres of land were allocated for each federal senator and representative. This land, when sold, then provided a permanent endowment for the establishment in each state of

> at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as related to agriculture and the mechanics arts . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life. (Deighton, 1971, p. 318)

Some states created new land-grant institutions, others assigned land-grant status to existing installations and, for some states, private universities were assigned land-grant duties.

The Morrill Act placed emphasis on teaching, and subsequent legislation emphasized research (Hatch Act of 1887--through the establishment of the Agriculture Experiment Station) and service (Smith-Lever Act of 1914--through the establishment of the Cooperative Extension Service). The second Morrill Act was signed into law by President Harrison in 1890, thereby granting additional funding to and the creation of 17 land-grant colleges for black people. In 1908 the Nelson Amendment to the second Morrill Act provided still more funding. Through the years Congress has recognized, through its support and appropriations, the important role played by land-grant institutions.

The Morrill Act digressed considerably from the approach of "classical" education that was so much a part of that era. It maintained that "campuses should be accessible to students from all economic classes--not just the wealthy. Higher education should be practical as well as classical. Colleges and universities should draw support from the federal government" (National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1989, p. 11).

One of the important aspects of the land-grant legislation is that it considered the "rapidly changing social patterns," and it thereby became possible for women to attend coeducational institutions (Deighton, 1971). Additionally, the federal and state governments worked together in accomplishing educational goals. The Morrill Act of 1862 was reactive and proactive at the same time. It was reactive in the sense

that discontent with the then-present higher educational system had been longstanding. By being proactive, this piece of legislation changed the higher educational system in the United States forever. Those who doubted whether the "industrial classes" could be educated need only look at the research accomplishments in medicine, agriculture, and engineering; Nobel Prize winners; international involvements; and public service.

We find in 1992 the everpresent struggle by institutions of higher learning to offer quality education. The theme statement celebrating the centennial of the land-grant system and its continuance into the future is as appropriate now as it was then.

> Education faces always the problem that the Land-Grant movement founders discerned a century ago: the requirement for reappraisal, reorganization and redirection to meet the needs of time and change. Persistence in old patterns, however resourceful and responsive in their day, are not sufficient to the future which becomes the pressing present. (Richard A. Harvill, as cited in Allen, 1963, pp. V-VI)

Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., prior to becoming Chancellor at the University of California at Irvine, reflected on the land-grant spirit and, in so doing, posed the question, "What are the needs of people in this time?" (Allen, 1963, p. 11). This same question needs to be the concern of all land-grant institutions today.

And so, inherent in the history of land-grant institutions is change. It is no different now. Land-grant universities and colleges must be proactive in meeting the changing needs of the American society and its people and, thereby, offer quality education to its constituencies.

History of Campus Child Care Services

Laboratory Schools

Children have been on university campuses for almost 100 years. The first laboratory school was established at the University of Chicago in 1896 by John Dewey. (A cooperative school was opened at the same university by parents in 1916.) Dewey and some of his contemporaries supported child-centered arrangements for children maintaining that "'better' children created a 'better' society" (Kahn & Kamerman, 1987, p. 122). Children were now being studied. Increases in child development laboratories at universities and colleges continued through the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s. Traditionally, laboratory schools have been affiliated with academic departments such as home economics, psychology, family studies, and education. Included in laboratory settings are the joint goals (or missions) of research, teacher preparation, and service. As laboratory schools increased, "child care was not a major consideration in the design of these schools" (Axtmann, 1988, p. 189). The 1920s' child care centers were the backdrop for parent education as well as teacher training and the study of children (Keyes, 1990). Much of the child study research prior to the 1940s was utilized by the federal government in their development of child care centers during World War II. Interest in preschool education by educators was increased as a result of the growth of preschools during the Depression and World War II (Pine, 1984). There was, by 1971, some kind of preschool setting on 40% of the 1,100 senior universities and colleges in the United States (Podell, 1982).

Other Campus Child Care

Interest in child care services dramatically increased during the 1960s and 1970s. Social change resulted in increased need for child care services on university and college campuses. This increase in child care services came about as a result of the women's movement, changing family structure, affirmative action, and the student movements (Keyes, 1990). Those advocating child care services on campuses not only included women graduates (Keyes, 1990), faculty wives, male faculty, university or college employees, and graduate students (Pine, 1984), but also undergraduates and women faculty (Keyes, 1990; Pine, 1984).

The child care issue became a political one. Pine (1984) aptly describes the mood and reality of the campus child care movement at this time. "Many students were activists, some were radicals, and confrontation was the principal tactic used to achieve the implementation of campus child care" (p. 11). Additionally, she reports that trustees, university administrations, and legislatures had received all kinds of pressure from child care advocates. Even though child care services increased at colleges and universities, the last 25 years have been anything but smooth. In its initial stages the students did not want the child care center to be run like a laboratory school which was overseen by faculty. Rather, what they did want was parent involvement in the center operation (Pine, 1984). Pine (1984) adds that in advocating campus child care (and often getting it), students brought children to classes where disruptions occurred, staged sit-ins, and met with university officials.

In the midst of campus activism for child care services Rae Burrell, in 1970, founded an organization known as the Robert F. Kennedy Council for Campus Child Care which focused on campus child care needs and concerns. The major goal of this fledgling organization was "the promotion of quality comprehensive child care at institutions of higher learning so that it would be available for all students who sought it and for all children who needed it" (Pine, 1984, p. 12).

By 1974 this organization became politically active at the state and federal levels. Emphasis was placed on quality care based on children's developmental needs and on a working relationship between center administrations, staff, and parents in campus child care programs. It was felt that the organization needed a new name. It then became known as the National Campus Child Care Council. To become an even more effective voice for advocacy and to meet the needs of its members, reorganization took place in 1980 which included another name change to the National Coalition for Campus Child Care. This grass roots organization has become the mainstay for those involved in campus child care who "often feel isolated and alone" (Pine, 1984, p. 15). This organization offers hundreds of people support and an opportunity to share professional concerns. Schwartz (1991) describes the search for identity among campus child care centers as these centers try to become part of an educational system which is geared for adult education.

In addition to the concern of identity, there is the issue of educating the university community that child care services are not merely custodial. Schwartz (1991) comments that by using the term "care" in campus child care, one thinks of these services as "akin to maintenance" (p. 16). Galinsky (1990) has attempted to

bridge the gap by combining the title of teacher and caretaker into one word: teacher-caregiver. This makes sense since all child care services involving young children demand both components: care and teaching. Willer (1990) points out that education and care are "inexorably intertwined . . . throughout childhood" (p. 5).

Current Need for Campus Child Care

Child care services on campus are needed for a number of constituencies (students, faculty, staff, community) and for a number of reasons. For the many undergraduate and graduate students with children, the availability of campus child care has made their college education possible. This is true in single-parent families as well as intact families. "Families with young children on college campuses are among the most stressed in the population. Parents have multiple roles to perform and their schedules are constantly changing" (Powell, 1988, p. 7). Wilson (1988) maintains that the pressures involving student parents include lack of money, schoolwork, identity formation, limited access to extended families, and trying to effectively fulfill the role of student and parent. Additionally, she points out that these pressures can lead to individual and parental stress and student burnout.

Students

In the last 25 years the profile of college students has changed. In 1985 out of 12 million students on college/university campuses, 43% were 25 years or older (Greene, 1985). The older, non-traditional student is increasing in the 1990s on campuses across the country. These individuals have different needs and

expectations than the traditional (18- to 22-year-old) student. The non-traditional student is a good student who offers much to the undergraduate experience, the institution, and campus life (Corrigan, 1984). Even so, the reality for many student parents is that "work and family take precedence. College is a third priority" (Greene, 1985, p. 29).

For families with children, one of the most pressing needs is child care for their children. Overall, it is women students who are most in need of child care, as many of these women are single parents (Alger, 1988a). Kaplan (1982) confirms the seriousness of the child care issue for women in professional and graduate schools, especially if the children are preschoolers. Besides availability, student parent needs demand that the child care system be flexible and affordable, provide support for student families, and address their parenting concerns.

Flexibility allows student parents to use child care services only when they need them (classes, study time, etc., and during the daytime, evenings, and weekends). Affordability is extremely important because most, if not all, student parents are struggling to survive financially. Often campus child care centers are more affordable than those in the private sector (Corrigan, 1984).

Faculty and Staff

For faculty and staff the availability of campus child care is increasingly becoming an important factor. Mollie and Smart (1990) report that for many couples on campus, child care is their major concern. Kraft (1984) reports that a certain professor at Ohio State University refused positions at six other universities because

the child care situation was inferior to what Ohio State offered or the waiting list was long.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has for years been concerned about the family and professional responsibilities of its members. The AAUP believes that quality child care services need to be available to faculty and that the university should be partially responsible for providing them (Faculty child care, 1990). Additionally, "the Association strongly recommends an institutional commitment to the provision of quality child care" (Faculty child care, 1990, p. 54).

For some faculty and staff with small children, the availability of an all-day child care center is especially crucial. For others, a half-day arrangement is satisfactory. Still, for others, quality after-school care is necessary and would be an important issue as well as affordability, although the latter may not be as big an issue as for students.

Community

Universities and colleges are intimately linked to the communities in which they reside. All universities and colleges confront the issue of competition for services, goods, and facilities with their respective communities. Public institutions by necessity must provide for the basic needs of their campus community (such as housing, dining, available bookstore, etc.) within the campus setting even though options are available off-campus. To maintain a harmonious relationship with and

to have the support of the local community, the university or college should not be viewed as a competitor in the community which offers similar services.

Corrigan (1984) maintains that child care programs can be of service to "communities, either through formal arrangements or through informal networks" (p. 7). Among other things, the staff could provide workshops, consultation services and, as Alger (1984) maintains, can act as a model for child care services in the community. In some situations the university or college augments what is available in the local community and, at other times, offers additional facilities, services, and goods to the surrounding area.

Attitude Toward Child Care by University and College Administration

How should we view child care services on campus? Why are they important? It is important to faculty, staff, and students, for they want to have a quality facility which is convenient, flexible, and affordable (especially for students)--one which meets the developmental needs of their children so that they can work and/or study without having to worry about them.

How important are child care services to the university or college? For the most part, the university views child care services as a way to recruit faculty and probably certain staff (Corrigan, 1984) and students (Alger, 1984; Corrigan, 1984). The hope is that it will influence retention as well (Corrigan, 1984). Other positive benefits accrued to the university from having child care on campus for faculty, staff, and students are a decrease in tardiness and absenteeism, an opportunity for training teachers and for doing research involving developmental issues related to children,

and integrating with the many departments on campus (Alger, 1984; Cook, 1984; Corrigan, 1984; Powell, 1988; Townley & Zeece, 1991).

Even though there are many positive benefits for universities and colleges by having child care services on campus, both laboratory schools and other child care services have, over the years, struggled to survive. Alger (1988b) maintains "there has been little support for campus child care from academic programs on many campuses" (p. 12). Additionally, she describes campus child care centers as oftentimes having to be self-sufficient and being located in less-than-optimal facilities while child laboratory schools include trained staff, are included in the university/ college budget, and have exemplary facilities.

Fountain and Boulton (1988) state, "The reality is that few if any colleges want child care on campus because they like children" (p. 85). Gulley et al. (1985) report that, historically, institutions and administrators are not supportive of child care services unless they are laboratory schools or research-related facilities which are allied closely with academic programming. Even though institutions of higher learning have had trouble in fully supporting child care services on campus, they have had to acquiesce due to pressure from many sources. Often support has come in the form of in-kind services such as providing the facility, maintenance, secretarial and custodial services, utilities, etc.

In looking toward the future, institutions of higher learning have the opportunity to be model facilities for the education and care of children. Universities and colleges need to be leaders in the area of day care (Corrigan, 1984). How we treat our children now has great impact not only on children's lives now and

in the future but on the country's future as well. Young children who are educated and well cared for result in a "well qualified" and "well educated" future labor force (Keyes, 1990). Corrigan (1984) views child care as a moral issue, "a commitment to the family and a humanistic commitment to the pressing needs of real people" (p. 7). Corrigan (1984) further observes that child care services do mesh well with the mission of education, research, and service. Additionally, he suggests quality child care benefits are accrued to society by the possible removal of social, economic, and cultural inhibitors which are a still a problem in our culture.

Land-grant universities and colleges, as a result of the Morrill Act of 1865, were created to meet the needs of the people/students at that period of time. The student population is different now, with increasing numbers of non-traditional students who have different needs. Child care services for many students are a necessity and not a luxury. Students should be able to expect child care which is affordable and competent (Corrigan, 1984).

The need for child care services among faculty and staff is also not a luxury. To keep up with societal changes, and to aid faculty and staff in fulfilling professional and personal goals, employers (i.e., the university or college) could show their concern and sensitivity by being proactive in the area of child care.

Universities and colleges need to remember that quality child care is not available to all parents. When universities and colleges fully support campus child care services, they not only are meeting the present needs of student, faculty, and staff families but are insuring their own future growth and development as well.

Additionally, they are advocating the rights of children who cannot speak for themselves (Povell, 1988).

In conclusion, universities and colleges, when they support child care services, tap into more global advocacy groups, in particular the Committee for Economic Development (CED). In their latest report entitled The Unfinished Agenda: A New Vision for Child Development and Education, they recommend that private and public resources must work together to address the early emotional, physical, cognitive, and social development in children (Hamburg, 1991). Institutions of higher education are in a unique position to serve as a role model in addressing this kind of enterprise.

"Profile" Research of Campus Child Care Services

Very little "profile" research has been conducted nationwide on campus child care. Between 1955-1980 the three early works which are often cited when discussing campus child care issues are Moustakes and Berson (1955), Greenblatt and Eberhard (1973), and Creange (1980).

More recently Gulley et al. (1985) developed a profile of campus child care services across the country using members who belonged to the National Coalition for Campus Child Care (NCCCC) in their sample. Herr, Zimmerman, and Saienga (1988) also used the members of the NCCCC in their sample as they, too, attempted to pinpoint what was happening with campus child care. In 1987 the National Organization of Child Development Laboratory Schools (NOCDLS) surveyed child

development laboratory administrators in order to develop a profile of child development laboratory schools.

Presently there is no research involving child care services offered to faculty, staff, and/or students at land-grant universities and colleges in the United States.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

From the research reviewed previously, we know that there is a long history of child care services in the United States and on university and college campuses. Moreover, land-grant universities and colleges were established to meet the needs of the people of the times. It is evident that quality in child care is extremely important and that the need for campus child care is increasing due to the needs of students, faculty, and staff. Finally, the literature demonstrates that campus child care is not always supported by university and college administrations.

The need for campus child care services is increasing among students, faculty, and staff. What is the response of land-grant universities and colleges to this need? To answer this question, a survey was created to provide a profile of child care services offered to faculty, staff, and students at land-grant institutions.

METHOD

Sample

Participants were 70 directors of child care centers or central administrators on land-grant university and college campuses. The initial sample of institutions, which yielded 121 participants, was obtained from the Fact Book, published by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (1989). Once land-grant institutions in each state were identified, telephone calls were made in order to determine both if child care was available which was associated with the institution and to secure the administrator's name and the address of the child care center. If university-associated child care was not available, an appropriate central administrator of the university was selected to receive the questionnaire. Approximately four weeks later, a packet of information was sent to the identified child care or central administrators. This packet included a cover letter introducing the author and the proposed project (Appendix A), the survey questionnaire (Appendix B), and a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Prior to mailing, surveys were labeled with identification code numbers which represented the area of the country (New England, Mid-Atlantic, South, Midwest, West, and Southwest) and the state and a number identifying particular institutions within individual states.

Instrument

The questionnaire distributed for completion was developed to address the following areas: 1) general demographic questions about each university or college; 2) general questions regarding child care services at each university or college; and 3) specific questions regarding an individual program such as budget, licensing and accreditation, quality of care, qualifications of staff, salary and benefits, and morale issues. The questionnaire consisted of 39 questions. Thirty-four of the questions involved the following types of responses: yes/no, short answer, and checking the appropriate response. Five of the questions solicited five-point Likert-type responses. Estimated time to complete the survey was 30-45 minutes. In its development, the instrument was piloted with six different professionals in the areas of child care, early childhood education, and family relations. Comments and suggestions of each individual were incorporated, and final changes were submitted to two individuals who were administrators of child care centers. No final suggestions for revisions were made at this point.

Analysis

Surveys were coded and raw data entered into the computer. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (percent, mean, range) for the purpose of developing a profile of child care services offered to faculty, staff, and/or students at land-grant institutions. Although the results reported from this survey provide a

general description of child care services throughout the United States, the major emphasis is placed upon issues of quality.

General Characteristics of Respondents of Child Care Centers

Originally 121 questionnaires were distributed. Within six months of the first mailing, non-respondents were either contacted by phone and/or mailed another survey with a letter (Appendix C), again requesting participation. The response rate to the questionnaire was 57.8% (n = 70). Respondents represented land-grant institutions in the following regions: New England (7.1%), Mid-Atlantic (18.6%), South (17.1%), Midwest (17.1%), Southwest (11.4%), and the West (28.6%). For individual state participation, see Appendix D. Campuses were categorized as residential (71.4%), commuter (5.7%), or both (22.9%). Total faculty/staff populations (n = 42) ranged from 250-20,000 with a mean of 6,493. Graduate and undergraduate student populations (n = 48) ranged from 2,050 to 62,700 with a mean of 22,570. Child care programs were described as lab schools (60%), preschools (41.4%), and day care (48.6%). Many child care programs identified themselves with more than one category. For instance, some programs were described as a laboratory school and day care, others as a preschool and day care, and still others as a laboratory school and preschool. Interestingly, 17% (n = 12) described their program(s) as laboratory, preschool, and day care.

Training, research, and service characterize land-grant institutions. Respondents from full-day programs ranked service as the top priority of their programs (44.3%) followed by training (11.4%) and research (2.9%). For half-day

programs respondents ranked training first (27.1%) followed by service (21.4%) and research (2.9%). Respondents did not always rank order their answers. Some only responded to one or two options, and some indicated "most important" more than once. Ninety-one percent (n = 64) indicated that child care needs were increasing, while 7% (n = 5) reported child care needs were remaining stable. Fifty-three percent (n = 37) indicated that resource and referral services were available on campus or in conjunction with their institution.

All states have licensing standards, and it was of interest to determine whether or not the child care services at land-grant institutions complied with state requirements. Combining responses for infant, toddler, preschool, and school-age programs, 81% of full-day and 58% of half-day programs were licensed by their state. (For breakdown by age groupings, see Table 1.) The fact that just over three-fourths of full-day programs were licensed may reflect some states' waiving of licensing for state-supported child care facilities. The discrepancy between full- and half-day programs is likely due to the fact that in some states, licensing is not required for programs which serve children less than four hours per day. A voluntary assessment of program quality is the NAECP accreditation. Again, combining results for all age groups, 28.75% of full-day and 34.5% of half-day programs had been accredited. (For breakdown by age groupings, see Table 1.) This is considerably above the nationwide average of approximately 5% as reported by the NAECP (Roy Ignacio, personal communication, July 6, 1992).

Table 1

Licensing and Accreditation for the Four Age Groupings

Age grouping	% licensed	% accredited
Infant		
Full-day (n = 24)	75%	21%
Half-day (n = 14)	64%	43%
Toddler		
Full-day (n = 33)	73%	27%
Half-day (n = 24)	58%	42%
Preschooler		
Full-day (n = 42)	76%	29%
Half-day (n = 41)	54%	34%
After-school care		
Full-day (n = 13)	100%	38%
Half-day (n = 21)	57%	19%

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to develop a profile of the availability of child care services at land-grant institutions and a description of these services, especially as it relates to issues of quality. This chapter will be divided into three sections. Section I will describe the overall characteristics of child care centers. Section II will address staff qualifications. Finally, Section III will examine administrative issues. In almost every question some participants did not respond completely. However, percentages of responses are based upon n = 70.

Section I. Overall Characteristics of Child Care Centers

This section will focus on institutions which provide child care in four target age groups (infant, toddler, preschooler, and after-school care), its availability, and whether or not the NAEYC standards for quality care in the areas of group size and teacher-child ratio were achieved.

Infant Care

Infants were defined as newborn to one year of age. Forty percent indicated that infant care was available at their institution. Approximately 34% offered full-day care and 20% offered half-day care for infants. Thirty-three percent had no programs available for children under one year of age. (See Table 2.)

Table 2

Child Care Services Offered for the Four Age Groupings

Age grouping	Available	Full	Half	No care
Infant (newborn-1 year)	40%	34%	20%	33%
Toddler (1 year-3 years)	60%	47%	34%	19%
Preschoolers (3 years-5 years)	82.9%	60%	58.6%	4.3%
After-school	34%	18.6%	30%	33%

Of the 28 centers who reported offering infant care, 86% provided full-day care, 89% offered care on campus, 75% offered care five days per week, and 68% provided care year round. Approximately 68% of full-day programs were open 10 hours or more daily. The mean group size in infant care for full-day was 9 children (n = 21) and half-day was 8.3 children (n = 6). The adult-child ratio for both full- and half-day programs averaged 1:3 (n = 27). (See Table 3.) Total enrollment figures for full-day infant care averaged 9.8 children (n = 18) with a range of 4-26 children; half-day programs averaged 9.2 children (n = 8) with a range of 2-18 children.

The staff-child ratio for infants (birth to 12 months) as recommended by the NAECP is 1:3 in groups of six children and 1:4 in groups of eight children. The present data indicate that the adult-child ratio meets the recommended standard but that the mean group size for both full- (9) and half-day (8.3) programs was significantly above established limits. (See Table 4.)

Table 3

Group Size and Adult-Child Ratio for the Four Age Groupings

Age grouping	Group size		Adult-child ratio
	Full	Half	
Infant (newborn-1 year)	9	8.3	1:3.16
Toddler (1 year-3 years)	14.1	13.9	1:4.4
Preschoolers (3 years-5 years)	24.1	20	1:6.8
After-school	20.3	20.7	1:10.3

Toddler Care

Toddlers were defined as children ranging from one to three years of age. Sixty percent of respondents reported that toddler care was available. Approximately 47% offered full-day care and 34.3% offered half-day care. Approximately 19% of respondents indicated no child care for toddlers was available. Of the 42 centers who reported offering toddler care, 79% provided full-day care, 88% offered care on campus, 67% offered care five days per week, and 60% provided care year round. Approximately 60% of full-day programs were open 10 hours or more daily. The average group size for toddler care was 14.1 children (n = 26) for full-day and 13.9 children (n = 12) for half-day programs. The adult-child ratio for both full- and half-day programs averaged 1:4.4 (n = 37). Total enrollment figures for full-day toddler care averaged 19.5 children (n = 22) with a range of 4-40 children; the half-day mean was 13.7 children (n = 15) with a range of 2-32 children.

Table 4

Staff-Child Ratios Within Group Size

	Group									
Age of children*	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22	24
Infants (birth-12 mos.)	1:3	1:4								
Toddlers (12-24 mos.)	1:3	1:4	1:5	1:4						
Two-year-olds (24-36 mos.)		1:4	1:5	1:6**						
Two- and three-year-olds			1:5	1:6	1:7**					
Three-year-olds					1:7	1:8	1:9	1:10**		
Four-year-olds						1:8	1:9	1:10**		
Four- and five-year-olds						1:8	1:9	1:10**		
Five-year-olds						1:8	1:9	1:10		
Six- to eight-year-olds (school age)								1:10	1:11	1:12

*Multi-age grouping is both permissible and desirable. When no infants are included, the staff-child ratio and group size requirements shall be based on the age of the majority of the children in the group. When infants are included, ratios and group size for infants must be maintained.

**Smaller group sizes and lower staff-child ratios are optimal. Larger group sizes and higher staff-child ratios are acceptable only in cases where staff are highly qualified.

Note. From Accreditation criteria & procedures of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs (p. 24) by National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984, Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children. Copyright 1984 by National Academy of Early Childhood Programs. Reprinted by permission.

The present definition in this study of toddler age (one to three years of age) varies from that of the NAECP. The NAECP divides children into three groupings (12 to 24 months, two-year-olds, and two- and three-year-olds) and has somewhat different recommendations for each group. The present data indicate a group size of approximately 14 children in both full- and half-day programs. This is higher than what is recommended by the NAECP (it is acceptable for the two- and three-year-old groups, however, but with caution). However, the adult-child ratio averaged 1:4.4, which would be an acceptable standard unless most children enrolled were 12 to 24 months of age. In that case, the NAECP recommends a ratio of 1:3 in a group size of six children. (See Table 4.)

Preschooler Care

Preschooler children range in age from three to five years. Child care for this age group was available at a majority of institutions (82.9%). Sixty percent offered full-day care and 58.6% offered half-day care for preschoolers. Only 4.3% indicated no care for the preschool child was available.

Of the 58 centers who reported offering care for preschoolers, 72% provided full-day care, 93% offered care on campus, 59% offered care five days per week, and 45% provided care year round. Forty-eight percent of full-day programs were open ten hours or more daily. The mean group size for preschoolers was 24.1 children (n = 34) for full-day and 20 children (n = 25) for half-day programs. The adult-child ratio for both full- and half-day programs averaged 1:6.8 (n = 51). Total enrollment figures for full-day care for preschoolers averaged 43.1 children (n = 28) with a

range of 8-120 children, and for half-day care 47 children (n = 26) with a range of 7-180 children.

The present definition of preschooler (three to five years of age) differs from that offered by the NAECP. In recommending staff-child ratio with group size, the NAECP divides children into four groups (three-year-olds, four-year-olds, four- and five-year olds, and five-year-olds). The present data indicate a mean group size of 24 in full-day care, which is higher than the NAECP recommendations. The half-day mean group size (20) was acceptable. The average adult-child ratio (1:6.8) was lower than any of their standards. (See Table 4.) With this kind of ratio and with qualified staff, it is likely possible to offer quality care in a group size of 24 children.

After-School Care

After-school care included care for kindergarten-age and older children. Approximately 34% of respondents reported that after-school care was available, with 18.6% offering full-day and 30% offering half-day care. Thirty-three percent of respondents indicated no after-school care options. Of the 24 centers who reported offering after-school care, 87.5% provided half-day care, 83% offered care on campus, 62.5% offered care five days per week, and 62.5% provided care between 24-52 weeks per year. Approximately 63% of half-day programs were open between one and seven hours. However, 33.3% of full-day programs offered after-school care for ten hours or more daily. This could be reflective of centers which are open between university/college terms, during university/college vacations, public school vacations, summertime, and/or nights. The mean group size for children in after-

school care was 20.3 children (n = 9) for full-day programs and 20.7 children (n = 7) in half-day programs. The adult-child ratio for both full- and half-day programs averaged 1:10.3 (n = 23). (See Table 4.) After-school enrollment for full-day care averaged 24 children (n = 8) with a range of 8-28 children, and for half-day care 25.9 children (n = 10) with a range of 12-44 children.

After-school-age children in this study included kindergarten-age and older children. Using the five-year-old and the six- to eight-year-old groupings by the NAECP, the present data are well within their recommendation, with the average adult-child ratio of 1:10.3 and a mean group size of 20.3 children in full-day and 20.7 children in half-day programs. (See Table 4.)

Child care settings which meet National Academy of Early Childhood Program standards for staffing (group size, child-to-caregiver ratio) provide a quality setting for children, a place where children's needs are met and where the cognitive, emotional, social, and physical development are promoted (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984).

Child care services were available throughout the year at many institutions. Approximately 46% were open between university/college terms, 34.3% were open during university/college vacations, 65.7% were open during public school vacations, and 62.9% were open during the summer. Child care was only available at night in 7.1% of the centers.

Satellite Centers

Satellite centers were not an option at most institutions. Approximately 14% indicated their availability. Of those offered, 2.9% involved infant care, 4.3% toddler care, 7.1% preschool care, 4.3% after-school care, and 1.4% a combination of care. The percentages by age groups are higher than the percentage who answered the general question. This can be attributed to those programs which had more than one age group in satellite arrangements.

Summary

The most frequently offered child care service was care for the preschool child followed by toddler care. Infant care was not as readily available, and care for the after-school child was the least available.

All child care services tended to be full-day (except for after-school care, which tended to be half-day), on-campus, five days per week, up to 52 weeks per year. Any number of programs in all age groupings offered care for 10 hours or more daily. Many programs were open between university/college terms, during university/college vacations, during public school vacations, and during the summer. The data indicate that satellite centers were not an option at many institutions.

The average total enrollment figures were the highest for preschoolers in both full- and half-day programs. The lowest figures were for full- and half-day infant care followed by toddler and after-school care.

Attempting to compare the group size and adult-child ratio with the age groups as defined in this study with those of the NAECP was, at times, somewhat confusing. It can be safely said by the data presented that the staff-child ratios were acceptable in all age groupings. The data involving group size are more difficult to interpret. Group size in both full- and half-day after-school programs met the recommendations of the NAECP, as did that of the half-day preschool programs. All other cases involved less-than-desirable mean group sizes as compared with the NAECP recommendations.

Section II. Staff Qualifications

Data suggest that centers were staffed with a variety of different types of individuals. Section II will describe who these staff members are and their academic credentials.

Directors

Of those responding, 100% of full-day and half-day programs utilized a director to oversee child care services. In full-day programs 26.3% of directors had earned a bachelor's degree, 36.8% had earned a master's degree, and 36.8% had received a doctorate degree. Approximately 51% received their degrees in the human, family, or child development areas, and 40.5% had received education degrees.

Of those responding in half-day programs, 15% of directors had received a bachelor's degree, 40% had received a master's degree, and 42.5% had earned a

doctorate degree. Approximately 61% received their degrees in the human, family, or child development areas, while 33.3% had received degrees in education.

The National Academy of Early Childhood Programs (1984) reminds us of the importance of administrators who administer effective and efficient programs and, at the same time, are attentive to the needs of staff, children, and parents. Additionally, administrators need to be forward-thinking and provide a mentorship role for the university and the non-university community involving issues of children. Administrators with more advanced degrees in the human, family, or child development areas and/or education would be better able to accomplish these goals.

Head/Master Teachers

Of those responding, 97.6% of full-day programs utilized head/master teachers, and 93.3% of half-day programs did so. In full-day programs 56.4% of head/master teachers had received a bachelor's degree, 2.6% were graduate students, and 17.9% had earned either a master's or Ph.D. degree. Sixty percent received degrees in the human, family, or child development areas, and 36% received degrees in education.

In half-day programs 32.1% had received a bachelor's degree, 28.6% were graduate students, and 32.1% had earned a master's or Ph.D. degree. The areas in which the degrees were granted were equally distributed in both the human, family, and child development areas and in education at 47.1%.

Head/master teachers need to possess many of the same qualities as administrators. They need to be knowledgeable about child, human, and family

development; be effective communicators; understand educational goals; and provide a positive role model to others. These goals are more readily available in programs where teachers have degrees in the areas of human, family, or child development and/or education.

Teachers' Aides

Teachers' aides were employed in 42.9% of full-day programs and in 25.7% of half-day programs. Credentials varied in both types of programs from high school diplomas to college degrees. In full-day programs 17.1% had some college education, with 1.4% having earned a bachelor's degree and a combined 18.6% having earned a high school diploma or Child Development Associate (CDA) certificate. In half-day programs 11.4% had attended college, with 4.3% having earned a bachelor's degree, 2.9% being graduate students, and a combined 5.7% having earned a high school diploma or CDA.

Additional Staff

In both full- and half-day child care programs, many other individuals were utilized in the classroom setting. In full-day programs 27.1% used student teachers, 32.9% used practicum students, 40% used work-study students, 8.6% used parents, and 21.4% reported using other volunteers in the classroom. In half-day programs 25.7% indicated the use of student teachers, 27.1% used practicum students, 30% used work-study students, 12.9% used parents, and 11.4% reported using other volunteers in the classroom.

The mean number of people working directly with children in full-day programs was 23.5 (n = 29) with a range of 2-115 people, and in half-day programs the mean number was 23.6 (n = 27) with a range of 2-175 people. Numbers of support staff varied between full- and half-day programs. In full-day programs the average was 3 people (n = 24) in comparison to 1.6 people (n = 21) in half-day programs with a range of 0-4 people.

The importance of consistent, stable, healthy (both physically and mentally), and knowledgeable caregivers cannot be overemphasized. Clarke-Stewart (1982) maintains that caregivers are "pivotal" figures in the lives of children. University settings are unique in that many people, in addition to directors and head teachers, provide care for children on a temporary basis. Child care directors and head teachers must be cognizant of this fact and its impact on children in order to provide the necessary leadership and mentoring.

Summary

Most full-day programs utilized directors and head/master teachers. Teachers' aides were not as prevalent. Work-study students were often involved in the classroom setting as were, to a lesser degree, practicum students and student teachers. Other volunteers were more accessible in the classroom than parents.

The majority of half-day programs employed a director. Head/master teachers and teachers' aides were not as available in half-day programs as they were in full-day programs. Work-study students, practicum students, and student teachers

were regularly utilized in the classroom setting followed by quite similar contributions by parents and other volunteers.

Directors in full-day and half-day programs tended to have graduate degrees in the areas of human, family, or child development followed by degrees in education. Head/master teachers in full-day programs more often had received a bachelor's degree followed by those with graduate degrees. The majority received degrees in human, family, and child development followed by education. In half-day programs the majority of head/master teachers was fairly equally distributed between those with undergraduate and graduate degrees. The degrees were equally distributed between human, family, and child development and education. The training of teachers' aides in full-day programs was similarly distributed between some college experience and a high school diploma or CDA. However, in half-day programs the majority had received some college education.

The average number of people working directly with children in full- and half-day programs was almost identical, whereas support staff in full-day programs almost doubled that found in half-day programs. This is probably not surprising because full-day programs often need to employ bus drivers, cooks, etc.

Section III. Administrative Issues

Administrative issues are a major concern in every child care program. Not only does the administrator have to be knowledgeable about child and family development, but he/she needs to understand budgetary issues, parent needs, staff development, and how the child care program "fits in" to the university/college and

the local communities. Section III will begin with budgetary concerns followed by issues of parent interaction, staff development, and university/community support.

Budgetary Concerns

The data indicate that approximately 67% of the child care programs were subsidized by the university/college. The majority (18.6%) received between 1-20% of their budget from institutional support. Another 17.1% received between 21-40% of their budget from the institution. Approximately 14% of child care programs were institutionally subsidized between 41-80%. Support services offered by institutions appeared to be an integral part of many child care programs (64.3%). Maintenance was provided most often (50%) followed by secretarial (32.9%), utilities (32.9%), and overhead (30%).

Respondents indicated that 45.7% of child care physical facilities were provided by the institution followed by 15.7% provided by individual college or department. The average cost to obtain a new facility was $1,127,142 (n = 7) with a range from $10,000 to $3,500,000. Approximately 41% reported their facility had been renovated. The average cost of renovation was $248,500 (n = 14) with a range from $10,000 to $1,500,000. Ongoing maintenance was provided by the institution in 21.4% of child care facilities followed by individual college or department in 5.8% of the facilities. In 21.4% of child care facilities, ongoing maintenance came from combined sources. However, 17.1% of centers provided their own ongoing maintenance.

Financial and economic status were rated differently by the two types of programs. In full-day programs 18.6% rated their programs average, 17.1% rated their programs as good, and 12.9% as very good. In half-day programs 18.6% rated their programs as good, whereas 8.6% reported their economic/financial status was very good and 5.7% rated their programs average.

Parent Interaction

Respondents in full-day programs indicated that they perceived parent-teacher relationships were either excellent (30%) or very good (18.6%). Half-day programs were similar with 28.6% for excellent and 15.7% for very good. Respondents felt that their ability to meet the needs of families was excellent (27.1%) or very good (18.6%) in full-day programs and excellent (21.4%) or very good (20%) in half-day programs.

Both full- (48.6%) and half-day (31.4%) programs provided inservice/ educational programs for parents. In full-day programs 15.7% of the inservice/ educational programs were offered during the term and 11.4% occasionally. Generally the director was the facilitator (34.3%) followed by the use of other resource people (20%). In half-day programs 10% reported that inservice/ educational programs were offered occasionally followed by term-related (8.6%) with the director (18.6%) and the use of other resource people (12.9%) being used as facilitators.

Quality child care experiences for children imply that there is open communication between parent(s) and the child care staff. This can be accomplished

through conversation upon arrival and departure, parent-teacher conferences, newsletters, lesson plans, telephone calls, short notes, and inservice programs. It is important to view the child care setting as part of the family system, with parents being their child's first teachers and alternative caregivers being viewed as facilitators in the guidance and care of children.

Staff Development

Inservice/educational programs were available to caregivers in full- (57.1%) and half-day (41.4%) programs. Full-day programs offered these services monthly (17.1%) followed by variable times (15.7%). In half-day programs 7.1% offered programs for caregivers both weekly and quarterly, and 5.7% offered them monthly and very frequently. The director most frequently facilitated these programs in both full- (51.4%) and half-day (31.4%) programs. Other resource people were also utilized in both full- (20%) and half-day (15.7%) programs. Of those responding, morale among staff members was reported as good to excellent by 94.9% of respondents in full-day programs and by 97% in half-day programs.

The chance of getting high quality care increases when caregivers receive training (Morrison, 1988). Positive outcomes for children come as a result of higher levels of education and training in early childhood education such as increased social interactions with adults, improved cognitive and language development, and the development of prosocial behaviors (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 1984).

University/Community Support

A concern of many child care administrators is whether or not their particular center/program is supported by other individuals and/or groups across campus and within the community. In full-day programs the highest support (good to excellent) came from the "non-university community" (45.7%). Other good to excellent support came from "department head in your department" (37.2%), "faculty and staff in your department" (34.3%), and "university personnel" and the "academic dean in your college" (32.8%). In half-day programs the greatest support in the good to excellent categories was reported among the "department head in your department" and the "non-university community" (41.4%), "faculty/staff in your department" (40.1%), "university personnel" (38.5%), and the "academic dean in your college" (34.3%). (See Table 5.)

The least amount of support in full-day programs in the good to excellent categories came from "academic dean not in your college" (14.3%) (no excellent rating reported), "department head not in your department" (18.6%), "board of trustees" (22.8%), and "central administration" (25.7%). Half-day programs reported the least amount of support from "academic dean not in your college" (8.6%) (no excellent rating reported), "board of trustees" (14.2%), "department head not in your department" (20%), and "central administration" (20.1%).

Table 5

Level of Support by Individuals/Groups Across Campus and Within the Community (Good to Excellent Categories)

Individuals/Groups	Full	Half
*Academic dean not in your college	14.3%	8.6%
Department head not in your department	18.6%	20.0%
Board of trustees	22.8%	14.2%
Central administration	25.7%	20.1%
Academic dean in your college	32.8%	34.3%
University personnel	32.8%	38.5%
Faculty/staff in your department	34.3%	40.1%
Department head in your department	37.2%	41.4%
Non-university community	45.7%	41.4%

*No excellent rating reported.

Summary

The data presented in the budgetary section indicated that most institutions subsidized child care programs and offered support services, especially maintenance, secretarial, utilities, and overhead. Often the individual child care facility was provided by the institution and the individual college or department. Most ongoing maintenance came from the institution and from combined sources such as the university, private vendor and city government, or university and leasing agent, etc. Approximately one-fourth of the respondents indicated that the ongoing maintenance was provided by the child care center itself. Data indicate that building a new or renovating an existing structure can be a costly venture.

Issues related to parent-teacher relationships and meeting needs of families were rated as good to excellent in many full- and half-day programs. Inservice/ educational programs were available to more parents in full-day (almost one-half) rather than half-day programs (almost one-third). Inservice in full-day programs tended to be offered either during the term or on an occasional basis. The facilitator was usually the director, but other resource people were utilized. In half-day programs inservice tended to be offered occasionally and on a term basis with the director being the main facilitator but also utilizing other resource people.

Educational/inservice programs were often offered to staff members in both full- and half-day programs. In full-day programs inservices were offered monthly or at various times with the director being the main facilitator followed by other resource people. In half-day programs inservice was offered at a variety of times

(weekly, quarterly, monthly, and very frequently). Usually the director was the main facilitator, but other resource people were utilized. Many in both full- and half-day programs reported that morale among staff members was good to excellent.

The highest support for full-day child care came from the "non-university community" followed by "department head in your department," "faculty/staff in your department," "academic dean in your college" and, finally, "university personnel." The least amount of support for full-day child care programs came from "academic dean not in your college" followed by "department head not in your department," "board of trustees," and "central administration."

In half-day programs the greatest amount of support came from both "department head in your department" and the "non-university community" followed by "faculty/staff in your department," "university personnel," and "academic dean in your college." The least amount of support was received by "academic dean not in your college" followed by the "board of trustees," "department head not in your department" and, finally, "central administration."

A possible explanation for the non-university community support may be that child care services on campus are frequently less expensive and of higher quality. Those who support child care services the least (i.e., administrators) may be the least aware of the program(s) and/or may be impacted by budgetary concerns and/or constraints.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Land-grant institutions were finally established, after many struggling years, during a period of great social change (1862) to meet the needs of people living at that time. For the past 20 years we have been in the midst of great social change, especially in the area of child care (Clarke-Stewart, 1982).

Working mothers and children in need of child care have been part of our country's history. However, at this point in time, record numbers of mothers are working (Hofferth & Phillips, 1987) and millions of children are being cared for in some kind of alternative child care (Dawson & Cain, 1990). Additionally, many university/college campuses across the country have witnessed a dramatic enrollment increase of a different type of student--the non-traditional student. This person is usually older and often female in a single-parent role. Students with children have different needs. Finding quality child care which is available, affordable, and flexible is one of their most important needs. Universities/colleges can play a pivotal role with regard to this issue.

Over the years the mission of land-grant institutions became rooted in teaching, research, and service. This mission, coupled with the goal of meeting the present needs of the people, is synonymous with education at land-grant universities/ colleges. From this mission and goal statement, land-grant institutions are viewed as agents of change and, as such, are often called upon to be proactive in meeting the needs of society or reactive if it is warranted. The issue of child care has become

important for many students, faculty, and staff on college campuses across the country. In addition to the element of service, child care has potential in the areas of recruitment and retention of university personnel.

This survey sought to describe what is currently available at land-grant institutions in the area of child care. The results yield information which members of university communities may find compelling. Most institutions surveyed are experiencing increased child care needs. The least-serviced children were in the infant and after-school age groups. There was almost no child care available at night and very little on the weekend. Staff-child ratios were acceptable by the NAECP standards in all age groupings, whereas group sizes were borderline in many of full- and half-day programs.

Many people are utilized in a child care program from directors to volunteers. People with the most responsibility, typically or not surprisingly, had the highest degrees. Directors and head/master teachers tended to be educated in the areas of family, human, or child development.

Most child care programs are subsidized by the university/college. Support services played an important economic role in child care programs, particularly in light of the fact that new child care facilities and the renovation of existing ones were reportedly expensive. Much of the ongoing maintenance was provided by the institution or individual college or department.

Parent-teacher relationships and meeting the needs of families were very good or excellent in many programs. Full-day programs tended to offer inservice for parents and staff. The least amount of support for child care programs came from

boards of trustees, central administration, and academic deans and department heads not in your college.

What implications do the results of this survey have for land-grant institutions as we approach the 21st century? Firstly, the underlying goal of land-grant institutions (meeting the needs of the people at this point in time) plus the mission of teaching, research, and service must be remembered by university personnel. Child care services fit well within the goal and mission statements.

Secondly, there is increased need for child care services at land-grant institutions, especially in the areas of infant and after-school care. Child care services are least available in the evening and on weekends. Universities and colleges which offer child care services to all age groups which are affordable and flexible in their availability (hours per day, days per week, and weeks per year) could well have the edge in recruiting and retaining faculty, staff, and/or students.

Thirdly, many people at different stages of their professional career, as well as volunteers, are working to provide child care services at land-grant institutions. Even so, from an economic viewpoint this is not enough. Child care alone is expensive, not to mention the cost of new facilities and the renovation of existing situations. Institutions themselves will need to be involved directly through their financial support and indirectly through in-kind support such as maintenance, secretarial, utilities, and overhead.

Finally, as was reported, the least amount of support for child care on campus came from the board of trustees, central administration, and some academic deans and department heads. Why is this so? One reason, no doubt, involves budgetary

concerns and/or constraints. However, another reason may be that these individuals are misinformed or uninformed regarding the importance, value, and necessity of child care services to their constituencies. Education regarding the needs of child care services and the goals of specific programs may do much to engender support.

Child care services at land-grant institutions are, in reality, a partnership issue --a partnership between the institution, the students, faculty, staff, and the community. These services are opportunities for some students to receive care for their children and for others to do practica, be a work-study student, student teach, and do graduate research. They also provide care for children of faculty/staff as well as research opportunities. The community benefits by having child care services which provide a role model for the surrounding community and serve as consultants to individual child care programs. Including the community as part of the partnership is good public relations and has implications for possible research and for practical experience for undergraduate and graduate students.

In reflecting on the land-grant spirit, are we asking the question that Aldrich (Allen, 1963) asked many years ago: "What are the needs of people in this time?" (p. 11). We know that child care needs are increasing at almost all land-grant institutions. We know that one of the most important needs of student families is affordable, available, and flexible child care services. We know that the issue of child care is also important to faculty and staff in the university/college community. We know what constitutes quality in child care (Bredekamp, 1986). We also know that "good quality care is good for children" (Phillips et al., 1987, p. 54).

In thinking about child care issues on campus it is important for all of us, but especially those in administrative positions, to reacquaint ourselves with the poignant comments of Richard A. Harvill 29 years ago.

> Education faces always the problem that the Land-Grant movement founders discerned a century ago: the requirement for appraisal, reorganization and redirection to meet the needs of time and change. Persistence in old patterns, however resourceful and responsive in their day, are not sufficient to the future which becomes the pressing present. (Harvill, as cited in Allen, 1963, pp. V-VI)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelstein, D., Sedlacek, W. E., & Martinez, A. (1983, Summer). Dimensions underlying the characteristics and needs of returning women students. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 46, 32-37.

Alger, H. (1984). Changes in the American family: Implications for campus child care. Focus on Learning, 10(1), 9-10.

Alger, H. (1988a). Testimony in support of HR 2111 for the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. In C. R. Keyes & R. E. Cook (Eds.), Campus child care issues and practices: A collection of conference presentations 1975-1987 (pp. 214-218). Milwaukee, WI: National Coalition for Campus Child Care.

Alger, H. (1988b). Meeting the challenges. In C. R. Keyes & R. E. Cook (Eds.), Campus child care issues and practices: A collection of conference presentations 1975-1987 (pp. 12-17). Milwaukee, WI: National Coalition for Campus Child Care, Inc.

Allen, H. R. (1963). Open door to learning: The land-grant system enters its second century. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Almy, M. (1982). Day care and early childhood education. In E. F. Zigler & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), Daycare: Scientific and social policy issues (pp. 476-496). Dover, MA: Auburn House.

Aronson, S. S. (1984). Injuries in child care. In J. F. Brown (Ed.), Administering programs for young children (pp. 109-110). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Axtmann, A. (1988). Co-investigation with infants on campus. In C. R. Keyes & R. E. Cook (Eds.), Campus child care issues and practices: A collection of conference presentations 1975-1987 (pp. 189-192). Milwaukee, WI: National Coalition for Campus Child Care.

Beck, R. (1982). Beyond the stalemate in child care public policy. In E. F. Zigler and E. W. Gordon (Eds.), Daycare: Scientific and social policy issues (pp. 307-337). Dover, MA: Auburn House.

Belsky, J., Steinberg, L. D., & Walker, A. (1982). The ecology of day care. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development (pp. 71-116). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bickimer, D. (1988). Voices. In C. R. Keyes & R. E. Cook (Eds.), Campus child care issues and practices: A collection of conference presentations 1975-1987 (pp. VIII-IX). Milwaukee, WI: National Coalition for Campus Child Care.

Brazelton, T. B., & Cramer, B. G. (1990). The earliest relationship. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bredekamp, S. (Ed.). (1986). Developmentally appropriate practice. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bredekamp, S., & Shepard, L. (1989). How best to protect children from inappropriate school expectations, practices, & policies: A reexamination of NAEYC's position on standardized testing. Young Children, 44(3), 14-24.

Caldwell, B. (1973). Can young children have a quality life in day care? Young Children, 28(4), 197-208.

Caldwell, B. (1984). What is quality child care? Young Children, 39(3), 3-8.

Catron, C. E., & Kendall, E. D. (1984). Staff evaluation that promotes growth and problem solving. In J. F. Brown (Ed.), Administering programs for young children (pp. 39-44). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Children's Defense Fund. (1990). S.O.S. America! A children's defense budget. Washington, DC: Author.

Children's Defense Fund. (1991). The state of America's children. Washington, DC: Author.

Clarke-Stewart, A. (1982). Daycare. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clarke-Stewart, K. A. (1987). In search of consistencies in child care research. In D. Phillips (Ed.), What does research tell us? (pp. 105-120). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Clarke-Stewart, K. A. (1988). Evolving issues in early childhood education: A personal perspective. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 3(1), 139-149.

Clarke-Stewart, K. A., & Fein, G. G. (1983). Early childhood programs. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 11 (pp. 917-999). New York: John Wiley.

Class, N., & Orton, R. (1980). Day care regulation: The limits of licensing. Young Children, 35(6), 12-17.

Cook, R. E. (1984). University involvement: A key to campus child care center survival. Focus on Learning, 10(1), 17-25.

Corrigan, R. (1984). Campus child care: Value to the college community. Focus on Learning, 10(1), 5-7.

Cosgrove, M. (1991). Cooking in the classroom: The doorway to nutrition. Young Children, 46(3), 43-46.

Creange, R. (1980, May). Campus child care: A challenge for the 80s. Field evaluation draft (Report No. HE 012 729). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Office of Education (DHEW).

Dawson, D. A., & Cain, V. S. (1990, October 1). Child care arrangements: Health of our nation's children, United States, 1988 (No. 187). Advance Data. Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, National Center for Health Statistics.

Deighton, L. C. (Ed.). (1971). Land-grant colleges. The encyclopedia of education (Vol. 5). New York: Cromwell-Collier Educational Corporation.

Division of Family Services. (1987, June). Center child day care standards. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Department of Social Services.

Division of Family Services. (1987, October). Family day care standards. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah Department of Social Services.

Dixon, S. (1990). Talking to the child's physician: Thoughts for the child care provider. Young Children, 45(3), 36-37.

Elkind, D. (1987). Miseducation: Preschoolers at risk. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Faculty child care. (1990, January-February). Academe, 76(1), 54.

Feeney, S., & Chun, R. (1985). Effective teachers of young children. Young Children, 41(1), 47-52.

Fountain, J. B., & Boulton, P. J. (1988). How to start a campus child care center. In C. R. Keyes & R. E. Cook (Eds.), Campus child care issues and practices: A collection of conference presentations 1975-1987 (pp. 85-90). Milwaukee, WI: National Coalition for Campus Child Care.

Galinsky, E. (1990). The costs of not providing quality early childhood programs. In B. Weller (Ed.), Reaching the full cost of quality in early childhood programs (pp. 27-40). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Greenberg, P. (1990). Before the beginning: A participant's view. Young Children, 45(6), 41-52.

Greenblatt, B., & Eberhard, L. (1973). Children on campus: A survey of prekindergarten programs at institutions of higher education in the United States. Washington, DC: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

Greene, E. (1985, September 25). Colleges hard pressed to meet demands for children; funds called inadequate. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 29-30.

Gulley, G., Taylor, J. C., & Muldoon, L. (1985, Spring). A profile of campus child care services in the United States. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 48, 8-13.

Hamburg, S. (1991). The unfinished agenda must be met. Young Children, 46(4), 29-32.

Hatch, O. G. (1982). Families, children, and child care. In E. F. Zigler & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), Daycare: Scientific and social policy issues (pp. 255-259). Dover, MA: Auburn House.

Herr, J., Zimmerman, K., & Saienga, P. (1988). A profile of campus child care centers. In C. R. Keyes & R. E. Cook (Eds.), Campus child care issues and practices: A collection of conference presentations 1975-1987 (pp. 21-29). Milwaukee, WI: National Coalition for Campus Child Care.

Hofferth, S. (1989, February 9). What is the demand for and supply of child care in the U.S.? Testimony presented before the House Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Hofferth, S., & Phillips, D. (1987). Child care in the United States, 1970 to 1995. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49, 559-571.

Honig, A. (1980). The young child and you. Young Children, 35(4), 2-10.

Honig, A. (1985). High quality infant/toddler care: Issues and dilemmas. Young Children, 41(1), 40-46.

Howes, C. (1983). Caregiver behavior in center and family daycare. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 4, 99-107.

Howes, C. (1987). Quality indicators in infant and toddler child care: The Los Angeles study. In D. Phillips (Ed.), Quality in child care: What does research tell us? (pp. 81-88). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

James, E. (1910). The origin of the Land Grand Act of 1862 (the so-called Morrill Act). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University Press.

Kagan, S. L., & Glennon, T. (1982). Considering proprietary child care. In E. F. Zigler & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), Day care: Scientific and social policy issues (pp. 402-412). Dover, MA: Auburn House.

Kahn, A. J., & Kamerman, S. B. (1987). Child care: Facing the hard choices. Dover, MA: Auburn House.

Kamerman, S. B. (1983, December). Child care services: A national picture. Monthly Labor Review, pp. 35-39.

Kaplan, S. R. (1982). A feminist Cinderella tale: Women over thirty in graduate and professional school. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 45, 9-15.

Kendall, E. (1984). Child care and disease: What is the link? In J. Brown (Ed.), Administering programs for young children (pp. 125-134). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Keyes, C. (1990). Multiple missions: Campus child care programs. Academe, 76(1), 25-28.

Klass, C. (1987). Childrearing interactions within developmental home- or center-based early education. Young Children, 42(3), 9-13, 67-70.

Kontos, S., & Fiene, R. (1987). Child care quality, compliance with regulations, and children's development: The Pennsylvania study. In D. Phillips (Ed.), Quality in child care: What does research tell us? (pp. 57-79). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Kraft, B. (1984, February 15). Day-care programs take hold on campuses. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 21-22.

Lombardi, J. (1990). Head Start: The nation's pride, a nation's challenge: Recommendations for Head Start in the 1990s. Young Children, 45(6), 22-29.

Lorton, J., & Walley, B. (1987). The administrator's handbook for early child care education. Atlanta, GA: Humanics Limited.

Marshall, H. (1989). The development of self-concept. Young Children, 44(5), 44-51.

Maynard, F. (1985). The child care crises. New York: Viking.

Mollie, S., & Smart, R. (1990, January-February). Paired prospects: Dual career couples on campus. Academe, 76(1), 33-37.

Morrison, G. S. (1988). Education and development of infants, toddlers and preschoolers. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Moustakes, C. E., & Berson, M. P. (1955). The nursery school and child care centers. New York: Whiteside.

National Academy of Early Childhood Programs. (1984). Accreditation criteria & procedures of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1990). Position statement on guidelines for compensation of early childhood professionals. Young Children, 46(1), 30-32.

National Association for the Education of Young Children and National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education. (1991). Guidelines for appropriate curriculum content and assessment in programs serving children ages 3 through 8. Young Children, 46(3), 21-38.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. (1989). Fact Book. Washington, DC: Author.

National Research Council. (1990a). Child care in a changing society. In C. D. Hayes, J. L. Palmer, & M. J. Zaslow (Eds.), Who cares for America's children? (pp. 3-15). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Research Council. (1990b). Conclusions and recommendations for policies and programs. In C. D. Hayes, J. L. Palmer, & M. J. Zaslow (Eds.), Who cares for America's children? (pp. 288-314). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Parker, W. B. (1924). The life and public services of Justin Smith Morrill. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Phillips, D. (1987). Preface. In D. Phillips (Ed.), Quality child care: What does research tell us? (pp. IX-XI). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Phillips, D., McCartney, K., & Scarr, S. (1987). Child-care quality and children's social development. Developmental Psychology, 23(4), 537-543.

Phillips, D. A., & Howes, C. (1987). Indicators of quality child care: Review of research. In D. A. Phillips (Ed.), Quality in child care: What does research tell us? (pp. 1-19). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Pine, M. (1984). The National Coalition for Campus Child Care: A case study of shoestrings and struggle. Focus on Learning, 10(1), 11-16.

Podell, L. (1982, May). On-campus child care at independent colleges and universities in New York state (Report No. PS 012 948). New York, NY: Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities of the State of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 219 136)

Povell, P. (1988). Critical issues in campus child care. In C. R. Keyes & R. E. Cook (Eds.), Campus child care issues and practices: A collection of conference presentations 1975-1987 (pp. 18-19). Milwaukee, WI: National Coalition for Campus Child Care.

Powell, D. R. (1988). Integrating child care and early childhood education. In C. R. Keyes & R. E. Cook (Eds.), Campus child care issues and practices: A collection of conference presentations 1975-1987 (pp. 1-11). Milwaukee, WI: National Coalition for Campus Child Care.

Ruopp, R. R., & Travers, J. (1982). Janus faces day care: Perspectives on quality and cost. In E. F. Zigler & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), Day care: Scientific and social policy issues (pp. 72-101). Dover, MA: Auburn House.

Schiller, J. D. (1980). Child-care alternatives and emotional well-being. New York: Praeger.

Schwartz, S. (1991). Children's centers in the campus community: Establishing an identity. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6(1), 11-17.

Shirah, S. (1988, December). Campus child care: Meeting unique needs. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 14(4), 135-137.

Townley, K. F., & Zeece, P. D. (1991). Managing the mission: The primary challenge to campus child care. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6(1), 19-27.

Travers, J., & Goodson, B. D. (1980). Research results of the National Day Care Study. Cambridge, MA: Abt.

Tyler, B., & Dittman, L. (1980). Meeting the toddler more than halfway: The behavior of toddlers and their caregivers. Young Children, 35(2), 39-46.

Vandell, D. L. (1990, Winter/Spring). The day care generation. Newsweek, pp. 86-87, 89, 92.

Voignier, R. R., & Bridgewater, S. C. (1984). Allergies in young children. In J. F. Brown (Ed.), Administering programs for young children (pp. 111-114). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Weber-Schwartz, N. (1987). Patience or understanding. Young Children, 42(3), 52-54.

Whitebook, M., & Granger, R. C. (1989). "Mommy, who's going to be my teacher today?": Assessing teacher turnover. Young Children, 44, 11-14.

Whitebook, M., Howes, C., Phillips, D., & Pemberton, C. (1989). Who cares? Child care teachers and the quality of care in America. Young Children, 45(1), 41-45.

Willer, B. (1990). The full cost of quality must be paid. In B. Willer (Ed.), Reaching the full cost of quality in early childhood programs (pp. 1-8). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Wilson, S. (1988). How campus child care centers can help student parents cope. In C. R. Keyes & R. E. Cook (Eds.), Campus child care issues and practices: A collection of conference presentations 1975-1987 (pp. 183-188). Milwaukee, WI: National Coalition for Campus Child Care.

Wingert, P., & Kantrowitz, B. (1990, Winter/Spring). The day care generation. Newsweek, pp. 86-87, 89, 92.

Winget, W. G. (1982). The dilemma of affordable child care. In E. F. Zigler & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), Day care: Scientific and social policy issues (pp. 351-377). Dover, MA: Auburn House.

Wishon, P. M., Bower, R., & Eller, B. (1984). Childhood obesity: Prevention and treatment. In J. Brown (Ed.), Administering programs for young children (pp. 118-124). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Young, K. T., & Zigler, E. (1986). Infant and toddler day care: Regulations and policy implications. American Journal of Orthopsychiatrists, 56, 43-55.

APPENDICES

Appendix A.

Letter Introducing the Author and the Proposed Project

July 1990

Dear Colleague:

I am a graduate student in the Family and Human Development Department, College of Family Life, Utah State University. I am working on a project which, when completed, will provide a profile of child care services offered by land-grant universities and colleges throughout the United States.

The issue of university/college involvement in campus child care is witnessing increased interest throughout the country. I am interested in knowing what involvement your institution has with regard to campus child care for faculty, staff, and/or students. I have enclosed a questionnaire and would appreciate your timely response. Please use the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to return the questionnaire.

Additionally, if you have any policy statements and/or brochures about your child care services which you would be willing to share, I would appreciate your sending them to me.

Thank you for the interest you have shown in the area of child care on campus and for your cooperation in this survey.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Bissonette
Graduate Student

Appendix B.

Survey Questionnaire

1888
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
FOR STUDENT SERVICES
Taggart Student Center
Logan, Utah 84322-0175

July, 1990

Dear colleague:

I am a graduate student in the Family and Human Development Department, College of Family Life, Utah State University. I am working on a project which, when completed, will provide a profile of child care services offered by Land-Grant Universities and Colleges throughout the United States.

The issue of university/college involvement in campus child care is witnessing increased interest throughout the country. I am interested in knowing what involvement your institition has with regard to campus child care for faculty, staff and/or students. I have enclosed a questionnaire and would appreciate your timely response. Please use the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to return the questionnaire.

Additionally, if you have any policy statements and/or brochures about your child care services which you would be willing to share, I would appreciate your sending them to me.

Thank you for the interest you have shown in the area of child care on campus and for your cooperation in this survey.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Bissonette
Graduate Student

CAMPUS CHILD CARE AT LAND-GRANT
UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

1. What type of campus is your institution?

   residential_____
   commuter_____

2. What is the approximate population size of your institution?

   faculty_____
   staff_____
   graduate students_____
   undergraduate students_____

3. How would you describe child care needs at your institution?

   increasing_____
   decreasing_____
   remaining stable_____

4. Does your institution provide resource and referral services in the area of child care?

   yes_____ no_____

   If no, are there plans to do so?_____

5. If your institution offers child care services, specify which college(s) and/or department(s) these services operate within?

   academic college_____ auxillary department/service_____
   academic department_____ other, specify_____
   _____

6. How would you describe your child care program?

   university/college laboratory school_____
   preschool_____
   daycare_____

PLEASE NOTE FOR THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

FULL DAY child care, in this questionnaire, refers to care for children for more than four hours per day.

HALF DAY child care, in this questionnaire, refers to care for children for less than four hours per day.

7. Does your institution provide child care services for the following age groups? If yes, are the services FULL DAY or HALF DAY?

	YES	NO	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
infants (newborn-1 year)	___	___	_____	_____
toddlers (1 year-3 years)	___	___	_____	_____
preschoolers (3 years-5 years)	___	___	_____	_____
after school care	___	___	_____	_____

If yes, are these services offered ON-CAMPUS or OFF-CAMPUS?

	ON CAMPUS	OFF CAMPUS	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
infants (newborn-1 year)	_____	_____	_____	_____
toddlers (1 year-3 years)	_____	_____	_____	_____
preschoolers (3 years-5 years)	_____	_____	_____	_____
after school care	_____	_____	_____	_____

If no, are there future plans to provide university/college child care services on your campus?

	YES	NO	ON CAMPUS	OFF CAMPUS	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
infants (newborn-1 year)	___	___	_____	_____	___	___
toddlers (1 year-3 years)	___	___	_____	_____	___	___
preschoolers (3 years-5 years)	___	___	_____	_____	___	___
after school care	___	___	_____	_____	___	___

8. Do any of your child care services involve satellite centers?

YES_____NO_____

If yes, please identify.

infants (newborn-1 year)_____
toddlers (1 year-3 years)_____
preschoolers (3 years-5 years)_____
after school care_____
combination (explain)_____
_____
_____

9. If you provide FULL DAY child care, how many children in the following populations use these services at your institution?

children of faculty_____
children of staff_____
children graduate students_____
children of undergraduate students_____
children of non-university, community individuals_____

If you provide HALF DAY child care, how many children in the following populations use these services at your institution?

children of faculty_____
children of staff_____
children of graduate students_____
children of undergraduate students_____
children of non-university, community individuals_____

10. When are child care services available at your institution?

A. INFANTS (newborn-1 year)

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
hours per day	_____	_____
days per week	_____	_____
weeks per year	_____	_____
special events (such as sports, concerts, etc.)	_____	_____

B. TODDLERS (1 year-3 years)

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
hours per day	_____	_____
days per week	_____	_____
weeks per year	_____	_____
special events (such as sports, concerts, etc.)	_____	_____

C. PRESCHOOLERS (3 years-5 years)

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
hours per day	_____	_____
days per week	_____	_____
weeks per year	_____	_____
special events (such as sports, concerts, etc.)	_____	_____

D. AFTER SCHOOL CARE

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
hours per day	_____	_____
days per week	_____	_____
weeks per year	_____	_____
special events (such as sports, concerts, etc.)	_____	_____

11. Is your child care program open or closed during the following times?

	OPEN	CLOSED
between university/college terms (quarters/semesters)	_____	_____
university/college vacation(s)	_____	_____
public school vacation(s)	_____	_____
summer	_____	_____
nights	_____	_____

12. What are the adult-child ratios for the following groups of children in your program?

infants (newborn-1 year)	_____	_____
toddlers (1 year-3 years)	_____	_____
preschoolers (3 years-5 years)	_____	_____
after school care	_____	_____
special events (such as sports, concerts, etc.)	_____	_____

13. What is the group size for the following groups of children in your program? (Fill in the number)

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
infants (newborn-1 year)	_____	_____
toddlers (1 year-3 years)	_____	_____
preschoolers (3 years-5 years)	_____	_____
after school care	_____	_____
special events (such as sports, concerts, etc.)	_____	_____

14. How many children are enrolled in your facility?

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
infants (newborn-1 year)	_____	_____
toddlers (1 year-3 years)	_____	_____
preschoolers (3 years-5 years)	_____	_____
after school care	_____	_____
special events (such as sports, concerts, etc.)	_____	_____

15. Are your child care services licensed by the state and/or accredited by the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs (NAECP)?

	FULL DAY		HALF DAY	
	licensed	accredited	licensed	accredited
infants (newborn-1 year)	___	___	___	___
toddlers (1 year-3 years)	___	___	___	___
preschoolers (3 years-5 years)	___	___	___	___
after school care	___	___	___	___

16. Please indicate what percentage of your child care services budget comes from the following sources?

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
child care fees	_____	_____
student services	_____	_____
tuition by college students	_____	_____
grants	_____	_____
other(specify)_____	_____	_____
_____		

17. Does your university/college subsidize your child care program?

YES_____ NO_____

If yes, approximately how much of your budget is subsidized by the university/college?

1-20%_____
21-40%_____
41-60%_____
61-80%_____
81-100%_____

18. Does your university/college offer support services for your child care program in ways such as custodial services, secretarial services, utilities, etc?

YES_____ NO_____

If yes, please describe the kinds of support services available to your program.

_____
_____
_____

19. Who provides the facility which houses your child care program?

_____

What was the initial cost to obtain this facility?_____

Did the facility require renovation prior to its use as a child care facility? YES_____NO_____

If yes, what was the cost of this renovation?_____

Who provides the resources for ongoing maintenance of the facility?

_____

20. What are the fees for child care services? (complete all those that apply to your program)

A. INFANTS (newborn-1 year)

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
per hour	_____	_____
per week	_____	_____
per month	_____	_____
per quarter	_____	_____
per semester	_____	_____

B. TODDLERS (1 year-3 years)

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
per hour	_____	_____
per week	_____	_____
per month	_____	_____
per quarter	_____	_____
per semester	_____	_____

C. PRESCHOOLERS (3 years-5 years)

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
per hour	_____	_____
per week	_____	_____
per month	_____	_____
per quarter	_____	_____
per semester	_____	_____

D. AFTER SCHOOL CARE

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
per hour	_____	_____
per week	_____	_____
per month	_____	_____
per quarter	_____	_____
per semester	_____	_____

21. Is there a director who oversees child care services?

FULL DAY PROGRAMS yes_____ no_____
If no, who performs this function?_____

HALF DAY PROGRAMS yes_____ no_____
If no, who performs this function?_____

22. What are the academic credentials of the director/person in charge?

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
graduate degree (specify area and type) _____	_____	_____
undergraduate degree (specify area and type) _____	_____	_____
some college (specify area)_____	_____	_____
high school diploma (yes/no)_____	_____	_____

23. As specified in the role statement, what percentage of time does the director/person in charge spend in managing the child care program? (Please specify)

FULL DAY _____ HALF DAY_____ other _____

What type of contract is the director/person in charge working under?

9 month_____
10 month_____
11 month_____
12 month_____
other_____

24. What is the salary paid to the director/person in charge for supervising this child care program? (select the one which applies)

FULL DAY	HALF DAY
per hour_____	per hour_____
per week_____	per week_____
per month_____	per month_____
per quarter_____	per quarter_____
per semester_____	per semester_____
per year_____	per year_____

Does the contract of the director/person in charge include benefits?

FULL DAY YES_____NO_____

If yes, please explain what the benefits are. _____
_____

HALF DAY YES_____NO_____

If yes, please explain what the benefits are. _____
_____

25. Does your child care program employ head/master teachers to supervise groups of children?

A. FULL DAY yes_____ no_____

If yes, what are the minimum academic credentials needed to be a head/master teacher?

	# OF TEACHERS
graduate degree (specify area and type)_____	_____
graduate student (specify area)_____	_____
undergraduate degree (specify area and type)____	_____
some college (specify area)_____	_____
high school diploma (yes/no)_____	_____
CDA (yes/no)_____	_____

What type of contract is the head/master teacher working under?

9 month_____
10 month_____
11 month_____
12 month_____
other (specify)_____

B. HALF DAY Yes_____ No_____

If yes, what are the minimum academic credentials needed to be a head/master teacher?

	# OF TEACHERS
graduate degree (specify area and type)_____	_____
graduate student (specify area)_____	_____
undergraduate degree (specify area and type)____	_____
some college (specify area)_____	_____
high school diploma (yes/no)_____	_____
CDA (yes/no)_____	_____

What type of contract is the head/master teacher working under?

9 month_____
10 month_____
11 month_____
12 month_____
other (specify)_____

26. What is the salary paid to head/master teacher(s) for supervising groups of children and for assuming related job responsibilities? (select that which applies)

FULL DAY	HALF DAY
per hour_____	per hour_____
per week_____	per week_____
per month_____	per month_____
per quarter_____	per quarter_____
per semester_____	per semester_____
per year_____	per year_____

Does the contract of the head/master teacher(s) include benefits?

FULL DAY YES_____NO_____

If yes, please explain what the benefits are._____
_____
_____

HALF DAY YES_____NO_____

If yes, please explain what the benefits are._____
_____
_____

27. Does your child care program employ teachers' aide(s)?

A. FULL DAY yes_____ no_____

If yes, what are the minimum academic credentials needed to be a teachers' aide?

	# OF AIDES
graduate degree (specify area and type)_____	_____
graduate student (specify area)_____	_____
undergraduate degree (specify area and type)____	_____
some college (specify area)_____	_____
high school diploma (yes/no)_____	_____
CDA (yes/no)_____	_____

What type of contract is the teachers' aide working under?

9 month_____
10 month_____
11 month_____
12 month_____
other (specify)_____

B. HALF DAY yes_____ no_____

If yes, what are the minimum academic credentials needed to be a teachers' aide?

	# OF AIDES
graduate degree (specify area and type)_____	_____
graduate student (specify area)_____	_____
undergraduate degree (specify area and type)____	_____
some college (specify area)_____	_____
high school diploma (yes/no)_____	_____
CDA (yes/no)_____	_____

What type of contract is the teachers' aide working under?

9 month_____
10 month_____
11 month_____
12 month_____
other (specify)_____

28. What is the salary paid to teachers' aide(s) for working with children in your child care setting? (select the one which applies)

HOURLY	FULL DAY	HALF DAY	# OF AIDES
$3.80-$4.00/hour			
$4.01-$4.50/hour			
$4.51-$5.00/hour			
more than $5.00/hour			

WEEKLY SALARY (specify all that appply)	FULL DAY	HALF DAY	# OF AIDES

MONTHLY SALARY (specify all that apply)	FULL DAY	HALF DAY	# OF AIDES

YEARLY SALARY (specify all that apply)	FULL DAY	HALF DAY	# OF AIDES

QUARTERLY SALARY (specify all that apply)	FULL DAY	HALF DAY	# OF AIDES

Does the contract of the teachers' aide include benefits?

FULL DAY YES_____NO_____

If yes, please explain what the benefits are._____
_____
_____

HALF DAY YES_____NO_____

If yes, please explain what the benefits are._____
_____
_____

29. Does your program employ any of the following people? If yes, how many people per year and what, if any, is their salary?

FULL DAY

	YES	NO	NUMBER/YEAR	IF PAID SALARY/HOUR
student teachers	____	__	_____	_____
practicum students	____	__	_____	_____
work study students	____	__	_____	_____
parents	____	__	_____	_____
other volunteers	____	__	_____	_____

HALF DAY

	YES	NO	NUMBER/YEAR	IF PAID SALARY/HOUR
student teachers	____	__	_____	_____
practicum students	____	__	_____	_____
work study students	____	__	_____	_____
parents	____	__	_____	_____
other volunteers	____	__	_____	_____

30. How many people work directly with children in your program (such as teachers, teachers' aides, etc.)?

FULL DAY_____ HALF DAY_____

How many people are considered support staff in your program (such as cook, custodian, bus driver, lab technician, etc.)?

FULL DAY_____ HALF DAY_____

31. How would you categorize staff morale in your child care program?

FULL DAY

poor_____average_____good_____very good_____excellent____

HALF DAY

poor_____average_____good_____very good_____excellent____

32. How would you categorize parent/teacher relationships in your child care program?

FULL DAY

poor____average_____good_____very good_____excellent_____

HALF DAY

poor____average_____good_____very good_____excellent_____

33. How successful would you rate your child care program at meeting the needs of the families you serve?

FULL DAY

poor____average_____good_____very good_____excellent_____

HALF DAY

poor____average_____good_____very good_____excellent_____

34. Are inservice/educational programs available to teachers and other caregivers in your programs?

FULL DAY yes_____ no_____

If yes, how often?_____

If yes, who facilitates these programs?

director/person in charge_____
head/master teacher_____
graduate student_____
other, specify_____

If no, are there plans to do so?_____

HALF DAY yes_____ no_____

If yes, how often?_____

If yes, who facilitates these programs?

director/person in charge_____
head/master teacher_____
graduate student_____
other, specify_____

If no, are there plans to do so?_____

35. Are inservice/educational programs available to parents of the various children in your programs?

FULL DAY yes_____ no_____

If yes, how often?_____

If yes, who facilitates these programs?

director/person in charge_____
head/master teacher_____
graduate student_____
other, specify_____

If no, are there plans to do so?_____

HALF DAY yes_____ no_____

If yes, how often?_____

If yes, who facilitates these programs?

director/person in charge_____
head/master teacher_____
graduate student_____
other, specify_____

If no, are there plans to do so?_____

36a. How supportive would you rate the following groups of your child care program at your institution? (Respond to all that apply.)

FULL DAY

	poor	average	good	very good	excellent
board of trustees	____	_____	___	_____	_____
university central administration	____	_____	___	_____	_____
academic deans (not in your college)	____	_____	___	_____	_____
academic dean (in your college)	____	_____	___	_____	_____
department heads/chair (not in your dept.)	____	_____	___	_____	_____
department head/chair (in your dept.)	____	_____	___	_____	_____
other (specify, if there is no dean or dept. head/chair) _____	____	_____	___	_____	_____
faculty/staff (in your dept.)	____	_____	___	_____	_____
university personnel	____	_____	___	_____	_____
non-university community	____	_____	___	_____	_____

36b. How supportive would you rate the following groups of your child care program at your institution? (Respond to all that apply.)

HALF DAY

	poor	average	good	very good	excellent
board of trustees	____	_____	___	_____	_____
university central administration	____	_____	___	_____	_____
academic deans (not in your college)	____	_____	___	_____	_____
academic dean (in your college)	____	_____	___	_____	_____
department heads/chair (not in your dept.)	____	_____	___	_____	_____
department head/chair (in your dept.)	____	_____	___	_____	_____
other (specify, if there is no dean or dept. head/chair) _____	____	_____	___	_____	_____
faculty/staff (in your dept.)	____	_____	___	_____	_____
university personnel	____	_____	___	_____	_____
non-university community	____	_____	___	_____	_____

37. How would you describe the financial/economic status of your child care program?

FULL DAY

poor____average_____good_____very good_____excellent_____

HALF DAY

poor____average_____good_____very good_____excellent_____

38. What is the main purpose of your child care program? Rank from most important (1) to least important (3).

	FULL DAY	HALF DAY
training (professional preparation of students)	_____	_____
research	_____	_____
service (education of children/parents)	_____	_____

39. Please add any comments you might have regarding the issue of child care or child care services at your institution.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for filling out and returning this questionnaire. I appreciate your prompt response.

If you would be interested in a copy of the results of this study, please detach and fill out the following form.

_____
(Detach here)

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____
_____
_____

Appendix C.

Second Letter Requesting Participation

January 1991

Dear Colleague:

On July 31, 1990, I mailed out questionnaires to all land-grant universities and colleges requesting participation in my study on child care services offered at land-grant institutions to faculty, staff, and/or students. My response rate was not as high as I would like. I am concerned about possible response bias. Therefore, I am sending a second mailing and, again, requesting your assistance. If you feel you are unable to participate fully in the survey, is it possible for you to answer questions 1-8?

Additionally, if you have any policy statements and/or brochures about your child care services which you would be willing to share, I would appreciate your sending them to me.

In closing, may I remind you that if you would like to receive a copy of the results of this study, please fill out the form on the last page of the questionnaire. Thank you for the interest you have shown in the area of child care on campus and for your cooperation in this survey.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Bissonette
Graduate Student

Appendix D.

Individual State Participation

State	Number of participants
Alabama	1
Alaska	1
Arizona	1
Arkansas	0
California	10
Colorado	1
Connecticut	1
Delaware	2
District of Columbia	1
Florida	1
Georgia	1
Hawaii	1
Idaho	2
Illinois	1
Indiana	0
Iowa	2
Kansas	0
Kentucky	2
Louisiana	1
Maine	2
Maryland	2
Massachusetts	0
Michigan	3
Minnesota	1
Mississippi	0
Missouri	2
Montana	0

State	Number of participants
Nebraska	0
Nevada	1
New Hampshire	1
New Jersey	3
New Mexico	1
New York	3
North Carolina	1
North Dakota	0
Ohio	2
Oklahoma	2
Oregon	1
Pennsylvania	2
Rhode Island	0
South Carolina	1
South Dakota	1
Tennessee	2
Texas	1
Utah	2
Vermont	1
Virginia	1
Washington	3
West Virginia	1
Wisconsin	0
Wyoming	1