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ABSTRACT
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Introduction

The rapid growth of single-parent and two-wage earner families has resulted in a dramatic increase in the need for affordable quality child day care.* In spite of major demographic and economic changes during the past twenty-five years, the United States remains the only industrial nation without a comprehensive child care policy. The lack of such a policy has resulted in a "patchwork of programs funded in a host of different ways serving only a fragment of the population."1 Because of the lack of affordable day care programs, over five million children under the age of thirteen are left alone for a significant amount of time each day.2

Although Massachusetts' commitment to child care has been high relative to other states, it is estimated that only about a third of Massachusetts' families are able to find the kind of care they want at a price that they can afford. During his reelection campaign in 1982, Governor Michael S. Dukakis said that there was a need for "the state to have a comprehensive, identifiable day care policy." To achieve that goal, in March 1984 the Governor appointed the "GOVERNOR'S DAY CARE PARTNERSHIP PROJECT" composed of state and local government officials, legislators, business and labor leaders, educators, providers, advocates, and consumers. Project members were asked to develop recommendations that would lead to more affordable, quality child day care programs throughout the Commonwealth.

I was hired to be the director of "The Governor's Day Care Partnership Project" in February 1984 by Joan Quinlan, the Governor's Advisor on Women's Issues and co-chair of the "Governor's Day Care Partnership Project."

* The terms child day care, day care, and child care will be used interchangeably throughout this thesis.
I was able to recommend membership, write the Project's Statement of Purpose, and develop the Project's working structure. I played an active role in developing the Project's recommendations and wrote the final report which was submitted to the Governor in October 1984. The report resulted in the Governor announcing a $17 million "Day Care Partnership Plan" in January 1985.

Serving as director of this Project was a unique opportunity to participate in a very important planning process. In the past government officials, day care providers, consumers, and advocates have been able to agree on what Massachusetts' day care system's problems were, but they have never been able to agree on solutions or who should pay for any intervention. At the end of the six month process, which lead to the Project's report, not only had Project members reached consensus on almost all of the recommendations, but there was strong support for the recommendations throughout the very diverse day care community. The Project and its report will have a major affect on the future development of day care services in Massachusetts.

This thesis is divided into three chapters: 1. The Need for Quality Affordable Day Care; 2. "The Governor's Day Care Partnership Project"; and 3. The Recommendations of "The Governor's Day Care Partnership Project". The first chapter explores the reasons for the dramatic increase in the number of working mothers and identifies the reasons for the lack of affordable quality child care. The second chapter discusses the events leading up to the appointment of "The Governor's Day Care Partnership Project" and the process used to develop recommendations. The third chapter, the recommendations, is divided into five sections: The Vision, 1989; Resource Development; Quality; Affordability; and Policy Coordination and Implementation. For each recommendation there is a discussion of rationale and implementation strategy. The recommendations as a whole, focus on the need
for state government to take an active leadership role in the development
of quality affordable day care services.

The problems confronting any attempt to provide more affordable
quality day care are complex and there are no simple, or easy solutions. The
Project's thirty recommendations are an attempt, though, to address these
problems in a fairly comprehensive manner. Massachusetts has never had
a comprehensive day care plan before. Future analysis will be needed to
determine if the Project actually met its goals.
Chapter One

The Problem

THE NEED FOR QUALITY AFFORDABLE DAY CARE

1.1 Increasing Numbers of Working Mothers

While America policymakers debate if mothers with young children should work, millions of women with preschool and school-age children are entering the labor force. Between 1950 and 1980 the labor force participation of mothers with children under six tripled from 14% to 47%. In 1980 there were 5.5 million working mothers with preschool children, representing the fastest growing segment of the workforce, with mothers of children under two entering the labor force at the most rapid rate of all. Sheila Kamerman of Columbia University points out that "we are approaching the time when most preschoolers will be children of working mothers, as most school-age children already are." By 1990 64% of all preschool children are expected to have working mothers. The "baby boomlet" is projected to add 6 million children to the American population by 1995. The majority of these babies' mothers will be working full time long before their children enter kindergarten.

Large numbers of young single American women have worked outside of the home since the Industrial Revolution. Only a very small proportion of wives and mothers worked for wages, though, except during times of national emergencies (e.g. the Great Depression, World War I and II). The dramatic increase in working mothers during the past two decades has resulted in only 11% of American families currently fitting our image of the "traditional" American family with father working, and mother at home caring for their children. Major demographic and economic changes lead to the increase in working mothers. The significant demographic changes that contribute to
the increase in working mothers includes: 1. increasing divorce and separation rates; 2. smaller families; and 3. increasing numbers of mothers who do not marry. Over the past two decades marital patterns have changed, and fertility rates have dropped. Young women are marrying later, giving birth later, and having fewer children. More and more women are remaining in the workforce even after marriage and/or childbirth.

A very important factor in the increase in working mothers is the growing number of mothers with no husband, either by choice or circumstance. In 1960 there were 4.5 million American female-headed households. By 1982 this number had increased to 9.7 million or one out of six families. During the past decade the number of female headed households with dependent children has doubled. Over 25% of all children thirteen years old and younger are now cared for by single mothers, and 50% of all children can expect to live in one-parent homes for a significant part of their lives.

The number of female-headed households is particularly significant in the black and Hispanic communities as the following chart points out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female-headed Households % of Black Families</th>
<th>Female-headed Households % of Hispanic Families</th>
<th>Female-headed Households % of White Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census)

Female-headed households are a larger portion of black families than any other subgroup. For whites the proportion is the smallest, but the increase is the greatest.

The majority of female-headed households are poor. Many single mothers find themselves economically responsible for their children yet unable to earn an income adequate enough to keep their children out of poverty. Although over one out of three marriages now ends in divorce and 80% of children remain with their mothers after divorce, only 4% of divorced women receive alimony and only 22% collect any child support.
Divorce often results in financial crisis for the woman and financial gain for the man. A 1976 University of Michigan study found that the economic status of divorced men improved 17% while the position of women declined by 29%. A more recent California study showed that the standard of living for divorced women plunged 73% while their ex-husbands experienced a rise in living standard of 42%. A divorced mother, confronted with the need to find a job to support her children, must often first find child care. The dilemma she may find herself in, though, is that she cannot afford child care because her income has been so drastically reduced.

Many single mothers, therefore, find themselves dependent on welfare. More than 1/3 of U.S. female-headed households are on AFDC. Depending on the state, AFDC payments in 1980 ranged from 49% to 96% of the poverty level. Many AFDC mothers find the lack of affordable child care a barrier to employment. When Massachusetts AFDC recipients were surveyed in 1975 "family responsibilities" (for many lack of child care) was given as the primary reason for not being in the workforce. As we shall see the lack of child care continues to be a major barrier to employment for many AFDC mothers.

Sixty percent of women currently on AFDC had their first child as a teenager. These women are particularly handicapped because more than half were unable to complete high school. Over 1.3 million children are now living with 1.1 teenage mothers and over one fourth are receiving AFDC. Most of these teenage mothers are unable to finish high school and/or work because they cannot find or afford child care. Over 800,000 children of teen mothers are in need of child care.

In 1980 3.2 million single mothers were working full time. Employment, though, does not guarantee an adequate standard of living for female-headed households. Twenty-two percent of working female-headed households and 33%
of single mothers with children under six are poor. Because of the lack of marketable skills, discrimination, and occupational segregation, many working mothers find themselves locked into dead-end jobs. There is a large earnings gap between families supported by women and families supported by men. The median wage for white female-headed households is 64.5% of families maintained by white men compared to 50.8% for black female-headed households and 52.5% for Hispanic female-headed households. The average median income for all full time working single mothers in 1982 was $12,070 and this will be an important figure to remember when we later explore the average cost of child care.

Single mothers are obviously working due to economic necessity. Inflation has resulted in many married mothers also having to work in order to keep their families out of poverty. Only one job in four now pays enough to adequately support a family of four. Thirty percent of all working families were maintained by two earner parents who would have had an income of less than $13,000 if only one parent worked, and at least half of all working two-parent families would earn less than $15,000 without the mother's paycheck. Many families must, therefore, have two pay checks or fall below the poverty line.

Women have also been pulled into the labor force by an accelerated demand for female labor. Fourteen of the twenty occupations projected to experience the largest growth through 1991 are female-dominated, with more than 66% female workers. Occupations have been historically sex-segregated, with women working primarily in clerical and service jobs. A 1981 MIT study found that 70% of all new private sector jobs created between 1973 and 1980 were "women's jobs". Unfortunately, most of these jobs tend to provide low wages and poor benefits.

The increase in the number of female-headed households and inflation
have resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of working mothers in
the past twenty-five years. There has also been an accelerated demand for
female labor. Many other mothers would like to work or complete high school
but are unable to do so because of their inability to afford day care. In
spite of increased labor force participation many female-headed households
live in poverty due to inadequate child support, lack of marketable skills,
discrimination, occupational discrimination, and as we shall see the high
cost of child care. Black and Hispanic female-headed households have the
highest rates of poverty compared to all other families.
1.2 The Inadequate Supply of Affordable Quality Day Care

Who is minding the millions of American children who have working parents? The answer for many is "day care". In 1980 an estimated 7.2 million children needed day care. Approximately one quarter of these children lived in single-parent families. Many parents, though, are unable to find the kind of day care they want at a price they can afford, resulting in parents either unable to work or forced to leave their children in less than adequate care.

Surveys show that most working parents would choose to have relatives care for their young children, but less than 50% of American families have this option. Our society's mobility means that many families do not live near grandparents or other relatives and even if relatives are geographically accessible they too are likely to be working. Few parents today raise their families in the neighborhood where they themselves grew up - close to relatives, friends, and neighbors that they know and trust and the extended family is all but extinct. In 1900 50% of Boston's families included parents, children and at least one other relative, but by 1977 the number of extended families had shrunk to 4%. The National Academy of Sciences recently reported that: "Many families today not only have parents who have less time available for their children, but also have declining access to such traditional support systems as kin networks and informal neighbors and church help." A 1981 study of Massachusetts families using subsidized day care found that the vast majority had no accessible relatives able to care for their children. Day care is therefore the crucial support that enables many parents to work.

The National Commission on Working Women, though, in a 1979 survey of 80,000 working mothers found that 33% had a serious child care problem. The study concluded that "working parents on average require four separate
arrangements in any given period to ensure 90% reliability. These multiple arrangements cost time, energy, and money and may have a negative impact on the child.

This same year the United States General Accounting Office reported that 3.7 million children were receiving inadequate child care. A 1980 New York City survey found that 40% of parents spent at least one month looking for child care and 27% looked for two months or more. Thirty percent of these parents had no interim child care resource. In 1982 the Children's Defense Fund estimated that 5.2 million children under the age of thirteen were left alone for a significant amount of time each day. A frighteningly large number of these children were preschool children.

Parents know intuitively (and the research clearly documents) that quality child care is critical to their child's development, but many studies show that "child care is so hard to find that expectations are often low, and the parent is thankful if the child is simply safe and fed." America's child care problem is growing worse, though, with projections that the 7.2 million children that needed day care in 1980 will increase to 10.4 million by 1990. "The need will grow even more dramatically during the next two decades because not only will the rate at which mothers enter the labor force continue to increase, but more children will be born, a reversal of the '70's trend of decreasing births."

Cost is the key factor why so many parents are unable to access quality child care. Day care is very labor intensive and even with low wages significantly depressing child care costs the average cost of care in the Greater Boston area in 1983 for example was:

$5700 – Infant Center
$3500 – Preschool Center
$4200 – Family Day Care
$1800 – School Age Center
Most parents can afford to pay no more than 10% of their gross family income for child care. Even at 10% of family income, many families find that child care is their fourth highest budget item following housing, food, and taxes. Low income parents may spend as much as one-third of their income on child care.\(^{47}\) It is important to note that 25% of the 14.3 million working families in 1981 had incomes below the U.S. Labor Department's "lower family budget,"\(^{48}\) and that the average median income for a working female-headed household is $12,070, making child care unaffordable for many families.

Yet, in spite of obvious major demographic and economic changes and pressures, three attempts (1971, 1975, 1979) to pass national comprehensive child care legislation failed and advocates have little hope of such legislation being considered in the near future. The United States is the only industrial nation which does not have a national child care policy. Gwen Morgan, who has worked for such a policy since the late '60's has warned that "for the first time in history, the two major functions of families, child rearing and maintaining economic self support and autonomy are in potential conflict with one another."\(^{49}\)

The Federal government has only given support to comprehensive child care programs during wartime and economic crisis. Although the federal financial commitment to day care was substantial during the Great Depression (1900 programs cared for 40,000 children) and during World War II (1.6 million children were cared for in 3000 centers), federal support was withdrawn as soon as the crisis ended.\(^{50}\) The federal government became interested in child care again in the mid-60's as a result of rapidly increasing AFDC dependency, but this support was not comprehensive, targeted instead to only some of our poorest families.\(^{51}\)

Advocates believed that a publicly subsidized child care system would
be the major social innovation of the '70's. Six prime factors, though, contributed to the failure of adopting a national comprehensive child care policy:

- Ambivalence over whether mothers with young children should work
- Child care being viewed as a private family responsibility and inappropriate for government action
- Lack of appropriate research and a convincing data base on the needs, costs, and benefits
- Conflicting goals and lack of political power among supporting groups
- Well organized and effective opposition groups
- The "redistributive" impact of comprehensive child care legislation

Policymakers refuse to acknowledge that day care is an urgent social need, unlike their European counterparts who routinely accept the notion that society shares in the responsibility for child care. American policymakers' ambivalence about public funding for child care results in a child care system which is "a patchwork of programs funded in a host of different ways serving only a fragment of the population."53

James Levine, who has written extensively about child care points out that "social scientists and policymakers have been far more concerned with the effects of maternal employment and day care on children than they have with the effects of the lack of child care - or of inadequate child care - on parents' lives."54 The benefits of affordable care are shown in two recent studies. Federal funding cuts in 1981 resulted in many lost subsidized day care slots. Two hundred and eleven parents, surveyed a year after they lost their space in a New York City subsidized program because of these funding cuts reported that they either quit their jobs, left their children unsupervised, stretched budgets to the breaking point to pay for care, and/or were often late or absent from work because piece-meal arrangements often broke down.55 A 1983 study titled "Cost-Effectiveness of City Funded Child Care Centers in the City of Los Angeles" clearly documents the relationship of affordable day care and family economic self-sufficiency. The study looked
at seven programs serving 355 children. Without these centers:

- 43% of working parents would have to quit their jobs
  (69% of single working parents)
- 83% of parents in school would have dropped out
  (88% of single parents)
- 80% of parents in job training would have left their program
  (92% of single parents)

Closing the Los Angeles programs would have cost the public $919,836 in
AFDC, unemployment benefits and lost taxes.

The current patchwork of federal day care funding includes programs
tied to social service, education, child development, and job training and
employment programs. Since 1976 the federal government has also provided
tax credits for child care expenses related to education and employment.56
The child care credit is now the largest single form of public expenditure
on child care; estimated to have cost the federal government 1.8 billion in
1984.57 Many analysts argue, though, that the credit is of little or no
benefit to low and moderate income families, the very families that are
most in need of assistance.58

From 1965 to 1982, day care expenditures by federal, state and local
governments grew from $12.3 million to $3.0 billion.59 The federal government
decreased child care funding in 1981, though, in spite of an increase in
the need for care. In a 1983 survey, the Children's Defense Fund found
that reduced 1981 federal day care funding triggered program cuts in 32
states and 25 states were spending less on day care programs in 1984 than
in 1981.60 Ironically, while the federal government is reducing support
for child care, the majority of Americans may in fact support the need
for subsidized child care. A 1982 Public Agenda survey found that 88%
agreed that most mothers work because they need the money and 60% agreed
that unless government provides adequate child care many families will
never be able to be self-sufficient.62 In the 1975 National Child Care
Consumer Study, 56% of parents with incomes below the poverty line said that it "did not pay to work" if they had to pay for child care and 82% of all respondents supported child care costs being adjusted to parents ability to pay.

Equal opportunity for women in employment and education cannot become a reality without a national child care policy. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reported in 1981 that "women are frequently unable to take advantage of educational or employment opportunities due to lack of or inadequate child care." The Commission went on to state that the lack of affordable child care:

- keeps women in part-time jobs that have low pay and little career mobility
- keeps women in jobs which they are overqualified for and prevents them from seeking or taking job promotions or training
- conflicts with women's ability to perform their work
- restricts women's participation in federal employment and training or education programs
- means that one out of five unemployed women are unemployed because they cannot make satisfactory child care arrangements

The inability to access child care is clearly linked with the rapidly growing number of poor female-headed households, and contributes to the fact that 30% of America's children and 40% of black children live in families unable to adequately care for them because of poverty. Educational and employment opportunities that parents cannot pursue because of inadequate child care are economic opportunities effectively denied.

Many policymakers have looked to employers to provide needed child care services and believe that "private industry holds the greatest potential for child care improvement." A 1981 Business Week survey of human resource executives reported that 67% expected child care to become a standard benefit by 1986. Yet, the 1983 National Employer Supported Child Care Project reported that there were only 240 employer-sponsored child care programs
nationwide and 50% were sponsored by hospitals.67

There are few employer-supported child care programs in spite of the fact that research documents their benefits. In a 1978 survey of 58 on-site centers, 88 percent of the employers felt that their center increased their ability to attract employees, 72 percent reported lower absenteeism, 65 percent reported improved employer attitudes towards the company, 55 percent reported lower job turnover, and 36 percent felt they improved community relations.68 Eighty percent of the employers who responded to the National Employer Supported Child Care Project claimed that their child care program aided recruitment efforts; two-thirds claimed that it reduced turnover; and half asserted that it reduced absenteeism and had a positive effect on productivity. Companies also reported that child care reduced tardiness, the need for overtime and temporary help, and also improved morale.69 The Pheonix Institute found many advantages to employer-supported child care including:

**Corning Glass** - reported 50% of their MBA's are dual career couples with child care problems. Employer-sponsored child care was a great advantage in recruiting women of child-bearing age.

**Vanderbilt Shirt Factory** - reported an effortless 15% increase in staff in 1979, despite a tight, competitive labor market after opening a day care center. They also noted a dramatic drop in turnover and absenteeism costs from $1000/year/employee to a negligible level.

**Zale Corporation** - reported that child care benefits are an especially effective recruitment feature for companies which rely on young, highly skilled workers.

**Intermedics** - reported a 9% reduction in employee turnover after six months of child care program operation and a 37% reduction after the second year. Since it costs $3000 to train each new employee the company believes its center pays for itself.

**Red Rope** - reported increased production rates and morale and a decrease in absenteeism and turnover after starting a day care center.

It is clear that with reliable care, working parents' absenteeism,
tardiness and turnover rates decrease while their morale and job performance improve. Business recruitment and training costs are high; therefore keeping highly trained women in the workforce by providing affordable quality day care simply makes good economic sense. The limited involvement of employers in providing day care may be due, in part, to their "lack of information about the problems facing working parents and the range of solutions to them." More companies may not be providing child care assistance because they simply are unaware of the benefits, or they lack information on how to develop a program, or are too small to develop a program on their own and/or believe the costs would be too great. Many employers may be interested in buying into existing services rather than starting their own programs. "They may find, however, that the inadequacies and inefficiencies of local services prevent their involvement." At this point it does not seem that employers alone will solve the American day care problem.

Some government officials and policymakers have argued that the cost of quality care is too high and that the way to provide more care and enable more parents to work is simply to lower current day care standards. The societal cost of low quality care is very high, though, since a child's first five years are the most important in his/her development. "The ultimate cost of unaffordable child care will be borne by our aging society three and four decades into the future; the failure to meet the needs of today's children will limit the potential of tomorrow's adults to support the social and economic institutions upon which larger and larger numbers of older Americans will be dependent."

Research done in above average quality programs documents that there are no differences in intellectual development in middle class children who do or do not attend day care and that quality programs may actually
positively impact low income children's development. In a recent Newsweek article titled "What Price Day Care?", Catherine Blusiewicz, a psychologist, stated that "everything depends on the quality of the care. The research is starting to show that kids in good day care do have some advantages ... but children definitely suffer in low quality day care." (emphasis mine)

*Changed Lives,* recently published, reports the findings of a twenty-year longitudinal study. This research documents that low income children who attended quality preschool programs: 1. performed better in school, 2. were more likely to complete high school and go on to college, 3. were more like to be employed, 4. were less likely to become teenage parents, and 5. were less likely to become involved in crime than children who did not have this opportunity. The study concludes that the benefits of quality care are clearly greater than the costs.

"Many experts consider this long-term experimentally rigorous study compelling evidence that early, high quality educational intervention is indispensable in efforts to break the cycle of poverty." (emphasis mine) It is easy to conclude from available research that quality care not only improves a child's health and learning, but benefits society by increasing social stability and enhancing future productivity.

The ability to provide quality care, care that meets the developmental needs of young children, is dependent on the talents, training and commitment of the caregivers. Most children respond positively to a fairly wide range of settings as long as:

- caregivers are warm and concerned
- atmosphere is happy and friendly
- enough toys and activities are available
- program is adequately staffed
- caregivers frequently interact with children
- staff is adequately trained
- staff is adequately paid
The National Day Care Study conducted by Abt Associates in 1979 found that caregiver training, group size, and teacher-child ratios were the factors that determined quality in both centers and family day care homes. The findings also point out that there were major differences between unlicensed, licensed, and "sponsored" (supervised by an agency) family day care homes. On average, "sponsored" family day care providers were better trained, offered a broader range of services, taught and interacted with children more frequently.

Several national consumer studies have shown that parents prefer structured programs that provide:

- learning opportunities
- socialization experience
- high quality of staff
- safety
- nutrition
- extended hours
- opportunity for parent involvement

Parents do want good care for their children, but day care costs a lot of money, good care costs more than poor care, therefore, there is not a lot of good care. Many parents face the difficult conflict of needing to work to support their children, yet being unable to afford adequate care for their children while they work.

The problem of a lack of affordable quality day care is growing worse as more and more programs are unable to find qualified staff willing to work at current wage levels. At the same time, these programs cannot increase wages because parents cannot afford increased fees. Most day care programs currently "operate at the brink of financial disaster and survive only by paying shockingly low wages." "Unlike other commodities or services whose rates can rise to match inflation, child care is constrained by fixed public allocations or limited family costs, neither of which stretch to keep pace with rising costs . . . In human services, the
traditional economic models based on supply, demand, cost and quality are inadequate.85 Wages, affordability, and quality are inter-connected and one of these factors cannot be changed without affecting the other two. (For a more detailed discussion on wages see Recommendation #12 page 54.)

A 1976 survey of 4609 families emphasized that parents wanted a variety of different kinds of child care programs to choose from.86 "A variety of programs is called for to meet the needs of different families and different children, in different circumstances with different cultural values."87 A flexible, pluralistic system, which offers lots of alternative administrative and programming patterns, though, "must consider the ability of social service consumers to afford, select or utilize services of quality, or to demand quality from service providers."88 Although a flexible variety of different arrangements is more likely to meet the varying needs of different families, consumers must be provided with education and protection since many parents do not now know how to locate existing day care programs or choose among them.89 "Informed consumer choice requires knowledge about a complex service which includes social, psychological, educational, physical and environmental, as well as fiscal and organizational dimensions of care."90 There are very few available services to assist parents in finding and choosing good care.

Individuals and community groups that recognize the need for additional day care services and who are interested in providing these services quickly discover the difficulty in finding suitable space, start-up capital, and/or program development assistance. Some communities create, intentionally or unintentionally, barriers to the establishment of new programs through stringent health, building, zoning, and safety codes. These barriers have contributed to the lack of affordable care in many
Many local public officials, like their Washington counterparts, seem unaware of the importance of affordable quality care for families achieving economic self sufficiency.

Virtually every professional in the child development field has attested to the fact that there is a lack of affordable quality child care. The United States is the only industrial nation, though, that does not have a comprehensive child care policy. Many parents simply cannot afford day care even though industry-wide low wages greatly depress the cost of care. Employers do not seem to be recognizing the need or taking action to provide child care assistance. Although some policymakers argue that the answer to the high cost of care is to lower standards, children suffer in low quality programs ultimately costing society because of the need for additional remedial education programs, greater welfare costs, and even future higher crime rates. Many parents also do not know how to locate quality programs. Community groups interested in starting new programs often lack needed resources or discover insurmountable local barriers to starting day care programs.

The overall national day care picture is grim. The next section of this thesis examines the state of day care in Massachusetts, since without a national child care policy, families must look to state government for help. The Child Care Resource Centers estimates, though, that only one-third of Massachusetts families are able to find the kind of care they want at a price they can afford. Lacking a national child care policy, the burden of increasing the supply of affordable quality care may fall on state government.
1.3 Day Care in Massachusetts

Massachusetts can point to many child care accomplishments with pride: leadership in early childhood training; licensing standards among the nation's most comprehensive; and a purchase-of-services system which includes a sliding fee scale and a commitment to continuity of care. These factors have supported the development of many fine community based programs. The need for child care, though, is currently about four times greater than the supply and only about 10% of families eligible for subsidized care are able to find it. There are only 124,000 licensed spaces for the estimated 500,000 children needing care. Although there are approximately 150,000 children eligible for state subsidized care, there are currently only 16,400 slots available.

Parents can choose from primarily two types of care: family day care or center-based care. A small number of family day care homes belong to Family Day Systems. The Office for Children (OFC) licenses preschool day care centers and registers family day care homes. There are currently about 124,000 children attending over 1700 licensed preschool day care centers and 9000 registered family day care homes. There is no way to accurately estimate how many children are in unlicensed care. Although there is a two year old statute requiring OFC to license school-age day care centers, regulations have not yet been written.

Funding for licensors has not kept up with the increase in day care programs. There were five licensors for 862 family day care homes in 1974 compared to ten licensors for 9000 homes in 1984. There were fourteen licensors for 1096 centers in 1974 compared to seventeen licensors for 1736 centers in 1984. The lack of licensing staff has had serious consequences on both the supply and quality of care.

In the Spring of 1984 one-third of all preschool center licenses had
expired and there were over 2500 family day care homes waiting to be registered; most waited more than three months. In the past Office for Children licensors often assisted in program start-up. Licensors simply do not now have the time available to provide technical assistance or visit programs to assure regulation compliance. Licensing regulations have not been reviewed since they were implemented in 1976.

The Office for Children also provides, through its 42 local offices, some information and referral for parents looking for care. This consists of providing parents with the list of licensed centers and registered family day care homes in their area. Offices are unable to tell parents where openings exist or the kinds of services each program provides. Although area OFC offices also do an annual local needs assessment, they lack the resources to develop additional services or help individuals and/or community groups establish new programs.

During fiscal year 1985 (July 1, 1984 - June 30, 1985) the Commonwealth will spend over $62 million to subsidize the cost of care for approximately 20,000 children through Department of Social Services (DSS) contracts and Department of Public Welfare (DPW) vouchers. DSS currently contracts with over 300 day care agencies to provide care to approximately 11,900 children whose families earn between 70% and 115% of the state median income for work related reasons. Families cannot earn more than 70% of the state median income to initially access a slot. They then pay on a sliding fee basis as their income increases. DSS also purchases care for 3700 "supportive services" children, who are in danger of abuse or neglect or have a special physical or developmental need.

Review of the state funding shows that provider rates have not kept pace with inflation and that the last substantial rate increase was in 1975. Rates were actually cut in 1982 and this has lead to an overall
decrease in program quality. Many program directors report that they are unable to find qualified staff at existing wage rates and that staff turnover rates have recently increased dramatically.\(^9\)

The state subsidized day care system is still recovering from a 1981-1982 crises, brought on by then Governor King's attempt to abolish the DSS contracting system. King wanted to provide day care subsidy only for Welfare clients through a reimbursement system which would have provided no more than $160 per month per child for child care costs. The legislature, though, refused to allow this change. King then transferred 25% of state funding for preschool day care to school-age programs in order to support his "Work and Welfare" initiative. This transfer resulted in a dramatic cut in services and reduced rates for most programs.

For the past two years the Department of Public Welfare has provided day care vouchers for participants in the Department's Employment and Training Choice Program. During FY '85 over 4500 vouchers will be issued. This program is an excellent example of the importance of day care to low-income families' ability to become economically self-sufficient. Over the past two years more than 13,000 AFDC recipients have graduated to jobs averaging $5.00 an hour, many received day care vouchers. Without these vouchers many clients could not have participated in the program. E/T's child care cost (approximately 13.5 million during FY '85) will be more than repaid in future savings in AFDC, not to mention the taxes these employed parents will pay as well as increased spending due to increased earning power. There is currently much concern, though, that parents will not be able to afford the cost of care once their vouchers expire (one year after E/T graduation).

In addition to OFC, DSS, and DPW there are at least seven other state agencies (Executive Office of Human Services, Communities and
Development, Economic Affairs, Labor, and Administration and Finance, as well as the Department of Education and the Governor's Office) involved in regulating, purchasing, stimulating supply, or developing policy for child day care. Trying to determine how day care policy is made is ambiguous and confusing both to those within state government as well as to providers, consumers and advocates. With little coordination, and sometimes conflicting objectives, it is no wonder that every year there seems to be a crises in day care policy. The Commonwealth lacks a planning process that includes the private sector, which would lead to the rational expansion of services in areas where there is the greatest need and the assurance that these services meet quality standards. This has lead to conflicting priorities and the lack of coordination of resources.

Some local governments and school committees have provided funding for day care programs. Boston and Cambridge participate in the Department of Social Services Private/Public Partnership Project (4-P) which provides a three for one match of local dollars. Boston has expressed interest in increasing its donation, but the day care portion of the 4-P program has been level-funded for several years. Amherst's town meeting last year approved funding for a staff person to provide information and referral services for local residents. Some local school districts (e.g. Cambridge, Sommerville, Falmouth, Lowell) provide space in school buildings for day care programs, especially school-age care. A few school committees, including Brookline and Newton, provide funding for day care programs. Many communities, though, have been reluctant to provide any support for day care programs. At least 24 Massachusetts communities have restrictive zoning ordinances, prohibiting family day homes in some or all neighborhoods.

Only about 900 Massachusetts children are currently attending an employer-supported child care program, and most of the employers providing
child care assistance are hospitals and universities. Only one union (Boston City Hospital Workers) has day care included in its collective bargaining agreement. The Commonwealth provides space in only two state office buildings for day care for state employees children.

The Massachusetts day care delivery system is clearly a patchwork of services, with little coordination or on-going planning. As many as two-thirds of parents needing care may be unable to find the kind of care they want at a price they can afford. Many programs are unable to attract qualified staff because of low wages. Funding for licensing has not kept pace with the growth of services resulting in serious delays in start-up as well as limited program monitoring and no available technical assistance. The potential for private sector support has yet to be tapped. Not only is there an inadequate supply of care, but there is little available assistance for parents who do not know how to find or choose care.

Gwen Morgan points out in Caring about Children in Massachusetts that "if parents who need to find child care in the community are finding it at a price they can afford, at a level of quality that supplements good child rearing, and in the form they want to choose, then there is no need for further action by government at any level." Clearly this is not the case and there is a need for state government action. Government officials, providers, consumers, advocates and community leaders have often been able to agree on what the system's problems are, but there has been little agreement on how to solve these problems or who should pay for the solutions. The next section of this thesis discusses the formation of the "Governor's Day Care Partnership Project", which was an attempt to bring all of the relevant players together to develop recommendations that would lead to more affordable quality child care throughout the Commonwealth.
During his 1982 reelection campaign Governor Michael S. Dukakis stated that there was a "need for the state to have a comprehensive identifiable day care policy." In several letters, following his election, day care advocates requested a clear process, in which they would be involved, that would develop this "comprehensive identifiable day care policy."

Two documents, Caring About Children in Massachusetts and A Comprehensive Child Day Care Delivery System: A Working Plan, released in 1982, emphasized the need for a comprehensive state day care plan. Advocates used these documents to support their request and add credibility to their case.

Joan Quinlan was appointed the Governor's Advisor on Women's Issues in August of 1983. As she spoke with community leaders and agency heads, the lack of affordable quality day care rose as a primary barrier to women achieving economic self-sufficiency. She brought her concerns to the Human Resources Cabinet, chaired by Philip Johnston, then Director of the Governor's Office of Human Resources. Johnston and Quinlan sent a joint memo on October 18, 1983 to the Governor, suggesting that he appoint a task force to "initiate an eight month-long process to develop a comprehensive child care policy." The state's economic growth and the initial success of the Department of Public Welfare's Employment and Training Choices Program (E/T) had focused more attention on the growing lack of available, affordable quality child care. More mothers entering the workforce increased demand for care at the same time that teachers and family day care providers were leaving the field because of low wages and the new availability of higher paying jobs in other sectors. The FY '85 budget
request included ten million additional dollars for day care vouchers for E/T participants, but there was growing concern that many parents would be unable to find care. At the same time the growing number of "protective services" day care placements were putting added pressure on the already overburdened delivery system.

The Governor approved Quinlan and Johnston's request and a staff person was hired in February 1984. In March he appointed the "GOVERNOR'S DAY CARE PARTNERSHIP PROJECT" composed of state and local government officials, legislators, business and labor leaders, educators, providers, advocates, and consumers. The mission of the Project was to recommend to the Governor a comprehensive day care plan, focusing on increasing the availability of affordable, quality day care services throughout the Commonwealth. The choice of the word "Partnership" was symbolic, used to stress the importance of bringing together and coordinating private and public sector resources to best meet Massachusetts families' and childrens' needs. Quinlan and Worcester Senator Gerard D'Amico co-chaired the effort and they chose October as the deadline for the Project's final report to enable recommendations to be included in the Governor's FY '86 budget request.

The Project's "Statement of Purpose" (see Appendix), distributed at the first meeting points to the need for a stable well-managed state delivery system as well as state policies that will stimulate other sector involvement. Project members focused on how to assure quality services, coordinate existing services, plan for future needs, and encourage other sector support and investment. In the absence of new federal funding Project members knew that they had to look to other sector support to expand existing services. The "mixed economy" of day care "financed and delivered by: families, non-profit individual entrepreneurs, large-scale profit making bodies, government agencies," and combinations of all of the
above, may actually be one of day care's system potential strengths.\textsuperscript{95}

Throughout the process of developing recommendations several vital state government roles were identified as necessary to expand and strengthen the existing day care delivery system:

- helping communities identify their child care needs and their existing gaps in services
- helping communities bring resources together to plan new programs and support existing programs
- providing technical assistance and incentives to develop new programs and expand existing programs
- determining quality standards and monitoring programs to insure that children's developmental needs are met
- subsidizing the costs of care for low and moderate income families
- purchasing care for families in crisis

In Government Initiatives to Encourage Employer-Supported Child Care: The State and Local Perspective, Dana E. Friedman points out four ways that state government can accomplish these tasks. I have expanded upon her definitions which are very useful in understanding the positive role state government can play in encouraging other sector support for child care.

- **educator** - through needs assessment and other mechanisms which point out the importance of day care
- **broker** - by bringing together a variety of community resources to develop and support programs
- **facilitator** - by providing technical assistance, matching funds, tax incentives, and a strong delivery system that other sectors can "buy into"
- **being a "model employer"** - and demonstrating the importance of day care to worker productivity

The Project's two major goals of developing a stable, well-managed delivery system and stimulating other sector involvement are clearly inter-related.

The Project's structure was developed before the first meeting. Facing a tight timeline, a complex agenda, and the difficult task of developing consensus among an extremely diverse group, it was decided that a clear structure needed to be outlined in advance. The goal was to assure that recommendations would be developed quickly and yet be processed through all the appropriate channels. Members were asked to participate on one
of four working groups: State Government, Private Sector, Local Government/School System, Higher Education, representing the four sectors needed to form a viable day care partnership. A fifth working group, State as Employer, was formed in May, with the Governor's approval, when its need became apparent.

**GOVERNOR'S DAY CARE PARTNERSHIP PROJECT**

Joan Quinlan  
Governor's Advisor on  
Women's Issues

Gerry D'Amico  
State Senator

Coordinating Committee  
(Working Group Co-Chairs)

State Government  
Working Group  
Philip Johnston, Secretary  
Executive Office of Human Services

Private Sector  
Working Group  
Evelyn Murphy, Secretary  
Executive Office of Economic Affairs

Local Government/School Systems  
Working Group  
Amy Anthony, Secretary  
Executive Office of Communities and Development and  
John Lawson, Commissioner  
Department of Education

Higher Education  
Working Group  
Gerard Indelicato, Governor's Advisor on Education

Each working group was chaired by a cabinet member resulting in preliminary recommendations being able to be "processed through" appropriate state agencies instead of agencies later reacting to a set of completed final recommendations. This meant that the recommendations had informal agency "sign off" before they became part of the final report.

As specific issues were identified, the State Government, Private Sector, and Higher Education Working Groups formed small "teams" to develop options for further discussion. Several teams asked outside "experts" to
participate. This process helped solve some of the more complex issues, since each working group met for only a few hours no more than twice a month. The Local Government/School System Working Group was small enough that there was never a need to form smaller teams.

Working groups and team meetings were fairly structured. Agendas were carefully worked out before each meeting by the Project's staff person and approved by the Working Group chair. Options were fairly open, though, and there was much give and take among participants. In spite of diverse roles and interests, Project members were able to reach consensus on almost all issues.

There was also a Coordinating Committee made up of Working Group Chairs and appropriate agency Commissioners, Secretaries, and Governor's Senior Staff. This group met only three times and meetings were primarily informational. The Project's progress was also periodically discussed at the Human Resources Cabinet and one formal presentation was made to a full Cabinet Meeting.

Although each working group had its own unique perspective, the Project's major recommendations (particularly Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies) were preliminarily developed simultaneously and separately by several different working groups. This obviously strengthened recommendations, which were reworked several times from many different perspectives.

The Project met as a whole three times with the Governor present. These meetings were intended to not only update the Governor on the Project's progress, but share information between working groups. The Project's staff member attended every working group and team meeting, as well as meeting frequently with working group chairs in order to assure needed communication and consistency. Key state agency staff members also met together
periodically to assure communication, to identify potential problems and to work out possible solutions.

The Massachusetts day care community is fairly well organized. It has been an effective lobbying group and had been influential in the Project's appointment. Input from the community was sought throughout the process. All of the major day care groups had a representative on the Project. Leaders had frequent conversations with the Project's staff person who also periodically attended their group's meetings to provide updates and answer questions. Comments and concerns were discussed in working group meetings.

During the Project's early stages, three public hearings were held (Worcester, Boston, and Springfield) to identify issues. Several hundred people attended, over forty testified, and many others submitted written testimony. Each working group's preliminary recommendations were summarized and sent to several thousand people, who were invited to a dozen statewide forums for reaction. Forum comments were summarized and became the basis for developing pre-final recommendations, which were then widely distributed for final comments. The first draft of the final report was reviewed by all Project members. The final draft was reviewed by coordinating committee members before it was submitted to the Governor in October.

The Project's structure seems to have worked well. The final report was submitted in time for the Governor's review before the completion of his FY '86 budget request. Recommendations already had initial agency "sign off" and were supported by all of the diverse day care advocacy groups. In addition many individuals and groups became aware of the importance of expanded support for day care through the Project's hearings and forums as well as media coverage of both.

The final section of this thesis presents the recommendations of the "Governor's Day Care Partnership Project." Recommendations are divided
into four sections: Resource Development, Quality Affordability, Policy Coordination and Implementation. The major recommendations are summarized below.

I. RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Only about a third of Massachusetts parents needing day care are able to find the kind of care they want and can afford. The bringing together of resources (business, labor, schools, local government, colleges, community leaders, etc.) must be done in each community with strong leadership on the state level.

1. Office for Children should develop a statewide network of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies.

2. The Executive Offices of Economic Affairs and Labor should initiate ten employer-sponsored day care projects during 1985.

3. The state should begin to become a "model employer" and address state employees day care needs.

4. The Department of Education should encourage local school systems to develop school-age day care programs, provide transportation, utilize space for day care, and develop day care programs for adolescent parents.

5. The Executive Office of Communities and Development should identify incentives for local housing authorities to develop programs and public housing residents.

6. The Executive Office of Communities and Development should identify communities with zoning barriers to family day care homes and develop solutions to these barriers.

7. The State should establish a Private/Public Partnership
Day Care Fund to leverage private sector investment in day care services.

II. Quality

A day care program's level of quality and its cost effectiveness are dependent on an adequate number of trained staff members committed to providing care which meets each child's developmental needs.

8. Department of Social Services should raise provider rates to meet recommended salary and fringe guidelines.

9. Department of Social Services should raise family day care provider rates to attract and retain capable providers.

10. Future day care funding should target the development of family day care systems in communities without them and expand existing systems.

11. A regionally-based comprehensive day care worker training model should be developed.

12. The Office for Children should receive adequate funding to appropriately fulfill its licensing responsibility.

III. AFFORDABILITY

Continuity-of-care and socio-economic program mix are two important criteria in assuring available affordable care.

13. Make Massachusetts' Individual Child Care Tax Deduction more progressive.

14. Increase the number of state subsidized slots for both currently eligible families and families earning between 70 - 115% of the state's media income.
IV. POLICY COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Trying to determine how day care policy is now made is ambiguous and confusing, both to those within state government as well as providers, consumers, and advocates. This situation impedes not only clear policy development and implementation, but also the effective management of existing resources.

15. Governor's Office of Human Resources should function as the focal point for the development and coordination of overall day care policy.

16. A Day Care Cabinet should be establish.

17. Governor should appoint a Citizen's Day Care Advisory.

The next chapter begins with a description of the kinds of services that might be available in one community in 1989 if these recommendations are implemented. It is important to note that increasing the availability of affordable quality day care is not a goal, in itself, but a tool in achieving other important state government goals which include:

- decreasing the number of families dependent on AFDC
- increasing the number of families living above the poverty line
- meeting the developmental needs of young children and providing compensatory education
- increasing the productivity of the workforce
- supporting community and regional economic development

"Self-sufficient families contribute to the near-term economic well being of the country, healthy children are the critical long term resource for a strong and stable nation." To address the day care needs of Massachusetts' families, state government needs to take an active leadership role. The Commonwealth cannot solve all of the problems alone and must work closely with the private sector which also has a high stake in the availability of quality affordable day care.
Chapter Three

The Planning Intervention

THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF
THE "GOVERNOR'S DAY CARE PARTNERSHIP PROJECT"

Central to the recommendations presented in this report is the recognition that parents' needs, resources and preferences vary dramatically. Parents need help, though, in finding care and knowing how to choose good care. Our goal should be for each community to have a variety of available child care models so that parents can choose from several good options, which might include: neighborhood infant/toddler, preschool and school age day care centers; work site day care centers; in home care; family day care homes and family day care systems; school extended day programs, and emergency care programs. Each community should have available care during the hours parents work, including evenings and weekends. Each child care option should be designed to meet each child's developmental needs.

3.1 The Vision, 1989

The goal of our recommendations is to stimulate community public/private partnerships that will increase the availability of quality day care. The ingredients and combinations of each partnership will vary. It may be helpful to envision one Massachusetts community five years from now in the Fall of 1989. The year 1989 was chosen to emphasize that developing community based child care will take a period of years.

One particular parent living in this community is about to enter the workforce and needs day care. This parent calls the
local Child Care Resource and Referral Agency (CCRR). This agency, supported with public and private dollars from state and local levels, serves both consumers and providers. The CCRR is the community's day care hub, gathering information, analyzing data, and facilitating the formation of public/private partnerships to develop and maintain programs, as well as assisting parents in finding good care for their children.

All the CCRR's program information is computerized so that a parent receives an up-to-date list of programs with available openings. Parents are also given information on how to choose a program and how to apply for available subsidies. This particular parent decides to visit three programs before making a choice.

The first is a center serving twenty preschool children and twenty school age children (after school and during school vacations) in two large classrooms in a neighborhood junior high school. The director of a local day care program, faced with growing waiting lists and encouraged by the Child Care Resource Agency, worked with the school principal to obtain state funds to renovate space in this formerly underutilized building. Several local businesses then donated money for equipment and other start-up costs.

Parents pay on a sliding fee scale. A quarter of the children are subsidized by the state and another quarter by the local United Way. Three of the children are handicapped and
the center's staff receives training and support from the school department's special needs office. Each year student teachers from two local colleges bring additional resources to the program. The town provides funding for supplies and transports the school-age children to the center each afternoon.

The second center, located in a new industrial park, serves fifty infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. Through the efforts of several state agencies and the local CCRR, the center was included in the park's original plans. The Child Care Resource and Referral Agency worked with the developer to design the center and encouraged each of the park's businesses to support the center, using materials and data prepared by the state Executive Office of Economic Affairs. The CCRR also helped in forming a non-profit corporation and in hiring qualified staff. The availability of the center has proven to be an important factor in drawing new companies to the park and creating new jobs for the community.

Two-thirds of the park's businesses subsidize their employees' cost of care (two have day care as part of their collective bargaining agreement). Several others donate funds or secretarial and accounting help. A quarter of the center's parents live in neighborhoods near the park, but do not work in the park. The center has five children, needing day care because of family crisis. Their care is paid for by the state.

The third program is a family day care system, a network of
family day care homes, which serves a hundred infants, toddlers, preschool, and school age children. The Child Care Resource and Referral Agency initially recruited interested family day care providers and then worked with staff from a neighboring community family day care system to develop an agency to give these providers training and on-going support.

Convinced by the CCRR that helping parents meet their day care needs would be good for their businesses, a local bank and insurance company pay for fifty percent of the cost of care for their employees' children enrolled in this family day care system. Two other businesses contract for special providers to care for their employees' children during evening and nighttime hours. The state subsidizes twenty-five of the system's children, many from newly arrived immigrant and refugee families. The local school district pays for the cost of care for four infants whose mothers are attending high school.

This particular parent, no matter what the family income, is assured that all three programs offer care designed to meet his/her children's developmental needs. Each program has an adequate number of staff, trained and committed to providing good care, and there is adequate space, supplies, and equipment. S/he will find that in these programs children are nurtured and parents are listened to.

This standard of care is established and maintained by adequate funding for: licensing, day care worker wages, and
training. This particular parent (and all parents) can find care, pay an amount s/he can afford, and work knowing his/her child is receiving quality care. His/her employer is assured a productive, dependable employee.

Many of the elements described in this 1989 imaginary community's day care system exist in real communities today. What is currently lacking, though, are mechanisms to integrate these elements, encourage the development of new partnerships and maintain an adequate level of quality. The following recommendations developed by the "Governor's Day Care Partnership Project" are a blueprint for accomplishing these goals. They are divided into four sections:

- RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
- QUALITY
- AFFORDABILITY
- POLICY COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Recommendations will require either administrative, legislative, or budgetary action or a combination of all three.
3.2 Resource Development

The recommendations in this section seek to expand the day care system's financial operating base by facilitating and stimulating other sector investment and involvement. In order to have optimal impact these resource development efforts should be targeted to a number of communities in 1985, adding additional communities in 1986 and 1987. This will require a coordinated effort of a number of state agencies. How to assure this coordination is outlined in Section 3.5, POLICY COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION.

The implementation of the recommendations in this section should not only increase the overall supply of child care but the kinds of care available. Parental choice is one important component in assuring quality care and is discussed in detail in Section 3.3, QUALITY. The goal of the recommendations, in this section, is for parents throughout the Commonwealth to have the kinds of child care options to choose from that are described in "The Vision, 1989", Pages 35-39 of this report.

A. CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL AGENCIES

Recommendation # 1

Over the next three years the Office for Children should develop a statewide network of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (CCRR).
Child Care Resource and Referral Agency Description

A Child Care Resource and Referral Agency (CCRR) will be a community's hub of day care activity, focusing efforts on promoting day care and bringing together the state and local resources required to support existing programs and develop new ones. Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies will make day care visible and accessible in each community.

The function of each Child Care Resource and Referral Agency should be to:

- Collect and analyze data to determine community needs and gaps in services.
- Develop new resources by acting as the community's day care broker, bringing together employees, labor, providers, parents, local government and school systems, and colleges to expand existing programs and start new ones.
- Provide technical assistance to groups interested in starting new programs and expanding existing programs.
- Help programs coordinate their resources, by developing for example a shared transportation system or toy library.
- Educate consumers by providing parents with information on how to choose a quality program, where openings exist, and what subsidies they may be eligible for.
- Manage both private and public sector vouchers, providing an easy mechanism for employer support.
- Provide and Coordinate day care worker training.

Implementation

The Office for Children should develop, maintain and coordinate this statewide network of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies. OFC should either:

- Help community groups develop a new not-for-profit agency
o Contract with an existing community not-for-profit agency able to perform these functions

o Increase staffing in an area OFC office to perform CCRR functions in the interim in areas where it is not immediately feasible or practical to develop a separate CCRR agency

Each CCRR should have an advisory board representing local businesses, local government, child care experts, and consumers. This board should be closely linked to local Office for Children Councils.

Although OFC should provide start-up costs and a continuing base of funding for CCRR's, local government, businesses, United Way and other community groups should also contribute. A local match formula, based on an area's economic needs and resources, should be developed, making sure that communities most in need of services are not prevented from developing a CCRR because of an inability to provide the required match.

B. EMPLOYER-SUPPORTED CHILD CARE INITIATIVES

Recommendation # 2

The Executive Office of Economic Affairs (EOEA) and the Executive Office of Labor (EOL) initiate ten employer-sponsored day care projects during 1985.

Rationale

Employers are an important resource in expanding day care services.
There are several good Massachusetts employer-supported child care models and there is increasing employer interest.

CCRR staff will help educate employers to the fact that available, affordable, quality child care is in their best business interest (lower rates of absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover; increased levels of worker recruitment, retention, productivity, and morale; better community relations and company image) and can help employers decide which options (supporting resource and referral services, providing vouchers, buying slots in existing programs, contributing start-up or expansion funds, providing support for existing programs, developing family day care systems, starting a center) will best meet their needs. CCRR staff will also work with Private Industry Councils, Chambers of Commerce and other business groups to educate them to the need for care and assist them in determining the best way each group can help.

It will be several years, though, before a statewide CCRR network exists that can focus on increasing employer-supported child care programs. Even after CCRR's are established they will need on-going support from the Executive Offices of Economic Affairs and Labor. EOEA and EOL need to take active roles in promoting employer-supported child care.

**Implementation**

EOEA and EOL tasks should include:

- Research and data analyses
- Development of brochures and other materials
- Outreach to employers
- Outreach to Private Industry Councils, Economic Development agencies, Chambers of Commerce, etc.
- Linking employees and employer groups with CCRR's and/or other community resources
- Making recommendations on other possible incentives that would increase employer-supported child care services

At the same time the Governor's Office of Economic Development should encourage developers to include day care space in industrial parks, business complexes and other new building efforts. Initial EOE and EOL efforts should focus, where possible, in the four areas where OFC's special "Citizen Involvement for Day Care Quality Project" (a federally funded two-year project which is in its second year) is working with citizens to develop strategies and build networks within their communities to stimulate and develop employer-supported day care.

Other efforts which would provide a climate for increased employer involvement in child care should include:

- The Governor lobbying the Department of Labor for expanded day care funding for job training and employment programs.
- EOE encouraging each Private Industry Council (with increased efforts in targeted communities) to use a larger share of its support services resources to provide day care funding for Job Training Partnership Act clients.
- The Dependent Care Assistance Plan (D-CAP) portion of the Federal Tax Recovery Act of 1981 codified into state tax law to protect it from future state decoupling with federal tax laws. The Department of Revenue should send all Massachusetts employers information about Dependent Care Assistance Plans and how to take advantage of these benefits.
C. STATE AS EMPLOYER

Recommendation # 3

The state should begin to become a "model employer" by aiding in the establishment of a non-profit corporation to help state employee groups start and maintain child care programs and providing start-up funding for three to five day care centers each year.

Rationale

The Commonwealth is the state's largest employer. As an employer, the state is just as affected by the changing composition of the workforce as private sector employers. Helping employees meet their child care needs will increase worker productivity and can demonstrate to other employers potential employer-supported day care models.

Chapter 677, passed in 1983, requires that based on documented need, space be made available for day care use for state employees in all state owned buildings. There is now a day care center in the McCormack Building and one will soon open in the new Transportation Building. Although Chapter 677 is a significant first step, employee groups need technical assistance and on-going support to develop programs. In addition to developing on-site care, the Commonwealth should carefully review other employer-supported child care models.

Implementation

The function of the non-profit umbrella corporation should be to:

- Develop state employee child care centers in state-owned buildings
o Establish policies for all state employee child care centers

o Provide technical assistance to state employee groups in developing programs

o Provide on-going support to centers

o Coordinate foundation and other fund raising efforts

These efforts should be supported by the Department of Personnel Administration. Its role should be to:

o Help organize and work with the non-profit umbrella corporation.

o Develop informational materials for state employees on day care options and work with personnel officers to disseminate this information

o Work with each state agency in developing and implementing a child care needs assessment

Funding should be provided through the state's capital outlay budget for renovation costs, equipment, and other appropriate start-up costs for day centers in state owned buildings. Efforts should include:

o Establishment of some centers outside of Boston, based on documented employee need.

o Day care included in state college campus expansion and renovation planning.

o Development of a downtown Boston infant/toddler center, possibly as a joint effort with the City.

Administration and Finance (A&F), along with other appropriate agencies, should examine the costs and benefits of establishing a Dependent Care Assistance Plan for state employees. A&F should immediately review the implications of a salary reduction plan, through which employees could voluntarily allocate a portion of their salary on a pretax basis for child care costs.
D. LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1. School-Age Child Care

Recommendation # 4

The Department of Education should encourage the development of school-age child care programs.

Rationale/Implementation

The number of "latchkey" children, children who are unsupervised after school and during school vacations, is rising dramatically. In 1982 the Children's Defense Fund estimated that almost half of the nation's children age thirteen and under were unsupervised while their parents worked. These children face loneliness, fear, danger, delinquency, and exploitation. School-age child care would enable these children to play, relax and learn new skills while interacting with caring adults.

The Department of Education should also encourage local school districts to start kindergarten the same time in the morning as other elementary grades and not to alternate children, enrolled in day care programs, mid-year from morning to afternoon sessions.

2. Use of School Space

Recommendation # 5

Amend "School Building Assistance Bureau" (SBAB) regulations (Chapter 685) to make day care an eligible expense.
Rationale/Implementation

Many school buildings are underutilized because of declining enrollments. The Department of Education should encourage local school districts to use available space for day care for both pre-school and school age youngsters (the needs of older children should also be considered). Local school districts should either provide the service directly or enter into a contractual agreement with a non-profit agency to provide care. Once CCRR's are developed they will be available for technical assistance and for linking school authorities with community groups interested in providing care. If space needs to be renovated for day care use or if a local school district is interested in constructing new space, funding should be made available (based on the economic needs of a community) through the School Building Assistance Bureau (SBAB).

All income received by a school district as reimbursement for providing support to day care programs (e.g., utilities, construction, maintenance) should return to the school district through a revolving account and not go into the city's or town's general account.

3. Transportation

Recommendation # 6

Amend school transportation regulations (Chapter 71-7A) to enable local schools (under regulations promulgated by local school committees) to transport children from day care to school and from school to day care and receive full reimbursement.
Rationale/Implementation

In many cases children's before and after school day care is not located in the schools they attend. Most day care centers either do not own vehicles or find that providing transportation is logistically impossible. Parents cannot leave work in the middle of the day to bring their children to day care. Currently Chapter 71-7A mandates local school districts to transport children only from home to school and back. Amending this statute will make day care accessible for many school age youngsters.

4. Adolescent Parents

Recommendation # 7

The Department of Education should encourage local school districts to coordinate with community day care programs so that adolescent parents can complete high school.

Rationale/Implementation

The need for day care is not only a concern for elementary school age children. Last year 2,500 Massachusetts adolescents under age eighteen gave birth. The inability to find affordable child care is the reason many will not complete high school. Since each community's needs for programs for adolescent parents will vary, DOE should encourage collaborative efforts.

The Department of Education should also broaden the focus of its training efforts to sensitize school adjustment counselors and other appropriate personnel about the needs of adolescent parents. A component of
the training should include how to help adolescent parents find community day care. This training could eventually be purchased from CCRR's.*

E. LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITIES

Recommendation # 8

Executive Office of Communities and Development (EOCD) make day care a priority use of modernization and supportive services funds.

Implementation

The Executive Office of Communities and Development (EOCD) should work with local housing authorities to determine tenants' child care needs. Housing authorities should be encouraged to make space available to help meet these child care needs. Expansion of existing programs and new program start-up should be a priority use of EOCD modernization and supportive services funds. Space should be made available for day care programs at no/or reduced rent.

EOCD should also work with public housing authorities to determine the barriers to tenants becoming family day care providers and develop policies that will increase the number of units available for family day care.

* Out of school adolescent parents may also need day care. Meeting these needs are discussed later in this report.
EOCD and the Department of Social Services should develop an interagency agreement targeting the expansion of day care services for public housing residents. EOCD should provide start-up funding through modernization and supportive services funds and DSS should provide operating funds once programs (which meet DSS purchase standards) are established.

F. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Recommendation # 9
The Executive Office of Communities and Development encourage the use of Small Cities Community Development Block Grant funds for day care program start-up.

Rationale

The availability of day care and community economic development are interconnected; therefore, the availability of day care should be on the agenda each time a state agency works with local government officials on a new industrial or office park, or other development project. Cities should be encouraged to use Community Development Block Grant or Small Cities Community Development Block Grant Funds to renovate space and/or provide operating funds.

Recommendation # 10
Executive Office of Communities and Development identify communities with zoning barriers to family day care homes and develop solutions to these barriers.
Rationale/Implementation

Many municipalities have zoning regulations that restrict family day care homes in residential neighborhoods. Attempts in three different legislative sessions to make family day care a "home occupation" failed, primarily due to home rule objections. Advocates now feel that even if the home rule objections could be overcome, making family day care a "home occupation" may not be an effective solution to existing zoning barriers in some communities.

The Executive Office of Communities and Development should identify communities with zoning barriers that restrict family day care homes in residential neighborhoods and work with providers, local officials, the Office for Children and community groups to develop uniform definitions and reasonable solutions to these barriers. EOCD, with the assistance of providers, local officials, OFC, and community groups, should develop any necessary and appropriate legislation to eliminate these zoning barriers by December 1, 1985.

G. PRIVATE/PUBLIC PARTNERSHIP DAY CARE FUND

Recommendation #11

Establish a Private/Public Partnership Day Care Fund.
**Rationale/Implementation**

Private/Public Partnerships are critical to day care service expansion. Using state funds to leverage private sector investment is an important mechanism of a coordinated effort to expand services.

The Executive Offices of Human Services, Communities and Development, and Economic Affairs and the Governor's Offices of Human Resources and Education should develop criteria for this fund. The fund should be used to match donations from private sector, local government, private charitable and higher education institutions to expand existing programs and to establish new ones. Evaluated annually, funding should be incrementally increased based on the availability of potential donors and documented area need. This fund is not intended as an alternative to the Department of Social Services Private Public Partnership Project account, but rather as a complement to it.
3.3 Quality

A day care program's level of quality and its costs effectiveness is dependent on an adequate number of trained staff members, committed to providing care which meets each child's development needs. There are fewer and fewer programs in Massachusetts, though, able to attract and retain trained qualified staff. This issue as well as adequate resources for program licensing and monitoring are addressed in this section.

We can no longer afford to debate if children should be in day care. Instead we must develop the best possible programs for the more than 100,000 Massachusetts children currently attending licensed day care programs. The kind of care children receive will affect their later school performance and the kind of adults they become. Adequate funding must be made available to assure that all programs meet each child's developmental needs.

A. Wages

**Recommendation # 12**

The Department of Social Services increase provider rates to meet the following salary guidelines for center and family day care system staff with a 25 percent fringe guideline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry Level</td>
<td>10,500 - 13,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Level</td>
<td>12,600 - 15,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teacher Level</td>
<td>14,700 - 18,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator or Center Director Level</td>
<td>17,850 - 21,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director Level</td>
<td>18,900 - Dependent on program size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director Level</td>
<td>Dependent on program size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation # 13

The Department of Social Services negotiate a "blended sub-unit rate" between $10-$12.50 with each contracted Family Day Care System.

Rationale

Historically, day care workers wages have been low because child care, perceived as "women's work", is not valued. The U.S. Department of Labor classifies parking lot attendants and day care teachers in the same occupational category. Nationally, two thirds of day care workers earn poverty level wages and the turn-over rate is twice as high as other human service workers. Research shows that based on qualification requirements, day care workers are the nation's most underpaid occupational group.

We now face a crisis situation, with almost every day care program throughout the Commonwealth unable to fill open staff positions. Directors report that along with rapidly increasing turnover rates, they are often forced to hire staff with inadequate qualifications. These high turnover rates have a negative impact on our children. All efforts to expand available day care services will be futile if programs are unable to find qualified teachers.

Substantial day care rate cuts during the last two years of Governor King's administration forced many programs to either lay off staff or cut salaries, which had not kept up with inflation, making an already bad
situation worse. Salary levels in some programs are lower now than they were before 1982.

This year, the average salaries in state subsidized programs are:

- TEACHER AIDES: $7,865
- TEACHERS: $10,586
- HEAD TEACHERS: $11,844

Day care teachers, unlike public school teachers, work year round. Over half of the workers earn less than $5.00/hour, and many receive inadequate fringe benefits. Family day care providers, who work ten hour days with no paid benefits, average $8.50 per day/per child (averaging less than $8,000 annually). "In the U.S. in general, and Massachusetts, in particular, we have a system of day care based on the exploitation of workers providing the care". (Morgan)

Day care worker wages are not related to training or experience. On average, janitors, typists, messengers, and clerks receive higher salaries than day care teachers. With Massachusetts' tight labor market, higher paying jobs are available to current or potential day care workers and qualified workers are leaving the field. Without substantial wage increases, who will mind our children?

Wage and Fringe Guideline Implementation

These recommended wage and fringe guidelines should be implemented within a two year period, with a cost-of-living increase the second year. Agency and program differences require flexibility in guideline implementation. A committee of day care providers, workers and other child
care experts should work with the Department of Social Services to establish qualification guidelines linking salary levels with training and experience.

**Family Day Care system "Sub Unit" Rate Implementation**

A family day care system's "sub-unit rate" is the amount of money it can pay a provider per child per day. The current average rate is $8.50/day/child. Most providers earn less than $8500/year. The Department of Social Services should negotiate with each contracted family day care system a "blended sub-unit rate" of between $10-$12.50. This will enable systems to:

- Raise their sub-unit rate to attract new providers and keep existing providers
- Set up a variable rate structure, paying providers a different rate based on a child's age, the number of hours a child is in care, a child's special needs and/or a provider's experience.

This rate increase will raise the average annual system family care provider income to approximately $10,000 per year.

**B. TRAINING**

**Recommendation # 14**

Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (CCRR) should determine area day care center and family day care provider training needs and then develop and coordinate appropriate training programs.
Rationale

Specialized training in child development and early childhood education is necessary for teachers to provide children with good care. The best day care programs have a "balanced" staff with differing backgrounds, training and experience. Low salaries, though, prevent day care workers from purchasing training. In addition workers have little incentive to purchase training since salary levels have historically not been related to training or experience.

Although the Department of Social Services has periodically provided training to workers in state subsidized programs, there is a need for a comprehensive training model accessible to all day care workers. A state-wide Child Care Resource and Referral network will provide a mechanism to coordinate and expand existing training programs.

Implementation

The development of a comprehensive day care training plan will require the coordinated efforts of the Office for Children, Department of Social Services, Department of Education, Governor's Office of Education, and the Board of Regents. Training should:

- Be financially and linguistically accessible to all day care workers
- Incorporate a counseling/career development component which includes evaluation and accreditation of past training and experience
- Address the special needs of family day care providers

A comprehensive training model should be implemented in one region during
FY'86, in two additional regions in FY'87, and be available statewide by the end of FY'88. If possible, the Region chosen to pilot the training model should be a Region with an established CCCR. Training should be accredited, competency-based, and financially accessible.

The programs should be piloted in one Region in FY'86, expanded to two additional Regions in FY'87, and be implemented statewide by the end of FY'88. Each Region's current DSS training funding level should continue until this training model is in place in that Region. "Appendix A" is a detailed description of this proposed training model.

During the first six months, a detailed needs assessment should be completed. Interested day care workers and family day care providers should receive guidance in evaluating past training and experience, and developing individual training plans and career goals.

Training should include (but not be limited to):

- Courses
- Workshops
- On-site workshops, etc.
- Child Development Associate supervision
- Degree programs

OFC, through CCRR's, should work with colleges and universities in the Region (with day care community input) to develop appropriate programs. Student intern programs and other higher education resource linkages should also be developed. Joint Head Start/Day Care training should be encouraged.
Tools to measure competency of entry level center workers and family day care providers should be developed.

OFC, DOE, the Board of Regents and the Association of Independent Colleges should develop a competency-based Early Childhood Education degree and certification. They should also work toward a reciprocity agreement for Early Childhood courses throughout the higher education system.

The Board of Regents should also develop a tuition waiver plan and school loan forgiveness plan for day care workers.

The Department of Education should also modify its existing Early Childhood Education Certification to include an Age 3 - Kindergarten Option, with approved licensed day care centers included as student teaching sites. This will require a statutory change.

**RECOMMENDATION CHANGES IN OFC LICENSING REGULATIONS REGARDING CENTER STAFF AND FAMILY DAY CARE PROVIDER QUALIFICATIONS**

The following suggestions for changes in licensing regulations regarding staff qualifications are contingent on the implementation of the recommended training model. Center-based day care workers and family day care providers should be able to demonstrate competence in the following areas within five years of the training model's implementation. Training should focus on the skills listed under each staff category. OFC should develop necessary tools for measuring competency and mechanisms for demonstrating competency.
*Entry level personnel - (within three years of hiring) will demonstrate skills in the following areas, measured by a competency-based tool:

- Child development
- Child management
- Health/safety/nutrition
- Teaching strategies
- Specific curriculum area (minimum 3)
- Parent communication

*Teacher level - In addition to above will demonstrate the following skills when hired:

- Daily and long-range curriculum planning
- Human growth the development
- "Child awareness training"
- Parenting skills
- Basic supervision/Peer relations

These can be demonstrated by:

- CDA or AA Early Childhood Education Degree (must include a supervised field placement) and one year experience.

or

- BA Early Childhood (must include supervised student teaching).

*Head teacher - In addition to above will demonstrate the following skills: [in programs where there is a director with starred skills (*)], the teacher need not demonstrate those starred skills (*).

- History of day care/models of care
- Financial management*
Community resources and networking
Administration*
Supervision/communication skills

This can be demonstrated by:

CDA of AA early childhood plus courses in above and three years of experience

or

BA in early childhood (which includes above courses) plus two years experience

*Teachers and Head Teachers should have a primary area:

- Infant/Toddler
- Pre-School

A tool should be developed to measure achievement in primary area.

*Family Day Care Providers (Providers receive provisional registration) - Renewal of registration after two years will require demonstration of following skills:

- Age appropriate behavior/home based activities
- Behavior management and limit setting
- Communications with parents
- Health/safety/nutrition
- Daily planning
- Juggling day care and personal needs
- Record keeping and taxes

A competency-based tool will be developed to measure skill achievement.
C. FAMILY DAY CARE SYSTEMS

Recommendation # 15

Future day care funding expansion should target the development of Family Day Care systems in communities without them and expand existing systems.

Rationale/Implementation

Family day care, while the preferred option for many parents, has a high provider turnover rate and is difficult to monitor in terms of quality. A Family Day Care System addresses some of these problems by:

- Recruiting, training, and supporting providers
- Referring and placing consumers
- Monitoring quality
- Providing back-up care when a provider is unavailable

Expanding Family Day Care Systems should not be interpreted, though, as an alternative to support and training for Independent Family Day Care Providers. Expanding support and training for all providers is necessary to raise the overall quality of family day care.

The Department of Social Services should study the implications of a recent complaint to The U.S. Department of Labor which threatens family day care system providers current status as sub-contractors. Policies should be developed to assure the continuation and expansion of family day care systems.
D. LICENSING

Recommendation # 16

The Office for Children must receive sufficient funding to appropriately fulfill its licensing responsibilities.

Rationale

Although the supply of day care has not kept up with the need, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of day centers and family day care homes during the last several years. Funding for the Office for Children for licensors has been inadequate to keep up with these increases. One-third of the state's day care center licenses have expired; the waiting list for family day care registration is over 2500; family day care providers wait months to be registered and are only visited if a complaint is filed; regulations have not been reviewed in eight years; a two year old statute requiring the licensing of school age day care centers has not been implemented. Maintaining the level of day care quality or expanding the supply will be impossible without adequately expanding OFC's licensing capacity.

Implementation

Of critical importance is:

- Adequate staff to license day care centers
- Adequate staff (including bilingual licensors) for a multi-area family day care registration model. This model would enable licensors to visit a percentage of registered family day care homes each year on a randomly selected basis.

Adequate staff is also needed to:
Review and revise all existing regulations. In reviewing regulations, attention should focus on staff qualification requirements. Specific suggestions for upgrading staff qualifications are in Appendix B.

Develop and implement regulations for: family day care systems*, school age day care**, special needs family day care, off-hour (nights and weekends) care, and drop-in care.

Translate family day care materials into appropriate languages.

Review programs currently exempt from licensing and develop future policies for assuring the quality of these programs.

Review the feasibility and implications of Group Family Day Care Home licensing.

E. PURCHASING STANDARDS AND MONITORING

Recommendation # 17

Develop purchasing standards for vouchers comparable to contract standards.

Recommendation # 18

Target sufficient funding to adequately monitor all state purchased day care.

Rationale/Implementation

All state subsidized care no matter what the purchasing mechanism (vouchers or contracts) should be the same level of quality. This fiscal year the State will purchase over sixty million dollars of day care services.

* Enabling systems to register their own providers should cutdown on the long family day care registration waiting lists.

** Statute should be amended to include "care for school age children before and after school hours and during school vacation." Age range should be changed from 6-13 to 5-14.
Monitoring will assure that quality standards are maintained. All day care programs should be required to provide a detailed breakdown of their administrative costs, assuring that day care funding supports quality services for children.

F. Families in Crisis

**Recommendation # 19**

The "Governor's Day Care Partnership Project" supports the recommendations of the Department of Social Services Supportive Services Day Care Task Force to increase supportive services day care rates to provide adequate staffing and reimbursement for transportation costs.

**Rationale**

Day care is often the most important component of the treatment plan for abused or neglected children or it is used to prevent abuse and neglect (referred to as Supportive Services Day Care). Many of these children are angry and confused, often acting out in the classroom, and require special attention. Some are developmentally delayed and need extra help and teacher time. Funding is needed for additional classroom and support staff to adequately meet these children's needs.

Most of these children also require transportation from home to day care and back home. The Department of Social Services requires that day care programs provide this transportation, but programs are finding it increasingly difficult to do this at current reimbursement rates.
Recommendation # 20

The Department of Social Services and Department of Public Health develop an interagency agreement with the goal of providing comprehensive services to Supportive Services children ages birth to three.

Rationale

The Department of Public Health funds Early Intervention programs for developmentally delayed children, aged birth to three. Many of the infants and toddlers in Supportive Services Day Care need and are eligible for these services.

A targeted pilot should be implemented in four communities. Ten children in each pilot program should receive Supportive Services Day Care in a Family Day Care System. Other appropriate services (e.g. physical or speech and language therapy) should be provided to these children by the community Early Intervention Program while the children attend day care. Early Intervention program staff should also help train each child's day care provider to best meet each child's needs.

G. SENSITIVITY TO MULTI-CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

Recommendation # 21

State subsidized day care programs meet the needs of children from all cultural backgrounds.
Rationale

Families needing day care services come from many different backgrounds and these backgrounds will affect the kind of programs parents want for their children. Day care programs need sufficient resources to meet each child's needs no matter what their family background. Of particular concern are refugee and immigrant families, since linguistic and other cultural differences should not prevent families from obtaining care or feeling comfortable with the care their children receive.

Implementation

In order to reach this goal:

- Sensitivity to multi-cultural differences should be addressed in each day care program's Request for Funding Proposal
- Adequate program funding should be provided for such things as bilingual teachers, translating materials, and/or developing special curriculum.
- Efforts should be made to develop new programs to fill existing service gaps.
- These issues should be addressed in any expansion of day care funding.

H. SPECIAL NEEDS CHILDREN

Recommendation # 22

The Department of Education should encourage local school districts to use federal funding (Chapter 94-142 and Chapter 83-313) to provide services to "special needs" children with working parents.
**Rationale**

Working parents with "special needs" children face an almost impossible task in finding appropriate care for their children. Some "special needs" children already in day care may not even be identified or receive appropriate services because of inadequate staff training and/or program resources. The Department of Education needs to work with local school districts to assure that "special needs" children receive the services they need while their parents are at work. DOE should encourage the development of local school district and community day care programs cooperative efforts.

**Implementation**

The Department of Education should provide training for day care teachers concerning Chapter 766 through the Commonwealth Inservice Institute. DOE should encourage local school districts to include day care teachers in Core Evaluation Teams and in the development of Individual Education Plans.

Chapter 94-142 and Chapter 83-313 funding should be used to:

- Provide personnel to work with "special needs" children in day care centers
- Transport children from day care to special services and back to day care
- Develop integrated full day programs

The Office of Handicapped Affairs should identify the problems of making centers accessible to handicapped children, parents, or staff and help identify renovation funding sources.
3.4 Affordability

The recommendations in this section address the issues of affordability, focusing on the importance of a continued state government commitment to the concepts of continuity-of-care and socio-economic mix. Both of these concepts are important criteria in assuring that parents will be able to continue working and that children's developmental needs will be met.

It is important to note, though, that many of the recommendations in Section I, Resource Development, should lead to not only more care, but more affordable care. Employers, local government, school system and college investment in child care should lower the cost of care for many parents. Without other sector involvement many parents will continue to be unable to afford quality care for their children.

A. CONTINUITY OF CARE

**Recommendation # 23**

Planning for all state funded day care programs should include a commitment to the principle of continuity-of-care.

**Rationale**

Continuity-of-care assures that low income families will not find themselves caught in a revolving door, losing day care at the end of a job training program or when they receive small increases in income. The issue of continuity-of-care needs to be a particular concern for state agencies in the
development and expansion of voucher programs, programs designed to help pay for child care for a particular population for a designated period of time. Vouchers are effective in giving particular populations immediate access to care, but if there are no subsidized contracted slots available when the voucher expires, the parent risks losing their care and not being able to work. Planning of voucher programs must include future expansion of the contracted day care system.

Implementation

Before implementing or expanding a voucher program, the question of how "continuity-of-care" will be guaranteed needs to be addressed. In order to maintain quality and stability, preference should be to expand the contracted day care system and not to extend vouchers. The ratio of vouchers to contracted slots needs to be carefully reviewed before expanding a voucher program.

Children needing to change programs due to age, family relocation or parental choice should be a priority for an opening in another state subsidized program. Siblings of children in care should be eligible for services and be a priority for openings.

The Department of Social Services, with appropriate community input, should review and revise its sliding fee scale.
B. SOCIO-ECONOMIC MIX

Recommendation # 24

Make the Massachusetts Individual Child Care Deduction more progressive.

Recommendation # 25

Governor take a leadership role in lobbying for changes in the federal Child Care Tax Credit which would provide increased benefits to low and moderate income families.

Recommendation # 26

Provide additional subsidized day care slots for families earning less than 70% of state's median income. Priority given to refugee and adolescent parents for this expansion.

Recommendation # 27

Target additional state subsidized day care slots for families earning between 70%-115% of state median income who are currently paying the full cost of care and will be unable to continue care because of rate increases.

Rationale

A two tiered day care system, with separate state funded programs for "poor" children, would be harmful for all of our children. Whenever possible, state agencies should purchase care in programs with a socio-economic mix of families, but maintaining this mix is a complex problem. Raising wages to assure quality could increase program rates to a level some moderate income families would be unable to afford.

Currently families are eligible for a state subsidized day care slot if they earn less than 70% of the state median income (they remain eligible up to
There are thousands of low income families eligible for services on program waiting lists. Refugee and adolescent parents are two populations now having the most difficult time finding affordable day care. At the same time, there are thousands of families earning between 70% - 115% of the state median income, ineligible to access a state subsidized slot, but not able to afford the full cost of care.

Implementation

1. Child Care Tax Relief

The maximum tax relief a Massachusetts parent can currently receive for child care costs is $129/year/child, through the Individual Child Care Deduction. On average, higher income families now receive the most benefit from this deduction. The Individual Child Care Deduction should be made more progressive so that lower income families would benefit more than higher income families. Lower income families' benefits should be raised by "redistribution" of this tax deduction.

Making this deduction more progressive is important, but even after this change, the child care deduction will only provide several hundred

*70 - 115% of State Income 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>12,852 - 21,084</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>15,876 - 26,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>18,888 - 31,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five</td>
<td>21,924 - 35,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dollars in tax relief for low and moderate income families. The Federal Child Care Tax Credit is much more promising and the Governor should take a national leadership role in changing the Federal Child Care Tax Credit to provide increased benefits to low and moderate income families.

2. Eligibility for State Subsidized Contracted Slots

Funding for state subsidized care should be substantially increased to:

- Provide additional slots for families earning less than 70% of the state's median income
- Provide additional slots for families earning between 70% and 115% of the state's median income. These new slots should be targeted to programs with parents currently paying the full costs of care, who will be unable to continue because of rate increases.
3.5 Policy Coordination and Implementation

This report addresses the state's role in increasing the supply of affordable day care and assuring that this care meets the developmental needs of young children. Implementation of many of the previous recommendations requires a coordinated effort of several state agencies. This section focuses on assuring this coordination and the efficient implementation of all of the recommendations of the Governor's Day Care Partnership Project.

**Recommendation # 28**

The Governor's Office of Human Resources function as the focal point for the development and coordination of overall day care policy.

**Recommendation # 29**


**Recommendation # 30**

Governor appoint a Citizen's Day Care Advisory Committee with broad constituency and geographic representation

**Rationale**

At least eleven state agencies are currently involved in regulating, purchasing, stimulating, or developing policies for child care. Day care is an issue which cuts across four secretariats (EOHS, EOCD, EOEA, EOL) and is an important agenda item of four agencies (DOE, OFC, DSS, DPW). Conflicting priorities and lack of coordination of resources and leadership by any one agency has been a continual problem. Trying to determine how day care policy
is made is ambiguous and confusing both to those within state government as well as to providers, consumers, and advocates. There is an obvious need for coordination of day care policy.

Project members carefully explored the concept of creating a new separate Day Care Agency or having the Office for Children be the state's "day care agency." Both of the options were evaluated as unlikely to be successful. The problems and expense of a new agency are obvious and families might best be served by stimulating day care interest throughout state government and not categorizing it as the sole responsibility of one agency.

The OFC statute does give it authority to coordinate day care across secretariats. As a line agency within EOHS, though, OFC has not been able to accomplish this task. This report does emphasize the need to give OFC sufficient resources to fulfill its mandates to promote the development of day care services, provide consumer education, and license care. It is unlikely, though, that OFC would be able to coordinate day care policy across secretariats.

**Implementation**

Each year by August 31st the Day Care Cabinet should submit an Annual Day Care Plan and Budget to the Governor for review and approval. This budget should then be incorporated into specific agency budgets.

The Advisory Committee should review the Annual Day Care Plan and Budget before it is submitted to the Governor and advise GOHR and the Day Care Cabinet on all major new policies and initiatives. The Cabinet and Advisory
Committee should determine each year if GOHR continues to be the appropriate office to coordinate day care policy.

GOHR should perform the following functions:

- Coordinate the implementation of this report's recommendations
- Staff the Day Care Cabinet
- Coordinate targeted resource development efforts
- Long range day care planning
- Stimulate research on child care issues
- Serve as the day care federal and legislative liaison*
- Coordinate a statewide needs assessment for future planning**
- Coordinate media and public education on day care issues
- Evaluate major new initiatives.

* Plan should include coordination with Head Start Planning.

** Future on-going data will be collected by the CCRR network.
On January 22, 1985, Governor Michael S. Dukakis announced his "Day Care Partnership Plan." (included in Appendix)

"At a time when nearly 50 percent of Massachusetts mothers with children under six are working, quality child care is a lifeline to the economic independence and stability of families and vital to a sound future for our children. Good day care is also a key to continued economic growth as Massachusetts employers seek to attract new workers in a full employment.

Over the next two years, we will take the lead in improving the availability and quality of child care an encouraging other employers to get involved. Our day care plan is a blueprint for forging new partnerships with business, local government, labor, schools and higher education that results in a system of day care second to none in the nation."

The plan includes funding (16.7 million dollars) in the Governor's FY '86 budget request for most of the "Governor's Day Care Partnership Project's" major recommendations. Many of the Project's administrative recommendations have begun to be implemented. Day care policy is now being coordinated by the Governor's Office of Human Resources, the Day Care Cabinet has been formed, and the Day Care Advisory is in the process of being appointed.

Two of the Project's preliminary recommendations were implemented before the final report was ever completed. The Senate Ways and Means Committee included $300,000 for a minimum of three Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (CCRR) in its FY '85 budget which resulted in four new CCRR's beginning operations in March 1985. The Executive Office of Communities and Development made day care a priority for its FY '85 supportive services funding and several housing authorities received funding to start new programs for public housing tenants.

The Governor's announcement of his "Day Care Partnership Plan" was covered by all four TV news networks and was reported the following day
on the front page of the Boston Globe. (see Appendix) The Globe ran an editorial supporting the Plan several days after the announcement. There has been substantial, favorable coverage in local newspapers and by several radio stations.

The legislature is currently debating the Governor's FY '86 budget request. All of the $16.7 million "Day Care Partnership Plan" funding was included in the House Ways and Means Budget. Even if the legislature passes the Governor's entire budget request, though, many of the system's problems will remain unsolved. The Governor's announcement emphasized that this was the beginning of a two-year initiative. It will be several years before we can determine if the Plan will actually "create a model child care system of affordable, safe quality care that is available to every family in Massachusetts who needs it."
Appendix
Day Care Task Force: Mission Statement

The Problem:

* There is a shortage of quality child care. The cost of child care is often prohibitive. For example, the Census Bureau reports that 36% of unemployed women with family incomes of $15,000 or less would work if day care were more affordable.

* The Commonwealth through the Executive Office of Human Services, can not fully meet the need for subsidized day care. The Department of Social Services estimates that the need for work related day care is six times the supply.

* The development of day care policy and delivery of services is fragmented within state government.

The Cause:

The rapid entry of women into the workforce; continued sex-segregation of women into low paying jobs; the increase in the number of women who are single heads of household and thus, living on the edge of poverty; the increase in two working parent families; lack of incentives and coordination to stimulate employer and community support for child care.

The Effects:

Inadequate supervision and care of children; barriers and disincentives to training and employment and as a result, to becoming economically self-sufficient; those parents who do work remain among the "working poor"; policies designed to stimulate child care are not achieving maximum benefit, and are at times working at cross purposes.

The Mission:

While recognizing the state's continued commitment to fund day care, the state must also develop policies designed to stimulate and leverage the growth of child care services among the private sector, local government, and community agencies and institutions in order to begin to meet need.

The Governor's day care task force will develop a comprehensive child care policy with the goal of increasing supply, improving access and affordability and promoting quality child care in Massachusetts.
It will do so by proposing specific policies to leverage day care, and specific methods for providing linkage between the potential sources of support for day care, including business, schools, municipalities, the state and community agencies.

The Task Force will use two existing policy proposals as working documents; (1) Caring About Children in Massachusetts, by Gwen Morgan for the Children's Agenda Day Care Seminar, and; (2) A Comprehensive Child Care Delivery System: A Working Plan by the Department of Social Services. Proposals will not be limited to those contained in these documents, however.

The Task Force will be coordinated by the Governor's Advisor on Women's Issues, as a member of the Human Resources Cabinet. Membership would include representatives from: (1) each Secretariat responsible for some aspect of day care policy, including: Executive Office of Human Services; Executive Office of Labor; Executive Office of Communities and Development and Economic Affairs; the Department of Education (2) The Governor's Offices of Educational Affairs, Economic Development and Human Resources; (3) The legislature; and (4) Business, labor, providers, parents, advocate and the community.

The Task Force would be divided into five working groups mentione above (business, schools, municipalities, state, community agencies). Each sub-committee will coordinated by the appropriate secretariat or agency. The task force will review and develop proposals, (starting January) hold public hearings around the state, hold a Governor's Conference on Day Care and have policy recommendations on line for FY'86 (summer '85).
"GOVERNOR'S DAY CARE PARTNERSHIP PROJECT".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The 70's raging debate, "Is day care good or bad for children and families?" became moot with dramatic increases in the number of mothers in the workforce and the number of single parents struggling to be economically self-sufficient. There is now widespread agreement that the availability of quality child care is essential for:

- sound economic development
- economic self sufficiency of families
- social service support to families
- social and cognitive development of children

Many Massachusetts parents, though, cannot find child care at the level of quality they want and at a price they can afford to pay.

The demand for care far exceeds the supply, but there are recognized strengths in the Massachusetts Day Care System. Hundreds of high quality, community-based centers serve a socio-economic mix of families. A variety of options including center based family day care, nursery schools, and school age programs are available in many communities. The Department of Social Service's sliding fee scale assures continuity of care for the approximately 16,000 children receiving subsidized care. If current management and policy problems can be solved, the voucher program will add needed flexibility to the stable purchase of service contracted system.

State government leaders, day care providers, consumers, and advocates recognize the critical gaps in the current Massachusetts child care system which go beyond the unavailability of supply to meet growing demand. The Governor has charged the "Governor's Child Care Partnership Project" with making policy recommendations that will lead to high quality, affordable, available, accessible child care throughout the Commonwealth. To accomplish this goal, we need to focus our attention on two areas.

Massachusetts has never had a comprehensive day care policy. This has lead to conflicting priorities and lack of coordination of resources. The system is currently recovering from a two year crises (81-82) which lead to cuts in rates and services and millions of wasted state dollars. Currently, at least nine state agencies (DOHS, ORC, DPW, DSS, EOAF, EOEA, EOC, DOE, DOL) are involved in regulating, purchasing, stimulating supply, or developing policy for child day care. Trying to determine how day care policy is made is ambiguous and confusing both to those within state government as well as to providers, consumers, and advocates. Critical to the success of our mission is articulating a coherent child day care policy addressing:

- How future policy will be determined;
- The best model for delivery of services;
- Who will be eligible for state-subsidized services;
It is very important for the state to develop the best means to perform in its roles as regulator (licensing) and funder. The word "Partnership", though, was chosen to symbolize coordination of resources both within and without state government. High quality, affordable, available, accessible child care throughout Massachusetts requires additional resources from business, labor, local government, school systems, charitable institutions, and higher education. A stable, well managed state delivery system will certainly facilitate other sectors investing resources to support existing programs and develop new services. Other policies must also be developed and implemented to maximize this investment. Recommendations should focus on the most effective role(s) for the state to undertake to stimulate additional resources.

There is clearly a need for educating business and community leaders of the need for and the benefits of day care. Information and technical assistance is also required. We need to reexamine our tax and revenue policies, zoning laws and economic development initiatives, looking for the best ways to increase supply.

The current national debate over education has ignored the significance of day care for both pre-school and school age children. Our schools are an important partner with parents and community agencies in increasing the quality and supply of child care for preschool and school age youngsters. We need to develop policies that will facilitate these partnerships.

Recent studies of the Massachusetts' day care system emphasize the severe lack of resource and referral services. Child care resource and referral agencies (CCHR'S) potentially:

- Give parents information about available services;
- Help parents locate services;
- Document area supply and demand;
- Provide training for care givers;
- Stimulate local supply;
- Provide a mechanism for employer support.

If the "Governor's Day Care Partnership Project" supports the need for CCHR's, it will be necessary to determine how they should be funded and implemented.

Our charge is to develop policies that will best utilize state resources to stimulate new investment which will improve quality and increase supply. Looking at the issue of quality, steps are already underway to increase the number of licensors and review state purchasing standards. This is a beginning, but adequately paid and trained staff is the crucial component of any quality program. How to provide decent wages and on-going training and, at the same time, keeping day care affordable for parents, is a difficult dilemma. Although there are no easy answers, increasing resources through new sources is an important step.
A stable, well-managed state subsidized day care system and policies that will facilitate, stimulate, and leverage resources from other sectors are clearly inter-related and dependent on each other. If we are successful the "Governor's Day Care Partnership Project" will build the foundation and develop the plans for a day care system that will truly meet the needs of families and businesses throughout the Commonwealth.
Day Care in Massachusetts

- There are approximately 100,000 children in licensed day care centers and family day care homes in Massachusetts.
- There are approximately 1,750 day care centers and 9,000 family day care homes.
- The Office for Children licenses day care centers and registers family day care homes.
- The average cost of care in the Greater Boston area in 1984 was:

  - Infant: $5,700/year
  - Preschool: 3,500
  - School Age: 1,800
  - Family Day Care: 4,200

- The state currently subsidizes the cost of care for approximately 16,400 low-income children. Parents pay on a sliding fee basis.
  - 11,900 through contracts with the Department of Social Services.
  - 4,500 through vouchers for clients of the Department of Public Welfare's Employment and Training Choices Program.
- The Department of Social Services also purchases care for approximately 3,700 children who have special needs or whose families are in crises (protective services).
- In FY'85, the state will spend approximately $63,900,000 to help pay for day care for low-income families:

  - Department of Social Services: $50,600,000
  - Department of Public Welfare: 13,300,000

Chronology of Governor's Day Care Partnership Project

- March, 1984: Governor Michael S. Dukakis appoints "Governor's Day Care Partnership Project" (GDCPP).
- July, 1984: GDCPP holds 12 statewide forums to discuss preliminary recommendations.
- Oct, 1984: GDCPP submits final report to Governor.
- Nov & Dec, 1984: Development of budget, legislative amendments and administrative action.
- Jan 22, 1985: Governor announces "Day Care Partnership Plan"
THE DAY CARE PARTNERSHIP PLAN

The American family is changing. Only 11% of families fit the image of the "traditional" American family, with father working and mother at home. Almost half of Massachusetts mothers with children under six are now working full time. They are working for economic survival. In today's economy, two paychecks are often necessary since only one job in four adequately supports a family of four. And they are working because almost 20% of Massachusetts mothers are the sole support of their families.

Who is minding these millions of children while their mothers and fathers work? The answer for many is "day care." Few parents today raise their families in the neighborhood where they grew up - close to relatives, friends, and neighbors that they know and trust. Day Care is the crucial support that enables parents to work.

In Massachusetts, though, too many parents are unable to find the kind of day care they want at a price they can afford. The "Day Care Partnership Plan" will create over the next two years, more, better, safer, and affordable day care and help solve the difficult problems parents face in struggling to both adequately support their families and care for their children.

More day care will also aid in the continuing economic success story of Massachusetts. As we near "full employment" day care will be necessary to attract new employees into the labor market.

This two-year plan was developed under the direction of the Governor's Advisor on Women's Issues with the help of over 50 state and local government officials; business, labor and community leaders, early childhood experts, and parents. "Partnership" is the key concept of this plan. Reaching our goals is dependent on bringing together and coordinating private and public sector resources to best meet the needs of Massachusetts families and children.

Under the coordination of the Governor's Office of Human Resources, four cabinet secretariats - Human Services, Economic Affairs, Labor, and Communities and Development - and the Department of Education will provide resources and the leadership that communities need in order to develop more, better, safer and affordable day care programs. Implementing this plan will require increased state funding (which is reflected in the Governor's budget request filed on January 23, 1985), new legislation (to be filed) and administrative action, much of it already underway.

CREATING MORE AND AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE

Recent studies show that as many as 1/3 of Massachusetts parents looking for child care are unsuccessful in finding care. Another 1/3 settle for care they feel is inadequate or a strain on their family budget. Parents confront long waiting lists (average wait is six months to a year) with infant care almost impossible to find.
The "Day Care Partnership Plan" will create more and affordable care through the following actions:

1. Develop a statewide network of Childcare Resource and Referral Agencies to:
   - Develop new day care programs by acting as the community's day care broker, bringing together employees, labor, providers, parents, local government, school systems, and colleges to expand existing programs and start new ones;
   - Provide technical assistance to groups interested in starting new programs and expanding existing programs;
   - Collect and analyze data to determine community needs and gaps in services.

2. Initiate 10 employer-sponsored day care projects during 1985, to serve as models to employers across the Commonwealth.

3. Increase day care for state employees:
   - provide assistance to employee groups in developing programs;
   - renovate space in five state-owned buildings for day care centers.

4. Increase available day care space:
   - in public school buildings through funding provided by the "School Building Assistance Bureau;"
   - in public housing projects through funding provided by the Executive Office of Communities and Development.

5. Increase the number of low-income parents who will receive state assistance in paying for child care.

CREATING BETTER CHILD CARE

The answer to the child care dilemma is not simply "more". We must develop the best possible early childhood education programs for the more than 100,000 Massachusetts children currently attending licensed day care programs. Children are our most important resource. We know that the kind of care these children receive will affect their later school performance and the kind of adults they become.
The "Day Care Partnership Plan" will address the need for better care through the following actions:

6. Substantially increase the salaries of day care staff in state subsidized programs to enable these programs to attract and retain qualified staff.

7. Train day care teachers and family day care providers through Child Care Resource Referral Agencies, ensuring better care for all children.

8. Educate consumers through Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies by providing parents with information on how to choose a quality program, where openings exist, and what subsidies they may be eligible for.

9. Increase resources to programs that serve children with families-in-crisis.

10. Form a Citizen's Day Care Advisory Committee with broad constituency and geographic representation to advise on the implementation of this plan.

**CREATING SAFER CHILD CARE**

At the time of greatest need, many parents have been frightened by reports of sex abuse in day care centers. Sex abuse is not only a day care problem, but a larger societal problem whose dimensions we are just beginning to realize. The challenge before us will be to deal aggressively with sex abuse while continuing to support day care in order to prevent such incidents in the future.

The "Day Care Partnership Plan" will address the need for safer child care through the following actions:

11. Increase protection to children in day care programs:

-- 20 additional licensors;
-- Human Services Interagency Team;
-- four person investigative unit;
-- educate parents through Child Care Resource and Referral agencies;
-- Inter-agency Agreement to share information;
-- children's educational materials; and
-- support legislation that will allow children to testify by video tape; protect day care workers that report suspected abuse; expand the definition of mandatory reporter according to Chapter 51A to include all day care personnel.
PARTNERSHIP PLAN: CREATING MORE AND AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE

- Local Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies Bring Together:
  -- business
  -- labor
  -- local government
  -- schools

- More State-subsidized Care
- More Care in Public Housing
- Additional Centers for State Employees
PARTNERSHIP PLAN:  CREATING BETTER CHILD CARE

- Increase Worker Wages
- Better Training of Teachers
- Assist Parents in Choosing Quality Care
PARTNERSHIP PLAN: CREATING SAFER CHILD CARE

- 20 Additional Licensors
- Human Services Inter-agency Team
- Investigative Unit for Abuse
- Review and Revise Regulations
- Inter-agency Agreement to Share Information
- Parent Education
- Children's Educational Materials
The day-care message

Governor Dukakis's commitment to day care is rare among public officials. His recommendations to expand day-care services in Massachusetts are vital to filling the crucial needs of working parents and their children for good, safe, affordable day care.

For more than a decade, government and business leaders have ignored the pressures faced by workers struggling to balance jobs and family life. Day-care scandals are rooted in the failure to formulate policies that serve those who must earn a living and raise children too. The grim tales of latchkey children left to care for themselves, the horror stories of sexual abuse at poorly staffed, underregulated centers are largely a result of this failure.

The situation has become critical. Only one-third of the state's families have the kind of care they want and can afford; one-third must settle for what they can find; one-third find no care at all.

Dukakis has requested $17.8 million to expand day-care services. The proposal, drafted by a governor's advisory committee, calls for salary increases and training programs for day-care workers, more subsidized care for moderate- and low-income families, better care for needy families, more licensing and monitoring personnel, and creation of referral-resource centers. In addition, a day-care cabinet will generate leadership within state government. More facilities at housing projects, public schools and state office buildings, along with more employer-sponsored programs, will offer parents a range of options.

By linking the state's continued economic success to expanded day-care services, the governor has sent an important message to the private sector. Productivity can be enhanced, and absenteeism, turnover and tardiness reduced, when workers know their children are well cared for. In the future, making it in Massachusetts may depend on making that connection.
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