CHILD CARE QUALITY

It is critical that the President's child care initiative retain a strong commitment to improving the quality of care. In prior years, the President's initiative included significant investments inboth subsidies and quality, because it makes little sense to spend more money on care that is in many cases substandard.

- Three multi-site studies conducted between 1988 and 1994, including the highly regarded *Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers*, found that only 12 to 14 percent of children in care are in arrangements that promote their growth and learning, while 12 to 21 percent are in settings that are unsafe and actually impair their development. For infants and toddlers, the percentage of poor/unsafe settings is much higher -- 40 percent (*Florida Child Care Quality Improvement Study: Interim Report*, Howes, Smith, Galinsky, Families and Work Institute, 1995).

- Children in higher quality settings develop receptive language more rapidly, have superior math skills, engage in more complex play with both objects and other children and exhibit fewer behavior problems (both at the time and upon entering school). Studies have found that the impacts on social skills and academic performance persist into elementary school (*Are They in Any Real Danger* , Love *et. al.*, Mathematica Policy Research, 1996)

- As noted in the CEA paper on early learning: "children who receive care in quality centers tend to be less distracted and more task-oriented, considerate, happy and socially competent in elementary school. They are more self-confident, proficient in language, advanced in cognitive development and make better academic progress. Conversely, children in poor quality programs risk the development of poor school skills and heightened aggression."

OPTION ONE: <u>Create a New Set-Aside With the Discretionary Title of CCDBG to Promote Congnitive Development of children aged 0-5 in child care.</u> In FY 2000, $1.182 billion discretionary title of CCDBG includes 3 discretionary pots of funds: (1) a 4 percent set-aside for quality activities; (2) $50 million for infant and toddler child care quality improvement activities; and (3) $173 million for general child care quality activities. By folding the second and third funding streams into one program to improve child care quality for children aged 0-5, and adding $277 million, we could create a $500 million school readiness fund. This fund would support child care quality improvements designed to promote the cognitive development (i.e. improve the language, reading and math skills) of children in care. Parameters of the $500 million fund inclued:

- The funds would be distributed according to the CCDBG formula, but in order to receive its share of the funds, a State would be required to submit a "school readiness plan" describing how the State would use the dollars to enhance the cognitive development of children in care. HHS would be required to approve the plan.
- The Funds would be used to improve provider training and retention, reduce teacher to student ratios, promote accreditation, increase reimbursement rates for accredited programs, etc.
- Each year, the state would be required to report on progress toward goals established in the plan

(e.g., number of programs with ratios below a specified level, number of children in accredited programs, number of providers receiving Aas or Bas or ECE through the program). States failing to make progress toward the goals would have to submit a corrective action plan or lose funding.

The Administration could seek minimal statutory language for this program, e.g. "$500,000,000 is reserved for activities in 658 (G) approved by HHS to support the cognitive development of children aged 0-5 in child care."

OPTION TWO: Re-propose the Early Learning Fund, a $3 billion over five year mandatory program to improve child care quality and promote school-readiness. Modeled on the successful North Carolina Smart Start initiative, the proposed Early Learning Fund provides challenge grants to communities (distributed by states) to support programs to improve early learning and the quality and safety of child care for children ages 0 to 5. Funds may be used for the following activities: providing basic training to child care providers (including first aid and CPR); connecting individual child care providers to centers for education and support; assisting child care providers to meet accreditation and licensing requirements; linking child care providers with health professionals; reducing group sizes and child-to-staff ratios; and providing home visits, parent education, and consumer education about child care

Quality Day Care, Early, Is Tied to Achievements as an Adult

By JODI WILGOREN

WASHINGTON, Oct. 21 — C early childhood education has a powerful influence on poor children that lasts into young adulthood, affecting things like reading and mathematics skills and even the timing of childbearing, researchers announced today, citing the first study ever to track participants from infancy to age 21.

Those who received high-quality day care consistently outperformed their peers who did not on both cognitive and academic tests, and also were more likely to attend college or hold high-skill jobs, the researchers found. The program also helped participants' parents, with teen-age mothers far more likely to have completed high school after their babies received the intervention.

"The so-called efficacy question, whether you can affect development in the preschool years, is resoundingly answered in the affirmative," Craig T. Ramey, director of the study, said at a news conference at the Department of Education. "It has become crystal clear that if you wait until age 3 or 4 you are going to be dealing with a series of delays and deficits that will put you in remedial programs."

The study of children on the lower rungs of society, called the Abecedarian Project, involved 111 African-American families in Chapel Hill, N.C., whose infants were medically healthy but, demographically, at risk for failure in school and beyond. Half the children were randomly assigned to full-time day care from infancy to age 5, while the others received only nutritional supplements and some social work. They attended comparable public schools from kindergarten on.

With low adult-child ratios and a stable, professional staff, the educational program consisted of a series of 200 simple games focused on language development, starting with visual stimulus for tiny infants and leading to scavenger hunts and mazes for older toddlers.

Although the newest findings will not be published until the spring, nearly 300 peer-reviewed articles based on the study, which began in 1972, have already appeared in a variety of academic journals.

The project has been praised by Hillary Rodham Clinton and other advocates of early childhood education, but criticized by other authorities who have attacked its research methods.

Pediatricians and psychologists hope to use the barrage of new data to persuade Congress and the states to broaden access to care for poor families, particularly those on welfare, and to improve conditions and curriculum in the current cadre of day-care centers. The announcement comes amid increased attention to the issue, with a group of experts scheduled to meet here next week to applaud France's universal preschool program.

"Most child care in America is borderline lousy and, at best, safe but not developmentally stimulating," said Michael H. Levine, who oversees early childhood development projects for the Carnegie Corporation in New York. "Whether or not there's a Government solution to providing high-quality care for all working families or not, there certainly needs to be a more balanced responsibility for responding to this research."

Abecedarian — the word, echoing the ABC's, means novice learner — found that children in the intensive educational program were more successful than their peers by virtually every measure:

¶Thirty-five percent of those in the day care program attended a four-year college before their 21st birthday, compared with 14 percent of the comparison group.

¶At age 21, twice as many of the day care graduates (40 percent) were still in school; 65 percent of those who received the intervention either had a good job or were in college, compared with 40 percent of the others.

¶Fewer of the participants in the child care program had children of their own by age 21; those who did became parents, on average, past their 19th birthday, while the parents in the other group were about 17.

¶By age 15, twice as many of the children in the control group had been placed in special education classes as their peers who received the educational day care. Only 30 percent of the day care children had to repeat a grade in school, compared with 56 percent of the others.

¶While test scores were below average for both groups and dropped over time, those in the child care program kept an edge of about 5 percentage points through age 21. The gap in I.Q., however, fell from about 17 points at age 3 to just 5 points by age 21.

¶The study did not find significant differences in criminal activity between the two groups, researchers said.

"This is the most intensely studied group of children on earth," said Dr. Ramey, who is now a professor of psychology, pediatrics and neurobiology at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. He and his colleagues at the University of North Carolina are vigorous advocates of early childhood education. They hope to continue tracking the participants to age 28 or 29. The research has been financed by the Department of Education and the State of North Carolina, among others.

The Abecedarian results echo results of several similar studies that indicate educational day care improves both academic achievement and social behaviors. It is the first program that began with infants — aged 6 weeks to 4 months — and followed them to adulthood, and shows more significant gaps at age 21 than a similar project, based in Michigan, that began with developmentally disadvantaged children aged 3 or 4.

"What's really important is that it's not just any child care, that it is high-quality early care and intervention," said Augusta S. Kappner, president of Bank Street College of Education in New York, who recently toured France with a group of 15 educators to study that country's program of universal free preschool. "What is high quality? Usually you're talking about the really important factors, such as the qualifications of the staff, the constancy of the staff, the quality of the curriculum, group size, parent participation."

The Abecedarian Project, based at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center in Chapel Hill, had a staff with qualifications akin to teachers in public schools, and virtually no turnover. Ratios ranged from 1 adult to 3 children to 1 to 7, depending on the children's ages.

On its Internet site, the Graham center says that "an important goal of the project was to break the so-called 'poverty cycle' by better-preparing children for success in school — and eventually life."

The learning games, like waving a scarf over an infant until he grabs it, or leading a toddler to identify like items among several pieces of silverware, are integrated into a high-stimulus day of art projects and playground visits.

"Many of the learning games happen during mealtimes," said Joseph Sparling, co-author of the curriculum, which was published in two books. "They happen during diapering; they happen when you're going outdoors. You could hardly distinguish them from good adult-child interaction."

Abecedarian cost the equivalent of $11,000 per child per year in today's dollars, but researchers said similar results could probably be achieved for less, since there were extra expenses associated with being a demonstration project.

"The argument that we can't afford this is absolutely bogus," Dr. Ramey said. "We get what we pay for. We're the richest country on the face of the earth; we're the richest we've ever been. We're not No. 1 in the world in education, in health care, in social services."

The New York Ti
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22,

[illegible] CONGRESS [illegible]	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	REPORT 104–725

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITY RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996

CONFERENCE REPORT

TO ACCOMPANY

H.R. 3734

JULY 30, 1996.—Ordered to be printed

fied in paragraphs (2) through (5) of section 658A(b)"; and

(IV) by striking clause (ii);

(iii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

"(C) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 5 percent of the aggregate amount of funds available to the State to carry out this subchapter by a State in each fiscal year may be expended for administrative costs incurred by such State to carry out all of its functions and duties under this subchapter. As used in the preceding sentence, the term 'administrative costs' shall not include the costs of providing direct services."; and

(iv) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(D) ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN FAMILIES.—A State shall ensure that a substantial portion of the amounts available (after the State has complied with the requirement of section 418(b)(2) of the Social Security Act with respect to each of the fiscal years 1997 through 2002) to the State to carry out activities under this subchapter in each fiscal year is used to provide assistance to low-income working families other than families described in paragraph (2)(H)."; and

(C) in paragraph (4)(A)—

(i) by striking "provide assurances" and inserting "certify";

(ii) in the first sentence by inserting "and shall provide a summary of the facts relied on by the State to determine that such rates are sufficient to ensure such access" before the period; and

(iii) by striking the last sentence.

SEC. 606. LIMITATION ON STATE ALLOTMENTS.

Section 658F(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 9858d(b)(1)) is amended by striking "No" and inserting "Except as provided for in section 658O(c)(6), no".

SEC. 607. ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE.

Section 658G (42 U.S.C. 9858e) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 658G. ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE.

"A State that receives funds to carry out this subchapter for a fiscal year, shall use not less than 4 percent of the amount of such funds for activities that are designed to provide comprehensive consumer education to parents and the public, activities that increase parental choice, and activities designed to improve the quality and availability of child care (such as resource and referral services).".

SEC. 608. REPEAL OF EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND BEFORE- AND AFTER-SCHOOL CARE REQUIREMENT.

Section 658H (42 U.S.C. 9858f) is repealed.

SEC. 609. ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

Section 658I(b) (42 U.S.C. 9858g(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ", and shall have" and all that follows through "(2)"; and

D rpt wne

Childcare '01

admin custom ↓ our proposal ↓

	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
PRA mandatory funds	$ 1,967,000,000	$ 2,067,000,000	$ 2,167,000,000	$ 2,367,000,000	$ 2,567,000,000	$ 2,567,000,000	$ 2,717,000,000	$ 2,717,000,000	$ 2,717,000,000	$ 2,717,000,000
CCDBG (excluding research)			$ 1,000,000,000	$ 1,173,672,000	$ 1,183,672,000	$ 1,173,672,000				
Proposed increase					$ 1,317,000,000	$ 1,317,000,000				
Total funds	$ 1,967,000,000	$ 2,067,000,000	$ 3,167,000,000	$ 3,540,672,000	$ 5,067,672,000	$ 5,057,672,000	$ 2,717,000,000	$ 2,717,000,000	$ 2,717,000,000	$ 2,717,000,000
Quality 4%	$ 78,680,000	$ 82,680,000	$ 126,680,000	141,272,812 80	$ 202,200,113	$ 201,801,113	108,408,300.00	108,408,300.00	108,408,300.00	108,408,300.00
Quality 4% of discretionary funds					$ 99,776,813	$ 99,377,813				
Infant set-aside			$ 50,000,000	$ 50,000,000						
Discretionary funds				$ 173,672,000	$ 173,672,000	$ 400,000,000				
Total quality funds	$ 78,680,000	$ 82,680,000	$ 176,680,000	$ 364,944,813	$ 475,648,926	$ 701,178,926	$ 108,408,300	$ 108,408,300	$ 108,408,300	$ 108,408,300
Total discretionary quality funds	$ -	$ -	$ 90,000,000	$ 270,501,513	$ 273,448,813	$ 499,377,813				
Total discretionary subsidy funds	$ -	$ -	$ 910,000,000	$ 903,170,487	$ 2,227,223,187	$ 1,991,294,187				

10m out for research

ELF

Disc. ↑ Quality set-aside

(cut?)

(match options)

Lump-sum bonus

Match?

Lump-sum?

① no new

② 80-20

③ F-match medicaid 30-50% Fed. gov't ... = poorer states

Matching option ... 80 by

Teacher retention

→ quality demands

reimburse rates for ... program

↑ hours → ↓ ...

training & retention

Finance to states

& in state plans

... gov't ...

New discretionary set aside

→ ... grants

→ ... how it goes out } ...

what it's spent on —

reporting

planning

plans & ... reports

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a publication.

Publications have not been scanned in their entirety for the purpose of digitization. To see the full publication please search online or visit the Clinton Presidential Library's Research Room.

Investing in Child Care

Challenges Facing Working Parents and the Private Sector Response

U.S. Department of the Treasury

	1996-97 Title I Pre-K Participants	1996 Head Start Enrollment	NCES Prekindergarten enrollment in public schools Fall 1995	July 1, 1997 Census Count 0-5 age children	July 1, 97 Census Count 3-year-olds	July 1, 97 Census Count 4-year-olds	Total	Kids Count 1997 -get 1998 Percent of 3-5 year olds NOT in nursery sch or kindergarten in 1993	Title I Pre-school Est Alloc Based on Title I Shares
Alabama	1,532	14,429	9,324	353,632	58,380	60,089	118,469	49%	$3,324,722
Alaska	157	1,299	2,419	60,140	9,914	10,411	20,325	46%	475,399
Arizona	3,073	9,818	4,027	448,703	74,032	74,549	148,581	42%	3,128,495
Arkansas	2,657	9,193	1,525	213,062	34,907	35,483	70,390	41%	1,988,326
California	3,308	72,606	69,182	3,230,830	538,045	556,396	1,094,441	43%	23,482,456
Colorado	2,046	8,647	10,472	330,091	54,157	55,457	109,614	39%	1,851,553
Connecticut	3,434	5,567	8,093	262,599	43,345	44,922	88,267	23%	2,019,678
Delaware	67	1,455	670	59,504	9,815	10,087	19,902	32%	500,000
District of Columbia	3,891	3,339	5,387	40,394	6,860	7,079	13,939	40%	633,963
Florida	22,632	27,535	51,123	1,152,128	191,651	198,440	390,091	35%	9,472,371
Georgia	2,822	19,563	22,621	672,305	110,934	112,942	223,876	47%	5,302,890
Hawaii	231	2,517	609	106,993	17,879	18,467	36,346	36%	529,768
Idaho	179	1,869	1,665	110,531	18,088	18,787	36,875	51%	576,381
Illinois	17,712	31,817	45,947	1,091,051	182,397	186,071	368,468	40%	8,590,470
Indiana	2,290	11,847	4,901	491,194	81,213	83,169	164,382	47%	3,115,281
Iowa	625	6,178	5,957	222,368	36,644	37,878	74,522	36%	1,382,102
Kansas	878	6,074	3,209	216,268	35,824	36,402	72,226	41%	1,490,943
Kentucky	3,303	14,447	20,290	309,980	51,402	52,378	103,780	41%	3,397,241
Louisiana	14,228	19,344	19,440	379,797	62,862	64,753	127,615	35%	5,035,599
Maine	75	10,816	821	85,202	14,027	14,940	28,967	38%	813,455
Maryland	6,313	8,915	19092	421,197	69,652	71,756	141,408	29%	2,778,526
Massachusetts		3,466	14,792	484,106	80,435	83,060	163,495	33%	4,114,177
Michigan	2,500	31,198	8,870	792,969	131,436	135,939	267,375	33%	9,059,255
Minnesota	555	8,641	8,340	382,462	63,383	65,186	128,569	39%	2,338,231
Mississippi	3,203	24,081	1,083	244,060	40,432	41,531	81,963	37%	3,284,239
Missouri	7,346	14,035	16,225	444,874	73,346	76,063	149,409	45%	3,488,943
Montana	172	2,304	519	66,174	10,929	11,417	22,346	43%	670,981
Nebraska	828	3,800	3,853	137,674	22,717	23,042	45,759	47%	835,880
Nevada	719	1,823	1,631	155,574	25,984	25,664	51,648	46%	629,429
New Hampshire	70	1,235	1,357	89,875	14,947	15,633	30,580	37%	481,414
New Jersey	2,905	13,085	9,301	676,117	113,168	116,513	229,681	33%	4,593,715
New Mexico	730	6,587	3,426	162,203	26,744	27,801	54,545	44%	1,662,480
New York	9,904	40,365	32,087	1,589,414	262,529	270,412	532,941	37%	19,249,423
North Carolina	7,723	16,002	9,013	628,063	103,639	106,796	210,435	42%	3,700,840
North Dakota	25	1,874	551	49,021	8,152	8,314	16,466	46%	488,272
Ohio	3,253	33,919	18,997	907,248	149,687	154,664	304,351	41%	8,021,732
Oklahoma	3,595	11,165	5,470	274,181	44,979	46,536	91,515	46%	2,325,634
Oregon	954	4,695	855	256,349	42,285	42,756	85,041	37%	1,831,201
Pennsylvania	3,346	26,198	3,502	898,798	149,884	156,274	306,158	40%	9,114,089
Puerto Rico	266	31,744	255				25,763		6,909,901
Rhode Island	212	2,567	531	75,250	12,718	13,045	104,281	32%	712,055
South Carolina	7,239	10,164	8,067	309,080	50,906	53,375	19,809	35%	2,492,323
South Dakota	275	2,258	1,475	59,840	9,734	10,075	146,478	47%	511,713
Tennessee	2,518	14,291	11,168	437,486	72,463	74,015	640,582	50%	3,453,037
Texas	97,541	52,107	133,754	1,932,096	317,705	322,877	75,309	42%	17,088,992
Utah	398	4,201	3,455	233,141	37,814	37,495	14,528	41%	869,859
Vermont		1,531	1,111	42,210	7,110	7,418	183,996	39%	477,894
Virginia	6,027	11,028	3,111	547,244	90,979	93,017	156,947	42%	3,073,923
Washington	1,712	8,878	5,984	467,582	77,407	79,540	42,693	42%	2,926,301
West Virginia	1,613	6,515	3,499	125,811	20,999	21,694	137,703	55%	1,961,054
Wisconsin	6,193	12,283	18,045	406,722	67,638	70,065	12,717	43%	3,309,466
Wyoming	256	1,279	0	37,661	6,260	6,457	0	46%	433,928
	263,531	690,594	637,101	23,171,254	3,838,437	3,947,130	7,785,567		200,000,000

PRESCHST WK4