Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. fax	Noa Meyer to Jurate Kazickers re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	09/30	P6/b(6)
001b. fax	Noa Meyer to Jennifer Nall re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	09/30	P6/b(6)
001c. fax	Noa Meyer to Debra Eton re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	09/30	P6/b(6)
001d. fax	Noa Meyer to Ann Bridman re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	09/30	P6/b(6)
001e. fax	Noa Meyer to Vivian re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	09/30	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Bobbie Greene
OA/Box Number: 15627

FOLDER TITLE:

Additional Information University of Maryland

2012-0872-S
rc965

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Map sent
10/1

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Office of the First Lady
Ph: (202) 456-6266
Fax: (202) 456-6244

To: Karen

Phone No.:

Fax No.: 682-2154

From:

No. of pages (including cover): 3

Comments: Map & Directions

Map Sent
10/1

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Office of the First Lady

Ph: (202) 456-6266
Fax: (202) 456-6244

To: Lt. Col Pote

Phone No.:

Fax No.: 703 784-1149

From:

No. of pages (including cover): 4

Comments: Maps & info for friday speech

Thanks

Non

October 1, 1997

MEMORANDUM

TO	**Lt. Col. Frank Pote**
FROM	**Noa Meyer**
RE	**The First Lady's Speech at the University of Maryland**

The First Lady will speak at 11:00 am at the University of Maryland, College Park, at the Tawes theater. Your name and Sandi Gojekian's names will be on the VIP list, so please arrive around 10:00 am to pick up your tickets from the VIP will-call table. If you have any additional questions, feel free to call me at 202-456-2787.

Map Sent 10/1

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Office of the First Lady

Ph: (202) 456-6266
Fax: (202) 456-6244

To: Molly Casey

Phone No.:

Fax No.: 903 836 0153

From: Noa Meyer

No. of pages (including cover): 3

Comments: Directions to U of M - glad you can join us!

Noa

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. fax	Noa Meyer to Jurate Kazickers re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	09/30	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Bobbie Greene
OA/Box Number: 15627

FOLDER TITLE:
Additional Information University of Maryland

2012-0872-S
rc965

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Map sent 9/30

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Office of the First Lady

Ph: (202) 456-6266
Fax: (202) 456-6244

To: Jurate Kazickas

Phone No. [redacted] P6/(b)(6) (001a)

Fax No.:

From: Noa Meyer

No. of pages (including cover): 3

Comments: Jurate,
The speech is being held at TAWES theatre at the University of Maryland-College Park. Please arrive around 10am. Your ticket will be @ the VIP will-call station.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001b. fax	Noa Meyer to Jennifer Nall re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	09/30	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Bobbie Greene
OA/Box Number: 15627

FOLDER TITLE:

Additional Information University of Maryland

2012-0872-S
rc965

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

9/30 Map

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Office of the First Lady

Ph: (202) 456-6266

Fax: (202) 456-6244

To: Jennifer Nacl

Phone N[redacted] P6/(b)(6) – [001b]

Fax No.: [redacted]

From: Noa Meyer

No. of pages (including cover): 3

Comments: Map & Directions

Please call w/ questions

Noa

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001c. fax	Noa Meyer to Debra Eton re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	09/30	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Bobbie Greene
OA/Box Number: 15627

FOLDER TITLE:

Additional Information University of Maryland

2012-0872-S
rc965

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

9/30
Map

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Office of the First Lady

Ph: (202) 456-6266
Fax: (202) 456-6244

To: Debra Eton

Phone No. [redacted] P6/(b)(6) [001a]

Fax No.:

From: Noa Meyer

No. of pages (including cover): 3

Comments: Map & Directions to Fridays Event. Call w/ questions.

Noa

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001d. fax	Noa Meyer to Ann Bridman re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	09/30	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Bobbie Greene
OA/Box Number: 15627

FOLDER TITLE:

Additional Information University of Maryland

2012-0872-S
rc965

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

9/30
Map

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Office of the First Lady
Ph: (202) 456-6266
Fax: (202) 456-6244

To: Ann Bridgman

Phone No. [redacted] P6/(b)(6) [001d]

Fax No.: [redacted]

From: NOA MEYER

No. of pages (including cover): 3

Comments: Map & Directions - Call w/questions -

Noa

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001e. fax	Noa Meyer to Vivian re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	09/30	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Bobbie Greene
OA/Box Number: 15627

FOLDER TITLE:

Additional Information University of Maryland

2012-0872-S
rc965

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

9/30
Map

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Office of the First Lady

Ph: (202) 456-6266
Fax: (202) 456-6244

To: Vivian

Phone No.: [redacted] P6/(b)(6) [001e]

Fax No.: [redacted]

From: NOA MEYER

No. of pages (including cover): 3

Comments: Map & Directions to Fridays Speech. Call w/ questions

Noa

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

FAX TRANSMITTAL

FAX Number: (301) 314-9560
Voice Phone Number: (301) 405-5803

DATE **September 29, 1997**

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING TRANSMITTAL: 3

TO: Noa Meyer **FAX #: 202-456-5244**

FROM: Sapienza Barone

Attached is a map to the campus and the locations of the two events. I will bring originals of the map to the advance meeting tomorrow so you can have them to give away. Thanks.

MAIN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING • COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND 20742 • (301) 405-5803 FAX (301) 314-9560

Children's Defense Fund

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TELEPHONE: (202) 662-3547 **FAX:** (202) 662-3560

TO: Ilona Meyer

FIRM:

CITY/STATE:

FAX NUMBER: 456-6244

FROM: **HELEN BLANK, Director, Child Care Division, Department of Programs and Policy**

DATE: 9-29-97 **TIME:**

NUMBER OF PAGES SENT (INCLUDING COVER SHEET):

COMMENTS:

This might be helpful for this speech.

If you have any problems receiving this fax, please contact Kanya Williams at (202) 662-3544.

25 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

1) Helping Families Pay for Child Care

Increasing numbers of working families cannot afford the cost of good child care, which can easily cost $4,000 a year for one child, and even more for younger children. Clearly the cost of decent child care is beyond the reach of many low and moderate income families unless they get help--for example, half of the young families with children (with family head younger than 30) earned less than $20,000 in 1994. This issue must be addressed through three strategies:

⇒ **Funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant should be substantially increased so that by the year 2002, states are able to serve all families with incomes below 85 percent of the state median income.**

⇒ **The Dependent Care Tax Credit should be improved so that it better meets the needs of today's families.** Specifically: 1) the credit should be refundable; 2) the sliding fee scale should be adjusted to provide increased assistance to the families who need it most; 3) the amount of expenses that families can claim should be increased so they more realistically reflect the current cost of child care; and 4) families who use accredited child care should receive a higher credit to encourage the use of high-quality child care.

⇒ **Incentives should be available to encourage the business community to improve and increase child care opportunities for their employees and their communities.**

2) Protecting Children from Harm and Improving the Quality of Care and Education Available to Children

Research indicates that a large percentage of child care is mediocre or poor. It also shows that nurturing relationships in the early years are critical to a child's positive development and future success. Therefore, eliminating all harmful and substandard care must be an immediate objective of any initiative. To ensure that children are in safe and supportive settings, states must have an infrastructure which includes strong licensing and enforcement, training, and resource and referral, and which must address the issue of inadequate compensation and benefits of child care staff (which are a principal reason for the poor quality of care).

By the year 2002, all states should have implemented sweeping improvements in protecting children in care from harm, and should have taken steps to ensure that children in child care are getting what they need to succeed. To accomplish this goal, an initiative should include two strategies:

⇒ Funds should be available to states that choose to implement one or more of the following strategies to strengthen the child care and education infrastructure:
- Improved licensing standards and enforcement, including additional staff to monitor and inspect programs to reduce the risk of harm;
- Increased reimbursement for programs meeting high quality standards;
- Policies to improve staff compensation and benefits in order to reduce staff turnover;
- Scholarships for caregivers pursuing a degree in early childhood;
- Statewide staff development systems and policies that help to improve training for staff;

- Statewide staff development systems and policies that help to improve training for staff;
- Targeted funding to enable child care and education programs to offer comprehensive services through linkages and support from health, social services, and mental health systems;
- Improved consumer education efforts including the expansion of local resource and referral programs; and
- Support to early care and education programs to use technology, such as long distance learning, more effectively.

⇒ The Higher Education Act should also be amended to allow loan forgiveness to students who earn degrees in early childhood related degrees and work in child care settings, and to provide targeted support to campus-based child care centers.

3) Keeping Children and Youth Safe and Productive through Better Use of Out-of School Time (School-Age Care)

Data suggest that at least 5 million school-age children age 5-14 are home alone after school. And many children who are in care are in settings that do not help them grow and learn. Research now proves that school-age children, like children of all ages, develop best in the warmth of close and consistent relationships with adults who can provide safe places and constructive activities during out-of-school hours. These key elements of quality programs are inextricably linked with positive educational and social outcomes for children. Therefore, any initiative should include the following effort:

⇒ **By the year 2002, funds should be available to local communities to support before-and after-school, summer, and weekend activities, and should be sufficient to serve all 5 million children.** These activities should be available in a range of settings, including schools, child care settings, religious institutions, homes, and community centers. Resources should be used to start, operate, and expand programs; support staff training, professional development, accreditation, and program assessment and improvement; and facilitate coordination that can make the most of public and private resources.

4) Expanding Good Care for Infants and Toddlers

Despite the research showing that the first three years of life are critical to children's development and future success, studies have shown that there are alarming and unacceptable gaps in the supply and the quality of infant and toddler care. Two components should address these problems:

⇒ **Substantial funding should be made available for states to strengthen and enrich programs serving very young children,** as well as increase support to parents of young children and other caregivers. Specifically, funds should be available for activities such as:

- Expanding Resource and referral programs;
- Operating family child care networks which serve infants and toddlers;
- Expanding the supply of infant and toddler care, especially for care that is in short supply;
- Supporting initiatives to increase the compensation of caregivers caring for very young children;
- Providing specialized training for caregivers working with infants and toddlers;

- Assisting programs serving young children in becoming accredited;
- Helping child care programs serve young children to allow them to link with other essential services in the community; and
- Providing parenting education and support programs.

⇒ Strong family leave policies are critical, as they enable working parents to stay home during the critical early months of a child's life or when a child is seriously ill, and to play an active role in their children's early development. Therefore, **the Family and Medical Leave Act should be expanded to cover more work places and employees, and to guarantee leave for a broader range of family needs.**

5) Continuing Support for Head Start and the Child and Adult Care Food Program

⇒ Head Start is an essential component of any initiative to strengthen families' access to strong early learning experiences. The Head Start reauthorization should continue the program on its path toward serving all eligible children. It should also recognize the growing need to reach younger children by expanding funds available for Early Head Start.

⇒ In addition, reauthorization of the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) should make it possible for for-profit child care centers serving low-income children to participate in CACFP, allow programs to serve school-age children up to age 18, and restore the option of a fourth meal or snack for children in child care centers and family child care homes.

Q&A

Questions and Answers About Young Families

Q: What's so unusual about young families with children?

A: Their economic losses are uniquely severe. Their median incomes plummeted by nearly $10,000 between 1973 and 1994 (a 33 percent drop from $29,611 to $19,786), in inflation-adjusted 1994 dollars. During the same period, incomes for older families with children fell by 4 percent. Incomes of childless families remained stable or increased.

Q: Are most "young families" headed by teenagers?

A: No, very few are. Young families in this report are those headed by someone younger than 30. Only 3 percent of the heads of young families with children are under age 20. Most (66 percent) are ages 25 to 29.

Q: Are the falling incomes of young families largely a Black and Hispanic problem?

A: No, incomes are plunging in every ethnic group of young families. Among White Non-Hispanics (who comprise 61 percent of young families with children), inflation-adjusted median income dropped by 22 percent from 1973 to 1994. However, the loss of income was even steeper for young Hispanic families (28 percent) and young Black families (46 percent) during the same period.

Q: The latest income figures in this report are for 1994. Has economic growth helped young families since then?

A: We use 1994 figures because they were the latest available when we wrote the report. Strong economic growth since 1994 has raised incomes for many groups of American families, probably including many young families. Census Bureau figures show that median family income rose by 1.8 percent for *all* families in 1995, the most recent year available. Among the youngest American households -- those headed by someone younger than 25 (including households without children) -- median incomes rose even faster (jumping 5.5 percent from 1994 to 1995), although we do not have 1995 income data for families younger than 30 with children.

Newer wage data, however, show that not all recent economic news has been good for Americans younger than 30. Among young hourly workers ages 20 to 29, for example, real average wages fell by more than 2.4 percent from 1994 to 1996.*

---

* For hourly wage data, see page 22 and Table 4 in *Rescuing the American Dream*. Similarly, government data on weekly wages (not shown in the report) indicate that, by 1996, young workers had not regained the ground they had lost relative to older workers. The relative median weekly wages of male full-time wage and salary workers younger than 25 fell from 67 cents per dollar earned by older

Moreover, any improvements that may have occurred in the last two years likely have only slightly offset the huge earnings and income declines of the previous 21 years and likely have done little to narrow the very wide income gaps that appeared between younger and older families. Between 1973 and 1994, median family income rose by 2 percent for all American families but dropped by 33 percent for young families with children.

Q: Is the real problem more single-parent families?

A: Only partly. Even among young two-parent families, more than 20 percent of children were poor in 1994. Moreover, while family break-up contributes to young family poverty, its role is often overstated. Often the absent parent's income is inadequate to support the family. Five out of six poor children who live in young families would still be poor even if America returned to the higher marriage rates of twenty years ago. Moreover, there is strong evidence that rising economic distress has contributed to family break-up, as well as the other way around.

Q: Why does the high poverty rate of young families matter, if their finances generally improve after age 30?

A: Most children in young families are younger than age 3 -- a time when even brief exposure to poverty appears to have major lasting effects. New research by the nations' leading poverty scholars shows that spending even a few years in poverty during early childhood is associated later with significantly lower educational test scores and, ultimately, appears to cause children to finish fewer years of schooling. Although young families contain only one in every six American children overall, they contain two out of three poor infants and toddlers.

Q: Can young families still avoid poverty through hard work and education?

A: Often they can, but far less than a generation ago. Work pays less and less for young workers. Poverty rates tripled between 1973 and 1994 among young families with children headed by a full-time year-round worker. Average real wages during the same period fell by 20 percent among hourly workers ages 20 to 29. Among young families with children who live below the federal poverty line, more than three out of five are working families.

Education is still important, but a high school degree, or even a couple of years of college, is no longer enough to protect against declining family income. Since 1973, median incomes have plunged more than one-third among young families with children headed by a high school graduate. A four-year college degree provides some protection, but is increasingly difficult to afford: The cost of a four-year public college equaled 26 percent of a moderate family income in 1994, according to the U.S. Department of Education, up from 16 percent in 1975.

---

workers in 1973 down to 51 cents per dollar in 1994, and remained standing at 51 cents in 1996. Young women's relative wages likewise fell from 85 cents per dollar earned by older women down to 66 cents in 1994, and continued to fall to 64 cents per dollar in 1996.

DEAR LORD BE GOOD TO ME THE SEA IS SO WIDE AND MY BOAT IS SO SMALL

Children's Defense Fund

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE
Tuesday, September 16, 1997

Contacts: Sarah Howe 202-662-3609 Lisa Butler McDougal 202-662-3615

YOUNG FAMILIES IN ECONOMIC FREEFALL DESPITE HARD WORK

Report Reveals Income For Families With Parents Under 30 Is Down By Almost $10,000

Washington, D.C. -- A generation of young parents under age 30 has faced a radical decline in wages over the last two decades. According to a new report by the Children's Defense Fund, typical median income of young two-parent families **has dropped by one-third (33 percent)** for a total decline of $10,000.

In addition, the poverty rate for children in young families has more than doubled since 1973, leaving **two out of every five of these children (41 percent) living below the poverty line.**

"The soaring poverty rates among young families who are playing by the rules and working as hard as they can are shocking," said CDF President Marian Wright Edelman. "If the fruits of economic growth had been shared equally among all families over the last 20 years, then the typical young family with children would have seen its income rise by 15 percent instead of falling by 33 percent. Strengthening the economic future of young families with children must become a priority for every sector of society."

Rescuing the American Dream: Halting the Economic Freefall Of Today's Young Families chronicles the status of the 10 million American children in families of all races, regions, and classes who are headed by someone younger than 30. The findings include:

- **Virtually every category of young families with children has suffered major income losses.** Median incomes have fallen for young families headed by Whites (22 percent), as well as Hispanics (28 percent) and Blacks (46 percent). In every region of the country, nearly one-third (30 percent) to one-half (49 percent) of children in young families are now poor. Only young families headed by a college graduate escaped unscathed (their incomes have risen).

- **The poverty rate of young families with children headed by a full-time worker has tripled since 1973.** Moreover, the relative hourly wages of workers in their twenties have plunged, so that in 1994 they earned 73 cents for every dollar earned by older workers--down from 88 cents on the dollar in 1973.

-more-

25 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone 202 628 8787
Fax 202 662 3510

- **The strains on young two-parent families are even deeper than the net income data show.** Incomes have fallen for young families headed by married couples (12 percent), as well as single mothers (22 percent) and single fathers (24 percent), during the same period. Yet the typical annual paycheck of young married fathers dropped by 30 percent. The depth of this decline is masked in the income figures for couples because young married mothers worked far more in 1994 (an average of 29 weeks per year) than they did in 1975 (18 weeks per year), yet failed to maintain family income. Their harder work has left parents with greater child care expenses and less time for their children.

In March 1995, there were 5.8 million young American families (headed by parents under age 30) with children. Nearly one-half of all American children are born into young families and spend some of their crucial early development years there. Additional findings from the report conclude that:

- **Grandparents bear an increasing burden of supporting young families.** The number of children living with grandparents as well as their own parents has doubled since March 1970, reaching 2.5 million in March 1995. Thousands of grandparents share their homes and incomes to rescue their young adult children and grandchildren from poverty. In 1994, 341,000 young parents ages 20 to 29 -- were unable to support themselves above the poverty line based on their own incomes, **and were spared from official poverty status only by living in the grandparents' or an extended family member's home.** The majority of the families who returned home (59 percent) would have been considered below the official poverty line ($11,821 for a three-person family in 1994) based on their incomes alone, yet they do not show up in poverty statistics.

- **Shelter is increasingly unaffordable for young parents. No age group is more precariously housed.** Among households headed by someone younger than 30, the proportion that own a home dwindled from nearly one in two (47 percent) in March 1980 to only one in three (33 percent) by March 1994.

  Among the youngest households with children--those headed by someone younger than 25--fully 30 percent paid more than half their income for housing in 1993--three times the comparable proportion in 1973. Households that must pay more than half of their income for housing are considered to have a "worst case" housing crisis by federal housing affordability standards and have alarmingly little income left to purchase food and other necessities.

- **A high school degree is no longer an adequate safeguard from poverty, yet for more and more families, the cost of college is rising out of reach.** Median income plunged by 47 percent from 1973 to 1992 (the latest available year) for young families with children headed by a high school dropout, and by one-third (37 percent) for those headed by a high school graduate with no further education. Only young families with children headed by a four-year college graduate avoided income losses (their incomes rose by 14 percent from 1973 to 1992).

- **A precipitous drop has left most children in young families no longer covered by private health insurance.** From 1989 to 1994 alone, the proportion of children in young families covered by private health insurance dropped one-fourth (from 59 percent to 45 percent). In young families with a year-round worker, the proportion of children with private health coverage dropped from 78 percent to 65 percent during the same five years.

- **Children in young families are especially vulnerable to poverty's lasting damage.** The disproportionate poverty among young families is alarming because more than two-thirds of these poor children in young families are younger than 6, an age when children are especially vulnerable to poverty's lifelong effects on education and learning, according to major new scientific findings cited in the report. Even a few years spent in poverty during a child's first years of life appear to significantly reduce educational test scores later on and harm chances for completing school, the report says. A child who grows up less educated as a result of poverty may have a harder time as an adult finding a job, especially one that offers a family-supporting wage, creating a vicious cycle of poverty.

"All sectors of society will share the long-term cost of this early poverty," says the report's author Arloc Sherman. "The private economy, in particular, is likely to suffer substantial productivity losses -- reflected in lower quality of work, fewer goods and services produced, and a loss of wages--as children grow to become less educated, less effective workers as a result of the poverty they experience while living in a young struggling family. All of this results in a dim outlook for the children of these young adults. Many young families face declining resources for taking care of their children and providing the food, clothing, shelter, health care, child care and education children need," Sherman added.

The report notes that much of the rise in young families' poverty is due to changes in the private economy. Business restructuring, growing global competitiveness, declining union influence, changes in workplace technology, the decling value of the minimum wage, and other factors have converged to drive down wages and job security for millions of workers, especially those with limited skills, credentials and seniority. Factors such as youth, less experience, lack of a four-year college education -- combined with limited child care options -- have thwarted many young families in their ability to compete for jobs. According to Sherman, "These families in particular have experienced dwindling rewards for their labor, resulting from shrinking wages and vanishing health benefits from employers."

The report also found that although family break-up also contributes to young family poverty, its role is often overstated. Five out of six poor children who live in young families would still be poor even if America returned to the higher marriage rates of twenty years ago. Moreover, there is strong evidence that rising economic distress has contributed to family break-up.

-more-

Rescuing the American Dream contains a number of recommendations on how business, government and local communities can collaborate to enable every family to gain the wages, benefits, education, training, child care, and community and other supports needed to meet their children's basic needs. Five steps outlined for strengthening young families include:

***Investing in child care.** State and federal governments must invest in making safe and nurturing child care affordable to all families with working parents. Head Start's high-quality preschool and developmental services should be expanded to reach all eligible children in need of services and should reach beyond 4- and 5-year-olds to serve children younger than 4.

***Increasing wages and benefits to support families.** The minimum wage must be raised until a full-time minimum wage job pays at least enough to support a family of three above the poverty line as it did during most of the 1960's and 1970's. (The minimum wage now provides only 83 percent of the 1997 poverty threshold). Businesses should also offer affordable health insurance coverage for the most vulnerable Americans.

***Strengthening housing support.** The Federal government must maintain and strengthen assistance to low-income renters. It also urges changes in the food stamp program to provide families with children with high housing costs the same enhanced benefits that elderly and disabled individuals with such costs receive, and calls on landlords and real estate agencies to comply with, rather than resist, laws that prohibit the discrimination against families with children which drives up housing costs and problems.

***Vigorous enforcement of child support laws.** Parents must take responsibility for supporting their children, but that public systems must work effectively to make sure those responsibilities are met. It urges states to collect vigorously regular and adequate child support from absent parents and construct a new "child support assurance" system to provide stable monthly income for all single-parent families.

***Maintaining an economic safety net and achieving full implementation of new health insurance program.** If young parents are given the tools they need, such as decent education, child care, health care, and access to jobs with family-supporting wages, their own work efforts will almost always be able to eliminate the threat of poverty for their children, but that state and local governments can avert the intolerably high human and financial cost of child poverty in young families by maintaining the economic safety net for the poorest families while enhancing supports like health coverage for moderate income working families. The report calls on the states to implement the new State Children's Health Insurance Program promptly.

-more-

The report notes that in the past, the nation worked together to meet the needs of young families. Edelman added, "When families faced economic crisis in the 1930's, the federal government created jobs and built housing, roads, and other public works. In the 1940's and 1950's, the GI Bill helped a generation of young veterans to attend college, start a business, or buy a house while profitable businesses shared their prosperity with their employees," said Edelman. "At every step in America's history, this nation has found new ways to help successive generations of young Americans make a strong start. We need the same commitment today to help these young families."

# # #

NOTE: Audio from Marian Wright Edelman is available free of charge by calling 1-800-883-5059.

KEY FACTS ABOUT CHILD CARE

Child care and early education are a necessity for millions of American families. Millions of children of all income levels are cared for by someone other than their parents every day.

- Each day, an estimated 13 million children spend some or all of their day being cared for by someone other than their parents, allowing their parents to work to support their families. Many of these children enter non-parental care by 11 weeks of age, are in care for close to 30 hours a week, and often stay in some form of child care until they enter school.

- In 1995, three out of five (62 percent) women with younger than six, and three-quarters (77 percent) of women with children ages six to 17, were in the labor force. In addition, growing numbers of women with very young children are in the workforce--59 percent of women with children younger that three were in the labor force in 1995. All of these working mothers must find someone to care for their children in order to work.

Many families cannot afford safe, nurturing child care.

- In 1990, mothers who were employed full time and paid for child care for a child younger than five paid on average about $3,650 for their youngest child in center-based care, $2,950 for family child care, and $5,025 for in-home care. This was only the amount they paid for their youngest child--families with more than one child in child care paid more.

- Obviously, low-income parents have difficulty affording even average-priced care for one child--at the rates reported above, a single mother working full time and earning the minimum wage would have to pay 41 percent of her income to put her child in a center. Given the other costs of raising a family such as rent, food, transportation, and clothes, it is clearly impossible for low-income parents to afford good care without help.

There is serious cause for alarm about the quality of child care.

- Good quality child care and early education have been proven to help children develop well and keep children safe while their parents work, and can be particularly beneficial to low-income children. However, studies have shown that far too many children are in care that jeopardizes their development and safety.

- According to Carnegie Corporation, child care and early education services "have so long been neglected that they now constitute some of the worst services for children in Western society." The care most children are in not only can "threaten their immediate health and safety, but also can compromise their long-term development."

- A recently released national study found that *"Child care at most centers in the United States is poor to mediocre, with almost half of the infants and toddlers in rooms having less than minimal quality."* It found that one in eight centers (12 percent) provided less than minimal quality care, with the proportion rising to fully 40 percent for rooms serving infants and toddlers, who are clearly the most vulnerable. Only one in seven (14 percent) received a rating of good quality care for children overall, with even fewer programs (8 percent providing good quality care for infants and toddlers.

Child care is in short supply, particularly for some age groups such as infants and toddlers.

- Three out of four parents of young children participating in a national poll in 1989 said that there was an insufficient supply of child care for infants in their communities. Two of every five parents said there were not enough programs for preschoolers, and one in three parents said they needed more programs for elementary school children.

- As more families are working shifts, or during non-standard work hours, there is an increasing need for child care during odd hours. Yet the supply of such care is minimal, forcing many families to make difficult choices.

- Low-income families face particular difficulties finding care. Numerous studies have found serious shortages of care in low-income communities, which often do not have an economic base to support adequate child care.

Finding good, quality child care is a special challenge for two groups of children--infants and school-age children.

- Parents of infant and toddlers face a particularly daunting task finding child care. Not only are the first three years a critical stage in children's development, but good care for very young children is more labor intensive and therefore more expensive. Research suggests that much of the available infant/toddler care is in short supply and is often unaffordable to parents. These problems have an even greater impact on low-income parents, whose children need supportive child care experiences to help them overcome the disadvantages of poverty.

- A 1995 study of child care prices in six cities found that, for a minimum wage worker, the family's child care costs at the average price of care for an infant in a child care center would be at least 50 percent of family income in five of the six cities examined. A full-time minimum wage worker paying the standard price at the lowest-priced center for infant care would be spending from 38 to 81 percent of their earnings on care in four of the six states. Another study found that in nine of the 12 states examined, infant care can take 60 percent or more of a parent's paycheck if she or he is working at a minimum wage. Given the other costs of raising a family such as rent, food, transportation, and clothes, it is clearly very difficult for low-income parents to afford good care for their young children.

- Experts estimate that nearly 5 million school-age children spend time without adult supervision during a typical week. Exact figures are not available, due to parents' reluctance to report that they leave children alone. Older children are much more likely to spend time on their own than younger children. Data from the NCCS suggests that less than 5% of children under the age of 8 are regularly in self-care compared to nearly 35% of twelve-year-olds.

- Children who begin taking care of themselves in elementary school are significantly more likely to report higher use of alcohol by eight grade. Regardless of how early they became latchkey children, eight-graders left home alone for 11 or more hours a week report significantly greater use of cigarettes, alcohol, and marijuana than children not left home alone.

- There is some evidence that low-income children have fewer opportunities for companionship and are more isolated from peers out-of-school activities than higher-income children. The National Study of Before and After-School Programs found that access to school-age care programs was limited for low-income families. Most programs (83%) operate exclusively on parent fees--effectively excluding families who cannot afford the tuition which averages $45 per week--and fewer than one-third of all programs receive any governmental support to subsidize enrollment of low-income children. Lack of transportation is also a major obstacle for many low- and moderate-income parents.