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Report On
CHILD CARE NEEDS OF WORKING PARENTS IN THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA

To the Board of Governors,
City Club of Portland:

I. INTRODUCTION

For the first time in history, a majority of U.S. women are employed -- 52 percent today, with an anticipated increase to 65 percent by 1995. Most of these women expect to keep working, regardless of economic cycles. By 1990, well over half of all women with children under six years of age will hold jobs outside the home. Only one in nine American families now fits the description of a "traditional" family, with fathers going to work and mothers staying home.

It is estimated that today, only about six million registered day care openings are available for the thirteen million children (aged 13 and under) of full-time working mothers. Most young children are cared for in their homes by a neighbor or relative, or simply care for themselves.

II. CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE AND LIMITATIONS

In December, 1980, your Committee began its study of the child care needs of working parents in the Portland Metropolitan area. Specifically, we were charged to:

"Examine and evaluate the present roles of government, business, the community, and the working parent in the Portland metropolitan area in providing child care to children without special problems. Identify any inadequacies and problems. Recommend courses of action by government, business, the community, and the working parent to improve such child care services."

Finding accurate and comparable data was difficult for the Committee due to the upheaval in the child care community brought on by greatly reduced federal funding in the past two years. Statistical data were lacking for the Portland area (Clackamas, Washington and Multnomah Counties); when statistics were available, the various figures and breakdowns often were not comparable. Your Committee, therefore, imposed a cutoff date of January 1982 for data collection. Latest census data were used when available.

Due to the broad scope of the charge, we limited the study by focusing on the child care needs of children 13 years of age or less, during daytime hours only.

III. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Caring for children is an activity that affects many population sectors. Working parents utilize the care, pay for it, and worry about it; both the public and private sectors provide the care and are affected by the child care concerns of employees; governments set standards and subsidize some of the cost.

Historically, Americans have believed that children--particularly preschoolers and infants--should be cared for on a full-time basis by their parents, particularly their mothers. This view, which relates child rearing to family solidarity, has strong advocates. Few people would argue
with this ideal, but reliance on others for child care has long been a necessity for most families, whether for a brief or an extended period. Although many families may believe that federal day care assistance has always been available, in fact it has evolved only in the last 40 years. Day care in the United States, despite growing demands for it from virtually all segments of the population, emerged with a stigma. Custodial day nurseries in the 19th century were set up to provide basic necessities for "day orphans," as the children of working mothers were called. In the mid-20th century the stigma began to fade:

"Only World War II and the urgent need for Rosie the Riveter and her female counterparts to bolster the war effort in US defense plants made child care outside the home socially acceptable. Through the Lanham Act (1942), federal funds were provided for day care. Over 300,000 preschool and school-age youngsters were enrolled until 1946 in more than 8500 programs in the schools."

The most famous of the industrial on-site centers in Portland were the two day care centers run by the Kaiser Shipbuilding Corporation in Portland during the war years, 1943-1945. Kaiser's Child Service Department boasted that these centers, located at the entrance to each shipyard, made possible 1,246,773 production hours in one year. Besides offering child care 364 days per year, 24 hours per day, the centers also provided such services as clothes mending, "carry-home" dinners, shopping, and appointment making. Operating costs came from federal and company subsidies and parent fees. Child care services were viewed as temporary measures for these women, a way to preserve the family in difficult times. Day care was not viewed as a service for average families during normal years.

During the era of the New Frontier and the War on Poverty, some groups championed day care. In 1967, amendments to the Social Security Act (Title IV) granted federal funds for child care to states on a matching basis. These funds were tied to aid to dependent children, food stamp, and lunch programs, all designed to serve the poor.

In the 1970s, day care programs changed from custodial care to care with an emphasis on learning skills. Political lines began to be drawn with this change. Opponents saw national legislation as government interference in family concerns. Several versions of the Comprehensive Child Care Development Act were rejected by Congress. One child care bill was vetoed by President Nixon who termed it, "...a radical piece of legislation."

Under the Reagan Administration, federal administrative and financial support has been reduced (see Section G.1 Federal Government Involvement).

IV. FINDINGS

A. Types of Child Care Providers

The three primary types of child care providers are (1) a child care center (which must be a registered facility), (2) a family day care home.

2. Prior to 1981, the terms "licensed" or "certified" were used.
(which may be registered or unregistered), and (3) a combination of a center and family day care home.

1. Child Care Centers

A child care center is required by Oregon law to be registered. Care for six or more children is provided in a setting where the provider is not a relative of the children. Centers vary in size and program capacity, most handling from 20 to 120 children. The centers generally operate weekdays from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. Until October 1981, the majority of centers in the Portland area used a sliding fee scale ranging from $7 to $15 per day, based on the number of children from the same family cared for and the income of the family. Eligibility for state aid recently has been reduced and with further budget cuts projected, the existence of the sliding scale is threatened. (See Section G. 2., State Government Involvement, for more detail.)

2. Family Day Care

Family day care includes any out-of-home care in a family setting by an unrelated individual. Family day care providers are not required to be registered and as a rule are not registered. Therefore they are unknown even to the professional workers in day care. Family day care allows for special child care arrangements such as caring for children in the same family, or offering long hours of care and flexible schedules. Family care providers may often care for three to four children under the age of six, including their own preschoolers, or care for school-age children after school hours. A few family care providers specialize in infant or toddler care.

Arrangements for family day care are usually made among friends and acquaintances. Occasionally arrangements are made by third-party referrals, through classified ads, or through listings in telephone directories.

Parents prefer care that allows their children to remain close to home, school, and neighborhood. Seventy-five percent of providers in Portland were found within one mile of the child's home. Seventeen percent were next-door neighbors.

Only a small percentage of the 70,000 employed women in Oregon who have children under 6 years of age, use child care centers or registered family day care homes. Informal family day care seems to be the norm. It has been estimated that in October 1981, 25 percent of the children in registered day care in Oregon received care in centers and 75 percent in family day care homes. Prior to the 1980 drastic reduction in state subsidies, approximately 49 percent of children received center care indicating that

4. Ibid.
when cost is less of a factor, approximately one-half of the population preferred center care.

3. Combined Center Care and Family Day Care

Center care and family day care are combined in this arrangement. Usually a child receives his primary care from a family day care provider and also participates in a center program one or two days a week. Parents who use this method say their children benefit from informal care, which provides an intimate relationship, coupled with center care, which provides the stimulation and education that a single provider may not be able to give. Additionally, the center provides continuity if the family day care provider changes, which is a frequent occurrence. Some family care providers use neighborhood pre-schools or kindergartens for their own children, and for other youngsters in their care (at reduced hourly rates), if parents are interested.

This combination of care also benefits the care providers. Family day care providers at times feel socially isolated and overwhelmed with the problems they face alone. This combined arrangement allows these providers to maintain regular contact with the professional staff at day care centers, and enhances the child care network within the community. In the spring of 1981, a "mixed model" which included the Child Care Coordinating Council (4C), a consortium of well-established child care centers, and Portland Community College, was started (see Section G., Community Resources). Another version of commonly used mixed care is that of before- and after-school care programs, with the school itself serving as the center.

4. Co-ops

In a co-op, parents exchange their time for child care, usually with no fee involved. The Northeast Child Care facility is the newest of four child care co-ops in the Portland metropolitan area. Other co-ops serve outer Northeast Portland, Southwest Portland, and Southeast Portland. These co-ops usually require a fixed number of hours of donated time in return for day care, and thus are not a viable option for most employees whose jobs require their presence during set hours. However, flexible work hours can allow parents who work full time to take part in co-ops.

B. National Child Care Needs

The number of working women has been increasing steadily since 1965. The federal Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that 52.5 percent of women 16 years of age and older were working as of August 1981, compared with 39.3 percent in 1965. Women now account for 42 percent of the total labor force, compared with 34 percent in 1965. There are 3.8 million working women with children but no husband in the home—more than double the number in 1970.

One out of every two households will soon be headed by a single parent. Half of all children in two-parent families have both parents employed.

In March 1980, 53 percent (30.7 million) of all children under 18 in the U.S. had mothers who were employed or looking for work. Forty-three

6. From interview with Leslie Faught, Director of the Child Care Coordinating Council (4C).
percent of children 6 years old or younger (approximately 7.5 million youngsters) needed full time preschool care. More than 2 million children between the ages of 7 and 13 needed after school supervision.

C. State and Local Needs and Costs

Since 1970, the number of women in the Oregon labor force with children 6 years old or younger has almost doubled. An estimated 70,900 Oregon women in the work force have children under six years of age. The 1980 Census data for Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington Counties show 147,929 children aged 0-9 years. Using the national estimate that 43 percent of these children have mothers in the work force, your Committee estimates there are 63,609 children who need child care in the Portland Metro area.

Data for 1981 from the Child Care Coordinating Council (4C) show that registered child care centers or registered family day care providers in Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington Counties have the capacity to accommodate only 10,814 children, 12 years old or younger (see table following). Eleven percent of the 63,609 children in need is served by day care centers; 89 percent is served in registered and unregistered family day care homes. There is no way to tell how many children are served by unregistered providers or are left home alone without any kind of supervised care.

In Portland there is a broad range of income levels among parents who work full time and seek child care. Because the majority of family day care users are either single or low-income parents, your Committee concentrated on the single woman's earning power to determine the financial effects of child care cost. We found that entry level, unskilled workers in Portland receive between $535 and $650 a month in gross income. With a degree of skill and experience, wages might increase to about $650-$1000 a month. With $2,400 annually a low average for the care of only one child, the cost for such care can easily consume up to one-third of monthly gross income.

In Portland there is a great variation in day care cost. Comparison of all information gathered shows the following range: $.75-$2.50 per hour or $180-$400 per month for one child under 3 years of age; $.75-$2.00 per hour or $160-$200 per month for one child over 3 years of age.

In some cases, the State Adult and Family Services Division pays a portion of day care cost scaled to the gross income of the low-income working parent who is not receiving public assistance, e.g., an employed mother with one child (see Section G.2, State Government Involvement).

8. Ibid.
10. Although the data included 0-12 year olds, there were relatively few children over 9 years old.
12. Family Payment Scale for AFS Day Care Program Adult & Family Services Division, Oregon AFS Staff Manual, October 1, 1981.
REGISTERED DAY CARE DATA BY COUNTY*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Family Day Care Providers</th>
<th>No. of Centers</th>
<th>Register- ed Capacity of Centers</th>
<th>No. Children En- rolled in Centers</th>
<th>Average Daily Rates in Centers</th>
<th>Average Monthly Rates in Centers</th>
<th>Years, of Age</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>1 to 2 1/2</th>
<th>2 1/2 to 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>4,242</td>
<td>3,352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,058**</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>7,136</td>
<td>7,015</td>
<td>5,473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Each family care provider can be registered for no more than 5 children in addition to her own family, and no more than 2 children under 2 years of age, including her own. The average is 3.4 children.

3.4 X 1,058 = 3,597 children in family care
7,136 children in centers

10,814 children (estimated) in registered child care.

D. Basic Requirements of Good Child Care

Vast differences exist in the cost, character, and quality of care offered, as well as in the size and adequacy of the homes and centers, the amount of equipment and educational materials, and program philosophies. The choice of care is affected by parents' differing values, income levels, time and transportation constraints, and possibly, problems with the care of other children. Because of this variety of needs, philosophies and restrictions, a model center or family day care home is neither possible nor desirable. However, certain basic elements essential to every program for children five years old and younger have been identified by eight national organizations interested in child care. The guidelines call for: (1) an

13. Guideline bulletin developed by organizations including the American Association of University Women, the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, Inc., the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the American Association of Elementary, Kindergarten, Nursery Educators.
environment that invites and nurtures the child's joy in discovery and learning by providing spacious, cheerful surroundings and equipment for play that encourages creativity and learning; (2) a planned schedule geared to the individual child, involving sensory, creative and intellectual experiences, freedom of movement, and sufficient rest and good food; and (3) a situation in which provider, parents, and children relate well to each other.

E. Effects of Child Care

Popular literature has contributed to the stigma from which day care suffers. Almost without exception, books and articles published in the 1950s and 1960s predicted dire consequences for the child placed in day care. A 1969 issue of Redbook treated maternal employment as a social ill with serious repercussions for children. A few books and articles in the late 1950s and early 1960s cautiously allowed that although day care was not nearly as good as maternal care, it was better than haphazard care or no care at all. These articles occasionally portrayed a working mother in a favorable light. Toward the late 1960s day care was presented more positively as a way mothers could expose their children to new experiences.

By the 1970s, popular magazine articles indicated that if high quality stable care was available, many women might find that combining work and motherhood would make them better at both. The climate had changed enough so that popular psychologists assured mothers that they were not seriously harming their children if they worked outside the home—that such an arrangement provided early educational opportunities.

In the past 25 years, a body of professional research has begun to emerge regarding the effects of nonmaternal care on children. It shows that, with few exceptions, such care does not have harmful effects on a child's maternal attachments, intellectual development or socio-emotional behavior. On the contrary, educationally-oriented day care programs have been found to stimulate a child's intellectual development. Unfortunately, much of the research has suffered from serious methodological flaws and has been limited in scope. The major problem in child care research is the inability to control all of the factors involved.

A project sponsored by the Federal Office of Child Development tested 11 common assumptions about the effect of center care and family care on children's behavior. This study concluded that day care is not disruptive to the child's emotional bond with its mother and that, when compared with age mates reared at home, day care children interact more with peers in both positive and negative ways.

F. Information and Referral (I&R) Services

Parents locate child care through various methods. The informal method is to ask a friend or neighbor. The formal network is known as information and referral (I&R). I&R is the process by which care providers are put in touch with care users, usually through a telephone exchange. Care providers are listed in a registry with name, location, fees charged and ages of youngsters taken. Care users are referred by the phone exchange to suitable care providers in their desired area. In the development of both for-

mal and informal day care, I&R services are the essential bridge between the users and the care providers.

In Oregon, the Childrens Services Division (CSD) is one such bridge. CSD staff inspect day care centers and register (voluntarily) family day care homes. CSD accumulates and files names of day care providers, supplying these names to any parent, whether or not that parent qualifies for state assistance.

In addition to linking providers and users, I&R can provide data for comprehensive, long-term planning of child care services.

1. Child Care Coordinating Council (4C)

Currently 4C is the primary source of I&R in the Portland area. 4C also gives technical assistance and information on child development to care providers, parents and other community members interested in program development. Services are supplemented through use of a lending library of over 5,000 items (toys and books for children, audio-visual equipment, slides and professional material). Before funding was cut in 1981, the 4C program operated an 8-hour switchboard and kept the only area-wide record of those providers willing to care for infants and special needs children, and to give evening or weekend care.

As a result of state budget cuts in July 1981, the 4C's budget was reduced 20 percent. In spite of the reduced funding, 4C kept open its I&R switchboard four hours daily, giving referrals to area-wide day care facilities. In one month (August 1981) the switchboard made 600 referrals. In recent years 4C received an average of 10,000 referral requests annually.

2. Other Local I&R Services

The Albina Ministerial Alliance is a Northeast Portland source, and West Tuality Child Care Services runs a 24-hour switchboard in Washington County. Other agencies, newspapers, and public bulletin boards also help parents locate child care.

During 1980-81, child care projects funded by the Network Child Care Demonstration Project operated in the Sabin and Sunnyside neighborhoods in Portland. The Network Project was designed to fill the gap in access to child care services that exists between the formal system of child care centers and the informal network of neighbors and friends providing family care. Its purpose was to develop neighborhood child care networks and to collect data on child care needs in order to inform employers and assist them in responding to employees' needs.

The Network Project decentralized the "matchmaking" operation by finding the person in each neighborhood to whom others turn for help and information. By providing consultation to a network of such matchmakers, a natural system of service delivery was created for the recruitment of care providers, and provision was made for a highly accessible mode of support for families making day care arrangements. The project was federally funded for a two-year period (July 1980 to October 1982) and was then abandoned due to lack of funds.
3. **Inadequacy of the Present System**

A problem with all of these methods is in matching the parents and the providers at the time of need. Current information is essential and is very difficult to maintain. Public as well as private information and referral sources are experiencing severe funding problems and lack the computerization to track rapid changes adequately. A local researcher told the Committee that, "The more successful these independent services or organizations become, the more strained are demands on their facilities and personnel, now faced with the added burden of fundraising in order to support continuation of service."\(^\text{15}\)

**G. Participants**

1. **Federal Government Involvement**

The federal government has been involved in day care regulation for 40 years, beginning with the Lanham Act. The main federal regulatory role is to provide regulations covering the physical health and safety of children in day care. In the fiscal year which began October 1981, federal funding for day care was put into a block grant with numerous other social service programs and was reduced from $3 billion to $2.4 billion. In 1980, the federal government issued additional regulations that set minimum standards for day care centers, but their enforcement has been delayed. Federal officials now say the rules are no longer applicable because social service money is being provided to the states in block grants, which have a minimum of strings attached.

One federal program that continues to operate with full funding is the Child Care Food Program instituted by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to improve the quality of food given to children in day care.\(^\text{16}\) Available only to registered providers, it is estimated that 65 percent of them use this food program.

For child care users, the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1982 provides for an income tax credit (not a deduction, but a direct credit against taxes owed) equal to 30 percent of the employment-related day care expenses of taxpayers earning $10,000 or less.\(^\text{17}\) The credit is reduced by one percentage point for each $2,000 (or fraction thereof) of earnings over $10,000. Thus, a taxpayer earning between $28,000 and $30,000 would receive a credit of 20 percent. In addition, the allowable expense base has been raised to $2,400 for one dependent and $4,800 for two or more dependents. Therefore, the maximum allowable credit for a taxpayer earning $10,000 or less is $720 for one dependent and $1,440 for two or more dependents.

\(^{15}\) Alice H. Collins and Eunice Watson, *Family Day Care*, Beacon Press, Chapter 4, 1976.

\(^{16}\) In Portland this program is administered by four different agencies, AMA, 4C, West Tualatin Child Services, and Child Care Support Services.

\(^{17}\) The State of Oregon allows a direct tax credit for child care up to a maximum of 20% of allowable expenses with a maximum expense base of $2,000 for one dependent or $4,000 for two or more. This credit may be claimed only if it is also claimed on the federal return. Oregon did not adopt the new higher federal limits (see Section G.1.).
Federal tax incentives for employers include tax deductions of operating costs of child care centers and of contributions to employees' child care expenses. Employers can also deduct at an accelerated rate the expense of acquiring, constructing, reconstructing or rehabilitating property for use as a child care center.

2. State Government Involvement

Most government involvement is at the state level. The Department of Human Resources, through the Children's Services Division (CSD) and Adult & Family Services Division (AFS) outlines its child care tasks as: a) providing information and referral to parents seeking child care, b) registering day care providers, c) administering the state subsidy program received from the federal block funds, d) setting standards for homes and centers, e) developing training programs for providers, and f) counseling parents and providers on child care needs.

In 1981-82, $3,354,325 state dollars were spent on employment-related child care subsidies. AFS devised a sliding benefit scale for child care subsidies. This supplement is based on the gross income and the size of the family of a low income parent who is not receiving public assistance. A subsidy is not granted if a physically able parent in a two-parent family is not working. For example, a single working mother with one child would be eligible for the maximum day care benefit ($173 per month for one child thirty-one months or older, or $216 for infant care) only if she earned no more than $609 gross income per month. With two children, an infant and one over thirty-one months, she could earn up to $658 a month for maximum aid of $389. Beyond that income level, she would have to contribute to the day care allowance. At a gross monthly income of $801-$849, the mother of the two children would pay $100 and AFS would contribute $289. For parents who are receiving assistance and working, the cost of day care is allowed as a work expense in computing the assistance grant up to a maximum of $160 per month per child.

CSD counselors assist prospective recipients in applying for the subsidy, and the check is sent to the parent, not to the day care provider. If the parent is to receive any kind of assistance from the state, the parent must use a registered provider.

The Oregon legislature directed CSD to inspect 15 percent of the registered family day care homes, unannounced, at least once a year. The registered family day care provider may care for no more than five children in addition to her own family, and no more than two children under two years of age, including her own.

The state budget crisis in the 1979-81 and 1981-83 bienniums has drastically reduced the funding of child care programs. As a result of the 1980 special legislative session, the original appropriation for all child care activities was cut from $21 million to $17 million. The Governor's original budget for 1981-83 set the child care portion at about $13 million. It now stands at $7.8 million, representing a reduction of almost two-thirds of child care funding since 1980.

19. Department of Human Resources (Interview with Information Officer November, 1981 and November, 1982).
Because cost is a major determinant of what human services will be provided and because all funds (both state and federal) are limited, an official of the Department of Human Resources told your Committee that the Department must make the hard choice of preserving services for those most dependent upon state resources. People who are mentally ill, criminally insane, handicapped, or who are elderly poor and sick, have few if any alternatives and must look to the state for help. Life-sustaining services to meet these peoples' needs have greater priority for state funds than have services for people in need of child care. In addition, child care constituents typically have been less vocal. These factors have resulted in decreased state funding of child care.

3. Employer Involvement

a. Day Care Sponsored by the Nation's Employers

There are several outstanding examples of corporate day care responses. Levi-Strauss, recognizing that a very necessary component of an employer-run day care center is parent involvement in policy and program, took a position of providing child care for employees only through community-based service providers. After operating a center in conjunction with a manufacturing plant in Star City, Arkansas, for a brief time, Levi-Strauss turned the center over to a community group. Half empty under Levi-Strauss management, it is now filled to capacity and continues to serve Levi-Strauss employees.

Intermedics, Inc., a Texas pacemaker manufacturer with a female employee population of 71 percent, solved its child care problem by constructing an on-site facility. The company maintains that it has reduced employee absenteeism, thereby gaining 3700 extra production hours that would otherwise have been lost. Employee turnover decreased by 9 percent in the first six months of the center's operation.

Stride Rite Children's Center is now ten years old and flourishing under stable corporate management and a healthy financial condition. Located in the Boston shoe factory, the center exists as an independent non-profit corporation. Funding comes from various sources: parent fees, the Stride Rite Charitable Foundation, the local welfare department, the USDA Child Care Food Program, and federally-funded employment and training programs.

Polaroid Corporation in Cambridge, Massachusetts, finances child care through a voucher system. The company determines the parent's share of cost (based on a sliding scale) and pays the balance of tuition at any registered child care facility in the state. The Polaroid community relations department started the program in 1971 and later subsidized care for the children of employees in more than 100 centers and family day care homes.

The Northside Child Development Center in Minneapolis is a joint effort of six major firms: Control Data, Dayton's Department Store, Lutheran Brotherhood Insurance Company, Northern States Power, Northwestern Bell Telephone, and Pillsbury. The center—an independent, non-profit corporation—serves 200 children ages 3 months to 13 years. Parents, business representatives, and community leaders serve on the board of directors. A combination of parent fees and corporate donations match government social service funds to support the program.
A day care counseling service operated by Illinois Bell Telephone since 1970 provides information and referral to employees in need of child care. A second purpose of the Illinois Bell service is to foster the development of new child care facilities. The company pays the cost of training new day care workers and assists people who are interested in providing child care in their homes.

**National Semiconductor** in Santa Clara, California, is setting up a child care hotline to offer information on existing programs and, at the same time, assess the child care needs of employees. When the needs are known, the company may consider options for directly providing or financing child care.

**Asian, Inc.**, an economic development organization in San Francisco, has developed a unique alternative to a center-based care—the Family Day Care Home Network. The network has set up twelve day care homes designed to offer round-the-clock care in a family-like setting. The homes are located in the vicinity of the city's major hospitals. Hospitals are asked to purchase slots for the children of employees. The staff of Asian, Inc., provides training and support services to family day care "parents," including assistance in renting space, securing loans for renovation, and obtaining licenses to operate.

The **Amalgamated Clothing & Textile Workers of America** offers child care as a membership benefit, jointly funded by employers, who contribute 2 percent of their gross hourly payroll, and by the union's Health & Welfare fund.

**b. I&R Services Across the Nation**

There are thousands of child care referral groups throughout the U.S., but only four percent are industry related. The Child Care Resource Center, a Massachusetts-based I&R agency, offers its services to local industries on a subscription basis. Other independently funded groups such as the Child Care "Switchboard" in San Francisco and the Preschool Association of the West Side (PAWS) in New York are offering similar expertise to business. Further, hundreds of firms list family day care and center care notices on their bulletin boards. Many personnel departments compile lists to share with new employees.

Business is also helping meet employees' child care needs through flex-time, part-time, and job-sharing schedules. Some offer "sick child leave" or allow employees to use their own sick leave if their child is ill.

**c. Day Care Sponsored by Local Employers**

Your Committee prepared a child care questionnaire that was sent to twelve firms in the Portland metropolitan area that employ large numbers of women. (See Appendix C.) Of the seven firms that responded, five did not consider employee child care a corporate responsibility, but did provide sick leave for the parent of an ill child (one firm with the caveat that this option was available only to salaried employees). Four firms had no present or future plans for an on-site facility, financial support for a community facility, or the inclusion of child care in their benefits package, but one of these firms may evaluate such programs in the future. Three firms provide child care I&R resources to interested employees. Five firms indicated a willingness to be part of a consortium to study long-
range solutions to child care problems, and one firm indicated a willingness to contribute dollars or in-kind services to such a study.

Currently, Holladay Park Hospital operates an on-site center for the children of employees, volunteers, patients and others. In the spring of 1978, with a consultant hired by the hospital, an employee committee developed the program that opened in June of that year. The center, located at the hospital, provides round-the-clock care seven days a week. Holladay Park finances 50 percent of the cost of care. An additional portion is reimbursed by Medicaid, which allows child care as a hospital business expense. Parent fees cover the remainder.

In March 1981, Multnomah County opened a child care center for its employees in a Northeast Portland church. One unique feature of the County program is the parents' option to reduce their fee by $60 per month by working only three hours per week at the center. Approximately 80 percent of the parents are able to take advantage of the rebate due to job flex-time allowed by the County. Children of non-employees are now eligible for day care at this facility. As of December 31, 1981, enrollment was at capacity (12 infants and 21 preschoolers), and there was a long waiting list of infants.

4. Community Resources

a. Child Care Coordinating Council (4C)

For more than 12 years, the Child Care Coordinating Council (4C) has played a major role in the organization and support of child care in the area.

When 4C was founded in 1970, its purpose was to coordinate child care funds and services in the Portland Metropolitan area. In the 1980-81 federal fiscal year, 4C had funds totalling approximately $1 million and the responsibility of state certification of day care homes in Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington and Columbia counties. 1,200 homes were certified.

4C is one of the four sponsors of the USDA food program. 4C currently administers approximately $300,000 for planning, monitoring of nutrition training, and administration of reimbursement vouchers for care providers. The Child Care Demonstration Project also was designed and administered by 4C. The project, federally funded at $537,000, had two principal goals: a) providing training and support for family day care providers within the Portland metropolitan area ( subcontracted to Portland Community College), and b) developing stable day care resources, including cooperative, sick, and alternative hour care, as well as traditional hour day care. The Multnomah County Day Care Cooperative was developed as a part of the demonstration project. Trainees completing the course received 36 credit hours from Portland Community College. Participating agencies included 4C, Portland Community College, Multnomah County, Portland Public Schools, Metro YMCA, St. Vincent de Paul and the Helen Gordon Child Development Center.

Recently, 4C together with PSU Regional Research Institute began work with local employers to develop employer-sponsored child care services and benefits. This effort includes working with employers to ascertain needs and tailoring programs to meet these needs. The company's work force is surveyed to determine the impact of employee day care needs upon the organization in terms of lateness, absenteeism, interruptions and turnover. If the survey indicates that employee day care needs are affecting the work
force significantly, 4C staff will work with the employer to develop an appropriate and cost-effective day care solution. Examples of day care-related employee benefits include referral services, "cafeteria" benefit plans and implementation of the provisions of the 1982 Economic Recovery Tax Act relating to child care credits.

In August 1982, 4C and the Regional Research Institute submitted a grant proposal to the federal Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) for a survey of 40 local employers and 20,000 employees to determine how day care needs affect the work place. The project involves consulting with participant employers to develop appropriate day care services. Another aspect of the program is the further development of the 4C's referral service, adding staff and computer capability to better serve area-wide day care referral needs. Survey data can help local foundations and government agencies make decisions involving day care. The grant application was screened by a panel of experts which gave the Portland project the highest national rating and awarded it $202,000 for an 18-month period. However, the ACYF grant did not include funding for a computer (about $10,000), assuming the program's general merit would allow 4C to raise the funds locally.

b. Other Community Resources

In some cases, when it is recognized that certain community needs are not being met, residents of an area organize to provide services to meet the needs. Examples of such independent organizations are the Albina Ministerial Alliance, offering multi-faceted family service in the Albina area, and West Tuality Child Care Services, Inc., which concentrates on the needs of children in rural and urban Washington County. In addition to the Community Child Care Switchboard previously mentioned, West Tuality Child Care Service operates a family day care program, training and technical support of the care provider, a provider newsletter, a federal food program, an equipment-lending service, two child care centers, a cooperative play-school, an organized parental support group, a summer migrant day care program for infants and children, and a new six-month Head Start pre-school. West Tuality is funded by community agencies including the United Way, parent fees and periodic small grants.

The Day Care Mothers Association is an independent group of family day care providers, both registered and unregistered, in the Portland metropolitan area. The Association provides a forum in which these providers can address common issues and problems relating to day care, has organized a free children's clothing exchange for day care providers, and has made available loans of day care equipment, food discounts, and backup providers for illness and vacation periods.

United Way supports child care in the metro area, providing operating funds in varying degrees to at least six centers in addition to West Tuality. Total funding in 1980-81 amounted to over $370,000, about 23 percent of the total budgets of these centers.

The YMCA-administered Latch Key day care program previously received federal subsidies for before-and-after-school care of school age youngsters in school buildings. Parents pay a portion of the cost based on a sliding fee scale. At one time there were as many as 12 Latch Key Centers, but

20. The term "latchkey" originates from programs for children who otherwise would carry keys to let themselves into empty homes after school.
Currently only two are operating during the school year. Within the last few years, government subsidies to Latch Key programs have been reduced or eliminated, thereby reducing the services they can offer.

Many churches, agencies and neighbors provide care to a large number of children. And, of course, the numerous family day care providers who care for the vast majority of children have arisen out of community needs.

V. DISCUSSION

In a country where one out of every five children under 18 lives in a single-parent family, where 42 percent of the work force is female, and where almost half of those women need child care services for 10 million children, it is clear that the problem of supplying adequate day care to these people must be addressed on a societal level.

The most obvious problem is economic. According to the Women's Division of the Federal Bureau of Labor, a woman worker today earns 59 cents for every $1.00 earned by a man. Equally difficult as the economic problems are the emotional problems of women who must work, "...but whose worth is unmet in the marketplace and whose children are undervalued by the greater society." Since affordable child care and funding for child care are major problems, equalizing pay would go a long way toward solving them. However, since it is clearly beyond the scope of this study to address an inequity of this magnitude, your Committee has addressed those options that could be implemented most effectively within the next two to three years.

We were charged with assessing the current roles of government, business, the community and the parent in the provision of child care. During the 24 months of this study, the Committee has witnessed a major shift away from government funding and regulation toward placing the entire burden on the parent. While some believe this shift has merit, it ignores the fact that many parents cannot meet this new requirement in the current economy. Critics charge that the current Administration's emphasis on encouraging welfare recipients to return to work is inconsistent with the Administration's policy to reduce child care funding. Since welfare recipients usually can obtain only minimum wage jobs, they cannot afford child care costs. The result is an increase in critical child care needs that must be met with decreased resources.

Your Committee witnessed another shift during its research process. Early information seemed to indicate that child care centers may offer more services, more learning opportunities and more stability than family care providers. However, as our research progressed, it became evident that most parents use family care providers. Reasons for this choice included lower costs, convenience, and a more "personal touch." Even when parents thought that a child care center might provide a more enriching program, the parent often chose a family care provider because of cost and location.

The following three sections discuss in more detail these roles and alternatives.

A. Quality of Care, Registration/Regulation, and the Government Role

It has become clear to this Committee that we cannot judge the "quality" of child care because parents' values vary widely. What we can do is make some statements and assumptions about the facts and how they might relate to the perception of quality care.

There appears to be no connection between registration of day care providers and quality of care. Moreover, since regulations are seldom enforced, registration may encourage a false sense of security about quality of service. For this reason, California is considering deregulation of child care services. Our research shows that regulations may be too stringent for centers, yet are not regularly enforced for family day care homes. Rules for homes seem to be imposed out of concern for lack of supervision, but frequently have the effect of discouraging exemplary providers from increasing their capacity or even staying in business at all.

Government does have an appropriate role in setting minimum standards for physical safety and staffing ratios, but current regulations need to be evaluated to assure that they are realistic, sensible and enforceable. Most regulations are imposed by the federal government; the state's role is primarily in enforcement.

Our interviews with child care centers showed that those centers perceived to have "high quality" programs have long waiting lists, so it appears that there is a shortage of "quality" slots. Definition of this term becomes even more elusive because no data exist to show what programs and services produce long waiting lists and therefore might represent "quality."

We would not advocate a quality control system, realizing that quality may be different to each of us, and that many of the factors involved cannot be enforced by regulation and registration. However, a computerized data base of day care options could go a long way toward solving the problems of matching parents' values with types of providers.

Your Committee considers federal funding as one way for government to meet its responsibility to the nation's children; however, under the present Administration expanded levels of federal funding seem unlikely. The federal government does provide an income tax credit of up to 30 percent for employment-related child care expenses. Prior to 1982, the maximum credit was 20% and the current Administration raised that limit. In addition, the expense base has been raised (see Section G.I). This is helpful to parents who are employed but does not address the needs of the increasing number of parents who are attending school in hopes of improving their job opportunities.

On the local level, the State Human Resources Department finds itself in the position of funding "life sustaining" rather than "life enriching" programs. Between 1980 and 1981, reported child abuse increased by 50 percent in Oregon. While better reporting is responsible for part of the increase, more abuse is occurring. While it is hard to argue with the view that child abuse and juvenile delinquency are high priority areas, we must also realize that adequate child care can be a major factor in the prevention of abuse and neglect. The chief of Multnomah County's Protective Services Division has said, "What we are dealing with is a lot of people who
are leaving their children unattended - 9 year olds taking care of 4 year olds - while mom and dad are out working."

B. Parents, Community and Business Roles

"Fifty-seven percent of mothers with children under eighteen now work, as do 42 percent of mothers of children under three. Two-thirds of all single mothers work, three-fifths of all husband-wife families have two wage earners, and half of all children in two-parent families have both parents employed.

Despite these trends, most corporate policymakers continue to behave as if their employees lived in "traditional" families, with fathers going to work and mothers staying home. Only one in nine American families now fits that description."

Working parents ultimately have the responsibility of finding care for their children and paying for an increasing share of the cost. Too often there is little time in a working parent's day to check the quality of care or to change providers frequently, unless there is a significant problem.

Your Committee was struck by the following example:

"Kay M. is a single, working mother supporting two small children. Her entry level job pays a gross salary of $650 per month. Her preschool children spend days at a Northeast child care center. Kay has no car and must catch a bus with her children from their home in Southeast Portland; transfer to get to the child care center in Northeast Portland; then return to the city center to get to work. The children started attending this center before the family moved and enjoy it so much their mother accepts the extra travel time.

"Kay qualified for marginal help with child care through ADS (Adult & Family Services). In 1980 she had to pay $60 a month of the care cost, but with decreased state assistance, she must now pay $160 a month. After food, clothing and housing essentials, Kay has only $30 a month in "disposable" income. She wants to stay off welfare and treasures her independence, but she feels the pressure of this decision daily."

In the Portland area in 1980 there were approximately 63,609 children, 9 years old or younger, in need of day care. In 1981, only 11,000 children were served by child care centers or registered family day care homes.

Most children receive care from informal, unregistered family day care providers. These providers are an integral part of the community role in delivery of day care services. They offer facilities, programs, informa-
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24. From an interview with Thomas Tison, Director, St. Vincent de Paul Child Development Center.
tion and support. Many parents prefer family day care situations because they perceive them as less "institutional", with a home-like atmosphere, more flexibility and, usually lower cost. Because the majority of family day care users are single or low-income parents who must spend up to one-third of their gross income on child care, cost is an important factor.

Some community resources (such as YMCA Latch Key) are being strangled by the loss of federal dollars which are not yet being picked up by the private sector (see Section G.4.b.). Many child care centers are non-profit and rely heavily on community support from United Way or other grants and donations. As noted, United Way has been instrumental in funding seven child care centers in the metro area, with a capacity of about 800 children. In 1981, their contribution to the centers varied from 18 to 33 percent of operating budgets.

West Tuality center has been innovative in meeting its community needs in an area that has both rural and urban populations with a great diversity of needs.

4C's new grant funding will enable them to meet many needs, including consulting with employers to develop appropriate day care services and expansion of their I&R system.

Witnesses stated that a problem that continues to exist within the community is lack of a support and training system for family day care providers (see Section A.3.). Family day care providers, in particular, exist in isolation. There is no community-wide network, either formal or informal, for many of these people to exchange ideas, learn early childhood education skills, or exchange toys and equipment. Nor is there a system for these providers to back up one another during times of illness or vacation. An information and referral system could help establish such a network.

For the most part, the corporate business community has been slow to respond to employment-related child care needs. The response to your Committee's questionnaire seems to support this general lack of concern. Employers counter with the fact that employees have not clamored for help with this problem.

The lack of hard data on problems associated with inadequate day care has forced employers to make uninformed decisions regarding child care options for themselves and their employees. I&R services can supply the data on which to base informed, intelligent decisions.

Businesses have several options when confronted with employment-related day care problems. A few have chosen on-site facilities. For some of them this has been successful. However, even for large firms which could provide the facilities, an on-site center may not be the best choice. The immediate concerns to both management and employees are 1) the dilution of profits in a company with a profit-sharing plan, where not all employees would use the child care service and 2) the lack of an adequately trained staff to administer the center.

Your Committee also found that locally there is insufficient interest and employee participation in employer-sponsored centers for the centers to be a viable option in most cases. In 1981, the only employers the Committee was aware of who sponsored care were Holladay Park Hospital and Multnomah County. Both of these facilities finally had to accept children of non-employees in order to justify remaining open.
While this lack of employee support seems contrary to popular assumptions, the Committee perceived a number of social and emotional factors working against on-site care. Parents often believe that their children should be cared for in their own neighborhoods, as close to home as possible. In addition, many parents want to keep their working lives separate from their family lives and responsibilities. For these reasons, your Committee rejected on-site, employer-sponsored day care facilities as the best solution.

This does not mean there is nothing business can do. Options include: flex-time or job sharing, allowing parents to participate in co-op care centers; a voucher system whereby the employer subsidizes day care at the facility of the parent/employee's choice; a "cafeteria-style" benefit system, where life or health insurance or vacation time can be traded for child care benefits; or direct employer subscription to a child care I&R system for use by its employees.

It would be most appropriate for business to become directly involved in the support of an area-wide I&R system, with both cash contributions and in-kind gifts. Computer technology, management expertise and other skills that already exist in the business community could be applied to the problem at a relatively low cost. And of course, they make up one of the sectors that stands to gain from a reliable child care system. While few studies have been done on productivity and child care, those that exist strongly support the hypothesis that reduced absenteeism and increased productivity are rewards of adequate child care provisions. Further, these provisions may improve employee morale and help employers eliminate a persistent source of employee dissatisfaction.

Participation in an I&R system can provide an inexpensive, effective employee benefit, especially when employees are represented by a strong bargaining unit that might very well demand more expensive, but not necessarily better, solutions. In many cases, child care problems are merely a low-grade annoyance to employers; they are not a major concern, but they just don't go away. I&R seems an inexpensive and painless way for business to offer solutions.

C. Information and Referral (I&R)

The lack of complete, current information on child care providers and users continues to be a major problem. From the users' point of view, it is a problem because providers do not advertise in a central place. Referrals are usually made by word-of-mouth. If a user is new in a neighborhood, needs immediate care, or has to change child care providers, finding those providers can be a difficult task.

Currently, there are several I&R services operating in Portland. A few serve individual neighborhoods, and one serves most of the metro area. But funding for these services has been cut. To serve I&R needs adequately, a computerized service is needed because parents/employees are highly mobile with constantly changing needs. Only a computerized service would have the capacity, speed and flexibility to maintain current records for the entire metro area.

It has been impossible for the Committee to ascertain the total number of care providers or to assess the unmet need because of the lack of available data. In addition to a computerized telephone referral system, a com-
prehensive I&R system is needed to gather data to indicate levels of need for services and funding.

VI. A MODEL CHILD CARE RESOURCE CENTER

Your Committee has envisioned a model that we feel would meet most needs in the most realistic manner. The main component is an I&R system to be used both for matching needs and for comprehensive data gathering and analysis. This system would consist of a centralized, computerized data base of all users and providers. Information would be updated quarterly to provide current, useful information. A centralized I&R system appears to be the most efficient and effective for the metro area. Although your Committee considered individual I&R services in various centers, this ultimately appeared to be confusing to users, less cost-effective, and possibly a duplication of services.

Other aspects of the model include training providers, possibly on a contractual basis with community colleges, and establishing a neighborhood network support system to combat the isolation problems of family day care providers. A lending library, equipment, materials and backup support could be made available to these providers. Another important function would be intergovernmental liaison to monitor, advise, and help revise regulations and process funding requests.

Start up financing should come from mainly private sources using dollar or in-kind donations and grants. (A simple survey included in utility bills—the results of which would be fed into the computerized data base—is an example of an in-kind donation.) State and federal funds could be used as available. Operating costs would be covered by direct subscriptions from businesses (fees for service).

4C's current programs meet most of our basic requirements. The recent federal grant awarded to 4C will allow for a new emphasis on employer's needs. However, even with this additional funding, 4C does not have the resources to train providers, maintain a neighborhood network support system, or staff its extensive library. And, as mentioned previously, local funds still must be raised to purchase a computer. Only computerized information will allow for analysis of levels of need for services and funding, and, therefore, for informed decisions by employers and government agencies.

In this current recession as in no other time in the past three decades, many parents are left without the means to meet their responsibilities in acquiring adequate day care for their children. Unless help is forthcoming from the community, federal and state government, and the employer, the problem will become much greater and more complex than ever before.

"We are guilty of many faults, but our worst crime is abandoning the children, neglecting the fountain of life. Many of the things we need can wait. The children cannot. Right now is the time his bones are being formed, his blood is being made and his senses are being developed. To him we cannot answer 'Tomorrow.' His name is 'Today'."

25. Gabriella Minstral, Nobel Prize-winning poet from Chile.
VII. CONCLUSIONS

1. Linking child care providers and users is a major problem. A centralized, computerized Information & Referral (I&R) service is needed to provide complete and current information to providers and users in the Portland Metro area.

2. Comprehensive data on child care providers, users, need for care, income and other factors is either unavailable or inaccurate. This lack of data prevents adequate planning and delivery of services at all levels. In addition to a computerized telephone referral system, an I&R service should provide comprehensive data gathering and analysis.

3. There is no single "best" method of child care, but your Committee finds that family day care is the most widely used type of child care.

4. The type of child care preferred is a personal, individual matter based on the values of the parents. "Quality" is difficult to measure and impossible to judge impartially. A computerized data base of day care options would help solve problems of matching parents' values with types of providers.

5. Paying for child care is a major problem. Costs of child care vary greatly, depending on the type of care provided. It is clear that parents' outlay for child care will increase as costs rise and subsidies are reduced and eliminated. In some cases, this places an impossible financial burden on parents.

6. Government has not provided adequate funds to meet the child care needs of low income workers, and probably will not.

7. The business and professional community does not generally consider employee day care needs as a corporate social responsibility and for the most part has been reluctant to become part of the solution.

8. The participation of business, government, the community and the care providers must be strengthened and upgraded, to help parents meet their responsibilities for their children's care. The lack of adequate, affordable child care is a problem that affects all segments of society.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The community needs a central, metropolitan Child Care Resource Center. The major component of this Center should be a computerized Information and Referral (I&R) Service. The computerized information would link providers and users, as well as develop an accurate data base for planning and delivering child care services. The Child Care Resource Center would also include training for child care providers and parents and a lending library, which would foster a program of networking among providers and parents. Financing should include in-kind contributions, grants, direct payment for services (subscriptions), and loaned personnel. This could eventually develop into a statewide system, allowing for a broader funding base.

The Child Care Coordinating Council (4C), a local, private, non-profit agency, has recently received a federal grant to establish a computerized I&R Service and to survey local businesses concerning employees' child care needs. However, the computerized service, to be fully im-
implemented, still requires local funding. We find that 4C's programs successfully incorporate the basic ideas and structure of the model Center that we envision. Thus, we recommend using this existing agency as the basis for a larger, more comprehensive system.

2. Business should recognize and accept child care as a valid and legitimate element which must be addressed at the corporate level on behalf of the workforce.

Business should provide child care information on site. This could be done via a bulletin board, a company newsletter, subscription to a comprehensive Information and Referral Service or other methods.

Corporate personnel policies should be reviewed with the goal of including flextime, shared-time, and multiple fringe ("cafeteria style") benefit packages that could help parents/workers arrange day care. All income levels should be considered. Subsidies or vouchers may be appropriate at low income levels, while at higher income levels there may be mutual tax advantages to direct day care payments in lieu of salary increases.

Local employers should look at federal tax incentives for day care provision and facilities.

3. Legislators at both state and federal levels should continue to fight for day care dollars in an attempt to restore prior levels of funding.

4. Neighborhood associations and community agencies, as well as local foundations, should be more responsive and assist in the development of alternatives to formal child care programs that cannot serve the needs of all parents. Further, they should cooperate fully with any I&R service established by providing input and information from their own areas.

5. The Human Services Standing Committee of the City Club of Portland should closely monitor the progress made on the recommendations listed above. Specifically targeted for monitoring would be:

a. The establishment and maintenance of a central computerized Information and Referral System; and

b. Business acceptance and implementation of child care-oriented policies, such as flextime, optional benefit packages, and child care information for employees.

Respectfully Submitted,*

Olive Barton  
Gail Brown-Arend  
Barbara N. Chalmers  
Mark A. Jensen  
Helen Lindgren

*Your Committee wishes to thank Rev. Alan G. Deale, Richard F. Liebman, Nancy Fuhrman and Joan E. Swinney who participated in earlier stages of the study. Jane Sterrett served on special assignment as the committee's report editor. We are particularly indebted to our Research Advisor, Ann Kottkamp, for her contributions during the course of the study.
Approved by the Research Board on January 27, 1983 for transmittal to the Board of Governors. Received by the Board of Governors on February 14, 1983 and ordered published and distributed to the membership for consideration and action on April 8, 1983.

APPENDIX A

Persons Interviewed

Donny Adair, Director of Personnel, Emanuel Hospital
Ethel Adams, President, Day Care Mothers Association
Alice Anderson, Program Director, North Portland Latch Key Program, St. Johns Day Care Center
Victoria Baum, Attorney and Chairman, Board of Directors, Forest Park Children's Center
Margaret Browning, Director, Helen Gordon Center for Child Development, Portland State University
Joyce Cohen, Oregon State Representative, District 24
Alice Collins, Professor, Portland State University (retired)
Carole Dendurent, Director, Canterbury Day School, Inc.
Joan Dunn, Director, Fruit and Flower Child Care Center
Arthur Emlen, Ph.D., Professor of Social Work, and Director, Regional Research Institute for Human Services, Portland State University
Leslie Faught, Director, Child Care Coordinating Council
Robert Frisbee, Assistant to Multnomah County Commissioner Earl Blumenauer
Ruth Hocks, former Administrator, Holladay Park Hospital
Vera Katz, Oregon State Representative, District 8
Jan Kubli, Director, Holladay Park Hospital Child Care Center
Barbara MacEwan, Day Care Coordinator, Adult and Family Services Division, State of Oregon
Judy Maloney, Director, Multnomah County Day Care, Inc.
Leilani Pennel, Program Administrator, Clackamas Child Day Care Centers, Inc.
David Porter, Director, North Portland Latch Key Program, St. Johns Day Care Center
Robin Ranck, Director, Mt. Park Home Owner's Association Play School
Jan Rich, Manager, Day Care Unit, Children's Services Division, State of Oregon
Pat Rumer, Director, Neighbor Network Child Care Demonstration Project
Annie Terry, M.D.
Thomas Tison, Director, St. Vincent de Paul Development Center
Claire Weddle, Director, West Tuality Child Care Services, Inc.

In January 1982, the Committee surveyed the following members of the business community:

Mike Cunningham, Employee Relations Manager, Port of Portland
Robert Himmelright, Personnel Manager, Wacker Siltronic Corp
Robert Lawrence, Manager, Personnel, Jantzen, Inc.
A.E. Manseth, Labor Relations, Pacific Northwest Bell
Richard Sermone, Director of Personnel, Intel Corporation
Tom Sloan, Vice President, Human Resources, Tektronix, Inc.
Del White, Personnel Director, White Stag Apparel
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APPENDIX C

Committee Questionnaire

1. Does your corporation consider child care a corporate concern and is it committed to helping to solve the problem?

2. Are there options in your benefits package that allow employees to make a choice of what is best for them where child care needs are involved (employee sick leave in case of an ill child, more vacation time in lieu of life insurance, stock bonus, etc.)?

3. Has your corporation had any plans for child care benefits or support for a day care facility in the past? Had you considered the possibility of an on-site center or partial financial support of one? Do you have any such future plans for this, or to cover any part of child care costs?

4. Would your corporation consider becoming a member of a consortium of other business firms to explore long-range solutions to the metropolitan child care problem?

5. Would your corporation be willing to contribute dollars or in kind services (legal, accounting, data processing, etc.) to such a consortium endeavor?