



DC Family Policy Seminar

A community service project of Georgetown University

“The Child Care Crisis in the District of Columbia: Can (or *Should*) Businesses Fill the Gap?”



BACKGROUND BRIEFING REPORT

The DC Family Policy Seminar provides accurate, relevant, non-partisan, timely information and policy options concerning issues affecting children and families to District policymakers.

The DC Family Policy Seminar is part of the National Network of State Family Policy Seminars, a project of the Family Impact Seminars, a nonpartisan public policy institute in Washington, D.C.

A collaborative project of the Georgetown University Graduate Public Policy Institute (GPPI) and its affiliate, the National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health (NCEMCH). The mission of the DC FPS is to provide District policymakers with accurate, relevant, nonpartisan, timely information and policy options concerning issues affecting children and families.

DC Family Policy Seminar

A community service project of Georgetown University

“The Child Care Crisis in the District of Columbia: Can (or *Should*) Businesses Fill the Gap?”

BACKGROUND BRIEFING REPORT

By

Helena K. Wallin

Donna Ruane Morrison, Ph.D., and Shelley Stark (eds.)

Organization and resource lists prepared by
Helena K. Wallin and Antoinette Z. Laudencia

Georgetown University
Graduate Public Policy Institute

March 6, 1997

Abstract

As increasing numbers of women with young children have entered the workforce, pragmatic problems associated with the management of both work and family lives have gained more visibility. Progressive businesses have started “work and family” policies to help their employees cope with these stresses and have begun to reap the returns of higher productivity, lower absenteeism and turnover, and greater company loyalty. Many businesses are also enhancing their traditional benefits packages of health insurance and expanded family and medical leave policies by offering on-site child care, child care referral lines, and “savings accounts” for child care expenses to relieve the burden facing some of their employees.

In the District of Columbia, where 60 percent of children under the age of six have a parent in the workforce, finding affordable and quality child care can be an enormous challenge to working parents. Moreover, the recent loss of subsidized child care slots and the closing of many family child care homes—at the same time that welfare to work policies will be pushing more mothers into the workforce—further exacerbates the child care dilemma. Businesses are in a strong position to take leadership in addressing the current child care crisis. Doing so not only meets civic responsibility, but is also directly tied to the corporate “bottom line.”

This report provides a brief introduction to the issues addressed by the DC Family Policy Seminar on March 6, 1997. The authors thank the numerous individuals in the District of Columbia Government and in local and national organizations for contributing their time and efforts to this seminar. In particular, it is important to recognize Bobbi Blok of the Washington Child Development Council for her leadership as advisor and as executive director of the host agency for the seminar. Special thanks are given to Shelley Stark, Vince Hutchins, Donna Ruane Morrison, Carol Mandel, and the staff of the National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health for their invaluable assistance in hosting this seminar, and to Richard Murphy and the staff of the Academy for Educational Development for providing space and technical assistance.

“The Child Care Crises in the District of Columbia: Can (or *Should*) Businesses Fill the Gap?”

This seminar is the 15th in a series designed to bring a family focus to policymaking. The panel features the following speakers:

- **Barbara Ferguson Kamara**, Executive Director, Office of Early Childhood Development
- **Donna Klein**, Director, Work-Life Programs, Marriott International, Inc.
- **Carolyn York**, Assistant Director of Women's Rights, American Federation for State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)

This seminar focuses on child care issues in the District of Columbia and aims to provide research and program information on how businesses may assist in solving the current child care crisis. The organizers of this seminar hope to encourage increased collaboration among community, government, and business members to ensure accessible, affordable quality child care for working families in the District. This background report summarizes the essentials on several topics. It provides an overview of the increased need for affordable quality child care in the nation and in the District; presents research concerning the effects of family-friendly employee benefits on employers bottom line; highlights innovative family-friendly business practices; and links the federal government's current role in encouraging employer response to this issue. The contents of this briefing report are as follows:

I. Introduction	2
II. Family Policies and the Bottom Line.....	4
III. Innovative Family-Friendly Programs	7
IV. Connecting Government Policies with Business Practices	10
V. Conclusion	13
Appendices	
Appendix A: District Resources.....	16
Appendix B: National Resources.....	22
Works Cited	26
About the DC Family Policy Seminars.....	28

I. Introduction

The changing demographics of the workplace are creating unique challenges for employers across the nation as a whole, as well as in the District of Columbia. Current economic conditions have given rise to increasing numbers of families with young children who must rely on two wage earners, and a large share of workers with children are single parents and the sole breadwinners. Recent estimates suggest a drop in the number of child care providers across the country and an increase in costs in the current child care marketplace. Moreover, welfare reform legislation will place additional burdens on the child care slots available for the children of working mothers.

The ability of employees to locate affordable, quality care in the District that is convenient and flexible should be of concern to employers.¹ When employees struggle to work out suitable child care arrangements on a daily basis as well as when special circumstances arise (e.g., caring for a sick child), it affects not only their personal lives, but their productivity on the job. While government agencies have been charged with underwriting funding for child care for low-income parents, private industry has a role to play in alleviating the child care dilemma as well. This briefing report will investigate the role that businesses can play as partners in addressing this issue for all employees—entry level through management—and will highlight the positive effect such initiatives can have on the corporate “bottom line.”

Background

The large-scale participation of women in the workforce, including those with young children, is a current fact of life for employees and shows no sign of receding.

¹For a detailed look at the child care debate for low-income working families, please read our September 1995 Briefing Report by Keri Whitacre and William Gormely, entitled *Caring for Our Children: Meeting the Needs of Working Families in the District*.

Currently, 58 percent of married women are in the labor force nationally and demographers expect that figure to rise in the coming decades (Clark, 1992). While many women might desire the challenge that working outside the home brings, the majority of women work out of economic necessity to defray the rising costs of raising a family and maintaining a household. For instance, in the 1950s, housing costs consumed 14 percent of an average American’s gross income, compared to 44 percent in the mid 1980s (Clark, 1992). Moreover, increasing numbers of women who are single parents are entering the workforce as the sole wage earner to support their family. In 1995, 74 percent of divorced women were participating in the labor force and sustaining a family in the absence of a second wage earner (Bureau of Labor Statistics, unpublished data, March 1995). In the District of Columbia, it is estimated that only 37 percent of children are growing up with both parents in the home (Washington Child Development Council [WCDC], 1996).

When the primary or secondary breadwinner is also the traditional caregiver for the children, working families need to arrange for the care of their preschool and school-age children, whether for the full day or after-school hours. Some families solve the challenge through shift work or alternate schedules but the majority rely on formal and informal child care arrangements. Perhaps in response to the “juggling act” that employment and child-rearing often entails for families, many families report a sense that work has taken over much of their private lives. This sentiment is reflected in the findings of a 1990 Roper Organization Poll. For the first time ever, more respondents (41 percent) said that the most important thing in their lives was leisure rather than work (36 percent). A CNN-Time poll in 1991 found that 61 percent of workers they interviewed felt that work and earning a living interfered with their ability to enjoy life (cited in Clark, 1992). Men, women, and their families seem to have entered a conundrum of sorts: parents need to work to support their children financially, yet, for

many, work interferes with their ability to spend a desired amount of time with the family they are supporting. Difficulties with child care are often at the center of these struggles.

Recent studies illuminate the effects that child care problems have on parents. Sixty-two percent of parents report that finding quality child care is the largest problem they encounter related to child care (Galinsky, 1994). Child care is often arranged informally via family members or unlicensed caregivers, or through a series of differing arrangements for different days of the week (Ferber and O'Farrell, 1991; Galinsky, Bond and Friedman, 1993). Unfortunately, 26 percent of employed parents with children under the age of 13 find that their child care arrangements have broken down in the past three months (Galinsky, Bond and Friedman, 1993).

In the District of Columbia, finding adequate care is difficult, due to both the growing number of preschool-age children and the lack of affordable care. In 1994, there were 50,000 children under the age of five living in the District—an 11 percent increase since 1990 (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1996). With 60 percent of children under the age of six having a parent in the labor force, child care is a necessity for many District families. Unfortunately, it is estimated that the number of available and regulated child care arrangements falls short of meeting the needs of approximately 62 percent of the potential demand for these services (WCDC, 1996). Consequently, parents may either be forced to place their children in unregulated (and potentially substandard) child care, or find alternate arrangements while they wait for a child care slot to open up.

Special Challenges in the District

Poverty exacerbates the problem of finding child care for many District families. In 1993, 37 percent of all children were living in poverty, with 23 percent living in extreme poverty—that is, with an income below 50 percent of the federal poverty level (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1996). The

District has subsidized child care services for 5,500 working families, but this is not enough to serve the hundreds of children whose families are unable to locate affordable care. In fact, the District has lost \$4 million in government funding for child care services over the last two years, which has led to cutting hundreds of subsidized slots and leaving many working poor families without help to pay for child care. Child care advocates in the District are also concerned that the existing subsidies do not cover the actual cost of providing care. Moreover, recent reports indicate that local funding for the upcoming fiscal year will be “revenue neutral” and will not expand to compensate for the influx of more working mothers into the workforce. Consequently, numerous child care centers are not able to offer subsidized slots since the centers themselves must make up the \$6 to \$14 difference per child per day in order to meet the market rate (WCDC, 1996).

The recent welfare reform legislation will place additional burdens on the District's child care community. Not only is the District currently unable to fund enough child care slots for its existing working poor population, but approximately 4,500 more children are expected to need child care when their mothers are required to move from welfare into the workforce. While more federal funding has been allocated to help defray the costs of child care for District mothers returning to work, it is not enough to cover the amount already lost in cutbacks over recent years. Another problem the DC child care community is experiencing is the loss of licensed family child care centers due to increased costs associated with licensing (WCDC, 1996). All told, the District of Columbia government and its agencies will face a daunting challenge in reaching its federally mandated welfare-to-work goals, due to child care limitations.

Child Care is Everybody's Business

Child care is clearly a strong concern for working parents in the nation as a whole as well as here in the District. Families are concerned with

finding quality child care for their children, affordable rates, and continuous care. Government agencies are overwhelmed by the growing need to expand child care services in response to the new welfare legislation (e.g., child care during job training, transitional child care programs for mothers leaving welfare for work). Welfare-to-work will not be possible without child care facilities and providers for the District's working poor families. Businesses are also concerned that the indirect costs of employee child care problems translate into losses in productivity.

Fortunately, some businesses and advocacy groups are becoming aware of the importance of a strong balance between the work life and family life of employees. In particular, child care issues have risen to become an essential part of the work and family life agenda. By helping employees to access affordable quality child care, businesses are finding out not only that they can help alleviate a major stressor in the lives of both their male and female employees, but also that they can actually see benefits in their own balance sheet due to decreased absenteeism and increased productivity. However, not all employers have responded to this need among their employees. While some employers are not able to respond for practical reasons (e.g., due to their small size), others are not aware of the impact that work/family issues, particularly child care, have on their employees.

In the following section, we present a variety of ways in which attention to child care issues increases employee satisfaction with their jobs as well as productivity.

II. Family Policies and the Bottom Line

Corporations consider the effect of personnel policies on their profits or other "bottom-line" outcomes. Businesses most often look at employee *output* in terms of how it affects their bottom line. For example, a manufacturer may look at how many products an employee assembles by the hour

or day and how shift work or part-time work will affect the number of products leaving the plant. While *inputs* are measured to test how they affect output, these inputs are generally the number of workers and the type of capital used in manufacturing the product. Measuring the impact of family policies in the work place requires a closer examination of the factors that make the most important *input*—the employee—function at his or her highest capacity. Researchers in the family and work field have identified three variables for businesses to look at when considering the impact of family policies in their workplace: turnover, absenteeism, and productivity.

Productivity

One argument on behalf of strong family policies at work is related to increased productivity of workers. Accountants and financial analysts understand that worker productivity is essential if company net receipts are going to grow. Productivity studies find that workers account for about 50 percent or more of controllable costs in most industries. In higher labor-intensive companies (e.g., government, services), workers account for nearly 70 to 80 percent of company costs (Friedman, 1991). While there has been much discussion concerning the physical and emotional needs of employees in relation to productivity, only now is research providing empirical support for views that were once based only on anecdotal evidence.

According to recent research, productivity is a large part of the work and family discussion. In terms of pregnancy and maternal leave policies, research findings suggest that pregnancy does cause a predicted "dip" in productivity due to days missed before pregnancy and on the job slow-down when employees feel ill during pregnancy. For instance, studies show that about 19 percent of pregnant women have health problems that interfere with their work and 38 percent often go to work in spite of feeling ill (Bond, 1992). However, these negative effects can be mitigated by flexible and supportive leave policies for women. Bond

(1992) describes the following findings with respect to a study conducted by the National Council of Jewish Women, Center for the Child.² The study divided companies according to their score on specific fringe benefits that address the needs and concerns of employees with families. Some of the fringe benefits include: health insurance coverage, significant time off for medical needs and parental leave, assistance with finding child care, and an understanding from supervisors concerning individual needs (Bond, 1992, p. 6). Companies that scored high on the fringe benefits were categorized as “highly accommodating,” and those that scored low were labeled “unaccommodating.” The study found the following results for all employees (full-time and part-time workers from different occupational groups):

- Job satisfaction: 73 percent of women in highly accommodating workplaces said they were very satisfied with their jobs, compared to 41 percent in unaccommodating workplaces.
- Job performance: Women in highly accommodating workplaces were 37 percent more likely to spend uncompensated time doing job-related work outside their regular work hours, compared to 25 percent for women in unaccommodating workplaces.
- Length of time pregnant women work: only 2 percent of women in highly accommodating workplaces stopped before their seventh month of pregnancy, while 16 percent of women in unaccommodating workplaces stopped working before their seventh month.

One study found that child care concerns affected concentration and thus productivity of 50 percent of women and 33 percent of men. A similar survey of the Adolf Coors Company found that 36 percent of employees reported a decline in pro-

ductivity due to child care concerns of their *co-workers* (Friedman, 1991). Thus, working parents bring much of their stress concerning adequate, available, and affordable child care to the workplace, disrupting their usual patterns of productive work.

Absenteeism

Employees are absent from work for a number of reasons, including: personal illness, illness of a child or elderly relative, and inability to arrange for child care. Showing up for work may also depend on an individual’s motivation, job satisfaction, and loyalty. Motivation can be affected (as we saw implied in some of the research above) by “the availability of support from the family, the community, and the company” (Friedman, 1991, p. 13). In the same study discussed by Bond (1991) above, rates of employee absenteeism differ depending on whether the employee works for an “accommodating” or “unaccommodating” workplace. In highly accommodating workplaces, women more than eight months pregnant missed only 2.1 days of work due to illness, compared to 3.4 days for women in unaccommodating workplaces.

While days and periods of absenteeism in the workplace are easy to quantify, reasons for the missed days are not always easy to measure, and the indirect implications of child care problems (e.g., arriving late to work, stress during the day over child care arrangements) are more linked to productivity than absenteeism. Data show that employees with children miss (on average) less than one day a year due to child care problems (Galinsky, Bond, and Friedman, 1993). Other studies show that 72 percent of employees who arrived late to work or left work early had to do so because of family obligations (Friedman, 1991). A study of Allstate employees found that 50 percent of their employees arrived late or left early at least five times in the previous three months due to child care concerns. Breakdowns in child care arrangements are also a source of lost days from

²Josef and Ward (November 1987). *Accommodating Pregnancy in the Workplace*. New York: National Council of Jewish Women, Center for the Child.

work reported by 15 percent of the mothers surveyed in the 1990 National Child Care Survey. Problems with child care arrangements thus cause disruptions to the work life of parents and thus indirectly affect their productivity.

Even if they have regular care arrangements in place, parents disrupt their work day or are absent when their children are sick. The 1990 National Child Care study found that children under the age of 12 were sick five days a year, on average. Parents have a number of options when deciding how to take care of their sick child on a work day. One hospital reported that 36 percent of their parents took a day without pay, 30 percent took a personal sick day, and 24 percent took vacation time to deal with a sick child. Employees in the most marginal sectors of the economy may risk job loss if they fail to report to work on a given day. Another study at the Manville Corporation looked at why parents lost time from work when their children were sick. Two-thirds of the respondents did not want their children home sick alone, one-quarter did not know a provider for sick children, and one-fifth could not afford one (Friedman, 1991). Though the reported rate of absenteeism related to child care (less than one day per year) may appear low, is possible that these data are underreported. Nonetheless, there is a clear linkage between stressors related to child care and worker productivity.

Turnover

There are two diverging schools of thought with respect to turnover and the bottom line. Some managers view employees as “easily replaceable” and are not concerned with the impact that hiring new employees has on their bottom line when employees leave. Another school of thought finds that employee turnover is a factor in lagging productivity in this country. In fact, “because of its hidden inefficiencies, high turnover results in products being delayed in research and development (R&D), deferred achievement of optimum manufacturing efficiencies, slower market penetra-

tion, and so on” (Phillips and Reisman, 1992). Beyond output inefficiencies, companies are beginning to take note of their high costs of training and recruiting. There is a need to retain their superior employees not only to defray the costs of hiring others, but to ensure that they maintain the quality of their workforce.

The 1990 National Child Care Survey found that 25 percent of mothers left their previous job for “family reasons.” The survey also found that 5 percent of mothers left their last job for child care reasons. Studies report the following findings about turnover and family related stress (U.S. Census, 1987; Bond, 1987; Rodgers and Associates, 1988):

- In 1984, 42 percent of full-time working women had at some point in their careers interrupted work for six months or longer due to family reasons (e.g., to care for a newborn child or a sick family member).
- An estimated 16 percent of new mothers do not return to their jobs after maternity leave.
- Between 1985 and 1988, the proportion of women who considered leaving work altogether due to family responsibilities increased by 50 percent, and about 50 percent considered quitting their present job to work for a company with more flexibility.

There are a number of hidden and visible variables that employers must consider when determining the cost of turnover in their organization. While many employers may find it “simpler” to hire another employee if a parent takes parental leave, the costs associated with such a hire may be more expensive than readily apparent. Table 1 provides estimates of how much it cost one company to replace a middle manager employee.

While large businesses must keep a job (or a job of similar worth) open to a parent taking time off for childbirth, in accord with the 1993 Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) legislation, small businesses (exempt from FMLA) need to weigh the

Table 1: Impact of Employee Replacement on the Corporate Bottom Line

<i>Variable*</i>	<i>Estimated impact</i>	<i>Cost**</i>
Incoming employee inefficiency (h)*	13.5 months, on average, to reach 100% efficiency	\$18,600
Inefficiency of supervisor and co-workers (h)	% time each day devoted to assist new employee: estimated 14% for supervisor, 12% for other staff	\$11,700
Departing employee inefficiency (h)	Efficiency declines 3 months before departure	\$2,200
Impact of departing employee inefficiency on remaining employees (h)	10% time lost each day, on average	\$800
Inefficiency while position is vacant (h)	Position vacant 13 weeks on average	\$19,000
Out of pocket processing costs (v)	Search, outplacement fees, advertising, orientation, training, etc.	\$2,400
Human Resources (HR) costs (v)	Time, cost, relocation for staff	\$900
Non-HR costs (v)	On average, 25 hours for supervisors, 18 for exempt staff, 6 for nonexempt staff	\$2,500
Relocation Costs (v)	Cost to move/relocate new employee	\$0
		TOTAL : \$58,100

Source: Adapted from J. Douglas Phillips and Barbara Reisman (1992). Turnover and Return on Investment Models for Family Leave. In Friedman, Galinsky, and Plowden (Eds.). *Parental Leave and Productivity: Current Research*. New York: Families and Work Institute.

*(h) indicates hidden variable, (v) indicates visible variable.

**Actual calculated costs for one middle management (exempt) employee in the research and development function at a chemical company.

costs associated with holding slots open versus replacement. As Table 1 indicates, replacing an employee, for any reason, is costly and thus a few preventative policies may save employers money in the long run.

III. Innovative Family-Friendly Programs

Innovative work and family policies have sprung up around the country in a variety of forms. From directly providing child care services or subsidies to their employees, to indirectly making it easier for parents to take care of their own children via flex time and telecommuting options, businesses are aware of and taking action on their employees' concerns about child care. In

the long run, businesses are counting on a return of their investment in the form of higher productivity, lower absenteeism and turnover, and higher company loyalty from their employees.

Employer-Aided Child Care Options

Businesses are using a number of solutions to help their working parents with child care options. Direct care services, financial assistance, flexible personnel policies, and information and education—these represent some of the cost-effective methods employers are exploring in order to support their working families.

Direct Care Services

Direct care services are hands-on services provided by employers to enhance child care options for their working parents. Options include (Josef and Ward, 1992):

- **Enhanced child care resource and referral (R&R) services:** Employers may provide these services directly, but many contract out this service to existing community based R&R agencies. Approximately 1,500 companies nationally offer this service.
- **Child care centers:** Employers subsidize the cost of the center either on-site or near-site for employees.
- **Family child care networks:** Employers may help to create a family child care network or contract for services from an existing network.
- **Emergency or drop-in child care:** To help employees when normal child care arrangements break down (e.g., sick provider, school systems closures), employers may contract out to R&R agencies or other community-based organizations to help find emergency or drop-in child care.
- **Care for mildly ill children:** Employers can contract out with a child care program for mildly ill children, or work with other employers in the area to develop a program for mildly ill children.
- **School-age child care:** Parents often worry about their children before and after school when their children are unattended. Employers may financially support: after-school family child care homes, programs in schools or community colleges, or community centers with programs for school-age children, or may sponsor “warm lines” for children to call in case they need companionship or advice by phone if their parents are unavailable.

Employee Financial Assistance

Some employers may have the ability to provide direct financial assistance to employed parents to pay for all or part of their child care. Josef and Ward (1992) list a variety of options:

- **Dependent Care Spending Accounts:** Through section 129 of the Internal Revenue Code, an employer may help employees with child care by putting pretax earnings into either a *flexible spending account* for child care only or a *flexible benefit program* for a variety of benefits. Employers may also contribute to this account to pay for some of the child care costs of their employees.
- **Discounts:** Employers may negotiate employee discounts with local child care providers.
- **Vouchers or direct subsidies:** Employers may subsidize or provide vouchers for particular child care programs.

Flexible Personnel Policies

Employers may also provide flexible personnel policies to help alleviate some of the child care burdens faced by employees. Today, many employers today use a range of options (Josef and Ward 1992), including:

- **Maternity and parental leave:** This leave (now required by law for employers with 50 or more employees) allows employees to take time off after childbirth or to care for a sick family member.
- **Sick and personal leave time:** Some employers allow employees to use sick or personal leave when parents need to stay home to care for their sick children.
- **Flexiplace:** This allows parents to work at home via telecommuting.
- **Alternative work schedules:** Flextime, compressed work week, voluntary reduced time programs, job-sharing, and part-time work are all examples of ways to give parents time to provide their own care for their children.

Information and Education

The information and education component of employer action to increase child care options for their employees covers some of the direct service issues listed above; however, this component works to increase the awareness of managers and supervisors about the child care needs of employees. These options (Josef and Ward, 1992) include :

- **Supervisor training:** Employers provide training to supervisors and managers to help them gain more sensitivity concerning employees' stresses and needs when balancing work and family life.
- **Employee information:** Seminars for employees on work and family issues, parenting workshops, or brown bag lunches are a good way to disseminate information on both how to balance work and family life effectively and how to find quality child care.
- **Education:** Many companies also produce newsletters and sponsor support groups for working parents.

Partnerships

Lastly, employers may band together and form their own child care partnership with other employers in the area. These partnerships can fund a near-site child care center for employees, jointly provide information and referral services for the community, or establish a sick-child care facility for their employees at one of the sites.

Model Employer Programs

Following are local model programs offered by big and small businesses that exemplify the movement to help working parents with child care needs:

D.C. General Hospital Child Development Center

This center was developed in 1987 by management not only to meet the need stated by employees, but also to recruit, hire, and retain D.C. General employees. The center serves children ages six weeks to five years, Monday through Friday 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Much of the center's operation is subsidized by the hospital, including meals, space, maintenance, utilities, phones, housekeeping, and laundry. Of the 32 children served, 17 slots are subsidized by the District government. The hospital union, AFSCME Local 1033, is hoping to expand the program to serve more children and add a school-age/summer program for the kids.

Marriott International, Inc.

Work-Life Programs are an integral part of the Marriott Corporation in the District of Columbia and nationwide. The Work-Life Programs help Marriott associates balance their work and home responsibilities. Marriott provides the following services to help with child care:

- **Resource Line:** a tollfree confidential program offering consultation and referral on a wide range of topics including: child and elder care referral to family child care homes, child care agencies, nurseries and preschools, nanny agencies, and back-up care for sick children.
- **Family Care Spending Account:** Associates can set aside pretax earnings to pay for child care.
- **Discount Directory Program:** This nationwide network of child care centers offers discounted tuition and/or registration fees to Marriott employees.
- **EF Au Pair:** Marriott helps to arrange (via the EF Au Pair company) live-in child care provided by European men and women ages 18-25, at an average cost of \$185 per week. Marriott employees receive a discount on

the program fee.

- **Alternative work arrangements:** The Work-Life department is available as a resource to discuss with managers and associates options to help balance work and family life more efficiently (e.g., flex-time or part-time arrangements, compressed work weeks, job-sharing, telecommuting).

Morrison & Foerster

Morrison & Foerster, an international law firm with an office in Washington, DC, has a number of family-friendly employee policies for non-partner attorneys and staff covering child care issues. Most notably, the firm offers a child care and eldercare referral service by a nationwide dependent care counseling and referral service (The Dependent Care Connection, Inc.), and emergency back-up care for the children of employees when their regular caregivers are not available (contracted with Lipton Corporation Child Care Emergency Child Care Center).

IV. Connecting Government Policies with Business Practices

While some businesses provide family-friendly policies and services out of concern for their workers and for the positive impact these policies have on their bottom line, recent federal policies encourage these practices as well.

Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993

The Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA or “the Act”) was the initial piece of legislation signed into law by President Clinton during his first term in office. The Act builds upon the 1979 Pregnancy Disability Act, which banned discrimination in the workplace on the basis of pregnancy. The FMLA is monumental since it guarantees the right of women and men to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave after the birth of a child and “requires the restoration of the employee to his or her position or an equivalent position upon return” from leave. The Act entitles an employee to

12 weeks of unpaid leave during any 12-month period for any of the following reasons (P.L. 103-3):

1. Birth of a child;
2. Placement of a child with employee for adoption or foster care;
3. Employee’s care of a child, spouse, or parent with a serious health condition; or
4. Employee’s own serious health condition, which renders that employee unable to perform the functions of his or her position.

The FMLA also authorized the formation of a two-year Commission on Leave to study the effects of the policy nationally. In 1995 the Commission released a study of its findings on both coverage and usage issues of the Act.

Coverage

The FMLA covers all employers with 50 or more employees and all public agencies, including state, local, and federal employers. In a 1995 study, 66.1 percent of the U.S. labor force (including private and public sector employees) were covered by the FMLA. One criticism of the FMLA is that it does not cover a majority of the private sector businesses in the U.S. because of the size restriction. While it is true that only 10.8 percent of the private sector worksites are covered by the FMLA, more than half of the nation’s private sector employees (59.5 percent) work for large companies that are covered by the FMLA (Department of Labor, 1996).

In the District of Columbia, this coverage involves an important issue, due to the nature of District workplaces. According to the 1990 Census, most of the District’s almost 304,000 resident employees (62 percent) work for private for-profit or not-for-profit companies and 32 percent work for local, state, or federal agencies. Many of the employees in the private sector work in the service or sales industry, and a number of those jobs are in small businesses with less than 50 employees (and thus are not covered by the FMLA).

Usage

The Commission on Leave found that while 86.5 percent of employers are aware of the FMLA and know whether or not they are covered, only 58.2 percent of employees at these covered sites have heard of the Act. The Commission found that knowledge of the FMLA was higher among employees who are salaried, unionized, and more highly educated. Though 40 percent of all employees surveyed indicated they anticipate using the Act in five years, only 16.8 percent had already taken leave for a reason covered by the FMLA. Of that group, only 7 percent designated their leave as FMLA leave (Department of Labor, 1996). This may be due to the fact that many employers and states have temporary disability policies, which sometimes allow up to eight weeks of paid leave due to childbirth (depending on the difficulty of delivery).

The cost associated with FMLA leave is another reason cited by employees for not using this leave. In the Commission's study, 63.9 percent of the employees stated that they could not afford the loss of wages during family leave (Department of Labor, 1996). Though the study explained that 46.7 percent of leave takers actually did have full wage replacement and 19.6 had at least partial wage replacement, it was found that wage replacement came generally from sick time, accumulated vacation time, or disability insurance. Wage replacement was found to occur most often among salaried employees, more highly educated employees, and unionized employees. Employees who are not union members, those who have the lowest levels of education and income, and Latinos are most likely not to receive any wages during leave. In fact, 9 percent of overall leave takers apply for public assistance to supplement their income during the time they take leave.

While the FMLA is a landmark bill intended to ease various stresses on family life (child birth, family illness), it is not a panacea for solving the nation's (and the District's) work-family dilemma.

In terms of child care, the FMLA is positioned to alleviate the need for finding child care for at least the first three months of the child's life, and to provide assistance in cases of medical emergencies. However, for many District of Columbia residents and workers, gaining access to the FMLA and compensating for the loss of wages are two difficult barriers to overcome in order to fully appreciate the usefulness of the Act.

Tax-Based Subsidies and Employer Incentives for Child Care

Paying for child care is a significant problem for many working parents. While not all families incur child care expenses,³ the average family spends \$79 per week per child in child care. This number can vary substantially depending on the age of the child and the location of the center—ranging from \$60 for a four-year-old in a rural family-owned center to \$240 for an infant in a child care center in the city (Stoney and Greenberg, 1996). There are a number of ways that the federal government provides tax subsidies to working families to help cover the cost of child care. On both the federal and the state level, tax subsidies take the form of tax credits, tax deductions for employees, and pretax programs. The subsidies are divided into two domains: federal and state.

Federal Tax-Based Subsidies

The Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit (CDCTC) is the largest tax-based subsidy for child care. Parents may receive up to 30 percent of the first \$2,400 of the cost of caring for a child under age 13. The percentage is higher for lower-income individuals, and the maximum amount of credit is \$720 for one child and \$1,440 for two or more children. The credit is nonrefundable, which means that families can “never recover more in credit than what they actually owe in taxes.” Thus, “families that have not earned enough to pay taxes

³Some families receive public assistance to pay for child care or receive care from a nonpaid family member.

but nevertheless have child care expenses cannot benefit from the credit” (Stoney and Greenberg, 1996, p. 86). In addition, amendments to the Family Support Act in 1988 modified the tax subsidy so that taxpayers can receive the credit only if they include the name, address, and taxpayer identification number of the dependent care provider. The number of claims under the CDCTC have dropped from 9 million to 6 million in the year following the modification to the Family Support Act. Critics of the CDCTC note that, although the credit is targeted to give a higher percentage of tax credit to lower-income families, in reality the benefits of CDCTC are primarily realized by higher-income families (Table 2).

Table 2: Working Families Receiving Child Care Dependent Tax Credit by Income

<i>Income</i>	<i>% Receiving CDCTC</i>
<\$20,000	14%
\$20,000–50,000	47%
\$50,000 or more	39%

Source: U.S. Internal Revenue Service. (1995). Statistics of income. *SOI Bulletin* 15,2. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.

Another federally supported tax provision is the employer-established Dependent Care Assistance Plan (DCAP). DCAP allows employees to use up to \$5,000 a year in pretax earnings for child care. Participating employers reduce the pay of an employee by \$5,000 a year and the employee receives a benefit for that same amount. This benefits both the employer and the employee since the employer saves on the social security tax and the employee saves on both the social security and the income tax. Since the DCAP is not a tax credit (rather, it reduces taxable income), it gives its greatest benefits to families in the highest tax bracket (Stoney and Greenberg, 1996).

State Tax-Based Subsidies

In addition to the federal tax subsidies, some states provide state tax subsidies. In 1994, 22 states and the District of Columbia offered subsidies to their working population. Additionally, 14 states provide Employer Tax Credits of 50 percent for employers who provide child care benefits to their employees. Unfortunately, the District of Columbia does not participate, and in states where this program is in place, it is not heavily used by employers (Stoney and Greenberg, 1996).

From the preceding review, it is obvious that many tax subsidies are available for working parents to help alleviate the financial strain of child care costs. However, many of these tax breaks are not geared for the lower-income workers due to the fact that the credits are nonrefundable. In the District of Columbia, which has a high percentage of low-income families and a median family income of \$21,000, this means that many families with the greatest need are not getting the greatest benefit out of these tax based programs.

Welfare Reform and Child Care

Though the welfare reform legislation does not focus on encouraging businesses to provide “family-friendly” initiatives, the new law will indirectly affect business practices as they hire new workers affected by the law. Many of these new workers will be struggling to find child care, and some businesses may be asked to “step up to the plate” to help with private sector solutions. President Clinton has already initiated a “Business Roundtable” and met with many of the Fortune 500 companies to look at solutions to many of the problems noted in regard to the new welfare legislation (namely job training, placement and child care).

Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 eliminated welfare support entitlements, formally known as

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). In its place, the Act created TANF, or Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, which provides a maximum of 60 months of support to families in need. The time limit is intended to encourage the use of welfare as a bridge to help parents get jobs rather than as a long term solution. The major impetus of TANF is to end the dependency of needy parents on government assistance by promoting personal responsibility via work and marriage.

However, the Act poses a unique challenge to policymakers around the country. The Act stipulates that 25 percent of the current welfare caseload must be off welfare and in the workforce by 1997, and 50 percent by 2002; however, it does not guarantee support to parents in terms of child care. The question asked around the country and here in the District is: How do we increase available quality child care for many of these parents leaving welfare for the workforce?

Child Care and TANF

The new law eliminated all of the federally supported categorical child care entitlement programs (At-Risk Child Care, Transitional Child Care, AFDC Child Care), consolidated the funding into the existing child care block grant (Child Care and Development Block Grant), and increased funding by \$6.6 billion over a six-year period, for a total of \$22 billion over the six years. The law requires states to maintain their own child care spending at 100 percent of their FY 1994 or FY 1995 levels (whichever is higher) to receive additional federal funds.

While states may receive more child care money than they are currently receiving, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that, given the work requirements for these welfare mothers, states will fall short of the child care expenditures they need by about \$2.4 billion. If states do not maintain their current spending on child care to receive the additional federal funding, this gap may grow even wider. The District of Columbia

must spend \$7.1 million to receive an estimated \$1.3 million in federal matching funds. Most, if not all, of these slots must be affordable enough for low-income working families.

Since many current welfare recipients will be going to work due to the implementation of the new TANF law, it is important to know in which industries many of these mothers potentially needing subsidized child care find work. The Florida Children's Forum study entitled "Parents Receiving Subsidized Child Care: Where do they Work?" (1996) determined that most mothers whose children currently received state subsidies for child care worked in the retail trade area, particularly in fast food or restaurant operations.

This information is important for policymakers and businesses for a number of reasons. First, work hours may be irregular or limited to hours during which it is difficult to find child care. Second, wages and salaries in these industries tend to be low, making it difficult for mothers who must now enter the work force to finance child care. Thus, one possible effect of the new TANF law here in the District is that the retail trade and services area will see a growing number applicants formerly on welfare, many of whom will have child care concerns. Businesses will need to anticipate how they will respond to these concerns in order to avoid high staff turnover and minimize absenteeism.

V. Conclusion

The District faces numerous child care challenges. Money is scarce, spaces are limited, and quality is of utmost concern for policymakers and parents. While this paper has outlined many opportunities for policies to support child care in the District, there are still a number of concerns on both the government and the business sides of the puzzle.

Low-Income vs. Upper/Middle-Income Policies

Many federal policies and business-friendly tax policies are discriminatory, offering child care support to middle/upper-income, educated, and unionized employees—their share of federal tax subsidies and incentives is higher and their ability to use the Family and Medical Leave Act is greater. Any changes to these policies need to look at reaching out to the lower-income working employees who have a great need for these benefits.

Welfare-to-Work Support

Many states have realized that welfare-to-work legislation is unrealistic and further supports are needed for families as they make the transition into the workforce. The District's current financial crises and the extreme lack of child care availability are making the transition even harder for many individuals moving from welfare to work. Including Fortune 500 businesses in discussions on helping with welfare reform on a national level is a beginning in addressing many of these issues, but must be augmented with a concerted similar effort here in the District.

Quality vs. Affordability

Even if more child care becomes available in the District of Columbia, it is imperative that quantity of slots (for low-income or others) does not jeopardize the quality of the care. Affordability is important as well, since substandard care may result if hasty efforts are made to develop child care alternatives to keep up with current need. Business leaders and government policymakers must acknowledge that affordable quality care is the goal of all programs to be developed.

Long-Term vs. Short-Term Benefits

In analyzing the efforts concerning child care and family-friendly policies in the work place,

businesses need to recognize the difference between short-term and long-term benefits. Though the cost of short-term responses to child care concerns (e.g., hiring temps to cover work shortages, investing in infrastructure for child care centers, subsidizing child care) may concern managers, recognizing and tracking long-term benefits such as increased productivity, greater loyalty, decreased absenteeism and turnover will validate the implementation of these benefit policies. Successful models have shown that businesses can care and have a reason to care about child care and family-friendly benefits for “bottom line” reasons.

Recommendations

In summary, businesses can support their employees with families here in the District in a number of ways. Following are a number of recommendations (by no means exhaustive) for local employers in conjunction with policymakers and communities, to help with the current child care crisis in the District of Columbia:

1. Extend child care benefits to all levels of employees (e.g., unionized and nonunionized; entry level and higher level).
2. Provide child care savings accounts to all employees (Dependent Care Assistance Plan).
3. Establish an on-site or near-site child care center for employees; for smaller employers, collaborate with other neighboring employers to do the same.
4. Voluntarily extend Family Medical Leave Act provisions to employees if a firm is not covered by the Act.
5. Support local child care programs with financial and in-kind donations to ensure quality and affordability.
6. Research, survey, and track the impact of family-friendly benefits at companies.
7. Join District policymakers, child care advocates, and parents in efforts to increase quality and affordability of child care programs in the District.

-
8. Support the development of child care networks.
 9. Increase public and private sector awareness of the funding shortfalls in expanding families' access to affordable quality child care.

A Final Word: Cooperation

The child care debate locally and nationally has reached a critical level, as more parents are working and less child care is available. While government provides direct services to low-income families for child care assistance, the federal entitlement for such a guarantee has been expunged. Businesses also provide aid via supportive family policies, tax benefits, and funding for child care. Neither government nor business alone can fully support the needs of working parents; but, working together, they can develop strong policies and solutions to help our local and national child care advocates negotiate their way out of the current crisis. As delineated in this report, business support for child care and supportive family policies is not only imperative as a way to reach federal and local social policy objectives, but also as a method for businesses to reach their bottom line goals of increased productivity and enhanced profits. ■

Appendix A

District Resources

The following section presents a brief description of child care programs available within the District of Columbia for children and families. This list is based on information obtained through informal surveys with local organizations and advocates. It does not represent a comprehensive analysis of local resources. Descriptions are included for purposes of reference rather than recommendations. For additional access to child care providers, please contact the Washington Child Development Council, host agency for this DC Family Policy Seminar (see listing below.)

Barney Neighborhood House

3118 16th Street, NW

3rd Floor

Washington, DC 20010

(202) 939-9000

Executive Director: Rob McLean

The Barney Neighborhood House provides after-school tutoring and activities for school-age children.

“Before and After School Program”

DC Public Schools

1230 Taylor Street, NW

Room 202

Washington, DC 20011

(202) 576-7132

Program Coordinator: Carver King

The Before and After School Program provides structured activities on public school grounds throughout the District for children ages 5–12 before and after school as well as during summer months.

Big Mama’s Childrens Center

4680 Martin Luther King Avenue, SW

Washington, DC 20032

(202) 563-5303

Director: Deborah Hall

Big Mama’s Childrens Center provides services for children ages 8 weeks through 14 years. The licensed capacity is 104 children. The curriculum is developmentally appropriate with an emphasis on afro-centric history. The center is open from 6:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Calvary Bilingual Multicultural Learning Center

1420 Columbia Road, NW

Washington, DC 20009

(202) 332-4200

Executive Director: Beatriz Otero

The Learning Center’s program is for children 2–5 years of age. Care providers speak Spanish and English.

Catholic Charities

1125 Neal Street, NE

Washington, DC 20002

(202) 396-8100

Director: Ruddy Hutchinson

St. Joseph’s Day Care Center

Taft Junior High School

18th and Perry Street, NE

Washington, DC 20018

(202) 526-0100

Director: Phyllis Toner

Catholic Charities operates two child care facilities in the District, one on Neal Street and the other at the Taft Junior High School. The center on Neal Street has been in existence since 1971. They serve children ages 6 weeks through 4 years, from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The Center at the Taft Junior High School serves children ages 2–5 from

7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Both centers serve low-income families in the District.

The Center for Youth Services

921 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003
(202) 543-5707

Director: Samuel Tramel

The Center for Youth Services is a private, non-profit corporation established to offer multiple services to disadvantaged inner-city adolescents. It offers a multifaceted program that includes developmental child care, parent education, developmental screening, and child care referrals.

D.C. Department of Recreation and Parks

“Day Care” (202) 576-7226
“Before and After School Care” (202) 576-7132
3149 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20010
(202) 673-7660

Director: Betty Jo Gaines

The D.C. Department of Recreation and Parks has three principal programs that focus on young children. One is the Day Care Program, primarily for preschool children; another is the Cooperative Care Program, which includes parents in the operation of care programs; and the third is the Before-and After-School Care (BASC) Program, which provides care, supervision, and activities for younger children of working parents before and after the school day. The neighborhood recreation centers in the system have for several years included informal before- and after-school activities, as working parents depended more and more on the recreation centers for supervision of their children during working hours. The Department also operates a number of Head Start programs in the District.

D.C. Jewish Community Center

1529 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 518-9400

Executive Director: Arna Meyer Mickelson
Youth and Family Division Director: Elona Shaffert

The DC Jewish Community Center offers two Pre-Schools, a No School Today program for children when school is closed, a Winter Camp during the school winter break, an After School Program during the school year for children in kindergarten through sixth grade, and “The Lunch Bunch,” a working mothers group designed for working mothers to help ease the stress of performing the balancing act of juggling time, making child care decisions, meeting the demands of a job, and trying to keep relationships healthy.

Edward C. Mazique Parent-Child Center

1719 13th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 462-3375

Executive Director: Leslie Johnson

The Center is a private, non-profit, community-based organization involved in early intervention, early education, and family support. The center offers thirteen programs at five different sites in the District. Overall, the Center serves 500 families in center- and home-based care.

Family and Child Services of Washington, D.C.

929 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 289-1510

Executive Director: Rhoda Veney

Family and Child Services follows a family-based child care model. It works with the Department of Human Services to provide child care to low-income families. It works with a network of 45 home providers to place approximately 150 infants and preschoolers in full-time child care.

Gallaudet University Child Development Center

800 Florida Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 651-5130

Director: Gail Solit

The Center provides center-based child care services for deaf and hearing children. The staff are half deaf and half hearing. It provides care from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. for children ages 2–5.

Gap Community Child Care Center

3636 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20010
(202) 462-3636

Director: Ms. Monica Guyot

The Center is a multicultural, educational, developmental program for children ages 6 weeks through 5 years. In addition to providing a full preschool curriculum including math, social studies, art, music, social skills, language, reading, etc., the center provides breakfast, lunch, and a snack for all participants.

Head Start Program in Washington, D.C.**United Planning Organization**

941 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 289-9100

Director: William Hughey

Established in 1965, the Head Start Program provides comprehensive child development services for low-income preschool children (3-5 years of age). All local Head Start programs offer four major components: education, social services, parent involvement, and health services (including medical, dental, nutrition, and mental health services). Local programs are administered through grants from the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The authorizing legislation specifies that at least 10 percent of Head Start's national enrollment must consist of children with disabilities. There are 39 Head Start facilities in the District, serving 1,665 children.

Howard University Hospital Child Care Center

1911 Fifth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 797-8134

Director: Michelle Parker

The Center primarily provides child care service to Howard University and the Hospital employees' children, with secondary service to Ledroit Park area residents. It provides child care and developmental services for children 6 weeks to 4 years of age, and also provides child care for

school-age children during holidays and on week-ends.

Hoya Kids

Georgetown University
37th & O Streets, NW
Healy Building, #207
Washington, DC 20057
(202) 687-4134

Contact: Kathleen Sampora

Georgetown University will establish an on-site child care facility for its faculty, staff, and students in September 1997. The Hoya Kids child care center, made possible through outside contributions, will offer placements to 60 children between the ages of 18 months and 5 years. Slots will be made available through random assignment and parents will be charged a sliding scale fee based on family income. The Center will operate from 7:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. to accommodate the needs of the campus community. The Center expects to receive accreditation from the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC).

**Intergenerational Child Care Program
National Child Day Care Association**

1501 Benning Road, NE
Lower Level
Washington, DC 20002-4599
(202) 397-3800

Program Director: Mattie Jackson

This program was developed in 1966 to involve older adults in 21 child care centers around Washington, DC. The older adults serve as teacher aides, and assist in housekeeping and clerical activities.

Kenilworth-Parkside Learning Center

1553 Anacostia Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20019
(202) 397-1827

Center Director: Michael Gross

The Center provides child care to children ages 2-4 from 7:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m.

**Mayor's Advisory Committee on Early
Childhood Development**
c/o Office of Early Childhood Development
717 14th Street, NW
Suite 730
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 727-1839
Chairperson: Beverly Jackson

The Mayor's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Development is made up of representatives from private organizations in the field of early childhood development, center operators, parents of children in both center-based and home-based child care centers, public and appropriate government agencies. The Committee advises the mayor on early childhood development programs in the District of Columbia and serves as an advisory council in the implementation of the early childhood development requirements of the federal government. The Committee serves as an advocate for the improvement of the quality of early childhood development programs and recommends methods of upgrading services.

**Metropolitan Washington Council of
Governments**

Child Care Advisory Committee
777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4226
(202) 962-3256

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments is the regional association of the Washington area's major local governments and their governing officials. The Council has a Child Care Advisory Committee comprising representatives from the public, private, business, and educational communities as well as individuals and organizations with an interest in child care issues. The mission of the committee is to promote available, affordable, quality child care throughout the Washington metropolitan region. The Council publishes free-of-charge the *Directory of Accredited Child Care Programs in the Washington Metropolitan Region*.

Northwest Settlement
448 Ridge Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Infant Center
224 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 332-3680
Center Director: Mattie Edwards

The Settlement is open from 7:30 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. for children ages 2-5. Northwest Settlement also has an Infant Center for infants ages 6 weeks to 2 years. The Settlement accepts vouchers from low-income parents.

**Office of Early Childhood Development
DC Department of Human Services**

717 14th Street, NW
Suite 730
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 727-1839

Executive Director: Barbara Ferguson Kamara

The Office of Early Childhood Development facilitates citywide coordination of public and private efforts to expand and improve child development services to better meet the changing needs of the community. This is done on behalf of children and families, and in partnership with all who are concerned with the future of children in the Nation's Capital. Some of the functions of the office include: advocacy; collaboration and coordination; consumer education and public information; data development and analysis; early care and education service; financial assistance; policy, legislation, and regulation review and development; public/private partnership development; and training and technical assistance. For information on training and events, call the 24-hour Child Care Calendar Line at (202) 310-2020.

"PhoneFriend"

Office of Early Childhood Development
717 14th Street, NW
Suite 730
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 727-1839

Executive Director: Barbara Ferguson Kamara

PhoneFriend is a free afternoon helpline for latchkey children, provided by the D.C. Hotline in cooperation with the D.C. Public Schools Department of Guidance and Counseling. Trained volunteers answer the phone from 3:00 to 9:00 p.m. each weekday and from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays. The PhoneFriend staff also make presentations to schools and community groups on school-age child care topics. The PhoneFriend number is (202) 223-2244.

Project ROAR (Reach Out and Read)

District of Columbia Public Library

901 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 727-1151

Contact: Maria Salvadore or Pamela Stovall

The purpose of ROAR is to promote reading among family child care providers and the parents and children they serve. A librarian visits providers' homes and offers story time that includes activities such as reading and acting out stories and fingerplays. The librarian leaves books for children to read and follow-up activities for providers and parents to do with children.

Rosemount Center

2000 Rosemount Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20010
(202) 265-9885

Executive Director: Jane Yocum

The Rosemount Center offers a bilingual, multicultural program with center-based and/or home-based care. The Center offers center-based care for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers, and home-based care for preschool children. The Center offers parents a combined option of home-based and center-based care. It also runs a Head Start program and participates in the Department of Health and Human Service's subsidy program. The Center also provides in-house special education and therapies for infants and children with disabilities. Finally, Rosemount Center runs a training program for child care workers at the Rosemount Center and other child care providers in the community.

The Village Day Care Center

2900 14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 234-5114

Director: Stephanie Tindal

The Village Day Care Center provides comprehensive child care service to families. It accepts subsidies from low-income families. The curriculum is developmentally appropriate and taught in a multicultural setting with a bilingual staff. It provides services for all children (including children with special needs) ages 2-1/2 to 5 years, from 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Washington, D.C., Association for the Education of Young Children

(202) 563-5303

Chairperson: Mattie Edwards

Washington, D.C., Association for the Education of Young Children is the local affiliate of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). It is a professional organization incorporated for the purpose of bringing together people interested in the education, rights, and well-being of young children; sponsoring activities and projects that will further the understanding of the needs of young children; determining the essentials of adequate group care of young children; interpreting these standards as need arises; keeping informed of and cooperating with the activities of other groups concerned with the welfare and education of young children; and investigating new trends in early childhood education.

Washington Child Development Council

2121 Decatur Place, NW
Washington, DC 20008
(202) 387-0002

Executive Director: Bobbi Blok

The Washington Child Development Council is committed to promoting quality early childhood education in the Nation's Capital. The Council is the resource and referral agency for families in the District. In addition to helping families find appropriate, affordable child care, the Council also trains

child care center staff and licensed home providers and provides advocacy support to local child care programs.

YWCA Child Development Center

624 9th Street, NW

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 626-0700

Executive Director: Josephine Pamphile

The YWCA Child Development Center provides child care programs designed to meet the needs of working parents and provides a developmental program within the framework of a full day of child care. It also has a fully licensed preschool program and provides a developmental program in half-day sessions during the school year from September through May.

Appendix B

National Resources

Catalyst

250 Park Avenue South
Fifth Floor
New York, NY 10003-1459
(212) 777-8900
Contact: Marcia Krops

Catalyst has a dual mission—to enable women in business and the professions to achieve their maximum potential and to help employers capitalize on the talents of their female employees. Catalyst’s Research and Advisory Services division analyzes workplace barriers and opportunities for women and helps companies and professional firms develop successful strategies to recruit, retain, and advance women. Catalyst conducts major research studies that are national in scope and cover a wide range of topics from women in corporate management to the implementation of flexible work arrangements. Catalyst also has an information center, a corporate board placement service, and a public information service, and produces various publications to further its mission.

Child Care Action Campaign

99 Hudson Street
New York, NY 10013
(212) 239-0138
Contact: Gail Richardson

The Child Care Action Campaign (CCAC) is a national, nonprofit organization that seeks to improve the lives of children and families and achieve major national goals by ensuring that all working families have access to good quality child care of their choice. Through conferences, research, advocacy, and publications, CCAC encourages public, community, and business leaders to invest in good quality child care to promote the well-being of children and families, boost

economic development, improve education, and achieve welfare reform.

Child Welfare League of America Child Day Care Services

440 First Street, NW
3rd Floor
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 638-2952

Contact: Bruce Hershfield, Program Director

The Child Welfare League of America is a national membership organization of 800 members, 200 of whom provide child care services. The Child Day Care Services program examines program practice and policy issues related to child care. In particular, it lobbies for federal funding, has developed a National Child Day Care Task Force, builds Family Child Care Systems, offers leadership programs, and tries to improve relations between child care and foster care services.

Children’s Defense Fund

25 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 628-8787

Contact: Helen Blank

The Children’s Defense Fund analyzes federal and state policy issues. It works with members of Congress and state legislators to develop child care policy. It conducts research in child care issues, trains child care advocates, and provides a leadership program for individuals in the early childhood field.

Children’s Foundation

725 15th Street, NW
Suite 505
Washington, DC 20005-2109
(202) 347-3300

Contact: Kay Hollestelle, Executive Director

The Children's Foundation (CF) promotes quality, affordable child care and other ways to improve the lives of children and the people who care for them. The foundation sponsors the Family Day Care Project, which provides resource development for children and parents as well as specialized training for caregivers and parents. It also sponsors the National Child Support Project, which helps custodial parents collect support and provides information on a variety of enforcement problems.

The Conference Board

845 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(202) 759-0900

Established in 1916, The Conference Board's twofold purpose is to improve the business enterprise system and to enhance the contribution of business to society. To accomplish this, The Conference Board strives to be the leading global business membership organization that enables senior executives from all industries to explore and exchange ideas of impact on business policy and practices. To support this activity, The Conference Board provides a variety of forums and professionally managed research programs that identify and report objectively on key areas of changing management concern, opportunity, and action.

Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition

1341 G Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 265-9090
Contact: Dr. Carol Bronson-Phillips, Executive Director

The Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition works to improve the status of early childhood educators nationwide. The council oversees the Child Development Associate (CDA) National Credentialing Program, a collaborative effort between the early childhood profession and the Administration for Children and Families. The program promotes a variety of training experiences

for early childhood staff and establishes national standards for the evaluation and credentialing of child care staff. The council's new CDA Professional Preparation Program, a nationwide network of one-year training courses, will provide uniform and accessible training for people interested in becoming CDAs.

Employee Benefits Research Institute

2121 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
(202) 659-0670

Contact: Pam Ostuw

The mission of the Employee Benefits Research Institute (EBRI) is to advance the public's, the media's, and policymakers' knowledge and understanding of employee benefits and their importance to our nation's economy and to contribute to, encourage, and enhance the development of sound employee benefit programs and sound public policy through objective research and education.

Families and Work Institute

330 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10001
(212) 465-2044

Contact: Ellen Galinsky

Families and Work Institute is a nonprofit research and planning organization that conducts research on business, government, and community efforts to help employees balance their job and family responsibilities.

Gallaudet University Child Development Center Project Access

800 Florida Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 651-5130

Director: Gail Solit

The Gallaudet University Child Development Center received a grant from the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services of the U.S. Department of Education to help integrate child care services for hearing and deaf children in other child care programs throughout the country.

National Academy of Early Childhood Programs

1509 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1426
(202) 232-8777

Executive Director: Sue Bredekamp

The National Academy of Early Childhood Programs is a component of the National Association for the Education of Young Children. The Academy administers a national, voluntary, professionally sponsored accreditation system for all types of preschools, kindergartens, child care centers, and school-age child care programs.

National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies

1319 F Street, NW
Suite 810
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 393-5501

Executive Director: Yasmina S. Vinci

The National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (NACCRRA) promotes the development, maintenance, and expansion of quality child care resource and referral services. The association offers parents detailed information about local child care and early education programs and providers, current openings, and sources of financial aid. It also sponsors regional and national conferences, provides technical assistance, maintains a clearinghouse for child care information, and publishes a quarterly newsletter, *CCR&R Issues*.

National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)

1509 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1426
(202) 232-8777

Executive Director: Marilyn Smith

NAEYC is the nation's largest membership organization of early childhood professionals and others dedicated to improving the quality of services for young children and their families.

National Association for Family Child Care

1331A Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 348
Washington, DC 20004
(800) 359-3817

President: Linda Geigle

The National Association for Family Child Care (NAFCC), formerly the National Association for Family Day Care, is an organization of family and group child care providers and advocates. The association began as a project of the Children's Foundation, and its *National Directory of Family Day Care Associations and Support Groups* continues to be published with the foundation. Other publications include a bimonthly newsletter, *The New National Perspective*, and a pamphlet, *How to Start a Family Day Care Business*.

National Black Child Development Institute

1023 15th Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 387-1281

Executive Director: Evelyn K. Moore

The National Black Child Development Institute (NBCDI), a national nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the quality of life for black children, focuses on three major policy areas: child care, child welfare, and education.

National Child Care Information Center

301 Maple Avenue West, Suite 602
Vienna, VA 22180
(800) 616-2242

Contact: Anne Goldstein, Director

The National Child Care Information Center is an activity of the Child Care Technical Assistance Project funded by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF). The center disseminates child care information in response to requests from states, territories and tribes, policymakers, parents, programs, organizations, providers, and the public. Other activities include: outreach to ACF grantees and the broader child care community; publication of the *Child Care Bulletin*; analysis of child care data submitted to ACF; and distribution of

research, listings, and abstracts of child care publications and resources.

National Conference of State Legislatures

Washington Office:

444 North Capitol Street, NW

Suite 515

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 624-5400

Contact: Carl Tubbesing, Deputy Executive Director

The National Conference of State Legislatures, which serves the legislators and staffs of the nation's states, commonwealths and territories, has three objectives: improve the quality and effectiveness of state legislatures; foster interstate communication and cooperation; and ensure a strong, cohesive voice in the federal system.

National Governors' Association

444 North Capitol Street

Suite 250

Washington, DC 20001-1572

(202) 624-5300

The National Governors' Association, an organization of the governors of the 50 states and the American commonwealths and territories, is concerned with shaping policies both at the state and national level.

The Urban Institute

2100 M Street, NW

Washington, DC 20037

(202) 833-7200

Contact: Sandy Clark

The Urban Institute is a nonprofit policy research and educational organization established in Washington, DC, in 1968. Its staff investigates the social and economic problems confronting the nation, and the public and private means to alleviate them. The Urban Institute continues to conduct extensive research on child care. Recent publications include: *Child Care Prices: A Profile of Six Communities* (1995), *The Effect of Transitional Child Care and Medical Benefits on Post-Welfare Success: Evidence From Two States* (1995), *Child Care Quality*

versus Availability: Do We Have to Trade One for the Other? (1994), *Caring for Young Children While Parents Work: Public Policies and Private Strategies* (1994), *The Effects of the Availability of Low-Cost Child Care on the Labor Supply of Low-Income Women* (1994), *Caring for Children in Low-Income Families: A Study of the National Child Care Survey, 1990* (1993), and *The National Child Care Survey, 1990* (1991). Copies can be ordered by phone at (202) 857-8687.

Zero to Three

2000 14th Street, North

Suite 380

Arlington, VA 22201-2500

(703) 528-4300

Contact: Beverly Jackson

Zero to Three (formerly the National Center for Clinical Infant Programs) is a nonprofit organization that works to improve the chances for healthy physical, cognitive, and social development of infants, toddlers, and their families and to create a context for improved understanding of early intervention and prevention programs. The organization offers training programs and materials, produces publications, provides technical assistance to administrators at state, community, and program levels, and sponsors seminars and conferences.

Works Cited

- The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (1996). *Kids count data book: State profiles of child well-being*. Baltimore: Author.
- Bond, J.T. (1987). *Accommodating pregnancy in the workplace*. New York: National Council of Jewish Women. Cited in D. Friedman. (1991). *Linking work-family issues to the bottom line*. New York: The Conference Board.
- Bond, J.T. (1992). The Impact of Childbearing on Employment. In Dana Friedman, Ellen Galinsky, and Veronica Plowden (Eds.). *Parental Leave and Productivity: Current research*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (March 1995). Unpublished Data. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Clark, C.S. (1992, August 14). Work, family and stress: Can overworked Americans cope with today's time crunch? *CQ Researcher*: 689-712.
- Ferber, M.A., & O'Farrell, B. (1991). *Work and family: Policies for a changing workforce*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Friedman, D. (1991). *Linking work-family issues to the bottom line*. (Research Report No. 962). New York: The Conference Board.
- Friedman, D., & Johnson, A. (1991). *Strategies for promoting the work-family agenda*. (Research Report No. 973). New York: The Conference Board.
- Galinsky, E. (1994). "Families at work: The importance of the quality of the work environment." In S Lynn Kagan and Bernice Weissbour, ed., *Putting families first: America's family support movement and the challenges of change*: San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Galinsky, E., Bond, J.T. & Friedman, D. (1993). *The changing workforce: Highlights of the national study*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Hochschild, Arlie. (1989). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. Viking.
- Josef, G. & Ward, P. (1992). *Options for the 90's: Employer support for child care*. New York: National Council of Jewish Women.
- Lee, C.W., Ohlandt, S.J., & Witte, A.D. (1997). *Parents receiving subsidized child care: Where do they work?* Tallahassee, FL: Florida Children's Forum. [on-line]. Available: Internet. Directory: <http://www.nap.edu/readingroom/books/child-care/contents.html>.
- Lord, M. & King, M. (1991). *The state reference guide to work-family programs for state employees*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Peters, J.L., Peters, B.H. & Caropreso, F. (1990). *Work and family policies: The new strategic plan*. (Research Report No. 949). New York: The Conference Board.
- Phillips, D. & Reisman, B. (1992). Turnover and return on investment models for family leave. In Friedman, Galinsky, & Plowden, *Parental Leave and Productivity: Current Research*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Rogers & Associates. (1985, 1998). Company surveys conducted in 1985, 1988. Boston: Author. Cited in D. Friedman. (1991). *Linking work-family issues to the bottom line*. New York: The Conference Board.

Stoney, L. & Greenberg, M.H. (Summer/Fall 1996).

The financing of child care: Current and emerging trends. *The Future of Children* 6, 2: 83–100.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1987). Male-female differences in work experience, occupation and earnings: 1984. *Household Economic Studies Series* 10.

U.S. Department of Labor (1996). Commission on family leave: Executive summary. Washington DC: Author [on-line]. Available: Internet. Directory: <http://www.dol.gov/dol/esa/public/regs/compliance/whd/fmla/family.htm>

U.S. Internal Revenue Service (1995) Statistics of income. *SOI Bulletin* 15, 2. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.

Washington Child Development Council. (1996). *Child care is everybody's business: The true cost of care in the District of Columbia*. [unpublished fact sheet]. Washington DC: Author.

About the DC Family Policy Seminars

The DC Family Policy Seminar (DC FPS) is a collaborative project of the Georgetown Public Policy Institute (GPPI)* and its affiliate, the National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health (NCEMCH). The mission of the DC FPS is to provide District policymakers with accurate, relevant, nonpartisan, timely information and policy options concerning issues affecting children and families.

The DC Family Policy Seminar is coordinated by Shelley Stark, Project Director, National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health, 2000 15th Street North, Suite 701, Arlington, VA 22201. (703) 524-7802.

*In January 1997, the Graduate Public Policy Program became the Georgetown Public Policy Institute.

To receive additional information about the DC Family Policy Seminar, or to request copies of the following briefing reports or highlights, please contact Helena Wallin or Antoinette Laudencia at (703) 524-7802.

- *Feeding our Families: Community Food Security in the District of Columbia*. November, 1996.
- *Keeping our Kids Safe: Preventing Injury in DC Schools*. September 1996
- *Fundraising for Family-Centered Organizations in the District*. July 1996.
- *Strengthening Families: Parenting Programs and Policies in the District*. April 1996.
- *Transitioning from Welfare-to-Work in the District: A Family-Centered Perspective*. February 1996.
- *Helping Families and Schools Get it Done: Mentoring Interventions in the District*. November 1995.
- *Caring for our Children: Meeting the Needs of Low-Income, Working Families in the District*. September 1995.
- *Families that Play Together: Recreation and Leisure in the District*. July 1995.
- *HIV/AIDS: Helping Families Cope*. April 1995.
- *Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Programs: A Family Approach*. February 1995.
- *Family-Friendly Welfare Reform: Using Welfare Policies to Strengthen the Family*. November 1994.
- *Preventing Family Violence*. September 1994.
- *Preventing Adolescent Violence*. May 1994.
- *Preventing Teen Pregnancies*. December 1993.