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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the primary concerns of individuals interested in the early development of children is the need for more quality child care services. The major factor in creating this need for child care services is the working mother. Statistics point out that in the early 1970's one-third of our country's mothers with children under six years of age were employed, creating from 4 to 6 million children who needed care (Hess, 1970; Keyserling, 1971; Report of the Governor's Conference, 1973). In Virginia, figures revealed that one-third of the women in the state with children under six were employed, creating from 101,000 to 136,700 children who needed care (Report of Governor's Conference, 1973; Serow, 1971).

It is reasonable to assume that most of these children are receiving adequate care and stimulation of growth. However, it is unwise and unethical to base the growth and protection of our children on this assumption. Child care services are necessary to help meet the growing need for child care in Virginia, as in the nation.

Traditionally, child care services have been an institution of Child Welfare Services (Kadushin, 1967). Currently, the demand for these services has caused other groups of individuals to establish child care facilities--religious organizations, hospitals, franchised systems,
industry (Kadushin, 1967; Keyserling, 1971; Serow, 1971). But still, the demand for these services continues to exceed the available supply. Greater efforts are necessary. Other approaches to the delivery of child care services are needed.

Kadushin (1967) felt that child care services ought to represent a community investment in its families. He advocated the joint cooperative activity of the health, education, and social work professions for effective implementation of child care programs.

Educators argue that the responsibility for child care facilities and programs ought to be given to the educational institutions. They feel that the school is already accepted in all communities as a place that cares for children, that the school has the available administrative structure and trained personnel, and that a child care program would merely extend the educational system downward to include a younger group.

Keyserling (1971) and the delegates to the Governor's Conference on Day Care Needs in Virginia (1973) suggested that child care services ought to be carried out in conjunction with the agencies involved in the training of child care personnel and that child care services should be utilized as learning laboratories for the training of child care staff. The delegates further recommended that a state plan be developed to maintain and oversee child care programs and that model child care centers be established within each region of the state.

In Virginia an educational institution is presently available that could incorporate the above recommendations. The institution is organized and administered as a state system that could provide training of
child care personnel, leadership and coordination of other concerned individuals, groups, and agencies in its community, and quality child care. This institution is the community college.

The Virginia Community College System is well suited to initiate and operate child care services. First, the physical sites are available and within reach of the majority of Virginians. The state's master plan divides the state into twenty-two community college regions. Several of these regions have two or more satellite campuses because of being either high-density urban regions with heavy concentrations of prospective students, or low-density rural regions where long distances necessitates a second campus. The campuses are within commuting distance (30-45 miles) of practically every Virginia resident (Wellman, 1969).

Second, although the classrooms for child care facilities are, in most cases, unavailable at this time, with planning and alteration the physical plants could be outfitted to meet the needs of young children with respect to furnishings, equipment, bathroom facilities, etc. Last, the resource of knowledge possessed by the community college staff is of extreme importance. A professional staff, especially trained in child development, early childhood education, or child care could: 1) act as leaders in binding together and coordinating the efforts of all those concerned with the care of young children, 2) develop quality programs of child care, 3) operate the child care centers along with the active involvement of parents and specialized child care attendants, and 4) act as consultants to help parents with their problems of child rearing.

The purpose of this investigation is to examine: 1) the attitudes of Virginia Community College officials pertaining to the relationship between child care services and Virginia's Community Colleges and 2) the
present state of development of child care services on Virginia's Community College campuses.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Traditionally, child care has been defined as an organized service for the care and supervision of children when circumstances call for normal care in the home to be supplemented (Kadushin, 1967; Hansen, 1970). Primary emphasis of the programs has been placed on the care and protection of the child.

The last decade has witnessed a change in the concept of child care with greater emphasis being placed on the developmental and educational aspects of group care. New definitions have emerged to encompass this "total developmental approach." Reports from the National Committee for Day Care of Children, the 1970 White House Conference on Children, the 1970 White House Conference Forum on Developmental Child Care Services, and the 1973 Governor's Conference on Day Care Needs in Virginia agreed that child care is a service that includes both the normal supervisory physical, health, and safety needs of children along with opportunities to develop the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical aspects of life to the maximum of the child's capacity (Kadushin, 1967; Report of the Governor's Conference, 1973; Report to the President, White House Conference on Children, 1970). Care and developmental opportunities were stressed for positively influencing and strengthening the lives of children and their families. This new developmental notion of child care, previously considered a radical notion, has now become widely accepted.
The purposes of child care are numerous. Streuer (1973) has identified the following:

1) to free the mother to help her attain economic self-sufficiency through employment;
2) to guard the welfare of the child;
3) to provide a supportive service to families presently self-sufficient but lacking adequate resources to pay for quality care;
4) to provide universal early childhood education;
5) to assure women and children the right to human growth and mental health.

Each of these, separate or in combination, is a strong argument for the provision of child care services.

Parents' Need

It has already been stated that child care services are most frequently used for the child of the working mother. Statistics revealed a constant trend toward an increase of women in the labor force. The Bureau of Labor Statistics survey (1971) estimated the number of U.S. children with mothers in the labor force in the following manner:

1960 - 19% participation of women in the labor force with children under six years of age;
1970 - 30% participation of women in the labor force with children under six years of age.

Keyserling (1971) stated that in 1960, one out of five mothers of children under six was in the labor force; in 1970 one out of three participated
in the labor force. She estimated that if the number of working mothers rises as rapidly between 1970 and 1980 as it did in the preceding decade, close to 2 million additional working mothers of about 2.5 million more preschool children will exist.

In Virginia this increase of women in the labor force was also present. A fact sheet developed by the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, revealed that the number of women workers in Virginia had increased 49% between 1960 and 1970, while the population of women increased only 25% (Report of Governor's Conference, 1973). Serow (1971) recorded the following information:

1960 - 23.1% participation of women in the labor force with children under six (based on the 1960 Virginia Census of Population);


The fact that a child's mother may be in the labor force does not necessarily imply a potential demand for child care services. Serow (1971) provided a reasonable approach to estimating a potential demand for the state of Virginia. He used information presented in a 1965 country-wide
survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Children's Bureau, and U.S. Department of Labor Standards Administration, Women's Bureau (Hess, 1970). The survey revealed only 5.6% of all children of working mothers were cared for in group-care facilities. However, Serow included the following children:

1) those cared for in the home by relatives under sixteen years of age (2.1%),
2) those cared for by non-relatives with other household duties (6.9%),
3) those caring for themselves (.5%), and
4) those whom the mother looked after while at work (15%).

By including these groups along with the 5.6% in group-care, a total of 30.1% of all the children under six with working mothers could be included in the figures on the potential demand for child care services. Applying this 30% to the 111,600 estimate of Virginia children under six with working mothers, Serow (1971) estimated the need for child care at 33,600 spaces.

Obviously, there are also additional children in the state who have need for child care services:

1) those with mothers who do not work because care is not available,
2) those with only one parent,
3) those with mothers who are ill,
4) those who live in crowded housing,
5) those who have inadequate opportunities for contacts with
children, and
6) those who need a more stimulating environment to foster their development.

To account for these factors, Serow (1971) assumed that 50% of the children under six with working mothers might have a potential demand for child care services, even though data to make a precise calculation were lacking. Applying this 50% to the Virginia figure of children under six with working mothers (136,700) Serow (1971) estimated the need for child care at 68,400 spaces. In summary, Serow (1971) provided both low and high estimates of the potential demand for child care spaces in Virginia—33,600 to 68,400 spaces.

**Children's Need**

It has become increasingly apparent that the early years of a child's life are critical to his total development. If his various needs—nutritional, motor, intellectual, emotional, social—are not met with adequate stimulation and fulfillment, a second chance for adequate development may not be available; the child may be handicapped for the remainder of his life. Unfortunately, our contemporary society has created situations that often make it difficult for the family to meet all the growth needs of the child (Boguslawski, 1966). Child care services with the new developmental stresses offer assistance with and enrichment of the child's life.

A considerable body of research documents the desirable effects on the young child of appropriately planned experiences outside the home (Swift, 1964). Specialists in early childhood education regard a good group experience as very desirable for the young child. Hymes (1973)
defined a good group as,

a planned community that focuses specifically on what a young child is like and on what will help him function at his very best (p. 13).

He emphasized that each child needs experiences with a) healthy physical movement of both the large and small muscles, b) the input of impressions and information through experiences with curiosity, c) social contacts, d) intellectual challenges, e) expression of imagination, and f) independence. Developmental child care services provide children with the equipment and experiences necessary for total development.

Lastly, a discussion of "latchkey kids"—those who let themselves in and out; those who are uncared for—will be included. According to Hess (1970) and Keyserling (1971) 18,000 or .5% of the children in our nation under the age of six were caring for themselves during the time their mothers were working. This estimate is considered low, since few parents would admit to such an arrangement. More child care services are needed, if for no other reason than to eliminate the existence of latchkey kids.

Available Supply of Child Care Services in Virginia

Serow (1971) provided information from the Virginia Department of Welfare and Institutions showing that as of 1971 there were 275 licensed child care centers in Virginia with a capacity for 13,622 children, along with 3,403 other spaces for children in licensed family day care homes. He also provided some data on the number of kindergarten enrollments (23,945) but commented that data on the capacity of nursery schools and kindergartens was incomplete due to the absence of licensing requirements
for privately operated schools and that not all mothers of kindergarten children were employed.

By totaling the figures available on licensed child care facilities, licensed family day care homes, and the probable number of kindergarten enrollments whose mothers were employed, Serow (1971) estimated Virginia's total child care capacity at 23,201 spaces. By using his 30% estimate of need for child care minus the total existing capacity and the 50% estimate minus the total existing capacity, he estimated the minimum shortage at 11,755 spaces and the maximum shortage at 45,151 spaces.

More recently, the Bureau of Special Services, State Department of Welfare and Institutions stated that as of April 1973, Virginia had 352 licensed child care centers that handled 19,061 children and 525 licensed family care homes that provided for 4,288 children. Specific data on other arrangements for care of children were not available (Report of Governor's Conference, 1973). Again, the total of spaces (23,349) fell far short of caring for the estimates of need--Women's Bureau estimate of 101,000, Serow's estimates of 111,600 to 136,000.

Federal Programs

The need for quality child care services has been established. The following discussion illustrates some of the steps our federal and state governments have taken to remedy the acute shortage of quality child care.

In 1971, Mary Dublin Keyserling, former Director of the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, stated, "a decade ago the federal government provided no funds for day care," (p. 63) (Keyserling, 1971).
However, by the fiscal year 1971 sixty or more federal programs appropriated about $250 million to fund child care for preschool children. Serow (1971) and Keyserling (1971) mentioned several of the major federal programs that have been established to provide funds: a) for the development and administration of child care projects, b) for the construction of child care facilities, c) for the training of child care workers, and d) for the care of economically and educationally disadvantaged children:

---The 1962 amendment to the Social Security Act provided funds for child care for the children of state welfare clients.

---The Work Incentive Program of the U.S. Department of Labor (aimed to train persons on welfare for permanent jobs) provided funds for day care for the children of the trainees.

---The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided funds for child care for economically and educationally deprived children.

---The Community Action Program under the Economic Opportunity Act of which Head Start is the best known, provided funds to develop, conduct, and administer child care projects.

---The Model Cities Program provided funds for child care facilities in selected communities.

---The Vocational Education Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and the Educational Professions Development Act provided funds for the training of child care workers.

---1A detailed analysis of federal programs relating to child care is contained in B. Rosenberg's Facts About Day Care issued by the U.S. Department of Labor and in the Women's Bureau publication Federal Funds for Day Care Projects (1969).
The last five or six years have witnessed increased concern and involvement of the federal government with the child care issue. Pressures from labor, religious organizations, feminists, minority groups, and educators have given rise to increasing numbers of legislative child care proposals being introduced into Congress.²

Hudelson (1971) and Serow (1971) reviewed the greatest national attempt to initiate a federal system of child care--The Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971. The program was established to provide educational, health, and nutritional services to millions of children, giving priority to those with the greatest economic need, but extending it to others as well. Attention was centered on children five years old and under, including infants. Priority was given to children of single parents and/or working mothers, though no mother would be forced to work in order to make her child eligible. Before and after school programs were also included. Fees were to be based upon family income, with care provided at no cost to families with incomes below an established level. Direct parental participation was encouraged.

Hudelson (1971) devoted an entire issue of the Report on Preschool Education to the progression of events relating to the proposal. He stated that both the Senate and the House of Representatives passed the proposal; however, President Nixon vetoed it on December 9, 1971. He objected heavily to the bill in the following areas:

²A complete record and synthesis of the legislative development of child care during the fall of 1971 (92nd Congress) can be found in Streuer's "Current Legislative Proposals and Public Policy Questions for Child care."
1) Neither the need nor the desirability of a national child care program had been demonstrated.

2) Many existing federal, state, and local efforts to provide services to the very young would be duplicated.

3) The bill was too costly.

4) The bill was family-weakening for it diminished parent involvement and authority and committed the national government to communal approaches to child rearing in opposition to the family centered approach.

5) The qualified people to staff the centers had not been defined.

6) The bill was administratively unworkable.

7) The states were relegated to insignificant roles.

Attempts were made to override the veto in the Senate but failed by seven votes to attain the needed two-thirds majority when several Republicans switched their positions on the bill. The Senate thus confirmed the veto and the Child Development bill was dead for that session. Nixon's veto stimulated the introduction of compromise proposals and strong lobbies for child care support at the national level. However, to date, none has become law and it seems unlikely that Congress will pass any child care legislation within the near future.

State Programs

Virginians have also expressed recent concerns over the lack of adequate, quality child care facilities. As evidence of this concern the Virginia Commission on the Status of Women obtained the funds to conduct a comprehensive study on the subject of Day Care Centers by William
Serow, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Population and Economic Research of the University of Virginia.

The overall purpose of Serow's report was to estimate the potential demand for facilities that provide care for preschool children (0-5 years) whose mothers participate in the labor force. Estimates were determined on a statewide and on a planning district basis. Not included in the estimates of potential demand were a) children who did not live with their parents, b) children who lived with their father only, and c) mothers who did not work due to a lack of adequate child care facilities for their children.

The report, entitled "Day Care in Virginia: Present Status and Future Requirements," presented the following summaries and conclusions:

1) Estimates reveal between 111,600 and 136,700 children under six whose mothers work. The need for child care in Virginia is estimated at between 33,600 and 68,400 spaces.

2) Estimates of existing facilities reveal about 23,300 spaces leaving a shortage of between 11,800 and 45,200 spaces.

3) The cost estimates of meeting this level of demand are high, as high as $180 million in the first year with recurring costs amounting to $90 million per year.

4) The federal government and some states have enacted legislation providing for the establishment, equipping, and operation of child care centers and the training of necessary personnel to staff these centers. Interest on the part of business is growing in providing quality care on a commercial basis.

5) To meet the need for child care in Virginia, interest and
concern must spread to all segments of society. The following steps might be taken to translate concern into action:

a) A series of more comprehensive studies could be initiated including:

--a statewide in-depth survey to determine the needs for child care among all segments of the population;
--a study of modern techniques used in child care so that new centers will provide a useful educational and social service to the child, not merely a custodial role;
--a thorough survey of child care legislation enacted by other states, along with their problems of implementation.

b) Programs could be initiated at more educational institutions, particularly the community colleges, to train directors, supervisors, and teachers.

c) State expenditures on child care, currently consisting of reimbursement to localities for the state's share (15%) of federally-sponsored programs, could be continued.

d) Specific tax incentives might be given to industry to encourage their support of day care centers.

In the final pages of the report, Serow (1971) commented,

In the state of Virginia, there has been very little in the way of legislation that would encourage the development of day care centers . . . It would seem that . . . drawing up of incentives to contribute to the establishment and operation of day care facilities should receive serious consideration by the legislature (p. 88).

Further evidence of Virginia's concern over the child care crisis
is witnessed in the Report of Governor's Conference on Day Care Needs in Virginia (May 1973). The conference was called together by Governor Linwood Holton to examine the state's need for child care and to take initial steps in providing quality services.

The goals of the conference were outlined by Governor Holton:

1) to hold a representative conference by bringing together all people in Virginia concerned with child care;

2) to plan cooperative programs for quality child care;

3) to coordinate efforts of all persons so that services will be beneficial and standards of quality will be consistently met;

4) to develop possible legislation to be offered to the General assembly where there is a need to provide statutes to ensure that the goals of child care in Virginia will be met.

The central overriding concern of the participants in the conference was the need for a new state office--an Office for Children in the Office of the Governor--to plan, promote, coordinate and evaluate the many and varied components involved in the delivery of child care services in Virginia. Other conference recommendations included:

--that the best of resources, both human and financial, be allocated to the new Office for Children;

--that the criteria for the director of the office include both a professional background in an early childhood field and administrative ability;

--that the structure provide for coordination of agencies;

--that a coordinating council be established to serve in an advisory capacity to the office and in an advocacy capacity for the well-
that the council establish within each county or planning district similar councils which would work for services for children at that level and make recommendations to the state level council;

--that special task forces and committees be named and receive the necessary support services and funding to begin work on the following implementation suggestions:

1) that the Governor assign the task of preparing a legislative proposal to establish an Office for Children for action by the 1974 General Assembly;

2) that the Governor immediately appoint a Task Force to develop patterns for funding assistance to child care programs;

3) that the State Board of Welfare and Institutions be advised of the support of the Conference for upgrading quality and including the developmental component in child care standards;

4) that the Virginia Day Care Licensing Statute be examined and, if changes are needed, that these be recommended to the 1974 General Assembly;

5) that funds be made available for better monitoring of programs under present licensing standards;

6) that a committee of representatives of the four year colleges, community colleges, and of this conference be named to make a comprehensive study of the quantity and quality of pre-service and in-service educational opportunities for
child care personnel in Virginia and that a state plan should be developed to make educational programs available to personnel in every geographic area;

7) that a committee of members of the State Department of Education and of early childhood development and education specialists be directed to consider the standards for the preparation of teachers of children under six.

Included in the recommendations section was the statement,

The conference is aware that there will be a period of time required for the establishment of an Office for Children and for its becoming functional (p. 18).


**Child Care on the Community College Campus**

Although child care services are, in fact, present on community college campuses throughout the country in the forms of community service, student service, and learning laboratories, the review of literature revealed very little printed information concerning child care services in affiliation with community colleges. Numerous readings were available on the general topics of community service (Reynolds, 1956; Medsker, 1960; Harlacher, 1969; Monroe, 1972), student service (Fitzgerald, Johnson and Norris, 1970; Monroe, 1972; O'Banion and Thurston, 1972), and learning laboratories (Blair, Curtis, and Moon, 1958; Nash and Lofthouse, 1964; Read 1971) and examples were often given as to particular services offered under each of these categories. However, few references specifically mentioned child care as an example of such a service.
In 1956 Leland Medsker under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation participated in an extensive series of investigations conducted under the broad title of "The Diversification of American Higher Education" at the University of California at Berkeley. Medsker's part in the investigation focused on the community college asking, "What is the role of the two-year college in higher education both now and in the future?" (Medsker, 1960).

Medsker covered a wide variety of topics pertaining to the community college, including research on the community service function of the institution. The sample of his community services survey included 243 community colleges of various organizational, financial, and control patterns. The data were collected on provided forms according to a uniform design developed by the director of the study. Of the 243 colleges, 219 (90%) reported special services that fell into the categories listed. Examination of the data led to the conclusion that community colleges were performing a wide variety of community services over and beyond formalized classroom instruction and, more specifically, that 41 of the 243 reporting colleges were performing child care services for demonstration and instructional purposes. Child care was present on the community college campus in a dual role (Medsker, 1960).

More recently, a 1972 survey of community services was conducted by the National Council on Community Services in Community and Junior Colleges. It gathered information on the administration of community services, the types of programs in effect, and the types of programs planned for the near future. The sample included 1000 community colleges across the nation; 787 (approximately 75%) responded. Twenty-three
programs, activities, and services were identified in the survey instrument. Respondents were requested to identify the types of offerings presently available at their college, those being planned and developed, and those not available or planned. The data collected from the survey ranked child care services 22nd (out of the twenty-three identified programs) under the category Programs Presently Available; 116 community colleges operated child care services at the time of the survey. Of greater importance was the data showing 172 more community colleges planning to open child care facilities, thereby placing it number one (out of the twenty-three identified programs) under the category Programs Being Planned and Developed. Examination of the data again revealed that community colleges were providing a wide range of community service programs and, more specifically, that child care services on the community college campus were numerous and of growing concern.

Traicoff (1972) concluded that child care centers on the community college campus, although a non-traditional form of involvement in the community, were a response to working mothers and student mothers, as well as laboratories for child development and early childhood education students. He felt that the large number of institutions planning to provide this service (172) indicated the need for high priority in national, regional, or state conferences and workshops.

In Virginia, to date, no evidences of child care service affiliated with the Virginia Community College System were available in the literature. The survey of community services by the National Council on Community Services in Community and Junior Colleges (1972) revealed:
No child care services on Virginia's community college campuses;
No plans to establish child care services in the near future.

In summary, the need for developmental child care services has been established. Although this need is most strongly felt by the working parent, it has also been approached from the point of view of the child. Federal attempts to ease the child care crisis have emerged in the form of scattered and unrelated programs to finance the various aspects of child care. The largest and most comprehensive attempt to initiate a federal system of child care—the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971—was vetoed by President Nixon as being fiscally irresponsible, administratively unworkable, and family weakening. On the state level initial steps have been taken (reports, conferences, studies, etc.) to investigate child care inadequacies. However, little legislative action has been passed with regard to child care and no plans have been formulated with regard to a state plan for child care services in Virginia. Lastly, child care services have been found on numerous community college campuses of our nation as community services, student services, and learning laboratories. Surveys revealed their increasing numbers and a growing concern for this particular type of service. In Virginia, no evidences of an affiliation between child care services and Virginia's community colleges were present in the literature.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

A project is only as strong as the amount and type of administrative leadership and support it receives; therefore, the sample for this investigation included all the Presidents and Directors of Continuing Education from Virginia's twenty-three community colleges.

Procedure

Permission to conduct this study was secured through Fred A. Snyder, Director of Research and Planning for Virginia's Department of Community Colleges. A listing of the twenty-three community colleges and their addresses was obtained from Don W. Galbreith, Coordinator, Public Service Technology, Virginia Department of Community Colleges.

A questionnaire, constructed by the investigator, was mailed to each subject along with an explanation of the purpose and scope of the investigation, a copy of the letter of permission, and a list of definitions. The instrument was designed to discover:

1) the attitudes about the relationship between child care services and Virginia's community colleges;

2) the present state of development of child care services on Virginia's community college campuses.

More specifically, the questionnaire was designed to elicit
descriptive information concerning the name and enrollment of the college, the population base served by the college, child care as a community service, child care as a student service, child care as a learning laboratory, and the plans of each college for implementing child care facilities. The total number of responses to the questionnaire is presented in Table 1.

**Analysis of Data**

All of the thirty-four questionnaires returned were used. However, examination of the data revealed a number of conflicting answers between Presidents and Continuing Education Directors of the same institution on questions that stated factual knowledge, as opposed to an attitude. The following topics evidenced conflicts:

-- population base served,
-- present student enrollment,
-- availability of child care, child development, or early childhood education programs,
-- implementation plans,
-- funds, staff, and physical facilities available.

Because of these conflicting answers it was often difficult to compare results. For this reason, information was presented as "responses from officials" rather than "responses from individual community colleges."

Also, questions pertaining to population base served and student enrollment were not used at all. Because of the small sample size and the fact that the total population was employed, descriptive rather than inferential statistics were used. Only the number of responses and percentages were computed for each individual item.
### Table 1
**Response to the Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number responding (n=46)</th>
<th>Percent responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials returning the questionnaire</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents returning the questionnaire</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education Directors returning the questionnaire</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges returning both questionnaires</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges returning one questionnaire</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges returning zero questionnaires</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The specific needs for child care services and the extent of these needs at each local community college are presented in Table 2. Fifty percent of the Presidents and 61% of the Continuing Education Directors felt that the communities in which they were located had a great need for child care services. They indicated by their answers that the community's need was much greater than that of the students or instructors of the college with 56% labeling a great need for a community child care service, 33% recognizing a great need for a learning laboratory, and 19% recognizing a great need for a student service child care facility. Responses totaled in the categories of "great need" and "some need" indicated that officials recognized that major needs for child care services existed in all three areas—the community, student groups, and educational curriculums. More specifically, 100% of the officials recognized "some" or "great need" for child care as a community service; 79% recognized "some" or "great need" for child care as a student service; 76% recognized "some" or "great need" for child care as a learning laboratory situation. In summary, the responses heavily indicated local needs for child care services. These data were consistent with the statistics presented in the review of literature revealing statewide needs for child care services.

None of the officials recognized "little" or "no need" for child care.
Table 2

The Need for Child Care Services as a Community Service, Student Service or Learning Laboratory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community Service</th>
<th></th>
<th>Student Service*</th>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Laboratory**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=34)</td>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td>(n=16) (n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great need</td>
<td>8 50.0</td>
<td>11 61.1</td>
<td>2 13.3</td>
<td>4 23.5</td>
<td>5 31.3 6 35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 55.9</td>
<td>6 18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some need</td>
<td>8 50.0</td>
<td>7 38.9</td>
<td>11 73.3</td>
<td>10 58.8</td>
<td>6 37.5 9 52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 44.1</td>
<td>21 65.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little need</td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>2 13.3</td>
<td>3 17.6</td>
<td>1 6.3 1 5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>5 15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need</td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>4 25.0 1 5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unanswered by one President and one Continuing Education Director.

** Unanswered by one Continuing Education Director.
care services at the community level; 15% saw "little need" for child care as a student service; 20% saw "little" or "no need" for child care services as learning laboratories—this attitude being expressed most frequently by the Presidents with 31% responding in this manner as opposed to 12% of the Continuing Education Directors. The lack of a need for learning laboratories appeared unrelated to the availability of child care, child development, or early childhood education programs; of those seven responses stating "little" or "no need" for a learning laboratory, three of the responding officials stated that their colleges did provide child care, child development, or early childhood education programs and four did not.

In Table 3: a) attitudes pertaining to the relationship between preschool oriented curriculums and child care services and b) information about the number of existing child care programs and services on Virginia's community college campuses are presented. Over one-half of the community college Presidents (63%) and Continuing Education Directors (67%) stated that their community colleges offered programs that focused on preschool children. However, none of the colleges provided a child care service, thereby reinforcing information presented by Traicoff (1972) in the review of literature.

It should be noted that one institution was associated to some degree with a child care service operated by the faculty wives club in a nearby church. Although it was provided as a student service, it was not maintained or operated by the community college per se.

Attitudes of the different groups of officials closely paralleled each other with respect to the relationship between child care programs
### Table 3
Attitudes and Information Pertaining to Child Care Programs and Services on Virginia's Community College Campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pres. (n=16)</th>
<th>C.Ed.D. (n=18)</th>
<th>Total Officials (n=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does your college offer child care, child development, or early childhood education programs of study?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does your college operate a child care service?</strong></td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>16 100.0</td>
<td>0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is it necessary to have an educational program of study related to early childhood before a child care service can be established?</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 20.0</td>
<td>12 80.0</td>
<td>5 29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unanswered by one President and one Continuing Education Director.*
and child care services. One-fourth of the officials felt that it was necessary for a college to have an educational curriculum pertaining to young children before a child care service could be established; 75% of the officials felt such an arrangement was not necessary. This attitude seems to imply that Virginia community college officials have accepted all of the major functions of the community college as defined in the literature:

1) preparation for advanced study (transfer),
2) vocational education,
3) general education,
4) student personnel services (guidance and counseling),
5) community service

(Harlacher, 1969; Kelley, 1970; Virginia Higher Education Commission Staff Report, 1965). The community college is not just an institution to provide opportunities for learning. Education, community service, and student service are recognized as equal functions of the institution (Evans, 1973; Reynolds, 1965; Thornton, 1966). Virginia community college officials have looked beyond the boundaries of the educational institution into the community to seek out the needs of the local citizens. Further, they have identified student needs, as well as the needs of instructors attempting to enhance their learning situations through the use of a learning laboratory. It appears that the child care service would be undertaken, not just to be educationally useful to the college curriculum, but for the good of the community and the student body.

The appropriateness of child care services in the form of community service or student service is shown in Table 4. Child care as a community
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presidents (n=15)</th>
<th>C.Ed.Dir. (n=18)</th>
<th>Total Officials (n=33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Service*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unanswered by one President.

** Unanswered by two Continuing Education Directors.
service was acceptable to all of the Continuing Education Directors (100%) and to a large majority of the Presidents (87%). As a student service a child care service was considered appropriate, although with less support. Sixty-nine percent of the Presidents considered it appropriate; 88% of the Continuing Education Directors considered it appropriate.

After appropriateness of the child care service was defined, official support for its establishment was determined. This information is presented in Table 5. Of the three major areas specified, the Presidents and Continuing Education Directors gave their strongest support to child care as a community service project (47%) with learning laboratories ranking second (35%) and student services last (30%). Twice as many Continuing Education Directors were likely to give strong support to child care services in each of the three major areas. Under the community service category 61% of the Continuing Education Directors and 31% of the Presidents gave high recommendations; under the student service category 41% of the Continuing Education Directors and 19% of the Presidents gave high recommendations; under the learning laboratory category 44% of the Continuing Education Directors and 25% of the Presidents gave high recommendations. It seems likely that the nature of the Continuing Education Director's position and the responsibilities attached to it would not only cause the Continuing Education Director to be more service oriented than the Presidents, but would place them in a position of greater contact with age groups in need of child care services.

Further information about the amount of support officials would give a child care service project is shown in Table 6. When Presidents
Table 5

Officials' Recommendations for Child Care Services as Community Service Projects, Student Service Projects or Learning Laboratories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community Service</th>
<th>Student Service*</th>
<th>Learning Laboratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents' Recommendations (n=16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents' Recommendations* (n=18)</td>
<td>5 31.3</td>
<td>6 37.5</td>
<td>5 31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Ed. Directors' Recommendations (n=17)</td>
<td>11 61.1</td>
<td>5 27.8</td>
<td>2 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Official Recommendations (n=33)</td>
<td>16 47.1</td>
<td>11 32.4</td>
<td>7 20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unanswered by one Continuing Education Director.
Table 6

Priorities Given to a Child Care Service Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community Service Project</th>
<th>Student Service Project*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Priorities (n=16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Ed. Directors' Priorities (n=18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Official Priorities (n=34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unanswered by two Continuing Education Directors.
and Continuing Education Directors considered a child care service project within the broad spectrum of community and student service projects possible, most responses were placed under the category of "average support." Although great needs for child care services were cited by officials, the average priority given to these needs implies that other needs exist at the community colleges that are considered of greater importance.

Traicoff (1972) presented information revealing national trends toward inclusion of child care services on the community college campus. Community colleges in Virginia are also experiencing increased concern and involvement with child care inadequacies. Information concerning the implementation of child care services is presented in Table 7. Approximately one-half of the reporting officials (53%) stated their institutions were considering the implementation of a child care service. However, practical considerations such as funding, physical facilities, and staff were, in most cases, unavailable. Only one-third of the responses indicated that early childhood staff members were available, although, in many cases, on a part-time basis; only one-fifth of the responses indicated that physical facilities were available to house a child care service and meet the needs of young children; no responses indicated funds available in the current budget for a child care service, although a small percentage of officials (13%) felt they might be able to secure funds from existing budgets.

Interest in funding information is presented in Table 8. Although 65% of the officials were aware of agencies to which proposals might be submitted for funding, interest in funding information was extremely high,
Table 7
Implementation Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>C.Ed.Dir.</th>
<th>Total Official Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否有您的学院正在考虑实施儿童保育服务？</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
<td>(n=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 50.0</td>
<td>8 50.0</td>
<td>10 55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否有足够的物理设施能够满足幼儿的需求？*</td>
<td>(n=14)</td>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td>(n=31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 21.4</td>
<td>11 78.6</td>
<td>4 23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否有可用的物理设施可以被改编以满足幼儿的需求？**</td>
<td>(n=11)</td>
<td>(n=13)</td>
<td>(n=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>11 100.0</td>
<td>0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否有早期教育领域的员工可以经营儿童保育服务？***</td>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 26.7</td>
<td>11 73.3</td>
<td>7 43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否有资金在预算中用于儿童保育服务？****</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td>(n=33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>16 100.0</td>
<td>0 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 - Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>C.Ed.Dir.</th>
<th>Total Official Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could funds be made available from your current budget?*****</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=14)</td>
<td>(n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of agencies to which proposals may be submitted for funding?</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
<td>(n=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unanswered by two Presidents and one Continuing Education Director.
** Unanswered by two Presidents.
*** Unanswered by one President and two Continuing Education Directors.
**** Unanswered by one Continuing Education Director.
***** Unanswered by four Continuing Education Directors.
Table 8

Interest in Funding Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ed. Dir.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Official Responses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
particularly on the part of the Continuing Education Directors. A few officials commented that they had investigated some funding sources through letters, personal visits, and phone calls but the results of their endeavors were unsuccessful. One Continuing Education Director stated that if his college could get the funding for a facility and the equipment, the college could manage to finance operation of a child care service.

Of the eighteen responses indicating institutions considering implementation of a child care service, the type and purpose of the service are defined in Table 9. Because of the construction of the question pertaining to the purpose for establishing a child care service, many officials marked more than one purpose for their proposed service. Therefore, it was difficult to determine whether or not plans for establishing a child care center fell in line with previously determined needs. Over one-half of the responses supported the child care service in all three aspects—community service, student service, and learning laboratory. Finally, Table 9 illustrates that all but one official saw child care in the new developmental framework, rather than in a custodial role.

Attitudes toward the adaptability of the state's master plan of community college locations in providing conveniently located child care services to Virginia's communities are presented in Table 10. A majority of the officials (71%), with slightly higher scores from Continuing Education Directors (Continuing Education Directors 87%, Presidents 57%), felt the scattered locations could lend themselves well to meeting child care needs.
Table 9

Type and Purpose of Proposed Child Care Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Care</th>
<th>Presidents (n=8)</th>
<th>Continuing Ed. Directors (n=10)</th>
<th>Total Official Responses (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Custodial and Developmental</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Laboratory*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Officials often marked more than one purpose for their proposed service.
Table 10

Adaptability of State Master Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents (n=14)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.Ed.Dir. (n=17)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Official Responses (n=31)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unanswered by two Presidents and one Continuing Education Director.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the present study was to examine 1) the attitudes of Virginia Community college officials pertaining to the relationship between child care services and Virginia's community colleges, and 2) the present state of development of child care services on Virginia community college campuses. All 23 community college Presidents and 23 Directors of Continuing Education were surveyed using a questionnaire constructed by the investigator. Data were collected during June and July, 1974. Sixteen Presidents and 18 Continuing Education Directors responded.

The data revealed that both Presidents and Continuing Education Directors were accepting of a relationship between child care services and the community college. Officials identified the greatest need for child care services at the community level, followed by lesser needs by students and instructional personnel. Child care services were considered most appropriate as community service followed by student service; official recommendations were strong for child care as a community service with child care as learning laboratories and student service following; only average priority and support were given to child care when considered within the realm of all community and student service.
Furthermore, over one-half of the responses indicated that child care, child development, or early childhood programs were in existence at the community college level. However, none of the colleges operated any form of child care service, even though 70% felt it unnecessary for a program of study to be in operation before a service could be established.

Next, although no child care services were present on Virginia community college campuses, responses indicated that plans for implementation were being considered at a number of the colleges. Plans specified establishment of developmental services for all three purposes—community service, student service, instructional learning laboratories. Practical considerations such as staff, physical facilities, and funding were, in most cases, unavailable. Lastly, the state's master plan of community college locations was considered well suited to meeting statewide child care needs.

Conclusions

Virginia community college officials appear to be concerned about the inadequacies in our state's child care services. They have recognized and defined the extent of needs that exist for child care services in various contexts—communities, student circles, and instructional areas. Their answers indicate that they recognize child care as a legitimate project of the community college and that they plan to support child care services on the community college campus in the form of community service, student service, and learning laboratories. Although officials exhibit positive attitudes
about the relationship between child care services and Virginia community colleges and actual steps have been taken by some of the colleges to set up child care services, no centers are presently affiliated with the Virginia Community College System.

Recommendations

In view of the present study, some recommendations for future action seem appropriate:

1) Reconstruction of several of the items on the questionnaire (particularly those questions concerned with the effect of population base served and enrollment on the need for services) could possibly eliminate conflicts in answering factual information.

2) Research into the areas of funding, physical facilities, and staffing could prove beneficial.

3) Further steps could be taken to identify funding sources and deliver them to the individual community colleges.

4) The information from this study could possibly be of value to the Governor's Office or any other state agency involved in the child care crisis. Presentation of the results of this investigation could make officials aware of the community colleges' resources and desires to participate in filling the need for child care services in Virginia.
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Community Colleges Surveyed

1. Blue Ridge Community College
2. Central Virginia Community College
3. Dabney S. Lancaster Community College
4. Danville Community College
5. Eastern Shore Community College
6. Germanna Community College
7. J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
8. John Tyler Community College
9. Lord Fairfax Community College
10. Mountain Empire Community College
11. New River Community College
12. Northern Virginia Community College
13. Patrick Henry Community College
14. Paul D. Camp Community College
15. Piedmont Virginia Community College
16. Rappahannock Community College
17. Southside Virginia Community College
18. Southwest Virginia Community College
19. Thomas Nelson Community College
20. Tidewater Community College
21. Virginia Highlands Community College
22. Virginia Western Community College
23. Wytheville Community College
Dear

Of growing concern to Virginian's today is the need for quality child care services. Although various agencies have provided these services, the need continues to exceed the available supply.

Recommendations from the Governor's Conference on Day Care Needs in Virginia (May 1973) suggest that the responsibility of child care services might be shared by the educational institutions. For this reason, the following questionnaire is being presented to Virginia's community college Presidents and Directors of Continuing Education. Its purpose is to discover a) attitudes about the relationship between child care services and Virginia's community colleges and b) present stages of development of child care services on Virginia's community colleges.

The following definitions may be useful:

1) child care service--an organized service to supplement home care that includes both the care and protection of children along with opportunities to develop the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical aspects of life.

2) community service--special services beyond formalized classroom instruction which result in programs beneficial to the community in which the college is located.

3) student service--special services beyond formalized classroom instruction which administer to the personal needs and problems of the students of the college.

4) learning laboratory--a laboratory setting to provide practical learning experiences, training, and research for those planning to work with young children.

5) custodial care--the provision of physical care, supervision, and protection.

6) developmental care--the provision of physical care, supervision, and protection ALONG WITH opportunities to develop the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical aspects of life.

Your efforts and cooperation in filling out and returning this questionnaire, as soon as possible, will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Judith G. Roehling (signed)
Ms. Judith G. Roehling  
Department of Management, Housing  
and Family Development  
College of Home Economics  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and  
State University  
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Dear Ms. Roehling:  

Your letter to Dr. Burnette about a study of child care services and programs at Virginia community colleges has been referred to me.

As you may know, we are developing a review procedure for considering requests to conduct research at our community colleges. This procedure is necessitated by the many requests we receive. Meanwhile, I will present your request to our research request review committee, using the materials and information which you have sent to Dr. Burnette. No other information will be necessary.

The committee will review your request on May 23 and I should be able to inform you of our decision by telephone on May 24.

Very truly yours,

Fred A. Snyder  
Director  
Research and Planning Division

FAS:egw

cc: Dr. Perry R. Adams  
Dr. William Keim
1. What is the name of your college? ________________________________

2. Estimate the population base served by your college. ________________________________

3. What is the present total student enrollment of your college? ________________________________

Child Care as a Community Service Project (Circle one answer.)

1. To what extent does a need for community child care services exist within your geographic location? Great Some Little No need need need need

2. Would you consider a child care service an appropriate community service project? Yes No

3. To what extent would you recommend the establishment of a child care service on your campus for the purpose of a community service? high recommendation average recommendation low recommendation

4. When considering the total community service effort of your college, what priority would a child care project receive? high average low

5. Do you feel that the state's master plan of community college locations would lend itself to offering conveniently located child care services to Virginia's communities? Yes No

6. Comments:

Child Care as a Student Service Project (Circle one answer.)

1. To what extent does the need for child care services exist among the students of your college while they pursue educational endeavors? Great Some Little No need need need need

2. Would you consider a child care service an appropriate student service project? Yes No

3. To what extent would you recommend the establishment of a child care service on your campus for the purpose of student service? high recommendation average recommendation low recommendation

4. When considering the total student services effort of your college, what priority would a child care project receive? high average low

5. Comments:
Child Care as a Learning Laboratory (Circle one answer.)

1. Does your college offer programs in child care, early childhood education, or child development?  
   Yes  No

2. To what extent does the need for a learning laboratory exist at your college to supplement child care, early childhood education, or child development programs?  
   Great  Some  Little  No need need need need

3. To what extent would you recommend the establishment of a child care service on your campus for the purpose of a learning laboratory?  
   high recommendation  average recommendation  low recommendation

4. Do you feel it is necessary for a child care, early childhood education, or child development program to be in force at your college before a child care service could be established?  
   Yes  No

5. Comments:

Plans for Implementing Child Care Facilities (Circle one, or more, if appropriate)

1. Is your college considering the implementation of a child care service?  
   Yes  No

2. If you are considering such a service, for which of the following purposes would it be established?  
   community service  student service  learning laboratory

3. What type of child care service would your college provide?  
   custodial  developmental  both

4. Is a physical facility available on your campus to house a child care service (special furnishings, bathroom facilities, equipment)?  
   Yes  No

5. If not, is a physical facility available on your campus which could be adapted to meet the needs of young children?  
   Yes  No

6. Are there staff members available at your college to operate child care services with skills in the areas of child care, early childhood education or child development?  
   Yes  No
7. Are the funds to operate a child care service available at your college?  Yes  No
8. Could funds be made available from your budget to operate a child care service on your campus?  Yes  No
9. Are you aware of agencies to which proposals may be submitted for funding?  Yes  No
10. Would you be interested in information on funding?  Yes  No
11. Comments.
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A STUDY OF CHILD CARE SERVICES IN
VIRGINIA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by
Judith Freyhauf Roehling

(ABSTRACT)

The present study investigated 1) the attitudes of Virginia community college officials pertaining to the relationship between child care services and Virginia's community colleges and 2) the present state of development of child care services on Virginia's community college campuses. The sample included all the Presidents and Directors of Continuing Education from Virginia's twenty-three community colleges.

Data obtained from a questionnaire constructed by the investigator revealed a) that both Presidents and Continuing Education Directors were accepting of the relationship between child care services and the community college campus, b) that they plan to support child care services on the community college campus in the forms of community service, student service, and learning laboratories, and c) that although attitudes were positive about the concept of child care on the community college campus, no services were available because of a lack of staff, physical facilities and funds.