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An increasing focus on early childhood education and brain research offers a prime opportunity for higher education institutions to research and formulate thought concerning quality child care. Currently, there is limited research examining the impact and roles of child care centers on university campuses. To add to the base of knowledge, this nationally-focused study examined the following broad question: “what value do campus child care centers offer to a given higher education institution and its surrounding community, especially from a center director’s perspective?”

An on-line survey was sent to over 400 campus child care directors at two- and four-year public and private colleges and universities to assess perceptions regarding their centers’ internal and external roles, as well as each director’s role. A response rate of 191 (48%) was achieved.

Directors believe their centers are most successful within the university by offering a variety of care options, modeling age appropriate practices, and providing work opportunities for students. Campus centers are most successful in their external communities by modeling quality child care practices and secondly, improving relations.
This study found a lack of substantial barriers to the successful daily operation of most centers.

The dependent variables of this study were center integration, internal and external success. Independent variables included number of years a director has served, years a center has been in existence, types of programs offered by the center, activities undertaken by the center director, and mission of center as understood by administrators. It was found that an active campus child care director with a comprehensive grasp and contextual leadership positively influences integration into the university. On the other hand, a major finding of this study was that only a small percentage of centers are fully integrated.

Administrators should continue to support the function of a comprehensive center. Overall, study findings reveal that the perceived value of the campus center is through dissemination of its mission of education, training and meeting the needs of its constituents for the benefit of the university.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

A college student is intently observing a child engaged in constructing a block tower within a college campus child care center. Why is this child at this place at this time? Is his parent a student in the university, on the faculty or from the surrounding community? Is the student observing the child as a course requirement? Are other researchers from various departments coming and going? These questions are of interest to early childhood researchers and to this end, the present study examined the reasons for university child care centers’ existence, the types of services they offer, issues and barriers to the ongoing operation they encounter, and the perceived value and impact of such centers. The roles of the campus child care center and the director, how the center is connected to a higher education institution, as well as the overall integration of the center into the university’s mission, also were investigated. This investigation is important because little research has been done in these areas beyond descriptive studies, and more is needed to understand of the roles of campus centers and directors in relation to higher education.

Background and Previous Research

The home ideally is a child’s first and primary place of holistic child care. From birth to school age, most parents care for their children in all domains: physical, social, psychological emotional, intellectual, and spiritual. With the increase of dual career parents in the work force, the need for childcare outside the home has risen. Over 50% of children under age one, 65% of preschool age children, and 75% of 6-13 year olds have mothers who are working outside the home (Gestwicki, 2007). This is an increase of more than 10% over the previous decade.
Given this trend, recent research has renewed focus on the need for quality childcare and early childhood education. Brain research has shown that there is a window of opportunity for brain development and certain peak times for various areas of development such as language (Arcangelo, 1998) and all areas of a baby's development ("Zero to Three," 2009). Quality early experiences are therefore foundational for children's learning and success throughout their school years. According to the Children's Defense Fund (2001), high quality child care and education have a positive effect on the academic performance of all children, especially children at risk for failure in school and those from low-income families. Schweinhart and Weikart (1985) reported that quality preschool programs can lead to positive short and long-term effects, especially for low-income children. Longer-term effects include higher intellectual performance, reduced special education placements, and lower high school dropout rates.

Early childhood programs in the United States are currently offered by a number of public and private entities. These include child care centers, family day care homes, in-home care, care of relatives other than parents, corporation-based centers, private preschools, and public school-based centers (e.g., after/before care, preschool, readiness or Head Start). The focus of this study is the college and university (i.e., campus-based) center. Such campus-based centers include a variety of forms (Keys, 1995). For example, some campus-based centers are located within laboratory schools or teacher education departments, others in home economic departments, and still others are within student or personnel service or family housing divisions. Such programs may be all-day, half-day, evening, weekend, or any combination of these. They may accept only children of students, faculty and staff or may also open their enrollment to the surrounding
community. The present study investigates the interactions between such campus centers, their university, and the surrounding communities because few previous studies about campus child care exist.

In the United States, there are around 2,000 higher education institutions, out of a total of 4,323 (46%), that provide early care and education programs (Carlson, 2003). Of these campus centers, about 75% are accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children or are in the process of accreditation. Given such standards, campus-based centers in general tend to meet a higher level of quality than do other forms of early care and education programs (Carlson, 2003).

Besides a need for quality child care, the changing demographics of college students must also be considered when looking at university-based childcare centers. Nontraditional students are older and often work, as well as have family responsibilities (Horn, Peter, & Rooney, 2002). Such older student populations have increased the demand for university based child care. In one study of the impact of campus-based child care centers, researchers found that more than 80% of student-parents aged 21-40 stated that child care was a critical issue in their decision to enroll at a certain institution (Fadale & Winter, 1991). The need for adequate and quality childcare has continued for these groups into the 21st century. Surveys often show that finding quality child care is a barrier for reaching educational goals of the nontraditional student (Gribbons & Meuschke, 2003), as well as the traditional undergraduate (Jackson, 1988).

Campus centers are one way to remove this barrier, in that such services have been shown to be effective tools in recruitment and retention (Kihara, 1997). Traditionally, however, colleges have slowly or rarely implemented these services to
meet the unique needs nontraditional students. For example, in the concluding remarks of a study by Cabrera, Nora and Castandeda (1993) on college persistence, the authors recommended that institutions need a focused effort to bring together a variety of student support services that address student attrition. Since child care can be a barrier for enrolling or returning to college (Fadale & Winter, 1991), it is beneficial to examine child care as a student support service and a possible aid to retention. For example, the University of New York conducted a study involving the impact of child care centers on student-parents, concluding that graduation rates were higher for student-parents when they had the support service of campus care. They were also more likely to remain in school, graduate in fewer years, and earn higher grades (Kappner, 2002).

Besides meeting the needs of student-parents, campus centers offer a potential breeding ground for research, lab work, and service in early childhood programs as well as other social service departments. However, initial research has found that campus-based centers as a whole still need to do a better job of linking to the overall academic mission of a university and to more carefully monitor and manage a center’s mission in regards to the teaching, researching, and service missions of a college and university system (Keyes, 1984, 1990; Townley & Zeece, 1991). Therefore, the present study investigates the internal impact of centers within the university, including activities like research, teacher training, and observation.

A campus center can also impact the surrounding geographical community. Higher education institutions are interested in communicating their mission to the surrounding community, and a good child care program is a public relation piece that demonstrates the value institutions place on children and families. It can serve as a model
of appropriate child care and early education practices to other child care centers, preschool programs, and parents through workshops and conferences. Possibilities for community connections include: center-based and home-based programs, parent education and counseling, referral services, before and after school programs, enrollment in the campus center, business sponsored events for families, specialty care such as sick, summer, evening and weekend child care, and other special services or events (Keyes, 1989; 1990).

Besides the need for more research on potential internal and external impacts of campus-based centers, little current research exists on the operational issues and challenges facing centers. Some studies indicate that financing is certainly a key issue, but so is the issue of appropriate role. For example, campus centers must meet the challenge of modeling quality curriculum in an appropriate context to combat the image that all they do is provide a baby or child sitting service (Schwartz, 1991). The view that such centers are a secondary service to the primary focus of higher education continues to perpetuate problems of funding, housing of the center, staffing, and academic support (Keyes & Cook, 1988). This service view accounts for many of the struggles for campus centers’ survival and place in higher education (Schwartz, 1991).

Laboratory settings that provide care for young children and their parents also are sources to obtain knowledge about child development and to develop teaching and research skills for college/university students. However, some critics suggest such lab experiences are limiting because they do not allow students to face the same issues child care professionals may confront in other off campus programs (Townley & Zeece, 1991). These authors contend that one way to combat this challenge is to provide a combination
of service and laboratory programs, thus creating a wider range of experiences for university students, while at the same time servicing the needs of families within the higher education setting. The more academic departments interact with the center, the broader the net of influence will be cast. Yet, this leads into another challenge – that of providing consistent and quality curriculum and staff to address increased diversity within the center. Educated staff is necessary to maintain quality and a consistent tone, especially if there is a high volume of students from various departments involved in the center on a day to day basis. These challenges and barriers shape the problem statement and research questions fueling the current investigation.

Problem Statement and Research Questions

Despite having nearly one-half of all higher education institutions offering a campus-based child care center, the role such centers plays within the institution is unclear given the relatively limited number of studies involving them. One aspect of campus center roles relates to how well it is integrated into the institution. Is it seen as an integral component of the university or as only a convenience and an entity to itself? An indicator of integration could be how well top level administrators understand the center’s mission and its importance to the university as a whole. In addition, what role does the director play in helping to develop and maintain a working relationship with the university? A national picture of descriptive data was offered by National Coalition for Campus Children’s Centers (NCCCC) via 1995 and 2003 membership surveys. Other descriptive studies date back to the 1980s, and are summarized in the following paragraphs.
One national descriptive survey (Carlson, 2003) indicated that the benefits of campus centers are not just for students. Carlson found that high-quality on-site care results in less absenteeism, higher productivity, and higher retention rates of student-parents in their work place. Another older national study (Creange, 1980) found benefits include recruiting nontraditional students to reduce enrollment declines, retaining students with young children, providing laboratory settings for research, reducing student lateness and absenteeism, showing a commitment to women and minorities, reducing faculty scheduling problems, attracting competent faculty and staff, and improving community-institution relationships. Overall, previous research has shown that campus child care programs can offer a solution to the challenges of providing quality child care and early education, serve as models for the community and advocates for children, and offer resources for other departments and programs on campus (Keyes & Boulton, 1995).

Despite these findings, most previous research studies are primarily descriptive in nature and have not offered a broader perceptual view of reasons these centers exist and their role in higher education settings. Most previous studies are also now dated, with publication dates in the 1980s or early 1990s (e.g., Corder, 1986; Keyes, 1980; McCorriston, 1992; Sparks, 1986) or have been localized or are regional, highlighting campus child care issues within states, areas or campuses (Gulley, Taylor, & Muldoon, 1985). Initial findings did point to internal and external benefits such as employer-sponsored child care benefits to campus employees, services to employee and student-parents, and observation facilities for university students (McCorriston, 1992). Currently however, campus centers are conceptualized in the literature as fulfilling a single role (e.g., staff/student clientele, lab, student practicums, research, cross departmental
functions) or a combination of these roles (comprehensive centers). More current information has attempted to clarify an understanding of the dynamic and interconnected nature of these roles and their interactions within the university and broader community.

The need and demand for quality care has grown tremendously, as previously noted. The increasing focus on early childhood education and brain research offers a prime opportunity for higher education institutions to lead research and formulate thought in this field. Currently, there appears to be a lack of attention directed towards research examining the impact and roles of on-site centers and the role of directors, especially in regards to higher education. Thus, the present study examines the following broad question: “What value do on-site child care centers offer to a given higher education institution and its surrounding community, especially from a center director’s perspective?” Other studies have investigated the director’s leadership role (Bloom, 1998), but little has been done concerning campus director roles and opinions.

A primary purpose of this study, therefore, is to investigate the types of services that university child care centers offer, reasons for their existence, barriers and issues and perceived roles of such centers. The perceptions of directors of childcare centers located on four-year public and private college campuses were assessed to discover each center’s internal, external and operational role and its place within institutions of higher education. Center directors wear many hats and perform several roles simultaneously, serving as the intersecting point of reference for families, children, staff, administrators, college personnel, and students and the community. This multi-faceted aspect of their work causes them to perceive the whole and then to react to it in some way. Their sense of the whole state of affairs, or prehensive grasp, at their centers can be influential to
interactions and roles within and without. This concept of prehension is explained further in the conceptual framework section. Thus, it was prudent to begin with the directors in examining and understanding their programs.

The research questions for this study examine contextual issues, internal and external roles, data dealing with barriers and challenges of campus-based centers and the role of the director. The main inquiry focuses on ways campus centers serve a specific function and influential role within institutions of higher education. The following specific research questions were instrumental in answering the central question of this study.

1. What is the current state of higher education sponsored early childhood and campus-based centers including:
   (a) the characteristics of these centers in regards to enrollment, clientele, types of programs offered; and
   (b) the factors which lead to their creation as understood by the center directors?

2. What impacts do directors believe their centers have had on their:
   (a) internal university community (e.g., student retention; research; teacher training); and
   (b) external university community (e.g., model quality care, training)?

3. What challenges to successful operation of campus-based child care centers do the directors of these centers describe?

4. To what extent do directors engage in activities which demonstrate a "prehensive grasp" regarding the role of their center (e.g., the activities
directors use to communicate the mission of their center and to integrate their center into the university)?

5. To what extent do several input variables (e.g., number of years a director has served, years a center has been in existence, types of programs offered by the center, activities undertaken by the center director, and mission of center as understood by administrators) relate to the perceived internal and external successes of the center, including the level of integration into the university?

This study was accomplished by surveying campus center directors who are members of a professional organization and located within public and private two- and four-year colleges and universities throughout the United States. A request for participation was sent out on a listserv as well as emailed to members' centers. The gender of the directors that responded to the survey is considered to be primarily, if not exclusively, female based on listserv and organizational directory observations. Directors are therefore referred to as females throughout the research study. Their identity as well as the center they represent remains confidential.

Conceptual Framework for Study

In this study, an examination of campus centers is the focus and was framed by what is currently known and unknown regarding the inner and outer dynamics of how such centers relate in a system of higher education. How such centers are connected to the university, as seen through the eyes of their directors, was examined to shed light on the roles such centers play and services offered in a broader, perceptual context.

Organizational theory and a common professional jargon are often lacking for directors of campus child care centers, argued Bickimer (1991) who discussed The
Prehensive Leadership Model (PLM) as a theory of organization that rests on the shoulders of two leadership theories (1989). The first is the special leadership theory that utilizes the work of Jacob W. Getzel, while the second, the general leadership theory, utilizes the work of Chester I. Barnard (Bickimer, 1991). Both theories focus on leadership in organizations. Special leadership involves the personal, local, “close-in” organization whereas general leadership is more impersonal and has a global, outward focus (Bikimer, 1989). Both types of leadership operate at the same time in ordinary situations. Bickimer’s reference to the Prehensive Leadership Model strives to build on these theories by translating them into practice for campus child care center directors. It advocates leadership to pose a “prehensive grasp” looking and feeling within and outside of the center. Prehension is the act of grasping or seizing; or apprehension by the senses or understanding (The America Heritage Dictionary, 1980). The premise of Bickimer’s work is that campus center directors have the responsibility to grasp wholeheartedly the vision and big picture of what the center is all about; what it wants to accomplish and how and to whom this should be communicated. This “prehensive grasp,” a solid self-concept, can rise above actual realities on the ground such as mediocre location or equipment, turnover, low wages and morale.

Utilizing concepts from PLM theory, this study examined the dynamics of the interaction between the center and university from the vantage point of a key figure, the director. If the director is the quarterback who carries the ball of vision, expertise, leadership and purpose, she is the influential factor in influencing the perception and role of the center. The interactions in which the director and center participates with the university is depicted in Figure 1, which shows the campus center with the internal and
external roles it can fulfill. The director is positioned as the key player and pivotal point in the ebb and flow of activity within and without the higher education institution.

Figure 1. Conceptual model for study.

Internal impact is characterized by participation of academic departments with the center. This study investigated what types of activities and their frequencies are involved with the various departments. External impact examined the ways in which the center interacts with the community surrounding the university and the roles the director envisions playing in that community. Operational challenges were examined including financial, lack of administrative and academic departmental support, staff turnover, child turnover/enrollment instability, low salaries, and low staff morale. Additional operational challenges identified by directors in open-ended response questions are discussed in chapters IV and V. The Prehension Leadership Model with the aspects of purpose,
willingness, and communication as demonstrated by the director, is also a component of
the conceptual model and is further explained in the next chapter.

Chapter I Summary

Chapter I has presented background and previous research, the problem statement,
research questions and conceptual framework. Chapter II will now summarize the
literature regarding the elements of quality care, the short and long term effects of quality
care, history of campus centers, benefits, roles and challenges of campus centers,
community involvement, and further discussion of the PLM, including a diagram
(Figure 2) that visualizes the components of the model. Finally, there will be a summary
of what is known thus far regarding campus centers and the focus areas of my study.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

As stated in the background and previous research section, research on quality child care and its effects support the need for such child care based on theoretical and practical characteristics of early childhood development and education (Barnett, 1995; Schweinhart & Weikart, 1985). Given the fact that a majority of campus centers are accredited, it is important to discuss characteristics of these centers that accreditation bodies such as the National Association of the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) require. Therefore, this literature review provides a snapshot of what an appropriate and good quality childhood program should look like and secondly, what research has found regarding long term effects of such programs. This examination establishes a foundation of what is required to meet the needs of young children in a high quality educational setting. A picture is then painted of the historical roots of campus-based centers in the United States as well as related research, impact, and documentation of this type of center in higher education.

Proposed and researched benefits and services of centers are examined including the academic success of student-parents, student retention and support services, and the needs of nontraditional students (i.e., internal roles). Also, the review offers examples of campus centers and their community involvement (i.e., external roles). Documented challenges and issues in the literature specifically linked with campus centers are discussed (i.e., operational roles). The Prehensive Leadership Model (PLM) is explained in relation to the director’s pivotal position within the center and university. Finally, the review summarizes what we do and do not know about such centers, and points to the need for additional research in this area.
Definition of Quality Child Care and Examples of Its Effects

According to the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC, 2004), high quality child care includes several characteristics. NAEYC’s criteria include

1. Children in the program are happy and relaxed as they learn and play.

2. A variety of engaging materials must be available that are appropriate for the specific grouping of children.

3. There are adults on staff that possess specialized training in early childhood development and education and are sufficient in number according to the age and number of children they are caring for.

4. Staff should recognize and respect individual differences in children’s abilities, interests, and preferences.

5. The needs of the whole child should be addressed including cognitive, social and emotional, and physical development.

This holistic approach not only addresses academic and kindergarten readiness skills such as colors and shapes, but goes beyond to help children learn how to learn, to process information, to be curious and creative, and to be beginning problem solvers.

Quality programs also address social skills such as getting along with others and sharing as well as language, thinking, and motor skill development. Additional characteristics include staff that meet regularly to plan and evaluate the program, a balance between outdoor play and quiet indoor play, and child-centered learning versus teacher-directed learning. Child-centered learning includes activities, lesson plans, and ongoing projects that are flexible and flow from the child’s interests and individual needs.
Finally, quality child care programs have an open door policy where parents are welcome to observe, participate, discuss policies, and make suggestions (NAEYC, 2004).

Quality programs consist of staff who are readily available to discuss a child’s growth and development as they learn through their play. Staff members also need to respect families from all cultural backgrounds and walks of life. NAEYC’s characteristics form the foundational building blocks for quality early childhood programs. NAEYC also offers accreditation as a measure of high quality programs to child care centers and preschools based on these principles (Carlson, 2003).

Quality early childhood programs, including preschool and child care, can have a positive effect on children (Abecedarian Study, 1999; Barnett, 1995; Morrison, 2009; Reynolds, Temple, Robertson, & Mann, 2001). Research reveals both short and long-term benefits, especially for children from lower socioeconomic status. An example of short term effects is an increase in academic achievement (Abecedarian Study, 1999). Examples of long-term effects include reduction of high school dropout rates (Reynolds et al.), higher educational achievement, and lower rates of juvenile arrests (Barnett, 1995; Reynolds et al.).

A recent study on the long-term effects of an early childhood intervention program on both educational achievement and juvenile arrest found that preschool participants in a Chicago early childhood program had a higher rate of high school completion and more years of completed education than those who attended less intensive preschools or had never attended preschool (Reynolds et al., 2001). That fifteen year follow-up study of low-income children in public schools sought to determine the
long-term effectiveness of a federal center-based preschool and school-based intervention program.

Barnett (1995) reviewed 36 studies of public programs and model programs to examine short and long-term effects of various types of early childhood programs for children from low-income families. He concluded overall that children do exhibit long-term benefits in the areas of cognitive and school outcomes. Short-term effects included increased intelligence quotient (IQ) and long-term effects included increased school achievement and grade retention, decreased placement in special education, and improved social adjustment. Of the 36 studies reviewed by Barnett, four criteria were met: the programs began at age four or earlier; the target population were children from low-income households; at least one aspect of cognitive development, school progress, or socialization were measured after age eight; and the research design employed a no-treatment comparison group that was fairly homogenous to the group of children who participated in the early childhood intervention programs.

Fifteen of the programs Barnett (1995) reviewed were model programs and generally had a higher level of quality than the large-scale public programs. They may have had more highly qualified staff, closer supervision of staff by experts in the field, lower child-staff ratios, and smaller group sizes than public program counterparts. Higher levels of funding per child, as compared to a Head Start or public school programs, made these advantages possible. One well-known study in this category is the Carolina Abecedarian study (1972-1985), which investigated children with an average age entering the study of six weeks to three months and the exiting age, five to eight years old (Barnett). The research design was a randomized controlled study of 57 infants from low-
income families enrolled in a high quality child care setting with 54 who were in a non-
treated control group (Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute, 1999). Treated
children scored significantly higher on tests of reading and math from the primary grades
through middle adolescence. All of the model program studies reviewed by Barnett did
show IQ gains either short-term during a child's participation, or long-term following the
study.

The reviewed studies have highlighted quality early childhood programs shown to
affect children in positive ways. The connection between high quality early childhood
programs that influence short term affects - such as academic achievement both in
elementary and later grades - and long term school dropout and juvenile arrest rates serve
to validate the services they offer. Not only have educational and intellectual outcomes
been affected, but social benefits for children have been documented as well through
these studies (Barnett, 1995).

Since many campus-based centers meet national accreditation standards, they
meet the criteria of quality centers as previously defined. They are therefore in a unique
position to affect the futures of young children who attend them within a setting
dedicated to the education of young adults. These centers are founded on educational
theories that promote optimal and influential learning and can be traced back to the late
1800s. These theorists and their theories are discussed in the next section on the history
of campus child care.

History of Campus Child Care

For nearly a century, programs for young children have been on university
campuses, with the first lab school established by John Dewey in 1896 at the University
of Chicago (Keyes, 1990; Keyes & Boulton, 1995). Over the decades, campus-based centers were formed to respond to the particular issues of the day relating to early childhood education.

In the 1920s, children were studied for the purpose of teacher training and parent education (Keyes & Boulton, 1995). These early centers were sponsored by academic departments and were half day or extended-day models with children arriving and departing at the same time.

In the 1930s and 1940s, lab nursery schools on campuses doubled, with the Depression and World War II contributing to an increase in personnel employed first in emergency nursery schools, and then in the Lanham child care centers that were opened during World War II (Keyes & Boulton, 1995). During this era, child care became a public issue when many mothers were employed in defense industry jobs. In 1943, the Lanham Act provided funds for centers for the children of these new working mothers (American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences, 2003). The number of centers on campuses increased as well as those at war plants, often staying open for 24 hours a day (Keyes, 1990). Of the 3,000 centers that were opened in response to this need, about 2,800 closed at the end of the war when most women returned home.

Educational theorists such as Piaget, Bloom, Bruner and Hunt characterized the trend of the 1950s and 1960s by focusing on children’s cognitive development. For example, Jean Piaget believed that learning occurred when children were actively constructing knowledge through exploration and discovery of their social and physical environments (Jackman, 2005). Other issues of the era included the impact of poverty on families as well as the civil rights movement. In response, universities and colleges often
designed innovative programs to help children who were poor (Keyes & Boulton, 1995) as well as implementing activities that supported children constructing their knowledge.

The period of the early 1970s to the mid 1980s has been labeled as a “survival period” (Keyes & Schwartz, 1991) for campus programs. Declining student activism and decreased availability of funds resulted in many centers closing or forced reorganization into more or less autonomous bodies (Day, 1984). Due to tight budgets and administrative cuts, centers sought to find alternative funding rather than direct funding from the college while others were forced to close (Keyes & Boulton, 1995; Kyle et al., 1999).

Renewed interest in child care centers by college faculty, students, and student unions occurred in the 1980s. Campus-based centers identified needs unique to their campus and modified their programs accordingly. Some centers began to employ integrated or comprehensive approaches that began with one type of program (e.g., center-based care), and added others such as a home-based child care or resource and referral services to help parents locate child care (Keyes, 1984; Keyes & Boulton, 1995). Often, centers formed partnerships with off campus organizations to boost funding and expand the population serviced by the center. The campus centers that did find funding often developed programs servicing the community through family day care, home support, and training as well as other family services. As seen in the past, integration of teaching, research, and service were again emphasized for effective campus child care systems (Keyes). Historically, the rationale for many of the earlier laboratory schools grew from within various university departments to meet the three prongs that still
comprise the missions of many campus-based programs today - that of teaching, research, and service (Corder, 1986).

During the early 1990s, one of the first national surveys of campus-based centers was conducted by the National Coalition for Campus Child Care, or NCCCC (Thomas, 2000). The purpose of the survey was to determine the number of centers that describe their function as child care service only, laboratory school only, and those that were a combination. The survey also examined the percentage of centers in which formal research was conducted. Findings from the survey which included responses from 314 programs, indicated that the 37% of campus centers identified their focus as only child care service, 11% as a laboratory school, and 52% as both lab school and child care service. Research was conducted by faculty in less than half, or 38%, of the centers. University students conducted research in slightly more than half, or 56%, of the centers. On four year campuses, over half, or 57%, of research connected with the centers was being conducted by faculty and over three-quarters, or 76%, was done by students.

In regards to the administrative unit under which centers operated, 39% of campus centers were housed in academic departments with the next most likely unit (29%), within student services. Less than 1% percent of the respondents reported partnerships with family housing, local public school systems, or Head Start programs. Most campus centers enrolled children of students, faculty and staff, and over half of campus centers, 64%, also enrolled children from the surrounding communities.

A variety of program types were available for parents including full day (81% of centers), half day (58%), flexible scheduling (42%), evening (13%), and weekend (3%). Around 6% offered options such as summer camp and care for school-age siblings on
public school holidays. A majority of the centers responding to the survey indicated that college students were involved in their programs through research, presentation of classroom activities to children, observation, paid work study, and student teaching.

A 2001 survey of campus early care and education centers belonging to the NCCCC reflected a change in how centers view themselves (Carlson, 2003). For example, the main area of growth has been in the area of comprehensive centers that combine service to staff and students and the education lab school, from 53% (Thomas, 2000) to 61% (Carlson, 2003). Centers offering service only decreased from 37% to 30%, and lab schools from 11% in 1993 and 1994 to 9% in 2001. In Thomas' survey, specific academic departments that worked with the center were not identified. Carlson (2003) listed the following academic departments as those that felt the existence of a center was a vital component to their educational process: education, social work, psychology, medicine, child care, child development, nutrition, speech and hearing, and linguistics. The broad categories addressed in the survey include: dates of establishment, benefits of on-campus centers, politics of origin, types of services offered (e.g., full day care), organizational charts, models of centers (e.g., lab, child care or comprehensive), demographic descriptions, operations, enrollments, and size in square feet, staffing, and center finances.

Overall, programs for young children have been on college campuses since the turn of the century; however, as described in the preceding paragraphs, their focus has changed over the past several decades. Early centers served primarily as campus laboratory schools that studied children, trained teachers and educated parents (Keyes & Boulton, 1995). Currently, campus-based centers perform a more expanded role in the
area of early childhood education. Programs often are comprehensive, adding components based on the needs of their constituents. Thus, research, training, education, home-based, and school-age programs appear to be coexisting within some campus-based centers. Yet limited research, especially which is current, exists regarding the internal and external impacts of such centers and key barriers they face.

University Child Care Centers: Internal and External Roles and Operational Challenges

The following sections summarize what existing research tells us about the ways in which campus-based centers interact and influence students, children, and staff within the institution as well as parents and the public outside the institution. In regards to external roles, opportunities for community involvement with the center are discussed. Finally, operational issues and challenges to the mission and existence of campus-based centers are outlined.

Internal Roles

Campus centers influence the internal community in various ways including the clientele they serve. As described in chapter I, student-parents face unique challenges in the pursuit of a college education. One way in which their academic success can be supported is by meeting their child care needs. Fadale and Winter (1991) conducted a study that focused on campus-based child care provided by 27 State University of New York community colleges for student-parents, with the purpose of determining the relationship of these campus-based child care services to the academic success of student-parents. In the study, academic success was defined as the completion of a degree or certificate program, transfer, or continued enrollment.
Data were collected through mail surveys distributed to the directors of campus centers housed on 27 community college campuses, as well as a questionnaire designed for student-parents. The data collected from 501 student-parents at 24 of the 27 colleges (88.9% response rate) confirmed a strong positive relationship between campus-based child care and student parent academic success, enrollment and persistence (Fadale & Winter, 1991). The sample was made up primarily of married females, 21 through 30 years of age, with an annual family income of less than $15,000, and if employed, employed on a part-time basis.

Survey results showed that on-campus child care was designated by 46.8% of student-parents as the most important factor that assisted their college participation. Twenty-nine percent identified child care as a second priority. Asked how important campus-based child care was to their decision to enroll in college and then to continue their enrollment, more than 80% of the student-parents replied that the availability of a center was a very important factor in their decision to enroll. Nearly 50% stated that they would not even consider enrolling without a campus-based care option. Child care was also a primary factor in the decision to continue enrollment in college, with 60% stating that they would not be able to continue without it. Beyond quality care for their children, around 90% of the respondents identified additional benefits from the center including social interaction with peers and advice from the staff concerning parenting concerns (Fadale & Winter, 1991).

The function of centers already in existence on college and university campuses should continue to be examined in regards to retention and to understand the interplaying dynamics of a campus center on its surroundings. Many administrators are concerned
with the “bottom line” in the face of tight financial resources, and thus, student retention is a key issue for many public universities (Creange, 1980; Gonchar, 1995). Colleges and universities have come to view students as consumers and, due to financial constraints and tight budgets, must consider and respond accordingly to their needs and especially to the growing number of nontraditional students.

Fadale and Winter’s study (1991) highlighted the fact that campus-based child care not only provided a valuable service allowing the student-parents to pursue an education, but also contributed to the overall growth and development of their children at a level of quality not available in other non-campus alternatives. Additionally the study concluded that student-parents achieved academic success approximately 20% more often than their general student counterparts at the participating institutions. During the period of the study, of the total 2,364 student-parents served by the colleges, 33% received a degree, 30% continued their education and more than 22% transferred to another college. These percentages result in 86.2% who are successful as defined for this study. Economic implications stem from the positive relationship between academic success and the existence of campus-based child care. Without the service, many of the parents, usually female, and often underemployed or unemployed, would not have been able to pursue their college education. When individuals are not able to obtain more productive employment, they can be categorized as underutilized resources for the communities in which they reside.

As mentioned in chapter I, the influence of child care centers within the university is not limited to educational settings and departments. Examples can be found in the literature demonstrating that a campus center can foster a cooperative participation across
disciplines. Gonchar (1995) highlighted the area of social work and service, studying the benefits and the effects of on-campus child care arrangements on a phone-interviewed sample of 75 inner-city student mothers at Lehman College in New York City. The findings indicated that on-site child care allowed the student-mothers to benefit to a greater advantage from their educational experiences. The exploratory study and its findings allowed social workers within this academic department to advocate for campus centers not as a luxury service, but as essential to the education of college student mothers as on-site libraries, rest rooms, and food services as well as to the overall academic mission of the college.

Keyes (1990) discussed the ever-widening net of influence for the mission of a university child care center. For teaching institutions, centers can be used for supervised observation, supervised participation, student teaching, and curriculum development. Centers support course work in special education, psychology, speech, audiology, counselor education, elementary education, early childhood, home economics, nursing, African-American studies, business, pediatrics, theology, and architecture. For example, at the University of New York, 21 departments used the campus center for the purposes of teacher observation and research. The centers not only promote teaching, research, and service, but have served a social self-interest function by increasing the area of remedial programs in response to a lack of basic skills observed in undergraduates in recent years (Keyes, 1990).

Townley and Zeece (1991), as well as Burton and Boulton (1991), maintain that a comprehensive campus child care system provides a link between theory and practice, research-based programs and service-based programs. These systems have traditionally
been the focus of campus center programming. Such a comprehensive model is helpful towards managing the mission of the center and its potential influence on the university.

There are six characteristics of comprehensive campus child care: child care that

1. is integrated with other departments on campus as well as the community;
2. provides flexible services to students and staff;
3. provides a diversity of educational opportunities for children and adults;
4. recognizes the importance of all jobs with appropriate compensation at the center;
5. encourages both qualitative and quantitative research; and
6. is innovative in regards to its structure, funding base and mission.

Center teachers and college faculty can work collaboratively to design agendas for research projects (Barbour & Bersani, 1991). These projects have built-in research capabilities to which non-campus programs often do not have access. According to Burton and Boulton (1991), the interest in examining early childhood issues from an ecological perspective can be foundational in analyzing the relationships between practices and outcomes. Possible research areas include: the effect of flexible programming schedules in early education and care; staff turnover and continuity; multiage classroom groupings; and interrelationships among agencies (or departments) serving the same population of children and families. According to Townley and Zeece (1991), other related research topics include child development, parenting, teacher education techniques, child care management and early childhood education.

Curriculum development for early childhood and higher education is another arena where academic departments and the campus-based centers could join forces.
Kinesiology, psychology and social work students as well as students from other departments could conduct research according to their disciplines, thereby expanding research networks across campus. Yet the extent to which this is actually occurring has not been extensively researched, particularly the challenge of establishing a research network. Challenges to creating a network include the questions concerning standardized testing associated with quantitative research (e.g., justifying Head Start programs) as well as the labor intensive qualitative methods (Townley & Zeece, 1991). Despite challenges to research methodologies, both qualitative and quantitative research is appropriate for the campus child care centers, particularly comprehensive centers. The strength of quantitative research lies in high reliability and problem application whereas qualitative is instrumental in theory construction and holistic investigations. Comprehensive centers who conduct research on program outcomes for children, families, students, and staff become trend setters in the field of child care and early childhood education. Research networks can be interdisciplinary and monitored by faculty and center teachers.

*Examples of External Roles*

Not only do centers involve and influence departments and programs within the university, but some do work with and for individuals and agencies in the surrounding external community. For example, the University of Wyoming has several of the types of campus involvement that were cited above as part of their comprehensive child care program (Keyes, 1990). Other innovative examples of community connections include a partnership with a local hospital. For example, the Ohio University center has served the hospital and campus community with hours from six o'clock a.m. to midnight. Once a center is firmly established in the academic community, it can further enhance its
presence through community involvement and service. The University of Maine has a public-private partnership wherein the university, corporations, and hospitals collaborate on various aspects of the center's operation. The University of Akron has a day-evening program which is sponsored by the education and home economics departments. Goddard College has a center for single parents and children. Hamilton College, which has a young student population, provides child care for its employees through the community center on its campus.

Often, campus-based centers custom-fit their programs to meet community needs. There are centers in every college within the City University of New York (CUNY) system, but they differ in focus. For example, a center at New York Technical College has an infant toddler room, two preschool classrooms, a teenage mothers' program, a foster grandparent program, a Saturday cultural arts program, and a food co-op. Bronx Community College Child Development Center has a preschool and a school-age program, as well as a family day care network, a food buying club, and Child Development Associate training (Keyes & Boulton, 1995). The San Juan Child Development Center located at San Juan College in New Mexico, functions as a training center for students in early childhood, nursing and psychology, and provides quality programs for the children of the families at the college. Links to the community include resource and referral services as well as seminars on child development for students, parents, staff and community. As these examples indicate, there are a variety of ways in which campus-based centers and community organizations are involved in meeting the needs of student-parents and parents from the community.
Operational Issues and Challenges

There are a variety of issues and challenges documented in the literature. One challenge to campus centers that integrate teaching, research, and service (i.e., comprehensive campus child care), is the lack of real life experiences that students may receive from the laboratory setting (Townley & Zeece, 1991). This in part is due to the fact that there is minimal need to learn how to maximize limited personnel resources or to solve the problems that occur from day to day in a private setting. Laboratory schools with foci of primarily teacher education and research have been criticized for having programs for young children that are limited in scope and life relevant skills and connections. Townley and Zeece recommend combining service-based programs that expand the opportunities both for student and parent involvement. An example would be a comprehensive campus child care program offering infant, toddler, school-age, special needs, and mildly sick care and making these services available for student participation in full-day, evening, and weekend programs. Thus, the authors contend that such a model represents more closely the real world for training of future child care staff, and connects lab schools and broad-based community settings. They note that continuity in curriculum is a challenge if multiple departments are involved. Possible solutions would be to reduce the saturation of adults by offering more diverse practicum and student teaching opportunities and by increasing the adult/child ratio at service-based sites.

Each center and campus needs to consider and balance internal (departments) with external (community) needs. Although there are benefits to community involvement, the service component should be fulfilled within the institution in regards to student instruction and faculty research (Townley & Zeece, 1991) and then spread outward in a
controlled manner, always reflecting the mission of the center and the institution. Often, there is a growth in the demand for new services (e.g., more space, additional salary dollars) that may take many years to implement. An integrated, comprehensive program is perhaps a model to implement that would meet the needs of the university community while at the same time maintaining the resources for quality academic and child care programming.

Funding by the university versus parent fee funding is another common challenge facing campus centers. According to Townley and Zeece (1991), when a center is funded primarily by university funds, teaching and research-based programs may become mandated to avoid competition with private industry. Thus, a program may not be able to charge what it actually costs to provide services. Service-based programs that struggle to establish institutional support often rely on child care tuition (Keyes, 1984). The flip side of the coin is that a center may not be able to pay competitive wages, retain quality staff, service low income or special needs children, or become self-supporting. The daycare trilemma of society is a balancing act between providing quality care for children, decent and fair living wages for child care staff, and affordability for parents (Gestwicki, 2004). One possible solution would be comprehensive campus child care which can combine funding sources to meet the needs of students, staff, faculty as well as families from the community. It is possible for a center to generate revenue for their sponsoring institution (Kyle et al., 1999). Financial aid programs can be one source to help pay tuition bills or to subsidize low-income families.

Other potential challenges involve administrative support and the morale of center staff, faculty, and students. Administration support is vital to the overall success of
centers. As previously discussed, a well-articulated and communicated mission statement is crucial to gain this support. Gulley et al. (1985) conducted a study aimed at identifying the kinds of support - financial and otherwise - which institutions provided to campus centers as well as the perceived level of morale. A survey questionnaire that identified demographic data of campus centers in the United States included two attitude questions dealing with administrative support. The list of campus child care centers was obtained from the National Coalition for Campus Child Care, and 342 questionnaires were retained. One of the two attitude questions on the survey examined the morale of those directly involved with the center. Respondents felt that the morale of staff, student workers, and faculty was relatively high. In regards to perceived levels of support from other segments of the institution, fewer than 50% reported strong support from any one group including the academic unit/department, the dean of the college/school, the president/chancellor, student affairs, personnel services, and similar organizations. As a whole, respondents did feel that there was some degree of moral support from different groups within the institution. In regards to type of support, the dean and unit support was generally perceived stronger than presidential, student affairs, and personnel services support. For centers connected with specific academic programs, the level of support for both morale and perceived level of support was higher than for those who did not have such an affiliation (Gulley et al., 1985).

In view of findings indicating that administration often lags behind other groups in supporting child care programs, defining and strengthening the mission of the center is crucial (Gulley et al., 1985). Keyes (1990) recommends documenting the center's relation to the research, service, and academic missions of the university as well as parent
comments regarding the positive impact of the center. Administrators may readily support a center that has clearly stated goals as to what functions it would perform within the institution. Many administrators also see the existence and value of a center focused on the education of children age zero to five as counter-intuitive to the sole purpose of the university to educate young adults (Carlson, 2003). Carlson points out in her survey that one way to build support within the administration is to present numeric data from campus surveys that indicates a need for quality care among student, faculty, and staff parents. According to Dr. Kappner, President of Bank Street College (2002), campus child care provides a vital educational function:

Its (campus child care) very setting provides an important model for young children: it demonstrates that education is a lifelong process. It places young children in a locale where education is valued and pursued; where adults as well as children are students; where learning is a way of life. It allows young children the chance to imitate their parents in an enterprise that will never fail them: the pursuit of learning. (pp. 1-2)

The effect of quality care, history of campus centers, internal and external roles as well as operational challenges and issues have been reviewed in this chapter. Attention will now be directed to the conceptual framework of the study.

Conceptual Framework

In chapter I, the Prehensive Leadership Model was introduced. The Prehensive Leadership Model (PLM) is comprised of the theoretical frameworks of Chester I. Barnard (Barnard, 1971) and Jacob W. Getzels (Getzels, Lipham, & Campbell, 1968). Both theorists studied organizational theory and leadership in organizations. David
Bickimer builds on their foundation to relate PLM and its concepts to the work of leadership and the campus child care setting. Key concepts from Getzel and Barnard’s theories will be briefly summarized to provide background for Bickimer’s interpretation and application of PLM.

Getzel emphasized the deeply personal side of leadership and the emotional responses of the leader in his special leadership theory (Bickimer, 1989). In this style of leadership, meeting individual needs is a priority. Barnard, in contrast, focused on outward, impersonal reflection, and feelings of generality. Leaders often practice both leadership characteristics simultaneously; they must have an inward eye to the health and interaction of their staff and constituents, while at the same time analyzing and building bridges of cooperation to the organization as a whole. Thus, both Getzel and Barnard focused on the duality of the leader’s state-of-mind (Bickimer, 1989). A leader’s experience is often concurrent with personal and impersonal feelings and attitudes and is, therefore, both affective and cognitive. A leader strives to meet the needs of individuals as well as, at the same time, maintaining an analytical distance from the organization at large. This dichotomy is detailed in Getzels’ Special Leadership Theory and Barnard’s General Leadership Theory. In relation to this study, a campus director looks and feels within his or her center to take in a sense of the whole situation (e.g., staff morale, center’s mission) and then without (university) to communicate, and interact. At times, the director must be personal while responding to situations and constituents and at other times, somewhat detached to analyze what must be done to increase the effectiveness and mission of the center within the higher educational setting.
The Barnard Model identifies "The Prehension," or a sense of the whole. The Prehension is made up of purpose (goals of a certain effort), willingness (cooperation), and communication (appropriate messages to link to the purpose with the needed level of cooperation) (Barnard & Andrews, 1971). Figure 2 illustrates these three components in a state of equilibrium as the top circle. The basic quality of Barnard's model is non-logical in nature. A leader emotionally grasps the situation surrounding him/her as one entity and has the insight and initiative to communicate the state of affairs with others.

The environment makes up the bottom circle of the Barnard Model including the physical, biological, psychological, and sociological environments. The next two components are effectiveness and efficiency. The last is the informal organization. These environmental elements also seek a state of equilibrium. The leader feels and thinks his way to an equilibrium of the top three elements within the prehensive grasp, but also must find a way to maintain it within his environments. When equilibrium is achieved between the two equilibria, effectiveness and efficiency can occur. Thus, a leader can be effective as the purpose of his organization is realized. Efficiency occurs when personal satisfactions are translated in action. According to Getzel, Lipham and Campbell (1968), an administrator has the challenge of achieving the maximum benefits of both effectiveness and efficiency. However, the requirement for both to be achieved is that institutional expectations and individual needs coincide. Since this never quite a reality, the leader must choose between his needs or expectations and can take any value of the two for a certain given level of satisfaction within the organization.

The attempt to achieve effectiveness and efficiency through equilibria is subject to the powerful impact of the tenth element, the informal organization which involves
activities outside of a formal, board room environment. It alone has the power to influence and interrupt communication. It also impacts positively or negatively the willingness of individuals to cooperate within the organization and how they feel about themselves. The relationship between leaders and followers is often strengthened more through the informal aspects of the organization than the formal channels. The study primarily utilized the prehension which includes concepts of effectiveness, efficiency, and reference to informal and formal organization.

Bickimer (1991) incorporates the theory of the Barnard Model into the practical work of the campus center director. He views the director’s leadership responsibility to create and maintain the equilibrium between purpose, willingness, and communication; collectively, the prehensive grasp of what the center is about and the vision it portrays. As stated in chapter I, this “prehensive grasp,” a solid organizational self-concept, can rise above the challenges and realities a center may face including staff turnover, low wages and morale.
Figure 2. Conceptual model of theory for study (adapted from Bickimer, 1989).

According to Bickimer (1991), PLM can be applied to two common challenges that centers face: stepchild status and low morale. A step child who possesses a strong self-concept can be better adjusted and incorporated into their family environment. This analogy also applies to campus centers that may not be interwoven into the fabric of the university system, but may be on the “fringe.” If a campus center is experiencing stepchild status, it is imperative that there be a strong sense of prehension on the part of leadership. An organizational prehension is the “whole” of the organizational setting that the director grasps. Secondly, the informal organization is seen as helpful to raise the
step-child status. Integration into the heart and soul of the university will be more readily accomplished through informal means rather than formal. This informal organization is part of the environment described as a component of the Barnard Model (figure 1). Academia is often molded by informal politics and networks (Bickimer, 1991). Often, the interactions that happen in informal settings do more to shape in this case, a center’s daily operations, then perhaps discussions and policies stemming from formal committee meetings or other formal means. Informal influences require PLM in order to lift the center from its stepchild status.

Low morale, the second challenge discussed by Bickimer (1991), refers to low status on campus as well as working conditions at the center. My study looks primarily at the connectiveness of the center and campus and the director’s role. Again, the grasp of prehension is applicable. The prehensive life, soul, and spirit of a center, first nourishes the director’s soul. Bickimer (1991) contended that motivation meets needs in exchange for cooperation. An enthusiastic leader is one who has a “well fed soul” that motivates others and lifts low morale. Bickimer also adds that prehensive theory does not justify the reasons for low morale. It can temporarily lessen the impact of low morale by encouraging a systematic approach to find solutions and thereby achieve long-term motivation.

The contextual leadership theory in a child care context is one in which leadership is perceived as a socially constructed, situational, and interpretive phenomenon (Nivala, 1998, 1999). The theory has its foundational roots in Urie Bronfenbrenner’s ecological theory (1979, 1989) and in Jarvilehto’s system thinking (1992). Bronfenbrenner’s theory examines children’s development within a context of systems of relationships that
comprise up their environment. These systems include the Microsystem where children spend the majority of their time; the Mesosystem, which is the link between Microsystems; Exosystems which influence children in settings where they do not play an active role; the Macrosystem involving the broader culture; and finally, the Chronosystem that includes the environmental contexts and events influencing a child over his or her lifetime (Morrison, 2009). Jarvilehto’s (1998) theory of the organism-environment system starts with the premise that organism and environment are inseparable, forming one unitary system. The two systems exist and interact because of one another (Jarvilehto, 1998).

The structure of contextual leadership was further explained in the work of Hujala (1996, 1999), who relates it to the theory of contextual growth in early childhood education. For the context of my study, a similarity between the prehension and contextual leadership theory is the role of the director (stakeholder) as she interprets the state of affairs at various times in the context of the culture of her center and in the university. In a previous study by Nivala (1999), leadership reality was defined as an interaction between the process and the context.

Nivala (1999) defines the micro, macro, meso, and exo levels of the contextual leadership theory. Briefly, the micro level involves the intra-culture of the center including the director, families, and the child care unit. At the macro level societal values and institutional structures define leadership. Interaction and cooperation between the micro levels comprise the meso level and interactions between the micro and macro levels comprise the exo level.
A study by Hujala (2004) examined leadership through the perceptions of the stakeholders involved in the Finnish early childhood system. Discussion topics included the challenges, roles, and responsibilities of leadership. Hujala found that comprehensive responsibility is connected to leadership, and specifically, the role of the director is to oversee the administrative, personnel and educational components of the child care center. Other central roles and responsibilities at the micro level included decision making, building vision and strategies, and advancing the mission of childcare.

Leadership at the macro levels was directly connected to the mission of child care in society, providing early childhood services for families. Leadership at this level creates frameworks and opportunities to implement the mission of childcare. Frameworks include policy, regulations and resources. In the Finnish system, these functions are primarily carried out by other stakeholders and administrators (Hujala, 2004).

The conceptual framework of my study provides a theoretical basis for the examination of the roles that campus centers and directors play in a setting of higher education. For example, purpose, the first aspect of "The Prehension," can be connected to providing a quality product (child care) to parents who know the positive effects and benefits that can be realized for their children. Goals can be an aspect of purpose as seen in a center's need to connect to the university at large. Willingness, or a sense of cooperation, can be linked to the internal roles of a center that have been identified thus far (e.g., meeting the needs of the student-parent population). Willingness could also be observed in the cooperation between the campus center, director, and administration. The third aspect of the prehensive triad, communication, can be addressed through interactions of the center outside the university and by communicating the mission and
documenting successes with the key players (e.g., administration) within the university. One further example is morale, cited as an operational challenge and addressed through an active, positive prehensive grasp.

Hujala’s (2004) study concluded that there may be contradictions between the micro and macro levels, and one reason is the differing opinions of macro leadership about educational leadership and their primary focus as financial leaders. This contradiction is one way Barnard’s concept of equilibrium as related to the prehension described earlier can be supportive of contextual leadership theory. It is the role of leadership to maintain the equilibrium between purpose, willingness, and communication, collectively the prehension grasp of what the center is about and the vision it portrays.

The contextual leadership model is mentioned to support the prehension theory in a current context, perceptions, and roles of child care leadership in the early childhood educational field as well as to give resources for future studies involving child care centers in various cultures and contexts.

What is Known and Knowledge Creation

What is known is that there is an increasing need for child care. The increased need for child care stems from demographic changes of recent years, including the entry and re-entry of women into the work force as well their pursuit of educational goals. As noted previously, over 50% of children under age one, 65% of preschool age children, and 75% of 6-13 year olds have mothers who are working outside the home (Gestwicki, 2007). Quality child care programs have been defined in recent years by accreditation organizations such as NAEYC. What also is known is that quality programs do affect
young children both academically and socially (Abecedarian Study, 1999; Barnett, 1995; Reynolds, Temple, Robertson, & Mann, 2001; Schweinhart & Weikart, 1985).

In regards to internal roles of campus child care, studies have shown that student-parents have identified campus child care as a very important factor in whether or not they could participate in college. Self-reported academic success and commitment to their roles as students and parents were also affected by the existence of on-campus care. Their children benefited in their developmental growth in quality programs that they would not otherwise have been able to attend off campus. The potential for internal impact can also be seen in cross departmental involvement with observation, training, and research. For external impact, some centers do extend their mission into the surrounding community in the form of partnerships with corporations and hospitals. Operationally, several issues and challenges face campus centers including providing real-life experiences, perceived mission and role (image), funding, and institutional support and morale.

According to Schwartz (1991), one of the biggest challenges for campus-based child care is in regards to image. Many view child care centers as a baby or child sitting service, but as the name child care implies, care is being given to young children hopefully by qualified staff who understand child development and developmentally appropriate practice. The issues such as funding, staffing, and academic factors stem from the view that campus child care provides a peripheral service to the main task of higher education (Keyes & Cook, 1988). The three-fold functions of teaching, research, and service are one way to combat this erroneous image. Within PLM, this image concern has been previously discussed in relation to the step-child status. The director
can influence the image of a center through achievement of a prehensive grasp and other activities as presented in the results of chapter IV.

The aim of this study was to learn more about campus center directors’ perceptions of what impacts and hinders the functioning of campus-based programs as well as how defined roles interact and connect with the broader university setting and mission. The directors’ prehensive grasp can be implied through the examination of survey responses in these areas and is discussed in chapters IV and V. Directors of campus-based centers interact at a functional (micro) level and thus, are resources for descriptive data on how well they perceive that the center is operating and impacting higher education and surrounding communities. There is a knowledge base of how these centers influence their internal and external communities, but the data and information is dated. Overall, this study sought to analyze in greater detail and add richness to the directors’ perceptions by including open-ended questions within the survey as well as opportunities to add additional comments.

The survey for this study is different from Carlson’s survey, Campus Early Care and Education Centers: A National Description (2001) that was described in the literature review section. The questions delved beyond descriptive information. For example, the first section of contextual questions included basic descriptors of the university. The second section looked at the current state of campus centers including factors relating to the establishment of the center. Open-ended response questions allowed the directors to elaborate on their choices. For example, as a follow-up to the establishment question, directors could list additional factors for why the center came into existence. The following two sections of the survey, Internal and External Roles, covered areas that were
not covered in the Carlson survey. Under Internal Roles, directors were asked about retention of traditional and nontraditional students, academic departmental involvement with the center (reasons and frequency), and various success points. Both surveys examined benefits of the centers to the institutions of higher education, but the survey from this study increased the possible options for benefits beyond the three broad categories in the Carlson survey (e.g., enrollment behaviors of student-parents, employee behaviors such as absenteeism and productivity, and provision of learning environments for college students). For example, open-ended responses were elicited from the directors regarding how each perceived overall importance of their center’s work to the mission of their institution. External Roles examined the center’s role in the community outside of their college or university, which was not addressed in the NCCCC report. In addition, directors were asked to comment on the external role they envision. Under a section entitled Barriers and Challenges, questions posed to directors addressed barriers to the successful operation of the center. Questions within the section entitled Center Integration/Role of the Director examined the integration of the center into the university as a whole and the influence of the director in the process. The director responded regarding the types of activities she engaged in to develop and maintain a relationship with the university and communicate the mission of her center. Thus, the perceptions and opinions of the directors throughout the survey marks a significant difference between the two surveys with the hope that greater understanding about the inner and outer dynamics of child care within the parameters of higher education occurred.
Chapter II Summary

In this literature review, a definition of quality child care was presented and framed by NAEYC's contributions in this regard. Studies were presented showing the long and short term effects of quality care. The history of campus child care was summarized; internal and external dynamics as well as barriers and challenges were documented and finally, a discussion of the Prehensive Leadership Model and contextual leadership theories occurred. Chapter III will now offer a discussion of the methods utilized in this research study.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Research Questions

The dependent variables of this non-experimental survey design are the perceived internal and external successes of the center, including the level of integration into the university. The independent variables include type of institution, number of years a director has served, years a center has been in existence, types of programs offered by the center, activities undertaken by the center director, and mission of the center as understood by administrators. The research questions for this study involve contextual, internal and external roles, and those dealing with operational challenges and barriers of the center. In addition, there are questions addressing the directors’ roles. The main research question is “What value do such centers offer to a given higher education institution and its surrounding community, especially from a center director’s perspective?” The following set of sub questions was helpful in answering the central question of this study.

1. What is the current state of higher education sponsored early childhood and campus-based centers including:
   a. the characteristics of these centers in regards to enrollment, clientele, types of programs offered; and
   b. the factors which lead to their creation as understood by the center directors?

2. What impacts do directors believe their centers have had on their:
   a. internal university community (e.g., student retention; research; teacher training); and
b. external university community (e.g., model quality care, training)?

3. What challenges to successful operation of campus-based child care centers do the directors of these centers describe?

4. To what extent do directors engage in activities which demonstrate a "prehensive grasp" regarding the role of their center (e.g., the activities directors use to communicate the mission of their center and to integrate their center into the university)?

5. To what extent do several input variables (e.g., number of years a director has served, years a center has been in existence, types of programs offered by the center, activities undertaken by the center director, and mission of center as understood by administrators) relate to the perceived internal and external successes of the center, including the level of integration into the university?

Research Design Overview

A quantitative approach with open-ended questions was utilized in this study. Numeric information was collected through an online, self-administered survey. The resulting data brought understanding to the research questions regarding the overall function and benefits of campus-based child care centers for higher education. Thus, the study utilized a broad survey to generalize results to a population (child care directors nationwide).

The research design was a cross-sectional survey designed to study the internal, external, and operational roles as well as director roles of campus-based child care programs on the institutions where they reside. The purpose of the survey was to collect
data at one point in time to answer questions about the opinions of directors concerning campus child care centers in two- and four-year institutions as well as to generalize inferences about these opinions for the surveyed population (Creswell, 2003). Descriptive data was collected and analyzed via a web-based survey whereby the participants selected from limited choices of responses for each question. Areas addressed included a contextual description of the center, current state of affairs on-campus centers, internal roles of the center within the university, external roles of the surrounding geographical community, operational status questions concerning challenges facing the operation of the center (key barriers), and questions regarding the director’s role within the university or college. Throughout the survey, participants responded to open-ended questions.

When the surveys were completed and returned via email, the researcher conducted the analysis of the descriptive and open-ended data. The analysis examined the means, standard deviations, and range of scores (for the variables) (Creswell, 2003).

The purpose of the overall research design of the study was to conduct an initial broad survey that collected data to enable the researcher to offer descriptive as well as open-ended observations regarding campus child care. The web-based survey allowed for the economy of design: time, cost, effectiveness, and turnaround time for data collection (Creswell, 2003).

Population and Sample

The sample consisted of campus center directors who are members of a national professional organization and located at public and private two- and four-year colleges and universities throughout the United States. The organization is nonprofit and educational, supporting research and activities of college and university campus child
care centers and the field of early childhood education. A description of the study, an invitation to participate, and the embedded link for the survey were sent out to distribution email lists of campus centers listed in the membership directory (Appendix A) as well as via the organization’s listserv (Appendix B). The email distribution list was created using the researcher’s university email account to circumvent firewall issues using the survey software program’s email feature. Prospective participants’ identities as well as the centers they represented remained confidential. The number of campus directors who participate in the listserv was unknown, but the email distribution lists included 435 directors listed in the organization’s membership directory.

A purposeful sampling strategy (involving a group that shares common goals and responsibilities) was implemented to support the central focus of the study: examining the role and impact of campus child care within the higher education setting through the eyes of the center director to gain perceptions of the functions of the programs within and without the institution.

**Instrumentation**

The survey entitled Campus Childcare Center Director Survey is an instrument that was designed for this research (see Appendix C). It contains a mixed format of question types including questions with limited responses: Likert scale, ranked items, and unstructured free response. The types of scales used to measure the items on the instrument were primarily categorical scales (e.g., yes/no, rank in order of importance, often from ‘not at all’ to ‘a great extent’) (Creswell, 2003). Since the researcher is the author of the instrument, the lack of pre-established reliability and validity is a limitation.
of the research design. Participants were advised that their responses to the survey questions were held in confidence.

A director of a community college campus center was asked to provide an expert review of the survey before it was submitted to the proposed participants. Her feedback was valuable to confirm the direction of the survey and to fine tune any questions to reflect more accurately the purpose of the study. She commented that the length was appropriate and there was clarity to the questions asked. This director took and studied the survey at two different occasions.

The Tailored Design Method has shown the ability to produce higher response rates (Dillman, 1978). The Tailored Design Method (TDM) consists of developing survey procedures that produce respondent trust and perceptions of a reward with reduced costs for choosing to respond to the survey. The goal of TDM is the reduction of survey error and was based on current results of how respondents read and respond to visual components of questionnaires (Dillman). According to social exchange behavior, attention is given to those survey procedures that create respondent trust and a perception of benefits outweighing the cost involved of participating. One of these procedures involved a multiple contacts strategy that is as important to online surveys as it is to mail surveys (Dillman, 2007). An initial invitation letter was emailed to campus center directors explaining the purpose of the study as well as instructions for clicking on the embedded survey link. The letter also detailed an optional drawing for which they could include their email address at the end of the survey (Appendix A). A separate email was posted to the listserv of the organization inviting directors who may have been missed through the distribution email list to participate (Appendix B). Directors who were
interested in participating in the survey could reply to the posting, after which the survey link was emailed to them. Email contacts were personalized, made through the bcc email feature, and did not reveal a multiple recipient address list or listserv origin. At the beginning of the survey, a consent message detailed how risks were minimized, how responses were kept confidential, and how to abort the survey. Approximately two weeks after the survey was sent to the participants, a reminder email with the link to the survey was sent to everyone on the email distribution list. Two weeks after the first reminder, a final email reminder was sent to everyone on the distribution email lists, and a posting on the listserv was made to indicate the survey would close in a week. A thank you was sent to respondents who included their name for the incentive but did not win in the drawing, as well as the winners of that drawing. This incentive drawing of a gift card was described in the initial email letter. According to Dillman (2007), an incentive is another survey procedure where the rewards, costs, trust, group, and individual value of the study is explained to the participant prior to completing the survey. Another reward is the value of mutual interest of the organization to participate and further the knowledge of their leadership, centers, and early childhood education in higher education.

All survey data is locked in the researcher's office at Cornerstone University as well as her home office, and will be stored on her university laptop's hard drive for a period of three years. A listing of all open-ended responses typed verbatim, including misspellings or grammatical errors are included in the appendices. The researcher analyzed the data, reported the findings, and made recommendations and assertions about higher education institutions in regards to childcare centers and early childhood education.
Data Collection Methods

The instrument of data collection was a web-based survey that was created and administered online using the commercially available Zoomerang survey program.

Survey

The software program Zoomerang allowed for the creation, administration, and tallying of the survey results online. Participants were able to take the survey on the internet and submitted their responses with the click of a button. Responses as well as nonresponses were monitored on the researcher’s computer regularly during the six week period that the survey was available.

Each of the directors received an email that introduced the study and reasons for the survey and communicated the researcher’s contact information regarding any questions or concerns (see Appendix A). I established rapport and trust through the data collection stage by communicating the need for the advice, shared values of the group (early childhood education), and insights of the respondents in a timely manner. The cost of the survey (time involved to take the survey) was offset by detailing the potential intellectual and professional rewards of the study for each participant. The researcher made the data and results available for any interested respondent upon completion of the study.

The survey instrument and research proposal were reviewed by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (Appendix D). Approval for the research under the “exempt” category was given on November 14, 2008.
Data Analysis

Several steps were included for the analysis of the survey data (Creswell, 2003). The first step involved reporting the return rate (how many surveys were returned and how many were not) (see Table 1). The second step involved the discussion of how response bias was determined based on the effect of nonrespondents and emails that were not deliverable on the overall results of the survey. The rate of nonrespondents was minimal due to the method of inviting interested participants, resulting in a higher than expected response rate. Results were tallied by the survey software program and then exported directly from the survey collection software to the Statistical Package for Software Solutions (SPSS) for analysis. I will discuss in the third step, the resulting descriptive data for each question: means, standard deviations, and range of scores.

Statistical analysis involving correlations or regressions between perceived outcomes and perceived inputs were conducted on the major outcome variables of the study. Regression tests were conducted to investigate the amount of variance regarding influential factors on the variable outcomes. For the purpose of this analysis, Likert scale data was assumed to be interval scale (Ravid, 2000). A p-value of .05 is acceptable in the social sciences and was set for all tests. All quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS, while qualitative data (answers to open-ended questions) were grouped and reported by analysis of common remarks (Patton, 2002).

The overall strategy for analyzing the open-ended data involved three steps: a general review of the information, examining the words used by the participants and finally, tagging responses in Zoomerang to group and analyze common responses (Patton, 2002). Although some open-ended responses had multiple levels of themes, the
researcher took the primary response offered that answered the survey question when placing responses in categories. The researcher examined the responses of the participants for patterns, themes and metaphors, as well as frequency and percentage.

Through the categorical aggregation of common responses, the researcher was able to interpret what is being said through each case and the resulting categories (Stake, 1995). The researcher did some direct interpretation, but categorical aggregation was the primary analytic strategy used due to the focus of research questions. Each category of questions in the study contained a specific theme but were interrelated to the overall purpose of the study.

Data Reduction

In preparing the data for analysis, the researcher analyzed unusable and missing data. For survey question one, asking for the size of the respondent's institution, participant number 264607990 entered that she had "no idea;" respondent, 265173320, entered "unknown." This data was taken out and considered as missing. For participant number 267232563 on survey question number three, for years served as director, the respondent identified herself as a program coordinator at the university administration level. She is over more than one center, her response for this question was deemed unusable. Another director responded "less than a year" and her response was then considered missing. For question six, when reporting full-time and part-time children enrolled in the center, the entry for participant 2713437321 was not easily interpreted and thus removed. Three additional responses to this question were narrative instead of numeric and were also removed. A response for the same question was "50% part-time, 50% full-time," and it was removed as well.
Delimitations and Limitations

A delimitation of this study was the average expected 30% response rate; however with an actual response rate of 48.75%, results can be generalized to the population of two- and four-year public and private universities that house centers, but not to the population of all universities in the United States. Generalization of the results was limited due to a nonprobability or convenience sample versus a random sample (Creswell, 2003).

A possible limitation was that the researcher could through the survey data, exaggerate the benefits of campus childcare programs in her interest to broaden the knowledge base in this field. A high level of personal interest (i.e., bias in traditional research) could affect the reporting of the results. This limitation was minimized through a recommendation section in chapter V.

In regards to the prehensive grasp and conceptual model for this study, the research and survey questions only addressed the surface perspectives. During the course of this study, probing for a further understanding of the full prehension of the directors as recorded through their open ended responses was not conducted.

Measures for Research Questions

Parametric statistics are used when a sample is large enough to represent the population. A sample size of about 30 is generally agreed upon by statisticians to fulfill this assumption of the parameter of a population (Salkind, 2004). Measurements taken on members of the population of campus child care center directors were described through descriptive statistics including means, medians, and percentages (Glass & Hopkins, 1996).
The first research question asked what the current state of higher education sponsored early childhood and campus-based centers is including (a) the characteristics of these centers in regards to enrollment, clientele, types of programs offered; and (b) the factors which led to the creation of the centers as understood by the directors. The resulting data was organized and summarized through the use of descriptive statistics which involve tabulating, depicting, and describing sets of data (Glass & Hopkins, 1996).

The second research question asked what the directors believed was the impact of their centers on: (a) the internal university community including areas such as student retention, research, and teacher training; and (b) the external university community including modeling quality care and training for early childhood professionals. Descriptive statistics were utilized for this question to comprehend the resulting data. Open-ended questions were also used to analyze what directors felt is the importance of the center internally and what the role should be externally in the surrounding community. Data was displayed in summary tables including frequency and percentage.

The third research question asked directors to describe challenges to successful operations of campus-based child care centers. Descriptive measures were used to summarize and explain the resulting data. A Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between Center Integration and Barriers and Challenges centers face. A regression analysis was used for center integration and barriers and challenges to predict whether or not the challenges affect integration of the center into the university systems to any extent.

The fourth research question examined the extent to which directors engaged in activities which demonstrate a "prehensive grasp" regarding the role and integration of
their centers. Summary tables (frequency/percentage) and narrative were used to describe the data for the quantitative and qualitative questions.

The fifth research question examined the extent to which several input variables (e.g., number of years a director has served, years a center has been in existence, types of programs offered by the center, activities undertaken by the center director, and mission of center as understood by administrators) relate to the perceived internal and external successes of the center, including the level of integration into the university. Multiple correlations were used to analyze this question including items "years center existed," "years director served," "center integration," "director activities," "mission of center as understood by administrators," and "internal success variables." If it was determined there was a significant correlation between items, the researcher then analyzed the results further by using multiple regression analysis. This analysis is used to predict the performance of two or more variables (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996).

In regards to Center Integration, a regression analysis was used to predict whether or not the years a center had existed and the years directors had served influenced the level of integration; whether or not barriers predicted level of center integration; whether or not years director served, formal and informal activities, and communicating the mission by the director influenced integration; and finally, whether or not integration is predicted by the level of comprehension of the mission by administrators.

In regards to internal successes, regression analysis was used to predict whether certain activities undertaken by the director affected the internal success outcome of institutional image. An additional regression analysis was used to predict whether or not selected director activities affected the outcome of research and observation as well as
faculty and staff recruitment efforts as a predictor of attracting faculty and staff to universities with campus centers. Several T-tests were also conducted to investigate the differences between center integration by types of programs, by internal successes, and finally, external successes by types of programs and types of institution.

Chapter III Summary

Chapter III presented the research questions and design overview, population and sample, instrumentation, data collection methods, data analysis, data reduction, delimitations and limitations, and measures for research questions. Chapter IV will present the results of the measures for each research questions.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

This chapter presents results regarding campus child care center directors’ perceptions of their role and university integration as collected via an online survey. The survey was distributed among members of a national professional coalition of campus directors. This chapter begins by presenting respondent demographics and response rates from institutions. Secondly, this chapter addresses the research questions posed in the previous chapter. Each of the five research questions are addressed sequentially in this chapter. Results presented include frequency data, percentages, means, correlations, T-tests, and linear regressions.

The survey used for this research contained a significant number of open-ended questions. To this end, this chapter contains a sample of direct quotes from respondents’ written comments to illustrate the various themes found. These are important to bring added richness, illustrative examples, and understanding to the close-ended responses.

Respondent Description

Of 435 emails sent with an embedded survey link, 393 valid emails were deemed deliverable and 42 undeliverable. Email addresses as extracted from the organization’s membership directory and listserv were double-checked prior to sending the survey link, yet the 42 undeliverable emails were due to incorrect or invalid email addresses. Of the 393 campus child care directors with valid email addresses, 191 completed and submitted the online survey yielding a response rate of 48.75%. Table 1 displays the total number of valid email addresses for campus directors, completed surveys and the percentage of response rate.
Four general contextual questions were asked in regards to size and type of institution, total number of years the center had existed, and years respondents had been directors.

Directors were asked to indicate the approximate number of students who attend their higher education institution. Numbers of both undergraduate and graduate students both full and part-time ranged from 54 to 89,000 with a mean of 16,421 students. The 89,000 total represented four campuses within one university system. To facilitate analysis, the total number of students was broken into four ranges: 50-5,000; 5,001-14,000; 14,001-30,000; and 30,001-89,000. Table 2 displays the frequency and valid percentages of the breakdown in size of institution.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Size</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-5000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-14000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14001-30000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001-150000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16,421.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directors also indicated their institution type. One hundred and four (54%) of the respondents were from four-year public colleges and universities, 63 (33%) of the
respondents were from community colleges, 19 (10%) were from four year private colleges or universities, 7 (4%) were from technical colleges, and 2 (1%) responded as other. Table 3 displays the total number of colleges and universities for each type and the percentage that each type represented. The total data responses for this question (n=195) was larger than the total respondents for the survey (n=191), because participants could click on more than one answer choice. Thus, four directors did select more than one type of institution within their campus system.

Table 3

*Types of Respondent Institutions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four year public college or university</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four year private college or university</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Years Center has been in Existence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-20 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40 years</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of years that the campus centers existed ranged from those that had just opened in 2008 to 80 years, with a mean of 28 years (see Table 4). For display and analysis purposes, the total number of years that the campus centers have existed was
broken into the following four groups: 1-20 years, 21-40, 41-60, and 61-80 years (see Table 4).

The numbers of years respondents have been a director ranged from a year to 34 years, with the mean of 12.38 years (see Table 5). For display and analysis purposes, the total numbers that directors have served were divided into four groups: 1-10 years, 11-20, 21-30, and 31-40.

Table 5

*Years Director has Served*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 years</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender of the directors that responded to the survey is considered to be primarily, if not exclusively, female based on listserv and organizational directory observations. Directors are therefore referred to as females throughout the research study.

**Current State of Campus Childcare Centers**

The first research question for this study examined the current state of higher education-sponsored early childhood and campus-based centers regarding characteristics such as full and part time enrollment, clientele, types of programs offered, and the factors which lead to their creation as understood by the center directors.

Directors were asked to indicate the number of children currently enrolled on a part-time (20 hours or less) and full-time (30-40 hours) basis. The resulting mean was 36 part-time children and 68 full-time children enrolled, with the range of 0-200 part-time
children and 0-450 full-time children. Table 6 displays ranges, mean and total N for part-time and full-time enrollment.

Table 6

*Part-Time and Full-Time Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Children</td>
<td>0-200</td>
<td>36.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Children</td>
<td>0-450</td>
<td>68.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The directors were asked to identify the percentage of children enrolled for three groups of clientele serviced by their center. This yielded a mean of 44.0% for children of student-parents with a range of 0-100%, 30% for children of faculty and staff with a range of 0-100%, and 28% for children of community members with a range of 0-96%. Table 7 displays the mean, range, and total N, the number of centers reporting, for three groups of enrolled children.

Table 7

*Groups of Enrolled Children*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-parents</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff Parents</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>30.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents from Community</td>
<td>0-96</td>
<td>28.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directors were asked to indicate what type of programs they offer at their center. They responded that 91.5% offer full-time child care, 83.7% part-time child-care, 74.3% formal preschool sessions, 73.7% infant/toddler care, 27.4% drop-in child care, 19.7% evening child care, 3.6% weekend child care, and 2.2% sick child care. Table 8 displays the valid percentages of the types of programs offered.
Table 8

_Type of Programs_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>With service</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time childcare</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time childcare</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant/Toddler</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-in care</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening care</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend care</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick care</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directors also indicated the extent to which certain factors led to the establishment of their center including interest of faculty and staff, students who were parents, administrators, community, and outside grants or funding. Responses were indicated with a 5-point Likert scale, 1=not at all, 2=to a limited extent, 3=to a moderate extent, 4=to a great extent and 5=not sure.

Of those respondents who felt they knew why the center was established, 61.6% indicated that to a great extent the interest of students who were parents led to the establishment of their center; 57.5% responded that to a great extent the choice of faculty and staff interest was a factor. Administration request was a factor to a great extent, for 30.8% of respondents. Community interest and outside grants or funding were factors to a great extent of the time 18.7% and 17.7% respectively. Table 9 displays the frequency, valid percents, and means of each of the answer choices for each factor. Directors could select “not sure” for this survey question and for analysis purposes, this choice was not calculated with the frequencies and means.
Table 9

Factors in Establishment of Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all n (%)</th>
<th>To a limited extent n (%)</th>
<th>To a moderate extent n (%)</th>
<th>To a great extent n (%)</th>
<th>Not sure n (%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>13 (8.1)</td>
<td>21 (13.1)</td>
<td>34 (21.3)</td>
<td>92 (57.5)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Parent</td>
<td>22 (13.8)</td>
<td>14 (8.8)</td>
<td>25 (15.7)</td>
<td>98 (61.6)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>24 (15.4)</td>
<td>36 (23.1)</td>
<td>48 (30.8)</td>
<td>48 (30.8)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>44 (29.3)</td>
<td>38 (25.3)</td>
<td>40 (26.7)</td>
<td>28 (18.7)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>73 (49.7)</td>
<td>29 (19.7)</td>
<td>19 (12.9)</td>
<td>26 (17.7)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = not at all; 2 = to a limited extent; 3 = to a moderate extent; 4 = to a great extent; 5 = not sure

Directors could respond to an open-ended question to explain additional factors that may have led to the establishment of their center. A total of 116 open-ended responses were given, and the researcher carefully read and highlighted each response, writing notes of keywords in the margins, and creating categories of responses.

Frequently occurring words were entered into the Zoomerang software to create a tag list. From the tag lists, themes and categories emerged. Many of the open-ended responses mirrored factors previously listed in Table 9. Of those representing “additional” factors, 36.9% mentioned providing a laboratory experience for students, 9.5% mentioned supporting an Associates of Arts Program, and 9.5% mentioned their universities and colleges established centers in response to events and demographics of the 1960’s and 1970’s (such as activist students in the late 1960’s, an increase of two marriage careers, and more single parents in the 1970’s). The following were also “additional” factors: Community reasons/affordable care (5.9%), State or federal funding (4.7%), Desire to serve (3.5%), Employee request or benefits (3.5%), Recruitment of new faculty, staff, or students (3.5%) and Supporting women in the work force (2.3%). Seventeen (20.2%) listed various additional reasons why the center was established and were placed in an
“other” category. A variety of factors or influences were listed under the other factors category including a desire to have a demonstration program of quality, a memorial to a former university president’s wife, and a place to feed young children in the post depression era.

There were ten uncategorized responses that included respondents who did not answer the question for various reasons such as not being able to locate the history of the center, respondents who were unsure, and those to whom the question did not apply or who stated that all of the establishment factors pertaining to them were covered in the previous survey question.

Table 10

Additional Establishment Factors (offered via Open-Ended Response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Factors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory (including placement and training)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Associates of Arts Program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In response to the 1960’s and 1970’s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Serve</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Request or Benefit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of New Faculty, Staff or Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Women in the Work Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open-ended responses (categories) that repeated what had been available in the previous survey question including staff and faculty interest, student parent interest, administrative interest, community interest, and state or federal funding, are not displayed in Table 10 because they are not considered additional factors for the establishment of the campus center. All open-ended responses can be found in Appendix E. Table 10 displays
resulting frequencies and percentages. Sample quotations are offered for the category with the highest frequency of responses.

A common theme that emerged from responses was creating campus centers for the purpose of placing and training students in a laboratory setting. Training primarily involves students applying the theory and best practices for caring of children in a child care setting. The following are two sample comments illustrating the category with the most responses as an additional establishment factor of laboratory placement and training:

1. “We are a laboratory school. Our program has an academic component.”
2. “The former president of the college wanted to establish a lab school to help early childhood students learn and practice appropriate teaching methods.”

Overall, in summary, the majority of directors that responded to the Campus Childcare Center Director Survey are from four-year public colleges or universities with a range of students between 5,000 and 14,000. Over half of the campus centers have been in existence between 21 and 40 years with half of the directors serving ten years or less. Student-parents represent the highest percentage of parents having children cared for by campus centers. Full-time enrollment and care reflects the highest percentage of care offered by centers over part-time enrollment and other types of enrollment. Faculty, staff, and students were the primary reasons why campus centers are established. In the next section, internal and external roles will be examined and how they impact the university and community.
Internal and External Roles

The second research question for this study examined the impact that directors believe their center has had on their internal university community (e.g., student retention, research, teacher training) and/or their external university community (e.g., model quality care, training). Internal impacts will be presented first, followed by a separate sub-section of external impacts.

Internal Roles Regarding Departmental Involvement

Directors were asked to indicate the primary reason academic departments, including Teacher Education, Social Work, Psychology, Kinesiology, and other departments, may participate with their centers. Responses were indicated with a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., 1=observation, 2=training, 3=research, 4=other and 5=do not participate).

Of the Teacher Education departments, 51 (27.4%) participated in observation, 121 (65.1%) in training, 3 (1.6%) in research, 3 (1.6%) in other ways, and 8 (4.3%) did not participate in the center at all. Thus, the training of students to teach was the primary reason for Teacher Education departments to be involved. Of the Social Work departments, 82 (45.6%) participated in observation (primary reason), 16 (8.9%) in training, 8 (4.4%) in research, 3 (1.7%) in other ways, and 71 (39.4%) did not participate in the center at all. Of the Psychology departments, 102 (54.3%) participated in observation (primary reason), 17 (9.0%) in training, 39 (20.7%) in research, 5 (2.7%) in other ways, and 25 (13.3%) did not participate at the center. Of the Kinesiology departments, 27 (15.4%) participated with the center for observation purposes (primary reason), 15 (8.6%) in training, 7 (4.0%) in research, 6 (3.4%) in other ways, and 120
(68.6%) did not participate in the center at all. Respondents could choose “other departments” on the survey question and 77 (42.1%) participated in observation, 46 (25.1%) in training, 24 (13.1%) in research, 21 (11.5%) in other 11.5%, and 15 (8.2%) did not participate in the center at all.

With the exception of the Teacher Education Departments, observation was the primary reason academic departments participated with their campus child care center. See Table 11 for a summary of frequency totals and percentages for Teacher Education, Social Work, Psychology, Kinesiology, and other departments. Other departments will be identified through discussion of an open-ended response later in this section.

Table 11

**Department Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Do not participate</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Ed</td>
<td>51 (27.4)</td>
<td>121 (65.1)</td>
<td>3 (1.6)</td>
<td>3 (1.6)</td>
<td>8 (4.3)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>82 (45.6)</td>
<td>16 (8.9)</td>
<td>8 (4.4)</td>
<td>3 (1.7)</td>
<td>71 (39.4)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>102 (54.3)</td>
<td>17 (9.0)</td>
<td>39 (20.7)</td>
<td>5 (2.7)</td>
<td>25 (13.3)</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>27 (15.4)</td>
<td>15 (8.6)</td>
<td>7 (4.0)</td>
<td>6 (3.4)</td>
<td>120 (68.6)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>77 (42.1)</td>
<td>46 (25.1)</td>
<td>24 (13.1)</td>
<td>21 (11.5)</td>
<td>15 (8.2)</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directors also indicated the frequency with which Teacher Education, Social Work, Psychology, Kinesiology, and other departments are involved with the center. Responses were indicated with a 4-point Likert scale, i.e., 1=not at all, 2=at least once per semester or term, 3=monthly, and 4=weekly.

In reference to how often various departments interacted with the campus center, Teacher Education departments were the most active with 71.5% of them involved on a weekly basis, while the next most active, “other” departments were involved at least once
a term (52%) (see Appendix F for the complete listing). For Psychology departments, involvement was at least once a semester (51.4%). For Social Work departments, the largest percentage was 42% not at all, and 39% once per term. In Kinesiology departments, 69.5% responded that students and faculty were not involved at all. Table 12 displays the frequency totals, percents, and means for each of the departments and response choices, which departments listed from highest to lowest mean.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Frequency/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Ed.</td>
<td>8 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Departments</td>
<td>25 (14.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>28 (15.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>74 (42.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>114 (69.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=not at all; 2=at least once per semester or term; 3=monthly; 4=weekly

Respondents were also asked to identify additional departments that participated in their campus center and the frequency of such involvement. One department that came up regularly in the open-ended responses was nursing, mentioned 78 times out of a total of 150 responses from 371 departments (21.0%). Music Departments for both training and education was the next most represented department (N=17, 4.5%), followed by dental and dental hygiene (N=16, 4.3%), occupational therapy (N=13, 3.5%), physical therapy (N=11, 2.9%), drama/theatre and speech (N=9, 2.4%), language and audiology (N=9, 2.4%), and finally, child development, communications science disorders, and family studies (N=8, 2.1%).
Table 13 displays the frequency and total percentage for each department that had at least 2% of the total open-ended respondents. On that table, the “other” category includes the total of all of the departments with less than 2%. Several respondents listed more than department; thus, the total of departments is over the 150 total responses for this survey question. See Appendix F for a complete listing of the 102 additional departments, colleges, and activities covering Accounting to Television, their frequency, and examples of the roles they play at the centers.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama/theatre</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Language Audiology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Science Disorders</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (all with less than 2% of total responses)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal Roles Regarding Center Accomplishments**

Directors were asked to indicate the extent to which their centers have been successful in accomplishing several activities within the institution such as providing opportunities for research and observation, modeling pedagogy and early childhood practices, providing work experiences for students, supporting class attendance for student-parents, and helping traditionally and nontraditionally aged students with children
stay in school. Responses were made on a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., 1=not at all, 2=to a
limited extent, 3=to a moderate extent, 4=to a great extent and 5=not sure).

Table 14

Center Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Pedagogy</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Limited extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Work</td>
<td>2 ( 1.1)</td>
<td>8 ( 4.3)</td>
<td>18 ( 9.6)</td>
<td>160 (85.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1 ( .5)</td>
<td>7 ( 3.7)</td>
<td>24 (12.6)</td>
<td>159 (83.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Attendance</td>
<td>3 ( 1.6)</td>
<td>7 ( 3.8)</td>
<td>56 (30.6)</td>
<td>117 (63.9)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/minorities</td>
<td>11 (6.1)</td>
<td>21 (11.6)</td>
<td>24 (13.3)</td>
<td>125 (69.1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp;</td>
<td>6 ( 3.3)</td>
<td>12 ( 6.6)</td>
<td>67 (37.0)</td>
<td>96 (53.0)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>8 ( 4.3)</td>
<td>27 (14.4)</td>
<td>48 (25.5)</td>
<td>105 (55.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain Nontrad</td>
<td>16 ( 9.1)</td>
<td>24 (13.6)</td>
<td>22 (12.5)</td>
<td>114 (64.8)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain Trad Aged Parents</td>
<td>16 ( 9.0)</td>
<td>28 (15.8)</td>
<td>26 (14.7)</td>
<td>107 (60.5)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>15 ( 9.0)</td>
<td>36 (21.6)</td>
<td>73 (43.7)</td>
<td>43 (25.7)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract Grad Students</td>
<td>69 (39.7)</td>
<td>33 (19.0)</td>
<td>37 (21.3)</td>
<td>35 (20.1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=not at all; 2=to a limited extent; 3=to a moderate extent; 4=to a great extent; 5=not sure

In order of highest to lowest means, directors felt that their centers were to a large
extent successful in modeling appropriate pedagogy and early childhood practices
(85.1%); followed by providing work experience opportunities for students (83.2%);
enhancing the institution’s image (63.9%); supporting better class attendance for student
with children (69.1%); showing a commitment to women and minorities (53.0%);
providing opportunities for research and observation (55.9%); helping nontraditionally
aged students with children stay in school (64.8%); helping traditionally aged students
with children stay in school (60.5%); attracting faculty and staff (25.7%); and finally,
attracting graduate students to the university (20.1%). Frequency, percentages and means for all categories are displayed in Table 14, with items listed from highest to lowest mean. Directors could select “not sure” for this survey question and for analysis purposes, this choice was not calculated with the frequencies and means.

In summary, given the educational focus of many campus centers (which will be examined further in the next section), modeling pedagogy to students is the highest internal success. This is followed by providing student work opportunities which is one way to service the constituency for which centers were established.

Internal Roles Regarding Perception of Center’s Importance to the Campus

Another aspect of the internal roles of the campus center is the director’s opinion of how important her center is to the university and why. A total of 171 open-ended responses were offered for the question, “In your opinion, currently how important is your center to your campus?” The researcher carefully read and highlighted each response, writing notes of keywords in the margins. The keywords were then entered into the Zoomerang software to create tag lists. Exact and close matches to keywords in the responses were then tagged to show themes and patterns. Based on the tag lists that were created, several categories emerged describing areas of importance for the center. Although responses often contained more than one answer, they were placed in the categories based on the primary and often the first response to the question.

One category that emerged was related to the functions of a comprehensive center including the three prongs of training, service, and research (N=69, 40.1%). An additional category that emerged was related to retention and recruitment of faculty, staff, and students (N=34, 19.7%). Several directors commented on their perception of their
importance, but also the perception from outside their center by administrators and others that was not as favorable. The category of challenges contained these comments along with other challenges including financial concerns (N=27, 15.6%). Another category was that of support for the success of students, faculty and staff as well as programs for the institution (N=23, 13.3%). A few directors mentioned the investment that the university had made, primarily relating to expanding or providing additional facilities for the center (N=6, 3.4%). An “other” category was created for uncategorized comments.

Table 15 displays the number of responses and percentages for these categories. A complete listing of categories and responses can be found in Appendix G.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Center</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Comprehensive Center”</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Service Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention/Recruitment</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges (mixed perception of impact of center)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support/Success (for students, faculty, staff)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment by University (facility)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comprehensive center was a common theme that emerged in this question and other open-ended questions. The basic components of the comprehensive center involve education, service, and research opportunities for students and faculty. The following two sample comments illustrate how directors view the importance of the center in regards to its comprehensive components:
1. "I think it is very important to the missions of service, research and scholarship."

2. "Our center is very important to our campus because it offers an on-site child care center for our student-parents, provides a site for early childhood practicum students to complete their practicum hours, and provides a site for students in other programs to observe children as required for their degrees."

Campus centers offer support for students, faculty and staff as well as opportunities for success in course and position work responsibilities. Three comments are offered to illustrate this category with the second highest number of responses:

1. "Very important—we give peace of mind to students so they can focus on studies and/or work."

2. "It is extremely important. About 80% of our students state they would be unable to attend school if it were not for our program."

3. "It is vital to the overall success and mission of the university. We provide support services to allow faculty, staff, and students to be successful in their work."

Overall, a variety of departments are involved regularly in the campus center (with a summary listing found on Table 13 and a full listing found within Appendix F). Campus centers are the most successful in modeling pedagogy and age appropriate practices and providing students with work opportunities, as well as providing the three characteristics of a comprehensive center: education and training, service, and research opportunities.
External Roles

Directors were asked to indicate the extent to which their center has been successful in accomplishing several external roles. These roles included modeling quality child care practices for other child development programs, providing early childhood education for the public via conferences or workshops, providing referrals to parents or employers looking for care, providing services such as child care for community members, and finally, improving the relationship between the community and higher education institutions. Responses were indicated with a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., 1=not at all, 2=to a limited extent, 3=to a moderate extent, 4=to a great extent and 5=not sure). Directors could select “not sure” for this survey question and for analysis purposes; this choice was not calculated with the frequencies and means.

A large percentage of the respondents felt that, to a great extent, their center modeled quality child care practices to the outside community (73.3%); followed by improving community relations (48.6%); providing referrals (37.6%); providing child care or services (46.1%); and finally, providing early childhood education training (35.6%). Frequency, percentages and means for all categories are displayed in Table 16, with the items listed from highest to lowest means.
Table 16

*Community Accomplishments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a limited extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>1 ( .5)</td>
<td>10 ( 5.4)</td>
<td>35 (18.8)</td>
<td>140 (75.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>5 ( 2.7)</td>
<td>22 (12.0)</td>
<td>67 (36.6)</td>
<td>89 (48.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>12 ( 6.5)</td>
<td>37 (19.9)</td>
<td>67 (36.0)</td>
<td>70 (37.6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>28 (14.9)</td>
<td>37 (19.7)</td>
<td>35 (18.6)</td>
<td>88 (46.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21 (11.2)</td>
<td>50 (26.6)</td>
<td>50 (26.6)</td>
<td>67 (35.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=not at all; 2=to a limited extent; 3=to a moderate extent; 4=to a great extent; 5=not sure

In summary, providing appropriate practices for community child development organizations and parents mirrors the offering of good pedagogy, the largest perceived internal success.

Another aspect of the external roles of the campus center was what the director envisioned the role her center could or should play in the surrounding geographical community. A total of 159 open-ended responses were given. The researcher analyzed the responses by reading and creating tag lists to track frequency totals of reoccurring words in Zoomerang and then grouped into related themes and categories based on the primary response. Of the responses, the concept of modeling emerged as a major theme for this open-ended survey question (N=71, 53.7%). This category included the following aspects of modeling: best teaching practices for young children, program quality in the community (role model), education of young children, and service provision (training, workshops and conferences). Other categories that emerged from the analysis of this open-ended question included providing high quality care (N=16, 12.1%); serving and supporting the community in a variety of ways such as offering full-time rather than...
part-time care (N=13, 9.8%); partnering with the community through training, volunteering, and providing services such as Early Childhood Block Grant programs for at risk three and four year olds (N=11, 8.3%); offering training, conferences and workshops for parents and teachers (N=11, 8.3%); providing leadership and leaders in the field (N=5, 3.7%); and early childhood special education and inclusion (N=5, 3.7%).

Table 17 displays the frequencies and percentages for the open-ended response. The other category included a variety of responses and can be found in the complete listing of categories and responses in Appendix H.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open-Ended Responses to Potential Role of Center in Community</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model (best practices, education, program)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide High Quality Care</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve &amp; Support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner &amp; Partnership</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Conferences &amp; Workshops</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Leaders/Mentoring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Special Education/Inclusion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the largest category of responses, the following statements are four illustrative comments regarding the role of the campus center as a model program in the geographical community surrounding the campus center:

1. “We serve as a role model in the community....”

2. “I feel we can and do serve as a model for other programs in the area. We actively provide training to existing programs on the administrative and teaching levels.”
3. "We are a model for high quality care and education – the only NAEYC accredited center in the area."


In summary in reference to external roles, campus centers are perceived to be most successful in their external communities by modeling quality child care practices and secondly, by improving relationships. Directors feel that their potential role in the community should primarily involve the continued modeling of best practices, education and quality programs and secondly, providing high quality care.

**Barriers and Challenges**

Directors were asked to indicate the extent certain barriers affected the successful operation of their center. They responded based on a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., 1=not at all, 2=to a limited extent, 3=to a moderate extent, 4=to a great extent and 5=not sure). Directors felt that to a large extent, the biggest barrier involved financial concerns (31.9%) with more than 70% of directors identifying this as either a moderate or great extent; followed by low salaries (21.0%); staff turnover (9.1%); lack of administrative support (7.9%), lack of academic support (6.1%), child turnover (4.8%) and finally, low staff morale (2.1%). Table 18 displays the frequency, valid percents, and means. Directors could select “not sure” for this survey question, and for analysis purposes this choice was not calculated with the frequencies and means.
Table 18

**Barriers and Challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and Challenges</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Limited extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>6 (3.2)</td>
<td>49 (26.1)</td>
<td>73 (38.8)</td>
<td>60 (31.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Salaries</td>
<td>38 (20.4)</td>
<td>61 (32.8)</td>
<td>48 (25.8)</td>
<td>39 (21.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Admin Support</td>
<td>57 (30.3)</td>
<td>58 (30.9)</td>
<td>56 (29.8)</td>
<td>15 (7.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Turnover</td>
<td>55 (29.4)</td>
<td>67 (35.8)</td>
<td>48 (25.7)</td>
<td>17 (9.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Academic Support</td>
<td>73 (40.3)</td>
<td>52 (28.7)</td>
<td>45 (24.9)</td>
<td>11 (6.1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Staff Morale</td>
<td>61 (32.4)</td>
<td>89 (47.3)</td>
<td>34 (18.1)</td>
<td>4 (2.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Turnover</td>
<td>77 (41.0)</td>
<td>65 (34.6)</td>
<td>37 (19.7)</td>
<td>9 (4.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=not at all; 2=to a limited extent; 3=to a moderate extent; 4=to a great extent; 5=not sure

In summary, means for these issues are generally low as directors are not reporting large barriers to the effective operation of their centers. The lack of substantial barriers for centers will be discussed in further detail in Chapter V.

**Center Integration and Role of the Director**

**Director Activities**

Directors were asked to indicate the extent to which they communicated their mission to administrators. They responded based on a 4-point Likert scale (i.e., 1=not at all, 2=to a limited extent, 3=to a moderate extent, and 4=to a great extent). Directors indicated to a great extent they were most active in communicating their mission to administrators (28.6%); followed by interacting formally (e.g., schedule meetings) (21.2%); collecting and reporting center usage and outcome data with administrators (20.9%); and providing information on the center for student recruitment to a moderate and great extent (18.1%). Informal interactions with administrators followed as the next
most frequent activity (20.7%). Faculty and staff recruitment (13.9%), along with seeking funding for grants and research (15.5%) were the least frequent activities.

Table 19

*Director Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a limited extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Mission</td>
<td>8( 4.3%)</td>
<td>49(26.5)</td>
<td>75(40.5)</td>
<td>53(28.6)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formally Interact</td>
<td>10( 5.4%)</td>
<td>62(33.7)</td>
<td>73(39.7)</td>
<td>39(21.2)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect/Report data</td>
<td>18( 9.6%)</td>
<td>64(34.2)</td>
<td>66(35.3)</td>
<td>39(20.9)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info/Student recruit</td>
<td>22(11.7%)</td>
<td>52(27.7)</td>
<td>80(42.6)</td>
<td>34(18.1)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informally Interact</td>
<td>12( 6.5%)</td>
<td>76(41.3)</td>
<td>58(31.5)</td>
<td>38(20.7)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff recruit</td>
<td>24(12.8%)</td>
<td>67(35.8)</td>
<td>70(37.4)</td>
<td>26(13.9)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Research</td>
<td>37(19.8%)</td>
<td>69(36.9)</td>
<td>52(27.8)</td>
<td>29(15.5)</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=not at all; 2=to a limited extent; 3=to a moderate extent; 4=to a great extent

Table 19 displays the frequency, valid percents and means, as listed from highest to lowest means.

In summary, in reference to director activities, they spend the majority of their time communicating the mission of their center in a variety of ways with top-level administrators, and they primarily interact with administrators in a formal manner such as meetings.

*Comprehension of Mission by Administrators*

Another aspect of the center about which directors were asked to respond involved how well they felt top-level administrators understood the mission and importance of the campus child care center. Types of administrators included the president, provost, chairs of departments which work with the center, faculty and administrators within departments that work directly with the center and those who do not work directly with the center, and finally, student affairs and non-academic unit
administrators. Responses were indicated with a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., 1=not at all, 2=to a limited extent, 3=to a moderate extent, 4=to a great extent and 5=not sure).

Directors could select "not sure" for this survey question and for analysis purposes, this choice was not calculated with the frequencies and means.

Directors felt that to a great extent, the faculty and administrators within departments working directly with center (58.0%) understood the mission, followed by department chairs (61.2%); university and college presidents (35.0%); student affairs (29.7%); provost (30.8%); and finally, faculty and administrators that do not work with the center (3.8%). Table 20 displays the frequency, valid percents and means, as listed from highest to lowest means.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Frequency/Percentage</th>
<th>Mission Frequency/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Limited extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (2.1)</td>
<td>6 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Chairs</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>18 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>10 (5.5)</td>
<td>50 (27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Affairs</td>
<td>4 (2.2)</td>
<td>59 (31.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>12 (7.7)</td>
<td>37 (23.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Admin.</td>
<td>23 (12.4)</td>
<td>95 (51.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=not at all; 2=to a limited extent; 3=to a moderate extent; 4=to a great extent; 5=not sure
Overall, these results indicate that administrators working more directly with the center understand its purpose more than top level administrators, although directors spend time regularly communicating the center mission to them.

**Center Integration**

Directors indicated the extent to which they believed their center is fully integrated into the university as a whole. Responses were indicated with a 4-point Likert scale (i.e., 1=not at all, 2=to a limited extent, 3=to a moderate extent, 4=to a great extent). The majority of the directors indicated their center was integrated into the university to a moderate extent (49.2%), followed by a limited extent (32.8%). Directors believed that 16.9% believed their center was integrated to a great extent. Table 21 displays the frequency and valid percents.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center Integration</th>
<th>Frequency (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n(%)</td>
<td>n(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>62 (32.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two open-ended questions followed, with directors indicating either how they felt their level of integration had been accomplished to a moderate or great extent (N=118), or how they felt their level of integration was only to a limited extent or not at all (N=68). All responses are listed in Appendices I and J. The researcher analyzed the responses by reading them multiple times and then creating categories based on reoccurring words as tagged in Zoomerang. Although responses often contained more than one answer, they
were placed in the categories based on the primary and often the first response to the question.

Table 22

Open-Ended Responses from Director's Noting Moderate to Great Extent Integration (Regarding "How" Accomplished)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships/Networking</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment/Support</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Visibility</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work/Diligence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Integration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Programming</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 displays the number of responses and percentages for each category. Following the table, sample comments are offered for the category with the highest frequency of responses.

Building and Maintaining Relationships (N=28, 23.9%) and Commitment and Support from various administrators, personnel and various departments (N=23, 19.4%) were the two largest categories that emerged from data analysis as primary reasons directors thought their centers are integrated to a moderate or great extent into the university as a whole. Communication and Visibility was the next most frequent category (N=17, 14.5%), followed by Active Involvement by the director and center leadership (N=10, 8.5%), Hard and Diligent work (N=8, 6.8%), Longevity of the center (N=8,
6.8%), Center Integration (N=5, 4.2%), Quality Programming (N=5, 4.2%), Service
(N=2, 1.7%) and finally, other reasons (N=12, 10.2%).

Directors see relationship as a primary key to integration and this was evident in
the following two sample comments:

1. "Relationships, relationships, relationships. I get out there and cultivate them
   constantly!"
2. "Relationship building over the course of 3.5 decades..."

As noted, directors who believed that their center was only integrated to a limited
extent or not at all, could also offer their open-ended responses as to why. Responses
(N=68) were grouped under various categories: Low Profile of the center either by
physical location or low visibility for other reasons (N=19, 27.1%); Limited Knowledge
of the purpose and function of the center, especially due to the image of the center as a
campus babysitting service (N=11, 15.7%); Non-applicable or not sure (N=6, 8.5%);
Financial Issues regarding budget, funding or amount of revenue generated (N=5, 7.1%);
Low Priority and focus elsewhere (N=5, 7.1%); Administrative Changes (N=5, 7.1%);
Lack of Administrative support or faculty support (N=4, 5.7%); Campus Structure (N=4,
5.7%); Size or Utilization (N=3, 4.2%); Lack of Early Childhood Program on campus
(N=2, 2.8%); New Center Program (N=2, 2.8%); Director Related Concerns (N=2,
2.8%); and Other (N=2, 2.8%).

Table 23 displays frequencies and percentages for all categories. The total number
of responses on Table 23 is 70 which is 2 more than N=68 for this survey question.
Table 23

Open-Ended Responses from Director’s Noting Limited to No Integration (Regarding “How” Accomplished)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Profile</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Knowledge</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-applicable/Not sure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low priority/Focus elsewhere</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Changes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Admin &amp; Faculty Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size or Utilization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Early Childhood Education Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Related Concerns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is due to the fact that one respondent listed three reasons for limited to no integration (and all three of the responses are listed under the limited knowledge category). A complete listing of all the responses and categories can be found in Appendix J.

Following the table, sample comments are offered for the two categories with the highest frequency of responses.

The category of low profile had the highest number of responses. Directors felt that their centers were not integrated at all or on a limited basis due to either the location of the center on campus, or because the director and staff were not out in the various departments of the university often enough to create a stronger presence and relationship.

The following are two different illustrative comments revealing how directors feel that
their center is integrated to a limited extent or not at all due to low profile of center on campus:

1. "The center is not considered as important as other activities on campus because no one has taken the time to think about it. The center is just kind of ‘there’ unless someone needs it for something."
2. "We are located at the College's East Campus, about a mile from main campus. Out of sight, out of mind!"

The following are two different illustrative comments revealing how directors feel that their center is integrated to a limited extent or not at all due to limited knowledge:

1. "Lack of awareness of child development/human development and what a lab school does. We are viewed as on-campus babysitting."
2. "Misconceptions regarding program's academic role in the department. Often seen by larger university community as a child care resource only."

Overall, in reference to mission understanding, it is interesting to note that although directors report spending the most time doing these two activities, communicating their mission and building relationships and networking with top-level administrators are not the category with the highest percentages for those who comprehend the mission. Also, 16.9% felt that their centers were integrated to a great extent into their university. In chapters I and II, the concept of “The Prehension” was introduced in regards to an intuitive style of leader who can grasp the whole of a situation and continue to be proactive and positive despite challenges that might arise. The activities of a director with strong prehension involve actively communicating her mission, yet this may not be a major factor in creating a high level of integration. Further
results and discussion of the activities of the campus center director and her center’s integration will continue in the present chapter and chapter V.

*Director Role*

Directors also indicated via an open-ended question what they felt is their primary role in developing and maintaining a relationship with the university (e.g., encouraging integration into the university). A total of 169 open-ended responses were given, and the researcher carefully read and highlighted each response, writing notes of keywords in the margins. The keywords were then entered into the Zoomerang software to create tag lists. Exact and close matches to keywords in the responses were then tagged to show themes and patterns. Although responses often contained more than one answer, they were placed in the categories based on the primary and often the first response to the question.

Based on the tag lists created from the primary focus in each response, the following concepts emerged as themes: Ongoing Communication or Communicating (N=34, 20.1%), Cultivating Relationships (N=20, 11.8%), Providing Services (high quality care, opportunities, service or information) (N=19, 11.2%), Promoting and Advocating for the Center (N=18, 10.6%), Increasing Visibility (N=17, 10.0%), Collaborating with Departments (N=10, 5.9%), Educating Administrators (N=9, 5.3%), Integrating into the University (N=9, 5.3%), Attending Committees and Meetings (N=9, 5.3%), Acting as a liaison between the Center and the University, (N=8, 4.7%), and finally, Maintaining Financial Stability (N=5, 2.9%). Any responses that did not directly relate to one of these categories were grouped under “other” (N=11, 6.5%). An example of other responses included being available for student classroom work and the strategic plan of a university.
Table 24 displays the number of responses and percentages for each category and all responses and categories are displayed in Appendix K. Following the table, sample comments are offered for the category with the highest frequency of responses.

Table 24

*Open-Ended Responses to Primary Role of Director in Developing and Maintaining University Relationship*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Communication</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating Relationships</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Services etc.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting and Advocating for Center</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Visibility</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating with Departments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating Administrators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration into University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending Committees and Meetings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison bet. Center and University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Financial Stability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A grouping of words that emerged as a primary category was ongoing communications which involved the director communicating with various groups regarding current center events, value and importance of the program, the role played in the college operation, services, and the mission and work of the center (N=34). The following are three different comments regarding the director's role of communication:

1. "Speak about current center events on an ongoing basis at management meetings, and continue to invite upper management to events."

2. "My primary role is to keep lines of communication open with other departments and find purposeful ways for us to work together. For example, if
the children are interested in teeth a visit to the dental clinique for further investigation can be arranged.”

3. “Effectively communicating the program’s role and need it fulfills for all members of university community.”

In summary, the ongoing, persistent, and varied work of the director demonstrates the comprehensive grasp of realizing instinctively what must be done to have a successful organization. As noted in chapter II, communication is one of the key aspects of “The Prehension” and refers to appropriate messages to those from who cooperation is desired (purpose and willingness). Results reveal that a campus director may recognize this by spending a large amount of time communicating the mission to administrators (purpose and willingness), cultivating relationships, and promoting and advocating along with the other activities directors identified as ways in which a relationship is developed and maintained with the university.

Center Role Via Open-Ended Response

Directors could choose to respond to one final open-ended question regarding any additional comments they wanted to share about their center and its role within the university (N=55). Responses ranged from “extremely fortunate” to commenting that the center gives more than the university gives in return. Twenty-eight of the responses were positive in regards to the support of the center and its image on campus. There were also a few responses commenting on the survey format and coverage. All categories and responses are displayed in Appendix L. The following are seven randomly selected comments from directors at the end of the survey:
1. "We are extremely fortunate. Our staff are paid well, we have low turnover. Our center was recently renovated. The campus is small (5,000 students) and so I have access to principle administrators. I have a GREAT HR Director, and that really helps."

2. "As a center, we need to consciously act to increase our visibility with the administrators as well."

3. "Our college has changed the whole focus of our center by concentrating on the $$ and the number of children served...not the quality of staff and care of the children!"

4. "I wish I had better documents and arguments for why we are important. The other thing is that when they do see us as important, it's just to recruit and retain students - not what we are accomplishing with children - they do not care about the 'early childhood education' part."

5. "We are the only university in our state that has a child care center on campus for staff and faculty. It is a huge recruiting tool and results in administrative support (program, advocacy, and financial)."

6. "Our college has built us a new 6,000 sq. ft. building because of our importance to the community and college...and 'gosh darn it,' we are good at what we do through the dedication of our staff. We have a 2 year waiting list and most parents know to get on our waiting list before they get pregnant. It takes that long to get into the program. WE work hard at community relations and it shows."
7. “I have been in the early childhood field for over 25 years. I have seen positive change with regards to early childhood programs importance and image. I anticipate our program taking on a greater role in the future with the growth of our campuses.”

Overall, and in conclusion for this section on center integration and the role of the director, the director’s role at a campus center is multi-faceted in the pursuit of integration into the university and communication of its mission.

New Variable Creation

In this section, I summarize efforts to collapse multiple items into single new variables, allowing for correlations and regressions to be run. A Cronbach’s Alpha reliability analysis was conducted to see whether or not these items and others on the survey could be condensed into specific variables. This statistical analysis is used to determine if multiple items correlate with each other to produce a single variable (Salkind, 2004). If the alpha is .700 or higher (meaning there is a strong correlation between items), a new variable can be created. If the alpha is lower than .700 (meaning there is not a correlation between items) then one or more items need to be removed in order to make the correlation stronger.

To examine the overall internal successes of campus centers and potential connections to the types of programs offered by the campus centers, all individual success variables - Research and Observation, Model Pedagogy, Work Experience, Attendance, Traditional Aged Student-parents, Nontraditional Aged Student-parents, Attract Graduate Students, Institutional Image, Women/Minorities, and Attract Faculty/Staff - were combined into a new variable called “Internal Success.” The alpha
was .733 when all individual internal success variables were combined, and thus, a new single Internal Success variable was created.

In order to examine the overall external successes of campus centers as it relates to the types of program offered, all individual success variables - Model Quality Child Care Practices, Provide Early Childhood Education for Public, Provide Referrals, Provide Services, and Improve Community - Institution Relationships were combined in a new variable, “External Success.” The alpha was .730 when all individual external success variables were combined into the single new variable of External Success.

The Campus Child Care Center Director survey originally involved seven barrier and challenge variables to the successful operation of a center. Two of the seven variables, Staff Turnover and Low Salaries, had high correlations when a Pearson Correlation was performed. The alpha was .701 for items Staff Turnover and Low Salaries, and a new variable, “Barriers” was created. The levels of correlations for all these variables are displayed in a future section (Table 29).

For the survey question asking directors to indicate the extent to which they performed various activities, four of the original seven variables were highly correlated. Collecting & Reporting Data and Communicating the Mission had an alpha of .708 and a new “Collect Data & Communicate Mission” variable was created. Formal and Informal Interactions had an alpha of .730, and a new “Interactions” variable was created. The levels of correlations for all these variables are displayed in a future section (Table 32).

For the survey question concerning how well top level administrators understand the center mission, two of the original six variables had a high correlation. The alpha
result for Provost and President was .756, and a new “ProvPres” variable was created. The levels of correlations for all variables are displayed in a future section (Table 35).

To examine the overall impact of director activities on center integration, the seven director activity variables were combined into one composite variable of Director Activities. The variables Providing Information for Student Recruitment Efforts, Providing Information for Faculty and Staff Recruitment Efforts, Seeking Grants or Other Research Projects, Collecting and Reporting Center Data, Communicating the Mission of the Center with Administrators, and Formal and Informal Interactions had an alpha of .793 and a new “DirectorActivities” variable was created.

Table 25

New Variables and their Cronbach’s Alphas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Success</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Success</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect &amp; Reporting Data &amp; Communicate Mission</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProvPres</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DirectorActivities</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the Cronbach’s Alpha reliability tests for all newly created variables are displayed in Table 25. These variables will be used in regression analyses later on in chapter IV and can be identified by the written description and table titles.
Input Variables in Relation to Outcome of Perceived Center Integration

The fifth and final research question of the study examines to what extent several input variables (e.g., number of years a director has served, years a center has been in existence, types of programs offered by the center, activities undertaken by the center director, and mission of center as understood by administrators) relate to the perceived internal and external successes of the center, including the level of integration into the university. When examining center integration, internal and external successes by types of programs centers offer, two variables, Weekend and Sick Child Care were not included because the total of responses were too small for group differences analysis via T-tests.

Center Integration Differences by Type of Programs Offered

The researcher examined whether or not center integration differed by the types of programs that were offered. A T-test was conducted to analyze the difference in mean extent of integration of a center into the university when compared by types of Programs which include infant and toddler, formal preschool, full and part-time childcare, drop-in, evening, weekend and sick child care. The assumption of equal variances was determined by the significance of Levene’s $F$ (sig <.05). Results showed that centers which offered “infant-toddler programs” ($M=2.87$) and those that did not ($M=2.59$), and centers offering a “formal preschool program” ($M=2.91$) and those that did not ($M=2.61$), showed significant differences for the Integration variable. Results are displayed in Table 26.
Table 26

Center Integration Differences by Type of Programs Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Infant-Toddler Infant-Toddler</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>-2.359</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preschool Preschool</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>-2.366</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.035*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Full-time Full-time</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>-1.095</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Part-time Part-time</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Drop-in Drop-in</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>-0.930</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Evening Evening</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>-1.180</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Centers that offer infant-toddler and preschool programs may be more visible and fully integrated in the university systems as a whole. An educational focus is predominant within campus child care centers and could reflect the importance of infant-toddler programs in view of current brain research regarding the importance of the first three years of life. Another reason these programs impact integration is because preschools often have a more structured daily schedule and learning focus than typical child care, thus involving more academic departments. Research has shown that academics taught through play-based, child-initiated learning activities focused on development rather than scripted direct teacher instruction is better for children long-term (e.g., college graduation rates, felony arrest) (Schweinhart & Weikart, 1998). Infant-toddler and preschool
programs perhaps are more visible leading to more integration because of the societal push for quality early childhood education experiences.

*Center Integration, Years Center Existed, and Years Director Served*

For the variable of Center Integration, a Pearson correlation was run to investigate its relationship with Years Center Existed and Years Directors Served. Measures of correlations describe the relationship and direction of that relationship (Hopkins & Glass, 1996). Table 27 displays the findings for these correlations.

The Pearson correlation found items Years Director Served $r(186) = .213, p = .003$ and the Years of a Center’s Existence $r(190) = .143, p = .050$ had statistically significant low correlations with Center Integration.

Table 27

*Correlation Table for Integration Variables, Years Center Existed, and Years Director Served*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Center Integration</th>
<th>Years Director Served</th>
<th>Years of Center Existence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center Integration</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.018*</td>
<td>.050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Director Served</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Center Existence</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Regression analysis can be used when more than one variable is used to make a prediction (Hopkins & Glass, 1996). A regression analysis was conducted for variables Center Integration, Years Center Existed and Years Director Served. These variables
explained 3.4% of the variance, which is low. Individually, Years Director (B=.013, p=.026) significantly influenced Center Integration. Results are displayed in Table 28.

Table 28

*Regression Table for Center Integration, Years Center Existed, and Years Director Served*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>YRS Cntr</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YRS Dir</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Center Integration and Barriers to Successful Operation of Center

A Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between Center Integration and identified barriers and challenges centers face. Table 29 displays the findings for these correlations.

The Pearson correlation found a moderate and statistically significant correlation between Center Integration and items Lack of Administrative Support, r(186)=-.361, p=.000, Lack of Academic Department Support, r(181)=-.185, p=.013, and Child Turnover, r(188)=-.202, p=.006.

There were significant correlations (0.05 level) among the barrier variables Lack of Administrative Support and Staff Turnover, r(184)=.160, p=.030, Child Turnover, r(185)=.317, p=.000, and Low Salaries, r(184).174, p=018. There was also a significant correlation between Lack of Academic Department Support and Low Salaries, r(179)=.160, p=.032 as well as with Low Staff Morale, r(180)=.179, p=.016. Finally, Child Turnover and Low Staff Morale were significantly correlated, r(187)=.172, p=.000.
Table 29

*Correlation Table for Integration Variables, Barriers, and Challenges*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cntr Integ</th>
<th>Finan Admin Supp</th>
<th>Lack Admin Supp</th>
<th>Lack Acad Dept Supp</th>
<th>Staff Turnover</th>
<th>Child Turnover</th>
<th>Low Salaries</th>
<th>Low Staff Morale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cntr Integ</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>-.361**</td>
<td>-.185*</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.202**</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integ</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finan</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.314**</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.502**</td>
<td>.160*</td>
<td>.327*</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supp</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>.160*</td>
<td>.179*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supp</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Turnover</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>.542**</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Turnover</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Salaries</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.441**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Staff Morale</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

A linear regression was used for Center Integration and various barriers and challenges to explore the extent to which these variables influence the level of center integration. The individual barrier and challenge variables account overall for 14.5% of the variance for the Center Integration variable. Individually, Lack of Administration
Support (B=-.231, p=.000) significantly influenced this item of lack of Center Integration. Results are displayed in Table 30.

Table 30

*Regression Table for Center Integration, Barriers, and Challenges*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack Admin</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack Dept</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Turnover</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Turnov</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Stf</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Integration, Years Director Served, and Director Activities

A Pearson Correlation was used to determine the relationship between Center Integration and various Director Activities. Table 31 displays the findings for these correlations.

Seven different director activities, as well as the number of years a director has served were significantly correlated to Center Integration. They include Provide Information on Center (as part of university student recruitment efforts) (r(186)=.210, p=.004), Provide Information on Center (as part of university faculty and staff recruitment efforts) (r(185)=.214, p=.003), Actively Seek Grants (or other research projects with various departments) (r(185)=.194, p=.008), Collect and Report Center Usage and Outcome Data (to various university administrators) (r(185)=.258, p=.000), Communicate the Mission of Center with Top-level Administrators (r(183)=.392,
p = .000, and finally, Formally and Informally Interact with Various Top-level University Administrators (r(182) = .398, p = .000).

Table 31

*Correlation Table for Integration, Years Director, and Director Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cntr Integ</th>
<th>YRS Dir</th>
<th>Infor on Center for Stud Recru</th>
<th>Infor on Center for Fac/st Recru</th>
<th>Seek Grant or Resea</th>
<th>Collect Report Data</th>
<th>Share Mission</th>
<th>Formal Interact</th>
<th>Inform Interact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cntr Integ</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>.210**</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.392**</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.398**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRS Dir</td>
<td>.182*</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.164*</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infor on Center for Stud Recru</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infor on Center for Fac/Staff Recru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.280**</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek Grants or Resea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect &amp; Report Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.723**</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.575**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Interact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.575**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Interact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
There were also moderate and high correlations among the variables Sharing the Mission, Collecting and Reporting Data, and Formal and Informal interactions. The variables Share the Mission of center in various ways with various top-level administrators and Collect and Report center usage and outcome data to various university administrators had a high correlation \( r(185) = .550, p=000 \). The variables Formally Interact with various top-level university administrators and Collect and Report Center Usage and Outcome Data to various university administrators had a moderate correlation \( r(184) = .432, p=000 \). Items Informally Interact with various top-level university administrators and Communicate the Mission of Center in various ways with various top-level administrators had a moderate correlation \( r(184) = .476, p=000 \). Items Formally Interact with various top-level university administrators and Communicate the Mission of Center in various ways with various top-level administrators, had a high correlation \( r(184) = .723, p=000 \). And finally, items Informally Interact with various top-level university administrators and Formally Interact with various top-level university administrators, had a moderately high correlation \( r(184) = .575, p=000 \).

A regression analysis was conducted for the variables Center Integration and the new, combined variables of Director Activities: Collecting and Reporting Center Usage and Outcome Data and Communicating the Mission as well as Informal and Formal Interactions. The variables Center Integration and new director variables accounted for 16.8% of the variance for the Integration variable. Individually, Informal and Formal Interactions (\( B=.152, p=000 \)) significantly influenced Center Integration. Results are displayed in Table 32.
Table 32

Regression Table for Center Integration and Combined Formal and Informal Interactions and Collecting Data and Communicating Mission Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Informal &amp; Formal</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collect Data &amp; Comm Mission</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

A third regression analysis was conducted for the variables Center Integration and the new, grouped variable of Director Activities. The Center Integration and grouped Director Activities variables accounted for 15.6% of the variance for the Integration variable. Individually, Director Activities (B = .067, p = .000) significantly influenced Center Integration. Results are displayed in Table 33.

Table 33

Regression Table for Center Integration and Grouped Director Activity Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Director Activities</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Center Integration and Mission Understanding

Another aspect of Center Integration examined through correlations of variables and a regression analysis was the relationship between integration of the center into the
university and how well administrators understood the mission of the center as perceived by the directors.

A Pearson Correlation was used to determine the relationship between Center Integration and Extent of Understanding the Center's Mission by various Administrators including the university president, provost, department chair, faculty and administrators within the department which the campus center is a part of, faculty and administrators outside the "host" department, and student affairs/non-academic unit administrators. Table 34 displays the findings for these correlations.

The Pearson correlation found a moderate correlation between items Center Integration and Provost understanding, \( r(154) = .348, p = .000 \), as did Department Chairs understanding and Provost understanding, \( r(155) = .359, p = .000 \). Items Faculty/Administrators understanding in departments outside the center and Provost understanding also had a moderate correlation, \( r(153) = .369, p = .000 \). Items Student Affairs/Non-Academic Unit Administrators understanding and Center Integration had a moderate correlation, \( r(183) = .353, p = .000 \), as did Student Affairs and Faculty/Administrators understanding within department, \( r(183) = .312, p = .000 \) and Student Affairs and Faculty/Administrators understanding outside department, \( r(183) = .338, p = .000 \).

Items with a moderate to high correlation include President understanding and Center Integration, \( r(181) = .410, p = .000 \), Provost understanding and President understanding, \( r(151) = .608, p = .000 \), Faculty/Administrators understanding within department and Department Chairs understanding, \( r(186) = .504, p = .000 \), Faculty/Administrators understanding without department and Center Integration,
r(184)=.406, p=.000, Faculty/Administrators understanding without department and President understanding, r(181)=.424, p=.000, and finally, Faculty/Administrators understanding without department and Faculty/Administrators understanding within department, r(184)=.423, p=.000.

Table 34

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
A regression analysis was conducted for the variables Center Integration and Extent of Understanding the Center's Mission by Administrators. The variables Center Integration and Extent of Understanding the Center's Mission by Administrators accounted for 23.4% of the variance for the Integration variable. Individually, Faculty and Administrators outside the Department understanding (B=.300, p=.000), and Student Affairs and Non-academic Unit Administrators understanding (B=.228, p=.000) significantly influenced Center Integration. Results are displayed in Table 35.

Table 35

*Regression Table for Center Integration, Mission of Center as Understood by Administrators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Dept Ch</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F/A w/in</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F/A w/o</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-acad</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

A second regression analysis was conducted for the variables Center Integration and the new, combined variable of the Extent of Understanding the Center's Mission by Administrators (ProvPres). The variables Center Integration and Understanding by Administrators accounted for 9.6% of the variance for the Integration variable, and significantly influenced Center Integration. Results are displayed in Table 36.
Table 36

Regression Table for Center Integration, Mission of Center as Understood by Administrators for Combined President and Provost Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ProvPres</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ProvPres</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>4.552</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Final Regression for Center Integration

A final regression was conducted to examine the influence on integration when the grouped variable of Director Activities along with Infant-Toddler care, Preschool programs, and the barrier, Lack of Administrator Support, were added into the same regression model. Preschool was not significant when the infant-toddler and the two administration variables were constant, so it was removed and in the final model that was run, the remaining three were all significant and shared large portions of the variance.

Center Integration, Infant-Toddler, grouped Director Activities, and Lack of Administrative Support variables accounted for 28.3% of the variance for the Integration variable. Individually, Infant-Toddler (B=.224, p.038), Director Activities (B=.059, p=.000) and Lack of Administrative Support (B=-.244, p=.000) significantly influenced Center Integration. Results are displayed in Table 37.
Table 37

*Regression Table for Center Integration, All Director Activities, Infant-Toddler and Preschool Programs, Barrier, and Lack of Administrative Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Infant-Toddler</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director Act</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack Admin</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Significant Center Integration Outcome Findings

Center integration has been examined in light of the relationships between the length of time director has served, barriers and challenges, the length of time a center has been in existence, director activities, and administrator understanding of the mission of the center. A final regression was conducted to examine the effect of type of program, director activities and lack of administrative support on center integration. All three predictor variables significantly contribute to center integration. Table 38 displays a summary of the statistically significant findings for the outcome variable center integration.

Table 38

*Summary of Statistically Significant Data Related to Center Integration (Outcome Variable)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Significant Variable</th>
<th>Significant P Values</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>Significance of result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences by Types of Programs offered-T-tests</td>
<td>Infant-Toddler</td>
<td>p=.019*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Centers offering infant-toddler programs report larger center integration factors than those that do not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38 – continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Significant Variable</th>
<th>Significant P Values</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Significance of result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.035*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Centers offering preschool report larger center integration factors than those that do not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression for Integration, Years Center Existed and Years Director</td>
<td>Years Director Served</td>
<td>p=.026*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>Center integration is positively influenced by the years a director has been at the center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression-Barriers and Challenges</td>
<td>Lack of Admin Support</td>
<td>p=.000*</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>Lack of administrative support negatively influences center integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression for Integration, Informal &amp; Formal</td>
<td>Informal &amp; Formal</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>Informal and Formal interactions by the director with administrators positively influence integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression for Integration, Grouped Director Activity Variable</td>
<td>Director Activities</td>
<td>000*</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>Taken as a group, all director activities positively influence integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression for Integration, Mission of Center as Understood by Administrators</td>
<td>Faculty &amp; Administrators outside dept.</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>Understanding of center’s mission by faculty and administrators outside the department housing the campus center positively influences integration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38 – continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Significant Variable</th>
<th>Significant P Values</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Significance of result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression for Prov/Pres Integration, Mission of Center as Understood by Admin.</td>
<td>Student Affairs &amp; Non-academic Unit Admin.</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>Understanding of the center’s mission by student affairs and non-academic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Regression for Director Activities, Infant-Toddler, Preschool, All Director</td>
<td>Director Activities &amp; Lack of Administrative Support</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>The combined variable, Director Activities, as well as Lack of Administrative Support,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Administrative Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>positively influences integration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Input Variables in Relation to Outcomes of Perceived Internal Successes

In this section, the success of the center within the center is examined according to the types of programs offered and activities the director engages in on a regular basis. Internal success variables include providing opportunities for research and observation, providing work experience opportunities for students, supporting better class attendance for students with children, helping traditionally aged students with children stay in school, helping nontraditionally aged students with children stay in school, attracting graduate students, enhancing the institution’s image, and showing a commitment to women and minorities.
Internal Successes by Type of Programs Offered

The internal successes were analyzed to see whether or not they differed by the type of programs offered. A T-test was used to investigate the difference between internal successes and the variables for types of programs centers offered at centers. The internal successes as perceived by the director combined into a single new variable. The assumption of equal variances was determined by the significance of Levene's F (sig <.05). Significant differences for Internal Successes were found for centers with Infant-Toddler Programs (M=31.9) as compared with those without (M=29.7); those with Full-time Child Care Programs (M=31.6) as compared with those without (M=27.6); those with Part-time Child Care Programs (M=31.9) as compared with those without (M=29.0); those offering Drop-in Care (M=33.4) as compared with those who do not (M=30.8), and those offering Evening Care (M=33.6) as compared with those who do not (M=31.2).

Results are displayed in Table 39.

Table 39
Internal Success Differences by Type of Programs Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Infant-Toddler</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>-2.328</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant-Toddler</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preschool</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>-1.599</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Full-time</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>-2.785</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Part-time</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>-2.491</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Drop-in</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>-2.491</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-in</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Evening</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>-1.180</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Internal Success Variables and Director Activities

Another aspect of internal success analyzed involved activities in which the director participated at the center and on the university campus. Specific internal success variables were chosen that related conceptually to the director activity variables. The researcher wanted to examine if the image of the center is influenced by specific director activities, such as providing information to faculty and staff who might be attracted to work at the university if there were child care services available. Also, whether or not institutional image is influenced by directors initiating grants and research projects with various departments is examined. Do director efforts to collect and report center usage and outcome data to university administrators predict how successful their centers will be in the areas of research and observation? And finally, is the success of a center in attracting faculty and staff influenced by directors who actively recruit and provide information about their center to potential employees? A Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between various Internal Success variables and all director activity variables (each item was examined individually).

There were moderate correlations (e.g., those with a correlation coefficient of at least .300) among the following variables: Attracting Faculty and Staff and Institutional Image ($r(164)=.400$, $p=.000$); Collecting/Reporting Data and Seeking Grants/Research ($r(185)=.301$, $p=.000$); Formally Interact and Provide Information for student recruitment ($r(184)=.302$, $p=.000$); Formal Interactions and Providing Information for Faculty/Staff recruitment ($r(182)=.308$, $p=.000$); Informal Interactions and Providing Information for Student Recruitment ($r(184)=.320$, $p=.000$); Informal Interactions and
Collecting/Reporting Data ($r(183)=.376$, $p=000$) and variables Informal Interactions and Communicating Mission ($r(182)=.476$, $p=.000$).

There were high correlations (e.g., those with a correlation coefficient of at least .500) among the variables Providing Faculty/Staff Recruitment and Providing Information for Student Recruitment ($r(186)=.504$, $p=.000$), Formal Interactions and Communicating Mission ($r(182)=.723$, $p=.000$). Table 40 displays the findings for these correlations.

Table 40

*Correlation Table for Internal Success Variables and Director Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Res &amp; Obs</th>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Attract</th>
<th>Fac/Staff Recruit</th>
<th>Fac/Staff Recr</th>
<th>grants</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Inform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Res &amp; Obs</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.196**</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.270**</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.189*</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.437**</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.177*</td>
<td>.164*</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/St</td>
<td></td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud Recruit</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/Staff Recruit</td>
<td>.280**</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruite</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Seek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/ Collect</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.723**</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.575**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
A regression analysis was used to investigate whether various director activities within the university affect the level of various internal successes at her center, particularly in the areas of academics. The director activities were selected for the analysis based on areas importance to academic institutions. These activities such as seeking research opportunities connect the center with the university and may help each entity to see the value of the other ensuring integration and longevity of the child care program. In Gulley et al. (1985), reference is made to the fact that administrators and institutions traditionally have not been very supportive of the idea of child care on campus, with the exception of laboratory or research opportunities with a direct link to academic programs. Research is a primary example of one area that is traditionally valued by higher education institutions. The fifth research question for this study examines whether certain director activities such as seeking research opportunities, can predict internal successes of the center within the university context. It is important for a center to enhance the image of the institution and the director does this through faculty and staff recruitment as well as grant and research opportunities. The director also utilizes collection and usage of center data to enhance research along with finding ways to communicate her mission to administrators.

A regression analysis was conducted for the internal success variables Institutional Image and the following director activity variables that could possibly influence this variable: Providing Information on Center for Student Recruitment, Faculty and Staff Recruitment Efforts, and Seeking Grants or other research projects with departments. These three director activity variables accounted for 8.5% of the variance for the Image variable. Individually, Providing Information on Faculty and Staff
Recruitment Efforts (B=.146, p=.019) and Seeking Grants and Research Opportunities (B=.233, p=.002) significantly influenced this item. The remaining four director activity variables, Collecting and Reporting Data, Communicating the Mission, Formal and Informal Activities were highly correlated and grouped together and run in a separate analysis. Results are displayed in Table 41.

Table 41

*Regression Table for Institutional Image and Director Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Stud Recruit</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fac/Staff Recruit</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek Grants</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

A second regression analysis was conducted for the internal success variable Research and Observation with Seeking Grants or other research projects with departments, Collecting and Reporting Center Usage and Outcome Data to Administrators, and Communicating the Mission with Administrators. The selected director activity variable accounted for 7.9% of the variance for the Research and Observation variable. Seeking Grants and Research Opportunities (B=.256, p=.000) significantly influenced this item. Results are displayed in Table 42.
Table 42

*Regression Table for Research and Observation and Director Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res&amp;Obs</td>
<td>Grants/Research</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data&amp;Mission</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A third regression analysis was conducted for the internal success variable Research and Observation and the combined director variable, Collecting and Reporting Center Data and Communicating the Mission. This combined variable accounted for 4.3% of the variance for the Research and Observation variable which is low. Collecting and Reporting Center Data and Communicating the Mission significantly influenced this item (B=.120, p=.003). Results are displayed in Table 43.

Table 43

*Regression Table for Research and Observation and Director Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data&amp;Mission</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05

A fourth regression analysis was conducted for the internal success variable Attracting Faculty and Staff and the director activity, Providing Information on Center for Faculty/Staff Recruitment. Providing Center Information accounted for 18% of the variance for the Attraction of Faculty and Staff Recruitment variable (B=.446, p=.000) and this variable was significant. Results are displayed in Table 44.
Table 44

*Regression Table for Attracting Faculty, Staff, and Director Recruitment Efforts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract</td>
<td>Fac/Staff Recru</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Activities of the director have direct influence on faculty and staff recruitment, grants, research and observation opportunities and further demonstrate that a comprehensive spirit and contextual leadership does prevail and produce specific accomplishments for the university.

*Significant Internal Success Outcome Findings*

Internal successes have been examined in light of the relationships between types of programs a center offers as well as director activities. In the next section, input variables will be examined according to outcomes of the external successes of the center within the university. Table 45 displays a summary of the statistically significant findings for the outcome variable Internal Successes.

Table 45

*Summary of Statistically Significant Data Related to Internal Successes (Outcome Variable)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Significant Variable</th>
<th>Significant P Values</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>Significance of result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>Infant-Toddler</td>
<td>p=.021*</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a difference in the internal success for centers who offer infant/toddler care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>Full-time Care</td>
<td>p=.006*</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a difference in the internal success for centers who offer full-time care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Test</td>
<td>Significant Variable</td>
<td>Significant P Values</td>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>Significance of result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>Part-time Care</td>
<td>p=.014*</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a difference in the internal success for centers who offer part-time care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>Drop-in Care</td>
<td>p=.005*</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a difference in the internal success for centers who offer drop-in care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>Evening Care</td>
<td>p=.012*</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a difference in the internal success for centers who offer evening care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression for Institutional Image and Director Activities</td>
<td>Fac/Staff Recruit</td>
<td>p=.019*</td>
<td></td>
<td>The image of an institution is positively influenced by a director's faculty and staff recruitment efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek Grants/Research</td>
<td>p=.002*</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>The image of an institution is positively influenced by the grants and research opportunities the director seeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression for Research and Observation and Director Activities</td>
<td>Seek Grants/Research</td>
<td>p=.000*</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>Research and observation opportunities are positively influenced by the grants and research opportunities the director seeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression for Research and Observation and Director Activities</td>
<td>Collect Data and Comm Mission</td>
<td>p=.003*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>Research and observation opportunities are positively influenced by the usage and outcome data collected and various ways mission is communicated to top administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression for Attracting Faculty, Staff and Director Recruitment Efforts</td>
<td>Fac/Staff Recruit</td>
<td>p=.000*</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>Attracting faculty and staff is positively influenced by the faculty and staff recruitment efforts by the director.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Input Variables in Relation to Outcomes of Perceived External Successes

External successes were analyzed to see whether or not they differed by the type of programs offered. T-tests were used to investigate the difference between external success and the variables for types of programs centers offered at centers including infant/toddler, preschool, part- and full-time, drop-in and evening care. The external successes as perceived by the director that were combined into one variable include: modeling quality child care practices, providing early childhood education for the public, providing referrals and services and improving community-institution relationships. The assumption of equal variances was determined by the significance of Levene’s $F$ (sig <.05). No significant results were found for the external success of the centers based on the types of programs offered. Results are displayed in Table 46.

Table 46

*External Success Differences by Type of Programs Offered*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Infant-Toddler</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>-1.107</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant-Toddler</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preschool</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>-1.621</td>
<td>61.502</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Full-time</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Part-time</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Drop-in</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-in</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Evening</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Overall, external successes were examined in light of the relationships between external success and types of programs a center offers. No significant difference was found regarding how perceived center successes in the surrounding community based on the types of programs it offers to its constituents. Because no significant differences were found, no correlations and regressions were run using the external success variable.

Chapter IV Summary

Chapter IV presented descriptive and statistical analysis data from the Campus Child Care Center Director Survey. Demographic information revealed that the average institutional size was between 5,001 and 14,000 students with the majority of the responding institutions being four year public colleges and universities. The average number of years that campus centers had existed was 27, and the average number of years directors had served was 12. Most children received full-time care and their parents were students. Faculty, staff, and student parent interest were the most common reasons centers were established. Further details concerning demographics, department involvement, successes, barriers and challenges that centers face, director activities, roles of the center, understanding of the mission, center integration as well as roles of the director are summarized and discussed in chapter V.

The study revealed differences in center integration between those who offered infant-toddler and preschool programs and those who do not. This could be due in part to the educational and research focus of universities and academic departments may be involved with campus centers for this reason. Integration is not significantly influenced by years the center has existed, but is significantly influenced by years the director has served. Lack of administration support moderately predicts lack of integration while
director activities of collecting and reporting center data to administrators, communicating the mission of the center to administrators, as well as formal and informal interactions with administrators positively predicts integration. Center integration is also impacted through the combination of all director activities, infant-toddler and preschool programs, and lack of administrative support. A center is more fully integrated throughout the university based on specific programs, the combination of several director activities and the challenge of lack of administrators supporting the mission of the center.

The study also revealed that how well the center is integrated can be predicted by how well department chairs, faculty and administrators within and without the department housing the center as well as non-academic unit and student affairs administrators understand the mission and its importance.

The internal success of improving institutional image was influenced by certain director activities including providing information for faculty and staff recruitment and by seeking grants and research projects with various departments. Predictors for research and observation were collecting data and communicating the mission. A significant predictor for attracting faculty and staff was the director activity of providing center information for faculty and staff recruitment. These activities and internal success variables were selected due to the academic and educational priorities of both universities and campus centers.

The study revealed that centers who offer infant-toddler, full-time and part-time, drop-in and evening-care programs report larger internal success factors than those that do not. The nature of many of the internal successes relates directly to the types of care these groups need to be successful. Externally, no significant differences were found
when the combined variable of external success was analyzed by the typical types of programs found at campus centers. The results revealed that most centers were established to service the needs of the internal campus community and due to a comprehensive grasp by many actively involved directors and centers, there is a stronger focus and more investment in the opportunities, activities and recruitment within the university.

All data and results used in this study are presented in this chapter. Further details of the results and the connections they have to previous research, as well as possible future implications, are discussed in chapter V.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the findings from the Campus Child Care Director Survey used to collect data from directors at two-year community and technical colleges as well as four-year private and public colleges and universities. The survey recorded their perceptions of internal and external center impact and center integration into the institution and the role they and their center plays in that process.

A primary purpose of the study is to examine director reports and perceptions of the types of services that university child care centers offer, reasons for their existence, barriers and issues, and perceived roles of such centers and directors. The study researched the following broad question: "What value do campus centers offer to a given higher education institution and its surrounding community, especially from a center director’s perspective?" The perceptions of directors of child care centers were gathered in order to discover centers’ internal, external, and operational roles and their place within institutions of higher education.

The directors in this study are members of a national organization of campus child care centers. A key strength of this study is the response rate of 48.75%, receiving data from 191 directors from 70 two-year and 123 four-year colleges and universities.

Contextual Questions and Current State of Campus Child Care Centers

The majority of the 191 respondents (63%) were from institutions between 5,001 and 14,000 students. The highest number of respondents were from four year public colleges and universities (54%) followed by those from community colleges (33%). Over half of the campus centers (59.5%) had been in existence between 21 and 40 years followed by those operating between 1 and 20 years (31.9%). Half of the directors had
been on the job between 1 and 10 years (50.5%) and 28.6% had been directing between 11 and 20 years. The numbers of years each director had served was identified as one of the variables in the statistical analysis of center integration as well as internal and external successes of campus centers.

The first research question focuses on descriptive information including the characteristics of the enrollment, clientele and types of programs the centers offered, and the factors that led to the establishment of the center as understood by the director.

Most children attending campus centers are enrolled on a full-time basis, and on average most were children of students (M=44 students per center), followed by children of faculty and staff (M=30 students per center), and then by parents from the community (M=28 students per center). Reflective of these statistics, most centers offered full-time child care (91.5%), followed by part-time (83.7%). Preschool programs (74.3%) and infant/toddler programs (73.7%) were the next highest percentage types of services offered. Despite calls for campus centers to offer a comprehensive model with expanded services (Townley & Zeece, 1991), only 19.7% offer evening care, 3.6% offer weekend care, and 2.2% offer sick care.

Reflective of the fact that most parents enrolling children at campus centers are students, establishing a center for them (61.6%) and the interest of faculty and staff (57.5%) were the two most frequent responses by directors. Responses to an open-ended survey question indicated that additional reasons for college and universities to create campus centers included providing opportunities for early childhood students (four-year degree programs) and child development students (two-year, associates of arts programs), and to participate in observation, training and teaching (field experiences and practicums)
in a lab school setting. Thus, meeting student needs and educational needs are important priorities for campus centers.

The contextual and current state of campus centers data gathered in this study is consistent with findings reported by Keyes (1995) who indicated that many center varieties existed, serving as laboratory schools for teacher education and other academic departments, offering full- and part-time care, and accepting children from student-parents, faculty, staff, and community.

Internal and External Impact

The second research question examines what impact directors believed their center has on the internal community of their university and then outwardly in the surrounding geographical communities. The following section discusses the characteristics and implications of various types of influence within the university and outside in the community.

Significant Department Involvement

The first area of internal influence examined is the area of academic departmental participation and the frequency of that participation. Observation is the largest area of participation for Psychology departments (54.3%), other departments (42.1%), and Social Work departments (45.6%), followed by Teacher Education departments (27.4%). For Teacher Education departments, training is the most frequent area of participation (65.1%), followed by other activities and functions of departments (25.1%). In the area of research, Psychology departments participate the most (20.7%).

Various university departments participate frequently with the campus center. On a weekly basis, Teacher Education is the department with the highest percentage (71.5%).
On a once per term basis, departments identified as other departments are most active (52.0%), followed by Psychology departments (51.4%), and Social Work departments (39.2%). Kinesiology departments (69.5%), and Social Work departments (42.0%) are the two departments most likely to not be involved at all in the campus center.

Nursing is the department most often indicated in an open-ended response question regarding additional departments that participate with the center, and upon further review, this department was indeed also mentioned in the literature (Keyes, 1990; Keyes & Boulton, 1995). Reasons for nursing departments to be involved included observations, research, health and nutrition activities, screenings, and training. Music is the next most cited additional department and examples of involvement include training, education, and music lessons. Dental, occupational, and physical therapy are also cited as additional departments; dental departments are involved for screenings, lessons, demonstrations, and various training activities; occupational therapy departments participated in practice using screening and assessment tools, field experience, and observation; and physical therapy departments interact with the centers by observing and interacting with children.

Overall, this study has identified more departments that utilize a campus center than have previously been cited in the literature. Appendix F displays a complete listing of these 102 additional departments, colleges, and activities covering Accounting to Television, their frequency, and examples of the roles they play at the centers. The high number and variety of additional departments involved in campus centers not presented in previous studies indicates opportunities to involve as many different departments
within a campus center and speaks to the integration of the center throughout the university.

Significant Training, Research, and Service Activities

Another area of internal impact within the institution involves the successes of the center in accomplishing several activities. Overall, the study found that modeling appropriate teaching strategies (85.1%) and providing work experience opportunities for students (83.2%) are perceived as the most successful internal activities. Other frequent internal impact activities include: supporting better class attendance for students with children (69.1%), helping nontraditionally aged students with children stay in school (64.8%); enhancing the institution’s image (63.9%); and helping traditionally aged students with children stay in school (60.5%). The high levels of these activities demonstrate significant internal supports offered via such campus centers.

One strength of my study is the care to detail respondents used to answer several open-ended questions. These responses give deeper insight into one main purpose of this study: examining integration and center role as well as director roles in higher education institution campus centers. The open-ended responses included in the appendices serve as a resource for current campus center directors as well.

One such open-ended question examines internal roles and the director’s opinion of how important her center is to the university and why. A total of 171 open-ended responses were offered for the question, “In your opinion, currently how important is your center to your campus.” Via these open-ended responses, my study found the functions of training, service, and research are the most important roles indentified by directors, which correspond with the definition of a comprehensive center in the literature
(Corder, 1986; Keyes, 1984; Keyes & Boulton, 1995). An additional open-ended response category for this question, supporting students, student-parents, and their success, is consistent with the second highest area of internal success by campus centers obtained via the closed-ended question results, providing opportunities for student work (83.2% to a great extent). This finding is consistent with previous research (e.g., Fadale & Winter, 1991), which addressed the importance of campus care for the student-parent’s success in college. The amount of time spent servicing the needs of student-parents is supported by theory and practice both in the literature regarding campus centers and in the reality portrayed by the respondents of this survey. It is interesting to note that a study by Gulley et al.’s (1985) found that centers’ perception of their purposes focused primarily on service provision for women and students (63.2%) rather than on developmental programs (58.5%). The trend over twenty years ago involved primarily the service prong of a comprehensive center with student training and creating model centers were not perceived as important. My study found that the comprehensive model involving service, training and research is strong for campus centers and their sponsoring universities.

Via a closed-ended question, the top area of perceived internal success is modeling pedagogy (early childhood practices) “to a great extent” (85.1%) and meets the educational and training needs of the students who observe and work in the center. A student-centered focus of campus centers is a natural extension of the setting in which they are housed.
Significant External Activities

External roles and impact are additional aspects addressed by the second research question. Overall, my study found that directors perceived their centers as successfully modeling quality child care practices to the outside community (75.3%). Thus, both within the university and in the outside community, modeling best practices is the highest perceived success.

In addition to modeling best practice, my study found that universities participate in the community in several additional ways including improving community relations, offering child care services, providing referrals, and conducting early childhood education training. These results reveal that communication and training of appropriate child care education and care is important not only internally within the higher education institution, but also externally within the community influenced by the center. These perceived external accomplishments are mirrored in the responses to the open-ended question where directors indicate what they envision the role of their center should be in the surrounding community. Modeling best practices, education, and programs is the category with the highest percentage of open-ended responses. These findings represent external community activities that campus centers are involved in, but few references to them previously existed in the literature.

Barriers and Challenges

Directors were asked the effect of several potential barriers on the successful operation of their center during the past five years. More than two-thirds of directors noted their biggest barrier involved financial concerns (31.9% to a great extent and 38.8% to a moderate extent). This was followed by just less than half indicating low
salaries as a challenge (21.0% to a great extent and 25.8% to a moderate extent). Financial challenges are still an issue that centers must attend to and as noted, the largest barrier overall. Yet since over one-third do not perceive finances to be a barrier at all, it appears that many centers have been successful in overcoming financial issues as a major barrier to their overall operation. Institutional funding for service-based programs is often a struggle for campus centers that rely on child care tuition (Keyes, 1984). Townley and Zeece (1991) discuss that comprehensive campus child care systems involving service, teacher preparation, and research, may capitalize on the strengths of programs by combining funding sources and expanding program goals to meet more fully the needs of its constituents. My study has shown the strength and importance of comprehensive systems, and it appears that centers have indeed focused on the strengths of their mission and found ways to be financially resourceful.

Interestingly, only a handful of directors indicated having significant challenges with other issues: staff turnover (9.1% to a great extent and 25.7% to a moderate extent); lack of administrative support (7.9% to a great extent and 29.8% to a moderate extent), lack of academic support (6.1% to a great extent and 24.9% to a moderate extent), child turnover (4.8% to a great extent and 19.7% to a moderate extent) and finally, low staff morale (2.1% to a great extent; 18.1% to a great extent). Overall, lower means for most potential barriers and challenges indicate that directors are not reporting large barriers to the effective operation of their centers. Directors with a strong, prehensive grasp may minimize barriers and through an optimistic outlook, are more likely to see opportunities where others may perceive barriers.
Center Integration/Role of the Director

The fourth research question of the study examines how well centers are integrated into universities, related director activities, and the extent to which directors demonstrate a "prehensive grasp" regarding the role of their center. Specifically, I examined how directors' daily activities and grasp of the whole related to their centers' integration within the larger institution.

Center Integration

Overall, my study found the level of center integration into the university as perceived by the directors is moderately high (49.2%), followed by a limited extent (32.8%), and 16.9% indicate their center is integrated to a great extent. Directors who felt their centers were integrated to a moderate or great extent felt this had been accomplished primarily through the building and maintaining of relationships, followed by the commitment and support of administrators and personnel in various academic departments. A metaphor that emerged as noted by two directors referred to the work of integration as "water dripping on stone." From these directors' perspective, a consistent and diligent effort is vital to integration.

Director Activities and Integration

Director activities examined the extent to which they are involved in providing information about the center as part of student, faculty and staff recruitment; seeking grants and research projects with academic departments; collecting and reporting center usage and outcome data to administrators; communicating the mission to administrators; and formally as well as informally interacting with top-level administrators.
Overall, my study indicates directors are involved the most in communicating the mission of their center to administrators (28.6% to a great extent and 40.5% to a moderate extent). In relation to this activity, directors were asked to what extent they felt various administrators understand what that mission was, with the greatest understanding occurring by department chairs (61.2% to a great extent and 28.2% to a moderate extent), faculty and administrators inside the department (58.0% to a great extent and 36.7% to a moderate extent) to which the campus center is linked and who work directly with the center; university presidents (35.0% to a great extent and 32.2% to a moderate extent); and provosts (30.8% to a great extent and 37.8% to a moderate extent). My study is consistent with previous research (Gulley et al., 1985) in that academic unit support, such as faculty and department administrators is generally higher than university administrator’s support. These findings are inconsistent, however, with aspects of Gulley et al.’s (1985) research, who found that dean support was generally perceived stronger than support from the president or student affairs.

In regards to communicating the mission, I found that how well administrators comprehended the goals and mission of their centers is influential in predicting how well their centers functioned in their institutional surroundings. A regression analysis reveals that how well the goals and mission of the center are understood by faculty and administrators outside the department housing the campus center as well as student affairs and non-academic unit administrator, does positively influence a center’s integration. These findings are consistent with the literature (Keyes, 1990) in that the importance of a center’s mission and the way in which it is conveyed to administrators, are vital to the center’s existence and integration.
The literature supports the need for a well documented and communicated mission as a means to increase administrative support and integration (Keyes, 1990). My study indicated that communicating information about the center’s importance and mission are key roles of the center director, and as previously mentioned, the activity that directors are most likely to engage in. My study also found moderate and high correlations among the variables of communicating the mission, collecting and reporting data, and formal and informal interactions with top-level administrators. These variables were combined and in the regression that followed, informal and formal interactions by the director with administrators positively influence integration. Via a regression using a grouped Director Activity variable (all director activities), director activities were found to influence integration positively.

In a final regression that was done involving center integration, results showed that Infant-Toddler, the grouped variable of all Director Activities, and lack of administrative support all had a significant effect on how well a center is integrated throughout the university. The Preschool variable was placed in a prior model, but was not significant when Infant-Toddler, Director Activities, and Lack of Administrative Support were held constant. Preschool was removed and in the final model, the remaining three were all very significant and shared large portions of the variance. These results show the importance of infant-toddler care to student parent persistence and faculty productivity. The power of a director active in various realms is important for her center to be successful in the academic setting. If the administration is not fully supportive of the center’s mission, this can have a negative effect on integration. It is interesting to consider the impact of director engagement on the university in juxtaposition to the
impact of administrators who may not support the diligent work of the director. These results demonstrate that programming, director activity and administrative support are factors that centers and higher education administrators should seriously consider when implementing and maintaining a campus child care center program.

These findings concerning director activity and integration suggest a holistic model of a director's role rather than isolated, individual functions. Indeed, a comprehensive, holistic approach of the director being involved in a variety of campus activities increases the chances that the center will experience greater visibility, shared knowledge of purpose, and ultimately, increased integration throughout the university. According to Bickimer (1989), a leader by intuition moves back and forth between special (personal side of leadership) and general (outward, impersonal reflection) theories of leadership. The author stated, "An intuition is a simultaneous, unified grasp of multivariate realities" (Bickimer, 1989, p. 141). My study indicates many campus directors are exhibiting behaviors that involve themselves in interactions and activities with administrators that, in turn, affect integration.

**Barriers and Integration**

Directors expressed that the low profile of their centers on campus (27.9%) and limited knowledge of the center's roles in the higher education setting (16.1%), are primary reasons for limited or no integration for their centers. An implication for combating these challenges is the hard, diligent work of directors to network and build relationships with staff and administrators, to communicate constantly and consistently, and to be visible on campus. These activities, coupled with the activities of communicating the mission (28.6% to a great extent and 40.5% to a moderate extent as
reported in a previous survey question) and formally interacting with administrators (21.2% to a great extent and 39.7% to a moderate extent as reported in a previous survey question), lead to a moderate or great level of center integration. My study also found that the primary role of the director in developing and maintaining the relationship with the university is via ongoing and frequent communication (20.1%) followed by cultivating those essential relationships (11.8%). Thus, there appears to be connectivity between the roles and activities of the director in relation to center integration, as both involve relationships, commitment, support and communication as well as to the overall prehension of the director and health of the campus center.

A correlation and regression conducted with the barrier and integration variables to explore whether common challenges influence how well the center is connected to the university found only one barrier, Lack of Administrative Support, negatively influences Center Integration. This further highlights the importance of consistent and purposeful engagement with administration in regards to the sustainability and connectiveness to the campus center.

Table 47

*Challenges and Barriers as Identified by Directors as Compared to Reasons for Limited or No Center Integration Via Open-Ended Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Challenges Category</th>
<th>Limited or No Integration Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial concerns</td>
<td>Low availability of infant/toddler spots and fees too high for students and staff. Limited financial support from university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size or utilization of center</td>
<td>Facilities too small and/or too outdated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low profile of center due to physical location or low visibility for other reasons; low priority and focus elsewhere</td>
<td>Center overlooked/low priority due to: size, off-campus location, under a certain department or not part of an academic department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited knowledge of the purpose and function of center</td>
<td>Mission related challenges: lacking integration, administrative support, overall importance and impact of mission. Important for student access, but not seen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack and/or changes of administrative support

as critical for other reasons.

Administrators not recognizing value of center and need for continual justification of importance to administrators.

Table 47 offers a summary view of challenges found by centers and the reasons offered by directors who believed their centers had limited or no integration. There is consistency between these sets of responses as many of the same types of barriers were identified in each.

Directors’ Prehension

As presented in chapter II, Bickimer (1991) believed that campus center directors have the responsibility to grasp wholeheartedly the vision and big picture of what their center is all about, what the center wants to accomplish, and how and to whom this should be communicated. Bickimer theorized that a strong “prehensive grasp” of such issues can overcome challenges such as mediocre location or equipment, turnover, low wages and morale. It is interesting to note in Gulley et al.’s (1985) study that seventy-three percent of respondents were center directors who had the task of keeping their own morale high as well as their colleagues’ morale, despite having to deal with budget constraints, shortages of staff and other related problems. Gulley et al. noted that to perceive and report low morale would be a negative action for most directors and according to Barnard, in opposition to a prehensive grasp.

According to Barnard and Andrews (1971), “The Prehension” in the Barnard model is made up of purpose (goals of a certain effort), willingness (cooperation), and communication (appropriate messages linking the purpose with the needed level of cooperation). These components remain in equilibrium as a circle atop the circle of “The
Environment" involving the physical, biological, psychological and sociological environments. My study focused primarily on the top circle of that model, whereby a leader must feel and think her way to an equilibrium involving the top three elements within a prehensive grasp, but also must find a way to maintain it within her environment. When equilibrium is achieved between the two equilibria, effectiveness and efficiency can occur. The director's role is the predominant key to equilibrium in Barnard's conceptual model. Contextual leadership theory as an additional aspect of the conceptual theory for my study views the leader as a participant in the interaction between processes and the context (Nivala, 1999).

My study indicates that most center directors view their role primarily as one of seeking integration and commitment of support by administrators (purpose and willingness) through the diligent pursuit of university officials via building of relationships and communication with top-level administrators (communication). Strong campus center directors play an integral role as a liaison between their center and universities (context), seeking support and communication from administrators and other staff and faculty while sensing if their micro environments or intra-cultures are in balance with the macro or institutional structures (Nivala, 1999). In this process, campus center directors are grasping a sense of the whole (prehension).

While my study did affirm aspects of the prehensive theory, one finding that was somewhat inconsistent involved the formal and informal aspects of what campus directors do. As mentioned, equilibrium between the prehension and environment of an organization must occur to achieve effectiveness and efficiency (Barnard & Andrews, 1971). A leader can be effective as the purpose of her organization is realized. Efficiency
occurs when personal satisfactions are translated in action. The attempt to achieve
effectiveness and efficiency through equilibria is subject to the powerful impact of the
tenth element, the informal organization. It alone has the power to influence and interrupt
communication. It also impacts positively or negatively the willingness of individuals to
cooperate within the organization and how they feel about themselves. Barnard and
Andrews stressed that the relationship between leaders and followers is often
strengthened more through the informal aspects of the organization than the formal
channels. Yet I have found that directors indicate they interact with administrators on a
formal basis, 21.2%, (e.g., meetings) to a great extent about the same amount as an
informal basis, 20.7%, (e.g., activities at center or outside institution). In addition, a
regression reveals that both types of activities significantly influence center integration.
This finding expands the important role of formal activities not covered in previous
theory.

Another aspect of Barnard and Andrews' comprehensive theory, is that of the "step
child status" of campus centers. Previously, this was discussed in relation to the
importance of the director's sense of prehension and moving from the fringe to the front
of the university system. It appears that this aspect of prehension is somewhat strong, in
that half of center directors felt their center is integrated to a moderate extent. Yet, only
16.9% of respondents indicate their center is integrated to a great extent, and nearly one-
third perceived very limited integration. Could it be that even though a director's
prehension might be somewhat strong and involve diligent work, communication, and
relationship building (primary reasons for moderate to great integration), that the top
reasons for limited integration, low profile and limited knowledge, are beyond her
influence and ability to control? A center director’s ability to rise above circumstances and an intuitive “sense of the whole” may play a key role, but is not the only piece of the integration puzzle.

Table 48 displays the findings of my study that are consistent and inconsistent with Barnard’s Conceptual Theory.

Table 48

*Myers’ Consistent and Inconsistent Findings with Barnard’s (1971) Conceptual Theory*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistent</th>
<th>Inconsistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A director’s primary role can be characterized by Barnard’s model of ‘The Prehension’; purpose, willingness, and communication.</td>
<td>Barnard discussed the importance of informal interactions with administrators and its power over the formal. My study found that directors interacted with administrators about the same via both formal and informal levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role a director plays is vital to the health of the campus center and is also vital to Barnard’s concept of equilibrium.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A director constantly seeks relationships and communication with the university and my study found this influences center integration. This is consistent with Barnard’s theory of prehension in which a director strives for the health of a center above the realities of the challenges it faces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of directors feel that their centers are integrated only to a moderate extent, reflecting Barnard’s “step child status.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Input Variables and Perceived Integration, Internal, and External Successes

The fifth and final research question of the study examines the extent to which several input variables (e.g., number of years a director has served, years a center has
been in existence, types of programs offered by the center, activities undertaken by the
center director, and mission of center as understood by administrators) relate to the
perceived internal and external successes of the center, including the level of integration
into the university.

Program Types and Integration

Turning to how integration may differ by types of programs, my study found that
centers who offer infant-toddler care and preschool programs are more fully integrated
into university systems than those who do not. Due to changes in national and state
standards (e.g., No Child Left Behind), policies and child care licensing laws regarding
additional educational requirements for those working with infants and toddlers (e.g.,
State of Michigan Department of Human Services, 2008), as well as brain research and
focus on parent education for the early years ("Zero to Three," 2009), the significant
finding for infant-toddler programs in relation to early childhood education is an exciting
and encouraging finding of this study.

In recent years, kindergarten curriculum has become increasingly academic which
in turn has had an effect on earlier concept of readiness and emphasis on high-stakes
testing. High-stakes standardized testing is used to make decisions about whether or not
children can be admitted into programs such as kindergarten (Morrison, 2009). Parents’
interest in providing the best possible experience to prepare their child for school has
contributed to a push for earlier academics, often in preschool settings. The challenge for
preschool programs is to find a balance between appropriate practice and readiness
requirements. Many campus center child cares that offer a preschool option are
accredited by NAEYC which endorses appropriate education methods and teaching
practices for young children. If campus centers can maintain this balance, an appropriate academic focus does correlate well with the academic mission of higher education and supports the legitimacy of offering this type of program.

_Director Longevity and Activities as Related to Integration and Internal Success_

In regards to whether or not center integration is influenced by the years the center has existed or years a director served, no moderate or high correlation is found among these variables. A regression analysis on these variables produces a low variance and found that individually, only the years a director served positively influenced center integration. The longer a director is at a center, the greater are the chances that it will be integrated due to longevity, director’s efforts, and perhaps, prehension as identified through open-ended responses listing longevity as a reason for moderate to great integration (see Table 22 and supporting quotations). However, due to that fact that the majority of centers are not highly integrated into the fabric of the university, it is apparent that longevity of a director is not a primary reason or influence for high levels of integration.

A regression investigated the frequency of certain director activities as related to one of the internal success variables: enhancing institutional image. My study found that seeking grants and research opportunities along with faculty and staff recruitment positively influences this item. For the internal success of providing research and observation opportunities, a second regression found that seeking grants and research opportunities with various academic departments positively influences this item which is characteristic of one of the functions of higher education, especially for research institutions. The ways in which directors participate in these particular activities do
benefit the center’s image at the college or university. Seeking and acquiring grants as well as research opportunities can be beneficial to the image of the institution.

*Internal and External Success Findings*

Internal success of campus centers is dependent on the types of programs they offer including infant/toddler, part- and full-time care, drop-in, and evening care. Campus centers who offer a variety of programs are perceived to be more productive and successful at activities that connect the center with the college or university in areas of research and observation opportunities, work experience opportunities, and exemplary early childhood practices. Attracting students, faculty, staff, women and minorities as well as enhancing the image of the institution are also areas where centers with these types of programs are perceived to excel.

For external successes, a T-test on types of programs offered revealed no significant differences on external success for infant/toddler, preschool, full-time or part-time care, drop-in or evening care programs. More attention is given by centers to the internal activities of the center and university and perhaps they are not as successful as they would like to be due to time constraints and servicing their constituents.

*Findings of Study as Compared to Previous Research Findings*

The following table (Table 49) summarizes the top findings of my study and compares them what was previously known about campus childcare centers.
Table 49

Top Findings of the Study and Comparison to What was Previously Known

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings (Myers, 2009)</th>
<th>Previous Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status of Campus Childcare</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supported from previous studies (e.g., Corder, 1986, Carlson, 2003, Keyes, 1980, McCorriston, 1992, Thomas, 2000).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Several academic departments participate on a regular basis by observing, training, and researching (i.e., the three prongs of a comprehensive center).</td>
<td><strong>Higher percentage of centers was service-orientated rather than comprehensive (Gulley et al., 1985).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Large number (N=102) of departments that interact with campus centers in one way or another.</td>
<td><strong>Smaller number of departments identified (e.g., Gonchar, 1995, Keyes, 1990, Townley &amp; Zeece, 1991).</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Internal Success (Perceived)</strong></th>
<th><strong>New Finding on variety of departments involved in activities of a comprehensive center.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Internal success of center is influenced by programs offered including infant/toddler, part and full-time, drop-in and evening childcare.</td>
<td><strong>New Finding not previously found in literature.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Centers support student recruitment and retention (over 60% of directors felt to a large extent their centers retained nontraditional and traditionally aged students with children).</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with the literature that reports up to 80% of student-parents would not be able to attend college without child care services (e.g., Creange, 1980, Fadale &amp; Winter, 1991, Gonchar, 1995).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Director Activities influence the internal success of a center (Table 45).</td>
<td><strong>New Finding not previously found in literature.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 49 – continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings (Myers, 2009)</th>
<th>Previous Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication of center mission is the top director priority and activity.</td>
<td>• New Findings not previously found in literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Directors' perceptions of formal interactions and activities (M=2.77) and informal (M=2.66) are nearly equal.</td>
<td>• Informal organization (Bickimer, 1991) can be more influential with administrators than the formal organization, but both are important and connect purpose and willingness of the organization's contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal and External Envisioned Community Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Directors perceive modeling quality child care practices as their largest success internally and externally.</td>
<td>• New Finding not previously found in literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barriers and Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 31.9% indicated financial challenges a concern to large extent. Perhaps through a comprehensive model, financial challenges are managed.</td>
<td>• Service-based programs reliant on child care tuition can struggle for institutional resources (Keyes, 1984). Comprehensive campus child care system can combine funding sources (Townley &amp; Zeece, 1991).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Via open-ended responses, several barriers and challenges not previously identified in literature: low priority, low profile due to location or other reasons, limited knowledge of purpose/function of center, administrative size or utilization of the center, and new program.</td>
<td>• New Finding not previously found in literature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 49 – continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings (Myers, 2009)</th>
<th>Previous Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration into the University</strong></td>
<td>• These areas of significance for integration are new findings and not reflected in the literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 16.9% of centers integrated to a great extent, and 49.2% integrated to a moderate extent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The directors’ presence and activities influence integration into the university, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Communicating mission of center (with university administrators understanding of centers’ mission a predictor).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Years director served.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Formal and informal director activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top two reasons for limited or no integration: low profile of center and limited knowledge of role of the center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Integration is statistically significant for programs with infant/toddler and preschool programs (compared to those without).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Understanding of the Center’s Mission</strong></td>
<td>• New Finding not previously found in literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrator level of understanding of the center’s mission does influence integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 58.0% of faculty and administrators within the campus center departments understand mission and center’s importance to a great extent, compared to only 3.8% of faculty and administrators who do not work with centers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less administrative support from outside unit housing center is supported from previous studies (e.g., Gulley et al., 1985).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New finding that University Presidents understand center mission to a great extent (35.0%) over Student Affairs, Provost, and Faculty/Administrators outside the department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having reviewed the key findings from my study, discussion will now turn to recommendations for future research and for center directors and higher education administrators.

Recommendations for Future Study

The study of human nature is highly selective hence, a caution concerning perceptive studies. Patton (1990) recognizes that through training and practice, qualitative researchers can observe and report findings with accuracy, validity, and reliability. My study recognizes the subjective nature of director perception and recommends further qualitative analysis in order to broaden understanding of the qualitative data. For example, future studies could address the perspectives of other stakeholders involving the center such as the president or provost.

In regards to the prehensive grasp and conceptual model for this study, my research and survey questions could only address surface perspectives, since a survey does not allow for an in-depth understanding of the full prehension of the directors. Further probing via qualitative research could be conducted to gain additional understanding regarding a director’s leadership functions within a campus center and higher education. This could be accomplished through interviews, detailed case studies, focus groups or perhaps an online research method such as a blog or wiki, which is method of research relatively unexplored, especially in social science research (Hewson, 2003; Mann & Stewart, 2000).

Qualitative studies could also address several limitations in my study. First, there was the absence of a follow-up question for the barriers and challenges survey question in order to probe further the director’s role in overcoming the barriers and obstacles that had
been reported. Another limitation is the multiple level responses found in some open-ended responses. Responses were coded based on the first or primary response that answered the survey question and then as themes emerged, placed in categories. Since my study was mainly quantitative research with several open-ended questions included for depth of analysis, multi-level coding was not developed. These areas could also be included in future qualitative studies with a select group of directors either in face-to-face focus groups or online in order to examine additional themes and emerging concepts from the qualitative data.

An interesting future analysis might be the comparison of the role and leadership functions of campus child care center director with that of directors of a non-campus child care center director, as so adequately addressed in studies by Jorde Bloom and others. According to Bloom (1998) and the questionnaire she used to collect data from 257 directors, various metaphoric images were used in the responses to describe themes of how the directors viewed their work and the discrepancies that exist between their current and ideal situation. One director in Bloom’s study referred to herself as an orchestra conductor who attempts to bring out the best sound and harmony out of a large group of very different and sometimes competing sounds (e.g., prehension!). The most frequent metaphor directors used when referring to their role, was that of a juggler. My study alluded to the multi-faceted work and role of the director as was described through the various activities directors were involved with on the university campus. Through the open-ended responses of my study the various metaphors that did emerge (e.g., constant dripping of water on stone), these could lend themselves to a future study comparing
different types of directors and their roles through metaphorical and qualitative study methods.

My study also raised questions which could be pursued in future research. Related to center integration, why was the influence of the years the centers existed and years directors had been at the center low, and only the number of years directors served a positive influence? When certain activities of directors were considered individually (providing information on student, faculty and staff recruitment and seeking grants and research projects) and taken in consideration with years directors served, there was not a significant influence on integration. Yet when these same activities were taken as a collective group (adding in the highly correlated and new variables of Formal/Informal and Collect Data/Communication Mission), there was a positive influence. Future studies could perhaps investigate the reasons for this difference and expand study on the effect of director activities within and without her center. Also, according to descriptive statistics from my study, since the majority of respondents were from public universities and colleges with 5,001 to 14,000 students, does size and type of institution have an influence on integration as well?

In regard to the understanding the center’s mission by administrators, it was interesting to note that administrators outside of the department housing the center positively influenced integration rather than administrators within the department. Yet via a close-ended question, administrators within the department and work directly with the center understood the mission to a larger extent than those that did not. This area could be pursued as well in future studies to examine the reasons for the differences between these
two distinct groups of administrators and how they comprehend the role and mission of the center.

Finally in regard to internal and external successes of the center, an overall question for future study would be ways to increase external successes in the surrounding community and how these successes affect and influence internal success and integration of the campus center. There were a larger number of internal successes than external and this could simply be because internal activities within the center and university are the main area of focus for campus centers. Another question would be why there are higher levels of internal successes dependent on the types of programs centers offer than those found for the external, especially for full-time and part-time care, evening, weekend, sick and drop-in care.

Recommendations for Center Directors and Higher Education Administrators

Based on the findings of my study, the function of the comprehensive campus center as defined in the literature as offering teaching, research, and service, is healthy at many universities, of which over 60% are perceived to be integrated to a great and moderate extent. To combat the challenge of providing real life experiences for students working and training in the comprehensive center, the literature (e.g., Townley & Zeece, 1991) recommends adding more programs to those already offered such as special needs and mildly sick care. It is recommended that centers consider adding services not currently offered on a wide spread basis such as drop-in, evening, weekend and sick care. According to NASCD (National Association for Sick Child Daycare), obstacles for offering mild sick care include an absence of providers largely due to lack of information, lack of licensing procedures for sick child care, difficulty getting insurance, and funding
challenges. In states that lack licensing for sick care, child care providers could perhaps advocate for the need for sick care to state legislatures or seek development of a temporary sick care off-site, perhaps at a local hospital. If campus centers could add this service to a comprehensive childcare package further meeting the needs of student-parents, faculty, and staff, increased recruitment and enrollment could then support the cost of offering sick care and other types that are not often offered as well such as drop-in, weekend and evening care.

Centers should continue and if possible, expand formal preschool and infant-toddler programs and services within the context of the comprehensive center. As noted previously, brain research as well as national and regional policies have increased the focus and importance of quality early childhood education. My study supports the need and expanded pursuit of the best possible education and care of young children.

Campus directors should examine ways to increase the profile of their centers and also combat a lack of knowledge of their purpose and mission. These top two reasons for lack of integration should be examined and strategies should be generated and implemented by staff and faculty involved with the center. Integration of the center into the university as a whole was a significant finding of this study and shows factors such as director activities, infant-toddler and preschool programs, and administrator understanding of the center’s mission all playing important roles. Yet despite diligent work by the director to communicate a mission, build relationships (primary roles of the director, see Table 25), and the presence of some prehension, a high extent of integration is still not a common reality for all centers.
The study found that administrators and faculty outside the department housing the center and their understanding of center mission, did influence integration but overall, the understanding was low as compared to other types of administrators. Higher education administrators should avail themselves of opportunities to learn more about the function, mission and importance of what the campus child care center brings to the table for their college or university.

Concluding Thoughts

The field of early childhood education needs to continue to be enriched by knowing more about the perceptions of those in leadership positions. Campus child care programs are strategically positioned in the context of higher education to provide a view through the window of the director’s office. Yet, no extensive or current studies beyond those providing descriptive data could be found prior to my study on campus child care centers, directors, and the internal and external roles they play in a higher education setting. Prior to Gulley et al. (1985), the majority of studies done on campus centers were restricted to specific issues within certain states, areas or campuses. My study is significant in that it offers a broad regional and an updated picture of such descriptive data as well as deepens the knowledge regarding such centers.

My study began with a description of a college student intently observing a child within a college campus child care center who was engaged in constructing a block tower. Questions that were asked about this scene included: Why is this child at this place at this time? Is his parent a student in the university, on the faculty or from the surrounding community? Is the student observing the child as a course requirement? Are other researchers from various departments coming and going? Reasons for university
child care centers’ existence, the types of services they offer, issues and barriers to the ongoing operation they encounter, the roles of the campus child care center and the director, how the center is connected to higher education institution, as well as the overall integration into the university’s mission have been investigated, analyzed and discussed in order to deepen the knowledge about the place that cares for this child.

Based upon my results, this child is likely to be a full-time toddler or preschooler whose parents are students or faculty at the university. In a lab setting, he is being observed by a student from any one of several departments for a variety of projects and course requirements, with approximately half of students observing from the social work, psychology, or kinesiology departments. The student in the center may be working in connection with a course project or completing an internship as the clear majority of students are from Teacher Education departments who participate for training purposes. Faculty or staff researchers that are coming and going would primarily be from Psychology departments.

Despite various barriers and challenges such as financial, low salaries, and lack of administrative support, the director finds that these challenges are not as problematic in the overall state of campus centers as for example, less than half see financial issues as a barrier to a large extent. The director of the child described earlier, is committed and advocates for her center through constant and consistent communication of the mission and other roles of the center. She is always thinking of ways to get her center noticed in the hustle and bustle of campus life. Modeling best practices is her center’s highest perceived internal and external success, and also what she envisions to be the center’s most important role in the surrounding community. The director has a grasp of the
importance of demonstrating age appropriate best practices for the care and education of the young child.

Although there are not high levels of center integration into the broader university, it does exist in moderate levels and is due to some prehension on the part of the director who understands the context of her leadership role within the early childhood and higher education communities. The director works steadily and continually at sharing with whoever will listen - staff, faculty or administrator, especially to those outside her department, in order to increase visibility, profile, and knowledge about all the roles of her center. She is encouraged that when administrators do see the value, importance, and understand the mission, her center is more fully integrated into the university over a third of the time at a moderate level. Some are hearing and comprehending her story! But at the end of a long day, she does contemplate why her center is not more a part of the university or why another staff member or administrator does not see the great importance of her and her staff's diligent work.

In conclusion, there does exist connectivity between director roles and select activities such as informal and formal interactions with administrators in relation to center integration. This connectivity involves communicating the mission, building and maintaining relationships, commitment, and support, as well as the overall prehension and contextual leadership of the director. My study has showcased leaders in early childhood education and their persistent work and sense of the whole in shaping the impact and value of their campus centers. The perceived impact and value of the campus center as seen in this study, is in the way it disseminates its mission of education, training and meeting the needs of its constituents and ultimately in these areas, for the benefit of
the university. Campus centers historically and currently are established with these needs and constituents in mind as over half are created because of faculty, staff and student-parents and as seen in an open-ended response, over a third for training and laboratory purposes.

Overall, the perceived impact and value of child care in higher education is primarily educational in nature as analyzed and described in my study through the types and levels of departmental participation and the primary internal and external success (modeling best practices). The influence and image of the campus center throughout the college or university as well as the comprehensive and contextual leadership of the director can be seen as a ripple effect as students whose paths have crossed with that child building with blocks graduate, move, and work in their world.
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Email Invitation for Participants
Email Invitation Letter

Dear Campus Center Director,

As director of a campus child care center, you are invited to participate in a research study examining the role such centers play within higher education institutions and communities. An online survey containing 23 questions will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Click this link to begin: http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB228HBR3B6WH

If you have received this email and you are not a director of a campus center, please forward this email to your director. You may also reply if you do not wish to respond and receive email reminders.

If you have any questions regarding the survey, you may contact me at, kerisa_a_myers@cornerstone.edu; or my dissertation chair, Dr. Louann BierleinPalmer, at Western Michigan University (269-387-3596 or l.bierleinpalmer@wmich.edu). You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293) or the Vice President for Research (269-387-8298) if questions or problems arise during the course of the study.

As a fellow member of NCCCC, thank you in advance for considering this opportunity to further the knowledge of campus child care centers from a director’s point of view. At the end of the survey, you will have the opportunity to include your email address for a drawing, awarding four $25 gift cards to thank you for your time.

Kerisa A. Myers
Appendix B

 Listserv Email Invitation
Email Invitation for Participants Sent to Listserv

Dear Campus Center Director,

As director of a campus child care center, you are invited to participate in a research study examining the role such centers play within higher education institutions and communities. An online survey containing 23 questions will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Click this link to begin: http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB228HBR3B6WH

You may have already received an earlier email concerning this study. This posting is to invite directors who may have not received that email.

If you have any questions regarding the survey, you may contact me at, kerisa_a_myers@cornerstone.edu; or my dissertation chair, Dr. Louann BierleinPalmer, at Western Michigan University (269-387-3596 or l.bierleinpalmer@wmich.edu). You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293) or the Vice President for Research (269-387-8298) if questions or problems arise during the course of the study.

As a fellow member of NCCCC, thank you in advance for considering this opportunity to further the knowledge of campus child care centers from a director’s point of view. At the end of the survey, you will have the opportunity to include your email address for a drawing, awarding four $25 gift cards to thank you for your time.

Kerisa A. Myers
Appendix C

Campus Childcare Center Director Survey
Campus Childcare Center Director Survey

Consent Message:

For participants volunteering to take this survey, responses will be confidential and not connected to the corresponding institution in the data analysis or result sections of the study. Since the survey was sent via an embedded URL, your email address will not be connected in any manner with your survey responses.

When you begin the survey, you are consenting to participate in the study. If you do not consent, you can simply choose not to continue at this time. If you decide after beginning the survey that you do not wish to continue, you may abort at any time. You also may choose not to respond to a particular question for any reason.

This study was approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) on November 14, 2008. Please do not participate after November 14, 2009. Thank you!

Please begin by clicking the following button.

I Consent to Continue Survey

Campus Childcare Center Director Survey

General Contextual Questions

1

Please list the approximate number of students who attend your higher education institution (combining both undergraduate and graduate students, full and part-time).
2

Please indicate the type of your institution:

- Community College
- Four year private college or university
- Four year public college or university
- Technical college
- Other

3

Please list the total number of years for each:

Years your center has existed

Years you have been a director

Current State of Campus Childcare Centers

4

To what extent was each of these a factor in the establishment of your child care center?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>To a limited extent</td>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty and staff interest

Interest of students who were parents

Administration request
Community interest

Outside grants or funding

5

Please explain what other factors may have led to the establishment of your center (other than those listed in the previous question)?

6

Please indicate the number of children currently enrolled in your center on a part-time (20 hours or less) and full-time (30-40 hours) basis.

# of Part-time children

# of Full-time children

7

Please identify the percentage of children enrolled for each of the following groups of clientele serviced by your center (combination of both part and full-time children). The percentages must total 100.

% children of faculty and staff

% children of student parents

% children of community members

8

Please indicate which type of program(s) you offer at your center:

1 No

2 Yes

Infant/Toddler
Formal preschool session(s)

Full-time child care

Part-time child care

Drop-in child care

Evening child care

Weekend child care

Sick child care

Internal Roles

Please indicate the primary reason each of the following academic departments may participate with your center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Do not participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Education

1 2 3 4 5

Social Work
If the following departments participate with your center, about how often are they involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other department(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you selected "other departments" in questions 9 and 10, please identify which departments, the role they play at your center, and the frequency of such activities.

To what extent has your center been successful in accomplishing the following:

| Provided opportunities for research and observation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Modeling of appropriate pedagogy and early childhood practices | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Providing work experience opportunities for students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Supporting better class attendance for students with children | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Helping traditionally aged students with children stay in school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Helping nontraditionally aged students with children stay in school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Attracting graduate students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Enhancing the institution's image | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Showing a commitment to women and minorities

Attracting faculty and staff to the university

13

In your opinion, currently how important is your center to your campus (e.g., to the overall mission of the institution) and why?

External Roles

14

To what extent has your center been successful in accomplishing the following roles in the local community that surrounds your institution?

Modeling quality child care practices (e.g., for other child development programs)

Providing early childhood education for the public (via conferences, workshops, etc.)

Providing referrals (e.g. for parents/employers looking for care)

Providing services (e.g. providing care for community members)
Improving community-institution relationships

What do you envision the role that your center could or should play in your surrounding geographical community?

Barriers and Challenges

In the past 5 years, to what extent have the following barriers affected the successful operation of your center?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of academic departmental support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child turnover/enrollment instability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Center Integration/Role of the Director

To what extent do you, as the center director, engage in the following types of activities within your university?

1. Not at all 2. To a limited extent 3. To a moderate extent 4. To a great extent

Provide information on your center as part of university student recruitment efforts

Provide information on your center as part of university faculty/staff recruitment efforts

Actively seek grants or other research projects with various departments

Collect and report center usage and outcome data to various university administrators

Communicate the mission of your center in various ways with various top-level administrators
Formally interact with various top-level university administrators (e.g., via meetings)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informally interact with various top-level university administrators (e.g., invite to center picnics)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do you feel that top level administrators in your higher education institution understand the mission of your center and its importance?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**President**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provost**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Departmental Chair(s) of Departments which work with your center**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty and Administrators within Departments that work directly with your center**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty and Administrators in Departments that do not work with your center**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student affairs/non-academic unit administrators**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19
Overall, to what extent do you believe your center is fully integrated into your university as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a limited extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20
If you believe that your center is integrated to a moderate or great extent, how do you feel this was accomplished?

21
If you believe that your center is integrated to a limited extent or not at all, what do you think are the primary reasons?

22
As director, what do you feel is your primary role in developing and maintaining a relationship with the university (e.g., encouraging integration into the university)?
Please include any additional comments you would like regarding your center and its role within your university.

Please include your email address on one of the lines below only if you are interested in receiving results from this study and/or you wish to be included in the gift card drawing. The information will not be connected to the responses of this survey. Thank you for completing this survey!

Email address for study results
Email address for gift card drawing
Email address for gift card drawing and results

"Submitting this survey indicates your consent for your answers to be used as research data."
Appendix D

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval Letter
Date: November 14, 2008

To: Louann Bierlein-Palmer, Principal Investigator
   Kerisa Myers, Student Investigator for thesis

From: Chris Chestham, Ph.D., Vice Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 08-11-02

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Higher Education-based Childcare Centers: Internal and External Roles" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: November 14, 2009
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Open-Ended Question and Response
Additional Factors in Establishment of Center

*Note: Responses were typed verbatim, including misspellings or grammatical errors.

Survey Question 5. Please explain what other factors may have led to the establishment of your center (other than those listed in the previous question)?

Laboratory/lab

-We are a laboratory school. Our program has an academic component.
-to serve as a lab training site for child development and teacher education majors
-Our facility serves as a laboratory setting for college students in early childhood education.
-To provide a laboratory environment for students
-the center was established as a laboratory school. The addition of full day full year care came 20 years later to support parents.
-Need for a lab setting on campus
-The need for an appropriate center for early childhood students to observe and be mentored.
-Labratory
-Availability of quality child care for field observations for our teacher preparation curriculum
-laboratory environment for University
-Need for a lab school and money available through state statute
-The former president of the college wanted to establish a lab school to help early childhood students learn and practice appropriate teaching methods.
-experiential experience for students
-lab schoo;
-receipt of federal funding, use as a lab site, lack of pre-k in communities
-We are a part-time lab school. The CCAMPIS Grant allowed us to expand and offer “extended” care (early drop off and late pick up). We’ve been able to continue doing so. However, children still only attend up to 20 hours per week.
-Need for a lab school where students could observe
-to be an active laboratory setting for students
-Lab site for the early childhood students. Need for the community.
-laboratory facility
-The biggest factor was academic interest, Initially of a women’s college with child development, nutrition, etc. as degrees, and now as a Psychology department interested in a laboratory school
-lab facility for ECE program
-We are a lab school for the ece dept.
-college wanted an ECE lab school

**Training**
- training opportunities for practicum students
- Under my administration it’s the need to have a high quality accredited program for children and for practicum students to get field experiences
- Having a link to the Early Childhood Program and other programs that train students for working with children and families.
- Needed as site for student observations, student teaching, etc.
- The need for high level lead teachers in a high quality program to work with school of education practicum students.

**Placement**
- placement for college students to work & learn
- placement needs of students in the dept of education for practical experience and student teaching experience

**Support for Associates of Arts Program**
- Support for Child Development AAS Degree program
- Establishment of the A.A.S. degree in Early Childhood Education a few years earlier.
- Most of the other community colleges in the state had child care centers on campus.
- The facility was added as a lab school to accommodate an on-site learning facility for the College's Early Childhood Degree Program.
- Child Development Instructional programs require a demonstration lab.
- To create a lab and observation environment of high quality for Child Development students.
- Lab school component for child development department
- Needed an academic lab for child development students so Child Development program advanced proposal through a college-wide initiative for fund a limited number of proposals with set amount of funds and we scored high enough to get started!

**1960's and 1970's**
- Strongly activist students in the late 60's
- it was established in the late 60's the women's movement played a huge part in creating this program
- 1970's - women with young children enrolling in higher education
- began in the 70's as a parent cooperative by the staff and students and has grown into an A.S. sponsored program of the university.
- We started off as a co-op in 1974 and grew into a licensed center. Then the University's Womens Commission worked to create a new facility.
- I believe leadership of a particular ECE faculty member was instrumental in the establishment of the center, along with state funding being made available for the start up of lab preschools at community colleges back in the early 70s.
- The community (town and colleges) saw the need for quality full time child care in our town. Thirty eight years ago, demographic were changing- more two career marriages, more single parents, and the recognized need for good child care led to our creation
- UA established a co-op center in the 1960's and moved to the full time child care center in 1975. UA has operated a lab school for over 40 years. Now all have been combined in the UA Child Development Research Center serving 110 children of faculty, staff and students and provides an observation, internship and research site for approximately 780 college students in a lab setting per year.

**Staff and Faculty Interest**
- Interest by certain staff and education faculty
- The founding Director was and is an ECE faculty and believed the college should have a place for students to see a model program and also provide a needed service to students and community members.
- The head of the early childhood academic program wanted to establish a lab school for ECE students to use for observation and practicum experiences.
- When child care was initially offered on campus it was staff, administration and students who pursued an operation on campus. At that time (in the 70's) it was primarily started as a babysitting service. Of course and thankfully, we have moved beyond that to early childhood ed.

A center was built in 1984 (licensed for 80 children) on campus specifically for early childhood and after school children and in 1999 an additional classroom was added in another building with the help of a state grant for an additional 20 children.
- Students and faculty members spearheaded establishment and sought United Way funding.
- ONE Early Childhood Professor who was bound and determined to open a quality child care center.

I believe leadership of a particular ECE faculty member was instrumental in the establishment of the center, along with state funding being made available for the start up of lab preschools at community colleges back in the early 70s.

**Student Interest/Student Affairs/Student Government**
- I believe that the students got together to help each other out while they were in class. The campus then decided that a child care center was warranted
- By far the greatest impact was student demand.
- Non-traditional parents who wanted to return to school who had children.
- Student government request
- don't know the actual reasons the center was established. However, it was established originally in the Student Affairs "side of the house" and is now in the Academic Affairs "side of the house." The campus administration does believe that the center should serve students to enhance access to higher education for people with young children. Even faculty and staff who use the center must enroll in 3 credits at the college.
- Student Government - need by students

**Administrative Interest**
- Financial support from Administration
- New president who is very focused on student access.
- One high level administrator was committed to improve the benefits available to working mothers on campus.
The Dean now President of the University was Dean in the College of Education and understood the importance both of early quality care and new for childcare to support staff. Also, there was a need for the old space (before the new center was built) for University parking.

Community Reasons/Affordable Care
- Affordable child care
- Need for high quality care and education in the community
- Community need -- support from federal funds through Head Start
- The need for low cost, high quality childcare in the community.
- The community (town and colleges) saw the need for quality full time child care in our town.

State or federal funding (grants)
- Need for a lab school and money available through state statute
- Receipt of federal funding, use as a lab site, lack of pre-k in communities
- Money was set aside by the state legislator for funding the establishment
- It is my understanding that there were grants to colleges to start nursery school training programs around this time.

Desire to Serve
- The desire to serve the staff/faculty/students & community; also, the desire of the state of Ohio to have child care available on all campuses
- Our main focus is to serve students (who are also parents)
- Our college is dedicated to "service to humanity". We consider the Center part of our community outreach

Employee request or benefit
- University Hospital Employee request
- Employee benefit listed in the AAUP union contract
- As a benefit for the college's employees

Recruitment of new faculty, staff or students
- Projected numbers of faculty and staff retiring 10 years out from the start of the project & recruitment of new faculty & staff
- The child care center is a major tool for faculty and student recruiting and retention
- Future-thinking about the role of work/life issues on attracting and retaining quality students, staff and faculty.

Supporting women in work force/changing demographics
- the principle to support women in the workforce or in higher education
- Women joining the workforce in jobs requiring higher education.
**Other factors**

- We replaced another preschool that had been on campus and closed due to facility issues. University was going to go with a private child care organization but decided later to open this one.
- desire to have a demonstration program that would support advancing knowledge about high quality curriculum
- Licensing rules changed and we needed to become a full center.
- Our lab school K-12 had just closed....space was available and the K teacher had a vision for early childhood
- Original facility was very old and only had capacity for 30 children which was not adequate to meet the growth of the university.
- Parent Education program offered
- contemporary thought of the times
- Family Residential Housing
- increasing capacity, creating a space designed for children
- at the time the university had established a position for child care. Unfortunately the university was not interested in actually providing child care. they were only interested in referral, resource, etc. the person hired took it upon herself to follow along with thier plan and found a church to rent which is where our program began. and never ended has only grown with parent support and advocacy
- We are an educational component of the Dept of Family and Consumer Sciences
- death of wife of benefactor prompted gift to fund new site; was adamant that money was to be used for that purpose even though administration was trying to sway to other projects
- Memorial to former Univ. President's wife.
- Feed young children in the post depression era.
- We are located in the Psychology dept. We were created from psychology (developmental area) faculty in order to study kids.
- We are within a University system and every other college in the system has a child care center for their students. However the President who began the child care center initiative left the college over 8 years ago and there have been 3 Presidents since then.
- Interest on the part of the Early Childhood Department

**Uncategorized Responses**

- I cannot answer question #4, since I wasn't on staff 15 years ago.
- None
- I wasn't here than.
- I am unsure
- the early history of our program has been difficult to find and very vague
- not sure
- listed above
- It was a long time ago so we are unsure.
- na
- n/a
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Open-Ended Question and Response
Additional Departments

*Note: Responses were typed verbatim, including misspellings or grammatical errors.

Survey Question 11. If you selected “other departments” in questions 9 and 10, please identify which departments, the role they play at your center, and the frequency of such activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Departmental Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>observations, research, health/nutrition, screening, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>training, education, music lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental (Hygiene)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>screenings, lessons, demonstrations, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>practice with screening and assessment tools, field experience, observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>observe and interact with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Disorders</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>readings, play performances, observation, research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Language Audiology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>observation, research, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>training, research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Studies (child &amp; family)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>practicums, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>observations, health screenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>activities for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>research projects, training, observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School/Medicine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>research, residents observe “normal development”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>observation, informal assessments, research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>planning and implementing curriculum, community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Departmental Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>observations, readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>class projects designing a center, observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Business Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>class projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>speeches, plays for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>community service, observations, practicums, internships, research projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>service learning projects, research projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietetics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>research, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>research projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>research studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>nutrition, seed to table activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric Nursing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>observations, practice developmental screenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric Residents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>observation, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>education grant for students/center children, projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>visits, collaborations and shared experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention/ Special Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>services, assessment, evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>provides hands-on experiences with equipment, observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>service hours and projects, observations and preparation of healthy snacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Education/protection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>activities for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Departmental Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>works at student/faculty level to extend curriculum/ reach out to families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>visits, collaborations and shared experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>community service, observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Residents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observe and practice child interaction, testing and/or research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Therapy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>photo shoots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians Assistants Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/language/hearing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>daily clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs/Life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>visits, collaboration and shared experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>class projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>visits, collaborations and shared experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Therapy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Research (graduate school)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Applied Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>visits, collaborations and shared experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>visits, collaborations and shared experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Departmental Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood within Family Studies and Human Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>community service projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternities/sororities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>training activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Programs and Exchanges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistant Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>health fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Therapy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New student orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Therapy/counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>training, internships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Research Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robotics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Tourism Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Departmental Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student in financial enterprise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fundraising activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student internships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student employees-various departments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student volunteers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>community service hours-variety of colleges/departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics and Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>early childhood physical activities class (4 year olds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Ministry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and movement students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Performances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Note: Responses were typed verbatim, including misspellings or grammatical errors.

Survey Question 13. In your opinion, currently how important is your center to your campus (e.g., to the overall mission of the institution) and why?

**Comprehensive Center Components**
- I think it is very important to the missions of service, research and scholarship.
- I think that the staff and faculty count on having child care available, and the Education Department counts on our support of their academic students through placement in our program, and through the on-site coaching, mentoring and instruction we provide.
- The largest education major on campus is early childhood education. As a teacher training and laboratory facility, the center is vital to the campus.
- Activities in the center meet all areas of the institution mission, teaching, research & service. We are important.
- Our center is very important to our campus because it offers an on-site child care center for our student parents, provides a site for early childhood practicum students to complete their practicum hours, and provides a site for students in other programs to observe children as required for their degrees.
- We provide opportunities for "hands on" training as well as a service to the university and its community. It is important to the university and the School of Education that we are nationally accredited.
- Important - we provide a quality field work site for students in child development and a practice site for specific skills for nursing students, as well as provide high quality child care for a small number of students.
- Very important - provide services for students to stay in school, staff and faculty to work and departments to use for training and research.
- We are an active lab school that supports teaching, research and outreach activities of faculty and students from across campus.
- Through staffing and program design we meet all the three fundamental missions of the university: teaching, research and service.
- Very important - because of grants we have gotten several students can attend with no child care cost to them, we have over 200 students a year use our center to complete homework assignments. We have faculty using our center for research. We are often on the media for child issues so we are enhancing the image of UNF.
- We feel we are a very important part of the University but administration may not share our views. We provide intern experiences for up to 30 interns a year, provide observation and interaction experiences for other child development classrooms, are flexible to accommodate needs of nontraditional students, etc.
- Very Important. Our program provides not only high quality care for families and children, but also provides a model for pre-service teachers to gain experiences in the field from experienced and talented educators.
- I think that the center is very important to retention of students, serving non-traditional students and the Child Development/Teacher Preparation instructional program.
- Very support academic mission, service to students, provide nationally accredited program for model, presence in the community, support community outreach programs
- The University mission is to educate every possible student in the state and we help by caring for their children and by providing a place to do observing and training.
- Our center is a shining star on this campus. The quality of the center is well known in the community and the center is spoken of and thought of very highly. The mission of the university is to promote learning through effective undergraduate and graduate teaching, scholarship and research in service to the state, the region and the global community. Our center serves a diverse population which gives the teachers in
training a diverse experience. Teachers in training are also exposed to an Early Childhood program based on current research and developmentally appropriate practice.

- We provide educational programs and services to support the learning environments for a diverse community. The center is able to assist students with childcare in order for them to attain their goals in higher education, workforce development and personal enrichment.
- We are important to the University's overall image and to the training of our student base. We remain committed to providing a research population for our department and other related University departments.

Education/Training

- I feel we are an integral part of the department of education at our university.
- We are the only lab site for certain ECE classrooms and play a big role in providing student teaching opportunities.
- Highly our purpose is primarily for student training and research purposes.
- The Center plays a vital role as field experience site. Although our employee children enrollment is currently low, it has traditionally been closer to 50%. This is a great employee benefit.
- We have over 300 students and/or visitors each semester participate in our program. Some visits are basically tours while others involve 130 hours of participation. We are a clinical training site for an EC training grant. Our administration continues to recognize our contribution to the University community.
- Our center is not here mainly for the students of the college. Student Support Services will offer some students assistance based on need, but students, faculty, staff, and community all pay the same amount. Because there is no sliding scale of any kind, a lot of students cannot afford care at our center. The center is mainly here for the purpose of providing an on-site lab school where Early Childhood Students can get hands on training. As early childhood professionals, we try to explain to higher administration that we are more than just a lab school, we are a learning facility for the children too, and that learning begins at birth, not age 5 when they enter Kindergarten.
- We provide a living, learning laboratory on campus for numerous departments, and contribute to significant service learning experiences for university students.
- We are the only true part-time developmental preschool (think of how preschool used to be) on campus. We train 34 college students a semester on child development and social interaction. Research is conducted in a short-term and longitudinal fashion.
- I feel it has come more important in recent times. As an early childhood professional, I am always trying to educate the community on the importance of quality programming and developmentally appropriate practice.
- I believe that my center is very important to the campus as it provides a great learning center for preservice teachers and provides a great atmosphere for the staff/faculty, HOWEVER, I don't feel that the campus feels the same way.
- Our center offers a high quality early education program to students staff and community families that we serve.
- Very important - It demonstrates a model approach to teaching.
- Very important, the University has a strong Graduate School of Educaiton so the lab. school is important. The University has a strong commitment to supporting its nontraditional student population.
- Moderate to important: we do provide lab training site to 450 - 600 students a semester.
- Very important—we provide a laboratory experience for students to observe children and teachers and to work with children under the guidance of experience teachers.
- Our part-time program is very important to our department, college and institutions as an experiential part of the course content. However, full-time care is obviously not as important since monies have not been provided to build a full-time childcare center.
- The center is a demonstration site for the state preschool curriculum. We receive visits from educators from all over the state.

We have an 87% student retention rate for students with children in our center.
- The college believes in lifelong learning beginning when children are young and continuing into the twilight years.
Service
- They see us as a service to student parents but also meets the mission of serving the community.
- Our mission is directly licked to the mission of the college. We provide a service students need if they want to stay in school. This is important in our community and to our school.
- I feel that we provide a very utilized service to the students which increase the enrollment of the college.
- We provide a service that many individuals who are considering attending the university or seeking employment at the university are needing. We are a small center and provide very individual attention to children. This is very attractive to many families. We also provide a vegetarian food program which is very appealing to many families. We enroll student families first which is very appealing to them in their efforts to find childcare in a competitive market.
- We provide a very important service. The majority of our clients are students.
- In my opinion we are very important because as a community college center we are serving the community, providing the only example of best practices in our community, and getting families with young children on our campus who then become future college students.
- A major initiative of our University President is to provide high quality early childhood services to faculty, staff and students. We are an accredited center, and we provide services to mostly graduate students, post-doctoral candidates, and research fellows from many countries. We are an essential part of their American experience, and are also a critical resource to single parent students and working families.
- The center provides a service to students and employees.
- Important as both a resource to staff and faculty with children, as a resource for college students, as well as a financial resource
- We fulfill the roles of service, and education...research is not done at this time though I wish it was!
- we provide early care and education services which are greatly demanded by our student population.
- I believe we are very important. We support many many single moms, minorities and low income parents with the SUNY block grant which provides tuition subsidy for child care while parents attend college
- Very important. Our university is working collaboratively with local hospital. Our center collaborates within our building with a center for children with special needs. Our children receive therapy and our program has some of there special needs children.
- We believe we are vital...of course. Our mission states that we are the community's college. We meet that by providing 60% of our enrollment to community families. As a community of learners the college mission seeks to expand and improve services in support of the people we serve. Our care and education program provides some of those services
- Extremely important, it is indicative of the commitment to the nontraditional student, helping in our mission to serve students who would otherwise not be able to attend
- We are important in that we provide a way for students to attend classes who may otherwise not be able to (because they have somewhere for their child to go while they are in school).
- Very important. A key part of the mission is to provide access and success to students. For many students, that must include child care.
- I believe we are integral to supporting to students, however, we are such a small program (capacity 50) that we do not meet the needs and maintain a waiting list.
- in a recent climate study the highest need for expanded services (72%)was child care; we were established by and prioritize the needs of students (first served, not open during class downtimes), faculty/staff see the need for expanded services to meet their needs
- Important - currently we clock over 4000 volunteer hours per year for students
- Our institution serves a large commuter population who has limited to no child care services and depends on the University service to meet their needs
- We serve students with children on campus and are making a big impact in their success on campus. We see a lot of women and minorities- 2 populations who often are the first to drop out of school. We are helping keep them at school.
- We are important as we offer a service that encourages student-parents to attend an institution, that prides itself "in enabling the people of New York to combine the strengths of their varied experiences with the skills they need to participate effectively in the wider society long committed to excellence and access in the education of undergraduate and graduate".
- Low-income parents cannot pursue their education without our on-site affordable, quality campus child care.
- We have been supported by the Associated Students for many years and feel we are valued for the services we provide to help student-parents succeed.
- We support the mission of the College by providing child care to enable student-parents to complete their degrees and we offer an early childhood education to their children. We also hope to serve as a model of best practices for the college community and academic departments.
- It is very important because of the amount of student-parents we have that could not attend school without adequate child care.
- I think that many single parent would not be able to continue school without our program. In addition we are able to assist low income student through our CCAMPIS grant.
- It is extremely important. About 80% of our students state they would be unable to attend school if it were not for our program.

**Research**
- Very Important due to the focus of research on campus
- It is a research institution - rated as 5th in the nation so it is important for this.
- Very important to psychology because our mission is a major part of their developmental research and training programs

**Retention/Recruitment**
- As a benefit under Human Resources Management, the center helps attract and retain staff & faculty by providing high quality child care. The center also provides employment through the federal work study program and training in child development to students in a variety of majors.
- It is very important in attracting and keeping staff and faculty.
- Highly important for recruitment and retention of faculty, staff and student families with young children.
- We provide the college with approx. 30 FTE's; we help with retention of students; we provide grant money to help students afford childcare; we are Middle States accredited; we are just fun to have around!
- Growing in importance, both as a recruitment tool for younger faculty and prospective education students.
- The Admissions Department and Human Resources let prospective additions to the University Community know of the availability of child care. Different Department Chairs within the colleges offer a tour of child care opportunities if prospective faculty members are interested in this option. Having a child care center is a drawing point for a lot of families.
- Very important. We are a recruitment tool for students, staff and faculty.
- We support their research and provide an opportunity for retention and recruitment for outstanding faculty members, students and staff.
- Very - it is a major recruitment tool with new faculty and students.
- Important in helping to retain first time in college students, especially minorities.
- It is a huge recruitment and retention issue. We still do not have enough high quality services. Campus care is the number one choice. NAEYC accredited facilities.
- It is currently being recognized as a potential source for student retention. This has not been the case until very recent years.
- This center attracts students and help to increase the number of transfer students and the number who graduate.
- Diversity is important and our center provides the opportunity for another population to attend.
- The Center contributes to the University's retention and graduation of students' effort.
- Assists in the persistence and retention of students with young children.
- Real important. The college sees it as a huge recruitment and retention tool.
- Helps to portray a family friendly image for the Institution and improves student retention.
- Very, we are a major recruitment tool for attracting and retaining quality staff and faculty. We have been asked to hold special enrollment slots to be offered to highly recruited faculty applicants.
- It is critical for recruitment and retention of families with young children - students, staff and faculty.
- Very important We can show that we support the recruitment and retention plan of the University
- Very Important because many times our center is used as University recruiting focal point
- The Center is incredibly important and has a significant waiting list (400+). There is a current push on campus to increase the amount of child care available in order to recruit and retain faculty. We provide a laboratory environment for research and teacher prep, contribute to community efforts two areas of mission for the University
- We serve as a recruitment tool for the institution, enrolling children of low income families in our free state preschool, whose parents must then enroll in classes at the college. We connect the parents to all the support services at the college, such as financial aid and counseling, so that they will be successful as both students and parents.
- I think having a child care center attracts people on campus. I think it is wonderful to be able to have the opportunity to have your child so close to where you work. We also provide a good discount compared to outside child care for the employees.
- It is important to the College's retention initiative relative to students with children and for students requiring a field placement site on campus.
- Vital if our center was not available some of our new faculty have stated that the would not have come to work at our university.
- The Child Care Program is extremely important in attracting and retaining world-class faculty, staff and students. The program has recently expanded to meet the child care needs on campus and continues to work to expand to meet the continuing need.
- The Center is somewhat important to the campus. The Center is used as a recruitment tool to young families.
- Fairly important; we have a great reputation and help attract faculty and graduate students
- Our Campus participates in Achieving the Dream initiative. Our center is very important in student retention as well as providing opportunities for student learners.
- We are a "star" — meaning we have a great reputation. We are a good draw for both students and faculty/staff.
- Very important in retaining nontraditional students.
- Child care access means parents in school!

**Challenges (little impact, mixed perception, value of role center plays)**
- While the services we provide are vital to the University, there are hurdles that we must address. These include low availability of infant/toddler spots compared to need and cost.
- It seems to be important for the families we serve, however we are such a small center that our waiting lists are so long.
- Our two small centers can't begin to serve the students, faculty and staff needs. One center is part time and closed in the summer. The fees for the infant/toddler center are too high for most students and many staff.
- Moderately important. The center is new and the campus community is still in the early stages of truly understanding its importance and value.
- Our center is moderately important to the overall mission of the institution. We are under the Auxiliary Services Dept. and the Business Office. I feel we are sometimes overlooked.
- We are not a big priority on campus mainly because of financial concerns and the fact that we are small.
- We would like to be more important but their has been a shift in importance of ECE on campus over the years. Mostly to administration.
- Since it isn't on campus, many don't know about it. The "center" is three separate classrooms in partnerships with community programs.
- I wish we were more a part of the overall mission of the college.
- Not all that important. Our department is small and does not generate income. The administration at the college supports what we do but I do not think they consider it part of the mission of the institution.
- Our current president resigned last week and a new interim president has yet to be named. At this point none of the auxiliary departments on campus are sure of their importance.
- Unsure at this time because of budget restraints
- Somewhat important. College is currently subsidizing $700,00 per year and is now looking at our role on campus and if it is vital to the college.
- We are important to those that use us, but in the overall mission of the institution we are a small part.
- We think we are vital, the President cares only so long as we don't cost any more than now. He does not support expansion.
- It varies - the college is proud to have a NAEYC accredited center and supports linkages with academic departments, but isn't as invested in financial support.
- It is important to student access, but it is not seen as critical for other reasons, at this time.
- It depends on the budget. In good budget years, the center is absolutely important to the admission and retention of students. However, it seems that in tight budget years, child care is typically on the "chopping block," in my college district. However, the center that I direct is in the academic affairs department and is integral to the training of future/current early childhood educators.
- Hummm.. that depends on who you really ask. Student Affairs departments recognize the value because we help support student-parents to come to class and be able to focus on their studies by relieving them of the stress of having their child in a quality program, sometimes Academic Affairs recognizes the value because we do allow student to come into the center to do observations, practicums, co-ops and internships, and maybe admin and finance recognizes the value but I am not always sure. We are a financially self supporting unit so I think that we really just fall off of their radar.
- On the larger scale of the campus - we are a small piece, however, to the few who use us we make a huge impact.
- The center has not impacted the overall mission of the institution to a great extent yet although we support it. the fact that there is a child care center on campus supports the mission of the university to retain and attract nontraditional students.
- We believe it's very important. Central Administration doesn't think it's as important. Our current facility is also not one to be proud of - we are trying to get support for a new center.
- I think we are very important. The administration does not agree.
- Very important to the Early Childhood Development department. Moderately important to the rest of the campus mission.
- Important to our Child Development Dept. Always justifying our worth to overall administration
- Our center has been an integral part of the campus community for more than three decades; it is highly respected but not nearly big enough to address need and that is emerging as an increasing source of stress.
- We are a private non-profit institution with a great reputation. We are unable to admit all the faculty and staff who apply. We receive little financial support from the college, but a lot of praise for the work we do. We are very important because we allow faculty and staff to go to work with few worries, but because we are not part of an academic department we are taken for granted.

Support (success of students, institution, faculty, staff, quality programs)
- I think it is important for the students to be successful.
- Our President just commented recently on the importance of the center to meet the overall mission of student outcome improvements.
- It is vital to the overall success and mission of the university. We provide support services to allow faculty, staff, and students to be successful in their work.
- We are a city that is more than 60% hispanic and low income. Have access to quality care and financial support for that care is essential for many people to obtain a college degree. We have 92 students on our waiting list who are unable to enroll because of lack of funding to pay for care.
- It is vital to the overall success and mission of the university. We provide support services to allow faculty, staff, and students to be successful in their work.
- The center is important because a great many people are now attending a community college to change careers. The non traditional student is a big part of the parents that send their children to our center.
- We help to support the non-traditional student component of the university and allow international families easy access to child care who are visiting professors and graduate students. We are in walking distance from all family housing units.
- The center is very important to the college, as we are able to provide childcare stipends to the students that would otherwise not be able to attend college.
- Quality child care and education means the u respects education at all levels from age 1 onwards!
- Very important - we give pace of mind to students so they can focus on studies and/or work.
- It's very important in supporting the needs of our mostly low-income, many non-traditional students. It is also an essential lab component for the ECE department.


- Very important for faculty, staff and students, as well as education students as workers and observers.
- Critical to helping student-parents complete their degrees.
- Essential. My institution has an important role in welfare reform. TANF families have children. There is a shortage of centers enrolling children whose care is paid for through state subsidies.
- Our center provides both faculty and staff members as well as students an enriching, engaging environment for their children each and every day. As a center, we bring a peace of mind to parents knowing that their children are in capable hands so that they can focus on their studies and attend class regularly. We also provide parents with a back up service that they can use when their primary provider is unavailable; thus, increasing attendance to both work and classes and increasing academic success for students.
- It is vital to the success of the programs across campus.
- The center is important to the campus because we are not only a laboratory school for departments, but we provide high quality child care as well.
- In my opinion, very important. We provide a quality, accredited program for the children served and a model program for students who are learning best practice for working with children.
- Essential because of lack of high quality care in community and assistance with recruitment and retention.
- Very important, we contribute to the overall excellence of the academics and services that make this University great.
- was recognized during our last North Central Accreditation as one of the premier programs of our institution.
- we are an internationally recognized program, the university likes that
- It fits with all the major points of the university strategic plan
- This depends on who you talk to but I believe that we support the university's mission primarily through providing child care for employees and students. A recent gender equity study has highlighted the importance of child care. We also recently started a faculty recruitment program which gives the provost's office 12 slots to use for recruitment and retention. It's been very successful.

**Investment by University (new facility)**
- In my opinion our center is very important to campus and has helped our college become one of the fastest growing colleges on campus. This was reinforced by the Universities' commitment of $13 million to build our new facility three years ago.
- very they have just invested 5.5 million in a new facility for us
- Extremely. We are in the process of opening a new state of the art education building for early childhood and we are the first floor of this 3 story building.
- Our center is becoming more important as we are presently building a free standing building to include infants we now serve toddlers, preschoolers and have before and after school program and summer camp. The new building will include observation rooms which we presently do not have. The president and many departments are VERY supportive and recognize the value of the center.
- the university had had a renewed interest in providing child care and is now building their second building
- We are expanding to a 6,000 sq. ft. new children's center to assist in creating 65 new slots. We currently licensed for 52 children. We are important to the college and the community as a training site for area child care providers as well as student.

**Other**
- The administration has continued to grow in their commitment to our program.
- We're doing a cost/benefit analysis this coming spring so hopefully we'll find out how important we are!
- Over time the importance of the program has increased. Our department bring in the most outside funding, therefore we get quite a bit of attention. We are involved in all institution committees and part of the strategic plan.
- The college mission speaks of support for all to acquire education. Our campus care program provides care to the children of students that otherwise would not be able to attend college due lack of affordable child care.
- very important, the campus director takes a special interest in the children and staff
- Extremely important and currently the Early Childhood Programs Department is the largest department on campus, employeeing the largest number of campus employees.
- since recently becoming accredited we are now recognized more
-we are considered important by the current administration
-Very important. We have a large waitlist and are presently full. We serve health system employees and are open 12 hours a day.
-very, very important
-Very important, for the above reasons (2x)
-all the reasons in #12
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*Note: Responses were typed verbatim, including misspellings or grammatical errors.

Survey Question 15. What do you envision the role that your center could or should play in your surrounding geographical community?

**Model**
- We should be a model center for the community.
- Perhaps acting not only as a model of best practices, but acting as a catalyst for collaboration with other centers.
- We should serve as a model for appropriate and quality programming for children.
- Model Program offering opportunities for observations, mentoring, professional development.
- We should serve as a model of high quality care and education for professionals and families. We should also be a voice/advocate for what young children need in terms of care and education.
- Provide a model for the community of quality child care.
- To provide a model infant/toddler and preschool programming site.
- As a model of what quality early childhood practices truly are and as an exceptional learning lab for area schools.
- Modeling, training, networking, consultation
- I feel we are a model for other centers in the community and provide support for their growth and services.
- We should be the cutting edge facility. We should be the model.
- We need to be more involved in the community in advocacy and public policy.
- As a model for other early care and education providers and to include others in trainings and conferences.
- We are a model early childhood site for our community and our region. Our teaching and administrative staff continue to be asked to provide training and workshops for surrounding programs and the region.
- To provide a model of quality care for other centers to emulate.
- We provide a model for other child care programs in our community. Our purpose is to serve only university affiliated families.
- given that we are not permitted to take community children who are younger than 4 years old, I don't think we can have a role in the community - however, if you are referring to the early childhood community in NYC we are very active and provide a model for high quality care and education for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers.
- Share in the University's commitment to community education by serving as a model for the local/state early childhood professional community. Share a strong image of young children to educate and shift community's view of young children and their value.
- State of the art facility and a model of quality ECE services.
- As a NAEYC accredited Center we can be a model for the community; our staff have worked as adjunct faculty for the early childhood department; other center staff have visited and observed our classes; Director was on a panel of recently NAEYC accredited centers at a national conference last spring.
- Provide a model of high quality child care.
- Serve as model for the early childhood field. We currently are assisting in expanding child care services to community by partnering with community agencies.
- We are a two campus system and the College just built our two centers within the last two years. We are already making an impact on the community as a model of quality care and as we age we expect that to increase significantly.
- model, training, and service provider
- I feel we are a great model to other institutions who are thinking of setting up a quality daycare and how it can be successful.
- As a model, as a training site, as a part of an ece conference
We can only serve as a model for tours and visitors as we have a waiting list of over 600 and serve the University community not the broader community other than as a great model. We do work with school districts and other colleges so that they can observe and use as a demonstration and model.

- We strive to be a model for other child care centers and work within all appropriate community agencies.
- Model Program offering opportunities for observations, mentoring, professional development.
- A model center for the community, providing services for the community, supporting other centers in the community by being on boards and offering training opportunities for other directors.
- Continue to be a model child care center.
- Modeling quality programing for children.
- Just as we are as a quality program for community members and their children.
- Our program should be and for the most part is a Model for the community/county.
- Limited resources/space limits our ability to be the "perfect" Model.
- We are a model facility and have an excellent reputation for providing quality care. We have a long waiting list, particularly for infants and toddlers. Some families choose to wait on returning to work until we can provide care for their child.
- We already are a model site for the majority of the surround area. Childcare Givers will attend college courses to receive their Certificate, Diploma, or Associate Degree in EC, and in doing so are observing and working in our facility where they are expected to model our teachers and learn from them. Other caregiver facilities will also tour our school to get an idea of what a quality childcare center looks like.
- The Center should stand as a model early childhood education example. Further, because we hire teachers with a minimum of a bachelor's degree, we provide an excellent example for other Centers with respect to programming, community relations, and professional development.
- To be the model program for training our ECE students while providing high quality childcare to our students, staff, and faculty.
- Our program is used as an example of exemplary childcare in the community.
- A model early care and education program
- Continue to serve as a model high quality center for area child care providers, as well as grow in our community outreach initiatives through various events and trainings.
- To provide a model high quality child care program for children and support to families.
- I feel we can and do serve as a model for other programs in the area. We actively provide training to existing programs on the administrative and teaching levels.
- Provide a nationally accredited child development program as well as serve as a model program.
- I envision us as being a model program for others in our community to learn from.
- We are a model center that other programs look to for assistance and training. We are consulted often and feel it is our role to offer our highly qualified expertise to other child care programs.
- We offer a type of preschool that is not typically found in the surrounding area.
- A model teacher preparation site as well as a high quality program for families as well as being an inclusive program for community children.
- I envision our center being a model program from other centers to learn from. I would like to have more opportunities to partner with other programs, so that we can all learn from each other and offer high quality programming for all children.
- Provide a model program and now a new facility as an example of quality.
- We are used by other centers as a role model for quality. Area 4 year institutions will use our site for additional lab work.
- We play a vital role in the local and area communities for training and excellent child care. WE serve as a role model in the community and are willing to assist all child care centers by being there for them to seek resources.
- Be a role model and also a resource/referral contact.
- The center should be role model for early care and education.
- Campus centers should be a role model to other centers providing top quality child care to families. We should also provide information about opportunities on campus for the community to engage in life long learning.
- I would like to serve as a role model to other centers, and to provide workshops and conferences for early childhood centers.
- Once we expand (if ever!) we would be able to be a great role model for quality child care practices and offer enough spaces for those in the surrounding community. There isn't enough good infant/toddler care in our area at present.

- It could not only model best practice for early childhood education but also prove to the day care community that inclusion of children with special needs can be handled in a cost effective, beneficial way for everyone involved.

- Modeling best practice to area ECE programs.

- Modeling best practices

- To provide the best care we can to our families, to stay current with childcare best practices, to maintain our accreditation, to enroll families on an ethical basis, to run a profitable business so we are there for our clients, to provide research, observation and employment opportunities for the university and to model best practices for families so the community knows what the appropriate standard should be.

- Model best practices in early childhood education

- Provide a site for model ECE practices.

- Demonstration site for best practices and teacher training.

- We are trying to be a model of best practices and serve as a resource for other programs.

- We should provide a model of best practices and be willing to assist others in the community in reaching those goals.

- Our provides a model of best practices in early care and education to our community and offers trainings, college classes and programs which provides technical assistance to community child care centers striving for higher quality.

- Model best practices for education and employers.

- Serve as a model for high quality care.

- We are a model for high quality care and education - the only NAEYC accredited center in the area.

- I feel we can and do serve as a model for other programs in the area. We actively provide training to existing programs on the administrative and teaching levels.

- Be a model program. Provide in-service and support pre-service teacher education. Demonstrate interest and skill at including children with special needs.

**Quality**

- A University based NAEYC program should set the bar for quality in that community

- Exemplify quality child care and early education.

- The center is a reflection of quality early care and education. It is the mission of the center to provide a collaborative environment for all ECE providers to reflect and grow in all areas.

- We are involved in several initiatives in our area. One of those is a partnership with business and community leaders looking at the establishment of higher quality child care centers in our area. We work with the Resource and Referral Agency on a contract training basis. We have a partnership with Early Head Start in our community.

- To provide high quality early care and education experiences for families and provide early childhood expertise to community agencies and groups.

- It has set a high standard in terms of early care and education services.

- Supporting other programs to offer high quality care and services.

- Believe that we should be open for families to learn about high quality care and for teachers in the community to see a model program. The administration on campus believes that students should have access to quality care on-site. They also believe that we should be a model program for our students and community.

- Offer high quality care and education to families

- The center provides a quality learning environment for the community and the college. The center is open to provide a learning environment for those parents that attend the college and that are community members.

- We have in the past and will continue into the future to be a Center of Excellence in child development and learning.

- With a much expanded program, serve as a much more visible quality model where community members could get first hand experience of excellent child care.

- We provide an quality example of developmentally appropriate practices and NAEYC accreditation standards to the community.
Providing a quality childcare facility for the community. Would like to see more facilities modeled after ours as there is a huge need for more childcare centers in our area.

I think exactly what we do - quality child care, parent support, placement for student teachers from other colleges, courses taught by our teachers at community colleges, many visit to the center, accreditation support, site for conference and teacher development from areas programs.

All children deserve quality early care and education and our program cannot serve all children who need that care. We would love to reach out more to the community as a model to others.

Serve & Support

Our missions are teaching, research and services so we actively pursue opportunities to serve our community, state and region as a model program. Our program includes our 12 county regional Child Care Management Agency which provides training for child care centers in these 12 counties as well as Resource and Referral for parents and eligibility for the subsidized childcare program. In addition we work with our City School System to train aids in our Pre-K programs in the public schools.

We would need to be larger to play a more important role in the community. At the present time we tend to serve the university community the most.

We serve an area of family housing and a limited local community. We aim to provide excellent services to children and families, and hope that we serve as role models for student teachers (from other institutions), volunteers, and the community. We also participate in professional organizations as a bridge between our institution and the early childhood community.

We could better serve our surrounding geographical community by providing full time care rather than part time care though it would have an impact on our role as a teacher training facility.

Expanding to serve more families

It should serve as a place for community childcare providers to come and observe in addition to the lab school capacity.

I think the Center should provide service to the children in the community in which it resides.

Supporting the entire network of child care providers with professional development and tuition assistance for student parents who use community based care.

We hope to establish a family services office that will work with community programs. We want to refer parents to programs and provide them with additional support so that community child care is strengthened.

We are involved in spreading best practices to other centers through training new teachers.

We not only provide direct services (free preschool) to low income families, we model what a high quality program looks like to the community, serving the same families the rest of the community serves.

Regardless of whether our parents are university affiliated or in the community, we are supporting the community by freeing up community childcare slots. Also, even though most of our families are university affiliated, the other parent most often works in the community. So, when you count both moms and dads, we have about half of them university affiliated and half of them working in the community. Therefore, we provide childcare to the community just as much as any community childcare center does. Our staff also serve on community childcare taskforces and is involved as leaders in a variety of early childhood groups in the community.

Continue to be a support to the many childcare centers in the area for observing and mentoring in the community.

Partner/partnership

It would be great to partner with other programs for some workshops for the community.

We are not open to the community but we do collaborate with the community centers in our area. The director belongs to the director's group that meets once a month and I also belong to a committee that puts on a early childhood training day for 300 early childhood educators in our area.

We are about to embark on a formal partnership between our school of education and the high need elementary school in our neighborhood, with our center playing a critical 'bridge' - we may be extending our program to a demonstration classroom in that school.

Partner with community school district to provide ECBG pre-k services and family support.

Part of the mission of the college is to be a good community partner, so we try to find ways to share our knowledge in the community through advocacy, training, mentoring and volunteering.

Partner with community school district to provide ECBG pre-k services and family support.
- our state has increased pre-k funding which we currently are a grantee. we have partnered with local programs and have been successful in engaging previously long time competitors into partners, hope to increase the partnership
- We are part of a collaborative plan with our community in teacher training and education.
- Demonstration school for child development department to assist with training of child care providers in the community
- Networking with agencies in the community.
- Collaborative partnerships are always part of our role

**Training, Conferences & Workshops**
- we should be more effective in providing training and internships for ece students.
- Provide a model training facility for other early childhood programs.
- The CDC should and does provide training to area providers as well as function as a demonstration site for the state curriculum.
  Teachers are able to visit classrooms observe and ask questions of master teachers.
- We want to be more active in internship training of entry level teachers in addition to modeling promising practices in ECE
- more in-service training for ECE
- Training. Exemplary model for early care and education.
- Work with other centers in improving their practice by providing workshops/training and keeping our center open for site visits.
- Host more workshops and educational opportunities. Partner with local AEYC chapter.
- Providing more Early Childhood Education for the public via conferences, workshops and meetings.
- continuing to be a resource for the community
- Hosting an Early Childhood conference is in our long range planning. We are also looking to create a partnership with the local school district to establish more purposeful placements of children with IEPs

**Leadership, Leaders**
- Our program is a leadership program in our area. We are one of the highest quality programs in the region and were just recently accredited with NAEYC. Our teachers all have BAs and ME.ds and they perform professional development for the wider community. I (the director) chair the public policy committee for our state aeyc affiliate and on the legislative committee for our state advisory board for ece.
- Providing a leadership role in local ECE community. Providing a high quality program for student teachers and ed. students to gain experience and for observation. I am an active memeber in two local ECE organizations.
- We're also a leader on local boards, like PAEYC or boards of other organization. We're trying to provide lots of support for the accreditation process. We also support the community via our web resources.
- We are and should be seen as a leader in early care & education for our community.
- We are definitely leaders in the early childhood community in our area. This is part of our mission statement.

**Early Childhood Special Education/Inclusion**
- Most semesters there is an opportunity to view how inclusion works in the early childhood setting. We are willing to help other centers become comfortable in this area by letting them hear how we have been successful.
  We are an Early Head Start Partner and allow the families who have come to us through that program to have childcare here for their older children as well as allowing them to stay in our program after their child "ages out" of the early head start program.
- Advocate for inclusive practices, continuing education, parent support programs
- A model arts integrated program demonstrating high quality inclusive early education.
- provide more inclusive care for children with special needs
- We have a long-range vision of providing a foundation for a Therapeutic Preschool.

**Other Roles**
- having a profound impact on the applicihian community in which we work
- The college is in an upscale neighborhood that provides most services to its residents. However, as an upscale institution it exemplifies to the community the importance of diversity in the clients it serves.
- Providing safe and educationally appropriate care for children, advocating for the needs of children and families.
- Providing a safe and constant place for children in this high risk area.
- We are hoping to structure our part time options which in turn I feel it will open up more full time spots for community.
- Ideally, we could offer our services to low income families and increase our diversity while offering important community services. Also, providing parenting classes with child care to members of the surrounding community.
- With our new building and increased size next year, we will be have a greater impact on our community with increased services and instructional opportunities.
- An educational institution that meets the needs of parents to help the raise socially competent children and a place for children to feel comfortable being themselves and free to explore.
- We would like to increase the size of our program to better serve our students and the university community.
- Parent trainings could be extended to the greater community through some type of formal referral system through pediatricians.
- With the economy, it is certain that there will be more students attending college from the community, and being here for them is a great comfort. Community people that will be returning to the work force are happy to have a place close to their homes and the grandparents of many of the children.
- More if we get an on campus site where we have more control over the program.
- I think we should be out in the community.
- A new center that is being planned will also include care and education for the general community.
- We should be providing more care to student parents but our region lacks state dollars to pay for care and we have limited dollars from CCAMPIS.
- We have been the primary provider across a five county area as well as on campus. Have a are also a Head Start/Early Head Start program.
- A larger facility would provide more space for student labs/training as well as openings for more children in quality child care.
- Envision: Should play the part of offering full-time care in our high quality NAEYC accredited program.
- Being part of the University requires that we set the standards and take an active advocate role with the state's early childhood initiatives.
- We currently employ a Community Consultant who heads up the Accreditation Project of our local NAEYC chapter. In addition we have four staff who provide training for other centers and we've hosted numerous leadership workshops, in addition to workshops geared towards infant and toddler teachers.
- I hope to attract students with children and/or employees to the college that have children. I think it is a great benefit and helps with the transition knowing your child is right around the corner from you at a high quality child care. It give the parents such a peace of mind.
- Resource for college and community as well as an economical entity in the community.
- With more funding, we can expand the center to include infant and afterschool care and a Kindergarten program. We will be able to meet the needs of students and community parents by offering childcare until their child is 12 years old.

Miscellaneous
- Please note: In question 16 - we rely heavily on workstudy to staff our program. Some students stay with us for 4-5 years, other are with us for a semester. Our lead staff have been here for 5-7 years.
- Not sure.
- See # 14 and supporting accreditation interest and training.
- Exactly what we do now.
- The roles you have all ready listed are enough...
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*Note: Responses were typed verbatim, including misspellings or grammatical errors.

Survey Question 20. If you believe that your center is integrated to a moderate or great extent, how do you feel this was accomplished?

**Relationships/networking**
- Relationship building over the course of 3.5 decades. The Governance Board structure includes appointed members by the president. Involvement with campus activities and varied communication about the center's work and activities.
- Relationships, relationships, relationships. I get out there and cultivate them constantly!
- As an alumni of the university, they sought me out to help open the program so some relationships were pre-established.
- Regular contact with top level university personell
- Relationship building between myself and my team, and the larger college body
- Much emphasis has been placed by the center director, center staff, and ECE instructors on building a relationship of understanding with the campus community.
- Through many meet-and-greet opportunities, participation at sports events, sending flyers through campus mail, word-of-mouth with the Advisory Board and satisfied parents
- Constant networking, partnering and interactions with many students - including lots of volunteers in addition to student participants.
- a lot of networking and contacting on my part.
- Networking, being visible, and advocating.
- It is about building connections with other departments of the college. I am considered an administrator so I attend many meeting with other department heads. This allows for formal and informal discussions regarding the center.
- It is a small campus, we have relationships with many individuals across campus through the child care relationship. We are also quite visible around campus, and have a reputation for excellence that the campus in general enjoys.
- Interfacing with all departments and being involved in the college's programs.
- Through working with the departments and administrators on campus and letting them know how we can help them as well as how they can help us. Communication is the key.
- Center director and staff have actively participated in campus committee work and college wide functions. We are seen as an asset to the college in the surrounding community.
- Networking on the campus with administrators, faculty, and staff and networking off campus by serving on community boards, regional boards, state boards, and national boards.
- Interaction with people on campus - guest readers, guest visitors, taking field trips on campus, trick or treating on campus, St. Jude fundraiser on campus etc.
- Joining University events, educating administrators at the top level on the need and importance, working with student leaders, campus media, having outcomes, advocate
- Continued work to "be at the table" through participation in campus committees, outreach efforts with administrators, and having administrator children in the Center
- The center is involved in all aspects of the college campus including campus meetings, community information outreachs, etc. Many departments and faculty extend their class assignments to include the use of the center with observations, service hours or assignments.
- Campus outreach and collaboration.
- the children are included in many activities on campus
-As time permits, the director and other full-time staff participate in campus-wide committees and work groups.
-Outreach by Director and teaching staff.
-Participation in College committees, mingling with College personnel at all levels at a variety of functions and events, providing input about the center and the center's mission within the College and the community any time an opportunity arises.
-the center staff works to keep involved in staff forums, meetings, etc. We also include the children in interactions with various departments.
-As Director, I take on the role as do other staff in getting involved on campus and getting the word out via meetings, campus online newsletter, student orientations, and other venues whenever possible.
- We make sure we have a positive image to the parents and community. We visit and use the various parts of the college.

**Commitment/support from administrators/personnel/various departments**

- Upper Administrative commitment to the mission of the preschool
- Our college was originally a teachers college, and only recently shifted to a liberal arts college. For this reason, education and certification is the biggest department. Our program has been beloved by the school for decades. We are very supported. We are very fortunate.
- Through the efforts of the Office of Childcare & Family Resources
- Support from student affairs and the president. The last director was here for 25 years, I have been here 10 years. This means we have worked with several people on campus. With the faculty and staff using the center that also makes us more involved in the center. Our teachers take classes on campus so we attract several students from these classes as well as educate the faculty about the center.
- It is part of a department Human Development and Family Studies. Located on central campus. Students hired and classes held in the building
- Through the Human Resources Department/Work and Family Services Coordinator
- With the support of the child development academic instructors and the department head
- The campus president at one point was housed in the child care center and she also worked in the center previously. I feel that the relationship was started early on. We receive great support from her.
- Due to the support of our Provost. She was the former Dean of our college and therefore very familiar with our operation and importance to the University faculty, staff and students and to the community.
- We are sponsored by WUD. This gives us a connection with the Student Union which is very valuable. We also have a strong relationship with the Office of Childcare and Family Resources. This office is a direct link to all things University and keeps us informed and in the eyes of the University.
- Our long term association with Student Support Services and our visibility as we participate in on campus resources. The level of autonomy and input we have with the Associated Students and Union organization. Our new collaboration with the ECE department to support student learning.
- Being receptive to opportunities to provide service learning opportunities and our position within student services.
- The center is within the early childhood academic department and I function as both director and department chair
- Support from top-level administration, as well as cooperation with humanities and education department. The college offers reduced tuition to student parents, as well as tuition discounts by contract to administrators, staff and faculty.
- Our vice president values our program and helps to maintain our visibility and growth.
- One of the most important reason is the University President's background is in Early Childhood Education. She has worked with children and has written several children's book and books for preschool teachers.
- The director, assistant director and Dean of the College of Ed work diligently to deliver relevant information to top administrators that would help them understand our dedication to the university and its programs.
- We are a private, university affiliated corporation. We have been included under the supervision of the Student Affairs department and now receive a great deal of assistance and support but not $ from them. We are a real part of the non-academic student support aspect of our university
- The message is clear from the president that we are important to the institution. It starts at pre-service activities and stay all year. This has taken a lot of time and commitment from the director.
-Continual interactions with appropriate administration. Good support from dean and president.
-By the ongoing interest and support along with the lab keeping the lines of communication going.
-The University committed to building a new facility and supported the staffing and enrollment increase necessary to proceed when it was their option to dissolve the program.
-The vision of the vice President of Student Affairs.

**Communication/visibility/PR**

- Annual report
  - Advertising in College employee newsletter
  - Occasional college wide e-mail noting special events or registration
  - Participation on various committees
- Annual one-on-one Meetings with VP and President to discuss accomplishments/goals for future
- By making the center visual. We are very integrated into the regional campus where we are located, but not really known at the main campus.
- Communication with my direct report and entire division
- Through constant communication, sharing information, our accomplishments and our mission publicly.
- We aim to balance the resources that we provide the campus with what we receive in return from the College community.
- Our visibility on campus - I communicate our successes with administrators via letters, photos, visits e.g. when we received our NAEYC Accreditation we issued a press release and invited the community to our Open House.
- I make sure that we get invited to major campus events e.g. we were present in March 2008 when Howard conferred an Honorary Doctorate degree to now President Elect Obama. He was the orator at our Charter Day Convocation. We saw him "close-up" and he shook hands with some of the children.
- Communication!!!! Written reports; informal interactions; involvement in committees; marketing
- Through public relations, community partnerships and marketing and because of the quality of the service that we provide.
- Word of mouth and inviting the right people to attend events at Piper
- Through advertising and word of mouth.
- Good and effective communication
- Communication at the administrative meetings
- Communication and thoughtful marketing
- We make our presence visible on campus. We invite the campus community to all center events. We share information through email and our website.
- Being visible
- Being visible and involved on many levels
- Constant Communication and Campus Participation
- Good public relations, becoming involved with everything that goes on.

**Active involvement of director/leadership from...**

- Continuing outflow of information regarding the center and my active involvement in many non-child care aspects of the college.
- As a Director, I serve in several capacities across campus and also teach in the ECE department. Also, I have a very active and caring Board of Directors.
- Director attending bi-monthly meetings with all upper level staff; Director teaching child development classes; staff on college committees; practicum and observation site for students
- Through leadership from myself, my supervisor and the president.
- I am also a teaching professor in psychology so attend faculty meetings, advise students, teach classes, serve on the university IRB, etc. Plus, I'm very proactive about communicating.
- Director serving on University-wide committees
- Mainly because I have been teaching early childhood classes as an adjunct so I have had contact with the academic division.
- Advocating for the importance of a nationally accredited early education facility in the fulfillment of the university's mission to serve students. In my tenure of 21 years, I have grown the program from 25 to 250 children being served within the campus and community. I have integrated the education component (AA/BA degrees in ECE) to grow the workforce and have one of the state's 8 Training and Technical
Assistance Program, which serves a 5 county radius. In these 20 years, I have had wonderful administrative support, with the foundation of being located within the School of Education Department.

-(Note: we do not have a Provost position)
The creation of the Center was spearheaded by a dynamic and visionary department chair who has since retired. At the moment we are benefiting from her position within the college community. In my experience at two previous universities where I ran their programs, it is the activities of the leadership in the department and in the child care center that makes a difference.

-largely through the efforts of the former Director who had a very visible presence in the University community. She spear headed the effort to develop a larger facility, was part time faculty and a member of many organizations.

**Hard work/diligence/team work**
- through a lot of hard work and networking throughout the years and PR about happenings at the center
- diligence on the part of the director with support of the department chair & faculty in our home department. I participate on committees; bring visibility to the center by offering high quality training & technical assistance in the community
- team work, providing what is needed, achieving high-quality/accreditation status
- Lots of hard work!
- Lots of work by ece staff and parent volunteers over many years, continuous activity like water dripping on stone...
- lots of hard work and involving students and their activity groups.
- By demand and popularity of children being present on campus. Lots of PR and hard work in letting everyone know how important we are to the college. Making our presence known by hosting events on campus of parents/kids/and College employees.
-It has been a very long, consistent effort - water dripping on stone! Good luck has brought a new Chancellor who truly "gets it"!

**Longevity of director...center...**
-I believe it is due to the longevity of the center and the participation of many faculty in the program over time.
- The children and staff show a strong presence on campus, participating in appropriate campus activities and interacting with other areas and departments.
- Through longevity of director becoming familiar with staff and faculty, good reputation among students, annual Silent Auction to benefit Child Care Center, serving on university committees.
- The long successful history of the Child Development and Teacher Preparation instructional program brings recognition and support to the college. The center is a big part of that.
I would have answered large extent 2 years ago, but we have new administrators who are not as familiar or engaged as previous administration.
- Years and years of existence and perseverance!! Directors need to be very visible...and not go away!!!
-This has been accomplished through longevity, reputation, and the fact we are considered a student service and as such are involved with all other student services and many academic programs.
-historical presence on campus, reputation within the community, informal and formal networking with campyus administrators
-established reputation as quality program; goodwill and continuing support on the part of the increasing number of employees whose children once attended the program; hard work

**Integration**
- Integration into the university community requires constant attention and outreach. It requires understanding the current commitments of the administration and helping them understand how child care supports those commitments. It requires being an integral part of the university community not just because of our early childhood education expertise, but having other valuable contributions to make as well-rounded professionals.
-we are as integrated as we can be given the science mission of the university - it was accomplished by being here and demonstrating to the families that we were doing a great job caring for and educating their children
-the overlap of department and collaboration
-our program utilizes so much of the university as learning experiences for the children that most people know us from directly interacting with the children/teachers.
-As noted, we are new. The integration is increasing as the college learns more about how we fit--it is great so far and we expect it to get better as we age.

**Quality**
- Quality programming; state and national recognition; staff/faculty/student involvement in program;
training/field studies component
- By providing high quality EEC, research opportunities for students, welcoming projects and taking walks with children to visit offices for 38 years
- Long history of high-quality programming and campus visibility.
- Quality of the program, experiences of families
- High quality care and demand by faculty and staff have resulted in lots of good PR

**Service**
- We serve faculty and families in every college on our campus.
- By meeting student and faculty/staff child care needs which creates word of mouth support from clients;
hiring students as child care aides (approximately 60 students for a total of 475 hours per week, per semester); presenting budgets to the segregated fee committee from which we get financial support; our immediate advisor is from the Office of Student Affairs and a valuable asset when representing us to other administrators on campus; and being a respected tool and model for the early and elementary education teaching degree program on campus; by being an exemplary site for the public school district Ready 4 Learning four year old kindergarten; by writing and being funded for a Diversity Innovation Grant in collaboration with the Multicultural Education Center (The TURTLE Project-Teaching! Understanding! Relationships! Through! Life! Experiences!), and a Collaborative Services Grant with two early education professors and the University Book Store (The Book Bag Project; etc

**Other**
- Building of a new center. We could drop after the newness wears off.
- Our best support comes from parents who have had children attend the center.
- Clear mission statement; director report to VP for academic affairs; success at achieving accreditation and grants.
- Through our university child care initiative.
- We are supported with student fees.
- We are a lab school. We have approximately 100 lab students per semester participate at the program, either as lab students, practicum students, or those completing observations. We also employ approximately 23 undergraduate students per semester and 10 graduate students.
- Putting it in the strategic outcomes, then creating a plan from objectives to tasks/activities and implementing it on a timeline to accomplish - 5 year plan. Being added as a member of the College of Education and Human Development leadership, thus attend meetings every other week with other department chairs - the Center as myself as director now have the statue of a department chair and am simply called a center director and given equality to academic dept. chairs.
- Limiting enrollment to campus community - they feel ownership and pride
- We have just opened recently, but the college is showing a great amount of interest in the child care center, and is making us feel like we are part of the community. They are very welcoming.
- Acquiring grants that add to the overall support of the college, receiving positive press that highlights the quality of the program.
- Once we achieved Middle State accreditation we began "Speaking the same Language" and received more respect from campus.
- Achieving accreditation
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*Note: Responses were typed verbatim, including misspellings or grammatical errors.

Survey Question 21. If you believe that your center is integrated to a limited extent or not at all, what do you think are the primary reasons?

Low profile (location/visibility)
- The center is not considered as important as other activities on campus because no one has taken the time to think about it. The center is just kind of "there" unless someone needs it for something.
- We are not "out there" enough. This is due to a variety of factors, some of which are beyond our control.
- Low profile on campus
Also, we are a half-day program - a lot of families need all day care
- Central Administration has other priorities. They do not see our Center as a valuable entity - especially since we don't bring income to the University and instead have to be subsidized.
- Location of center is in a remote area of the campus
- We are located at the College's East Campus, about a mile from main campus. Out of sight, out of mind!
- We are not visible. Our locations are on the fringes of the campus and "out of sight, out of mind"
- Our location in the community building of an apartment complex at the south end of campus gives us limited visibility. Personally, staff from our center do not usually have the time available to join the main campus for campus activities during the day due to lack of substitutes.
- We are physically distant from the main buildings, and cannot release staff from classroom duties so that they can get involved.
- Our department is an auxiliary program. Although we directly serve graduate students, we function with limited visibility to administrators from various departments.
- We are not directly involved in communicating with other departments
- We don't have high visibility on campus. If there are opportunities for me to communicate with high level administrators, I am often tied up at the center to be able to attend.
- We are located off the main campus, so we are visually isolated. Because we are off the main campus, we are unable to take walking field trips, which would allow us to be more visible to students. I think that although we extend invitations to our open houses and advertise when we are enrolling, we are still the best kept secret on campus.
- For our center to be on campus
- Not on campus and not exclusively a campus run center
- We are not directly on campus so not as visible
- We fall under the Housing Department and the University does not get involved in our operations.
- Probably because we are such a small center, we are not as visible to the overall campus or community so it doesn't feel like we are integrated at all into the university.
- I believe that due to the location (off campus) faculty and staff sometimes forgets that we are part of the college and do not provide references to students.

Limited Knowledge (image - campus babysitting)
- Limited knowledge of program outside of direct contact with us
- Most do not understand our role in providing care for children of students and how that is essential for some; also, they do not understand how we can be a recruitment tool for students and staff/faculty.
- Our University is trying to move from a more regional/commuter institution to one that attracts more traditionally aged students and the movers and shakers that are pushing this movement can't seem to get it through their heads that there are even 17-18 year old students out there with kids that still want to and can
be successful in college. So, they don't see the child care center as being as needed as it once because the "face" of the institution is changing.

- Lack of understanding on their part, lack of visibility on our part.
- Lack of understanding about early childhood issues, child development needs and family needs from the president. 2. Lack of administrative support at the center. The director is responsible for so much day to day record keeping, and hands-on administration (in the classrooms) there is little time to get out of the center and network on campus. 3. The day care center is managed by the college association and there is a split between faculty/staff positions which causes the day care staff to feel they are not viewed as professional faculty members on the campus.
- Misconceptions regarding program's academic role in the department. Often seen by larger university community as a child care resource only.
- This industry is still not respected nor understood. "it's just babysitting."
- Lack of awareness of child development/human development and what a lab school does We are viewed as on campus babysitting.
- Cdc teachers are still seen as babysitters, not educators.
- We are seen as a babysitting service; not as a professional organization.
- Awareness issues, time, too many obligations and not enough effort to actively involve the program.

Non-applicable/not sure
- n/a
- N/A
- NA
- N/A
- N/A
- Not sure....

Financial Issues
- Due to the budget cuts, the focus is elsewhere.
- We are a very small center and do not produce revenue. Without a federal grant we would be operating in the red. We are a financial liability.
- Funding, priority and staff support
- The college likes the center on the campus, but has limited spending, as they insist that we are financially independent of them. The only assistance (financially) is through the Student Association.
- Communication, financial resources. We are not a money making entity on campus. We are seen as a nice service for students and staff/faculty who have children despite our advocacy and pr efforts.
- Money

Low priority/Focus Elsewhere
- The Center is not valued as an important part of the university life. It is not seen as priority in the whole scheme of things.
- Not promoted; somewhat unknown entity until recently
- We are totally different from any other department and don't fit into the "mold" and I think sometimes the college "forgets" about our needs.
- Colleges and departments are unilaterally focused: Communications within the University community is very limited.

Administrative Changes
- We have had turn over in several administrative positions recently
- New administrative changes such as new president.
- Consistent turnover within the University Administration
- We have a new President and this semester we will be involving him in our program and informing him about what we do.
- We have a new college president, and she has torn down the administrative structure, gotten rid of 8 administrative units along with the administrators of those units and recently announced her reorganization plan. We are at this point being shifted around to a different department and everyone is unsure where to give their alliances.
Lack of Administrative Support (faculty support)
- administration not valuing what we do as an educational setting.
- Lack of support from top level admin.
- To be more fully integrated into the University as a whole we would need great Departmental and faculty support. We need them to utilize our population for research and training on a more regular basis. Our part time hours and lack of diversity serve as barriers to this.
- Lack of administrative support at the center. The director is responsible for so much day to day record keeping, and hands-on administration (in the classrooms) there is little time to get out of the center and network on campus. (**see full response under limited knowledge category)

Campus structure
- Our center does not function as the rest of the college functions. Our staff work different hours to accommodate our hours of operation. It is often forgotten that we care for children and not adults, so when college offers things on campus or security issues occur, our center is often not notified properly or allowed to attend the same functions do to scheduling.
- The program reports to Student Affairs and Campus Life, not an academic department. Until a few years ago there was a laboratory school in the School of Education and a rift between the programs. Since that program was closed due to budget cuts and with a new professor in the School of Education who has a current day ECE perspective and interest in teacher training we are gaining a better footing with this critical academic department.
- There have been barriers to overcome within the campus structure to move this program forward. Such as, policies and procedures within the Human Resource Office, Purchasing, and the Business Office, which often don't fit in running a child care business.
- The day care center is managed by the college association and there is a split between faculty/staff positions which causes the day care staff to feel they are not viewed as professional faculty members on the campus. (**see full response under limited knowledge category)

Size/utilization
- We have seven campuses and the center is located at one campus where the child development department is housed and most of the child development courses are taught. Because of our size we can only serve a limited number of children.
- Used by a small percentage of faculty/staff and students
- We serve relatively few of the students enrolled at the University. The University is trying to "grow" more traditionally students.

No early childhood education program on campus
- The university does not offer a program in early childhood education. For a long time the center was a little known around campus except for parents with children in care.
- We do not have an early childhood program on campus.

New program
- Our center is newer on campus and is still forming relationships with different parts of the campus. Additionally, I was unable to answer some of the above questions as our administrator care for many of the above matters.
- We are a new program and we have had many delays in opening due to problems with the building. So we have not been functioning long enough to become intergrated into the college.

Director Related
- The former director who operated the program upon it's creation often did not support such an integration and since taking over the management, we are slowing sharing our program and philosophies with others.
- Lack of time on part of director to accomplish this mission.

Other
- The acceptance by the campus I believe is the problem.
We have provided care for the children of many faculty and staff and they continue to communicate with us about their children's accomplishments and to let prospective parents know that they should do what they can to be admitted. Our work-study students are very happy to work here and well connected with teachers. We are not college employees although we have college id's. We do not have formal structure in place for connecting to college administration. Because we do a good job, it seems the colleges do not think anything needs to be changed. We really do need an advocate, but it is hard to find a way to put that in place - particularly in these bad economic times.
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*Note: Responses were typed verbatim, including misspellings or grammatical errors.

Survey Question 22. As director, what do you feel is your primary role in developing and maintaining a relationship with the university (e.g., encouraging integration into the university)?

Communications/Communicating (speak, talk, share, mission)
-Speak about current center events on an ongoing basis at management meetings, and continue to invite upper management to events.
-Staying in contact with the department chair and dean of the college to let them know the value of our program to their commitment to students.
-I constantly talk about the Center and it’s importance to the university, include in written documents & publications.
-Consistency with meaningful and strategic information in addition with opportunities for engagements.
-To communicate the work we do here.
-Communicating and educating many departments about our services.
-Keeping in touch with others on campus to stay in the loop about university happenings.
-Continue to offer invitations to special events, sent reports of milestones and accomplishments and share information on what is going on throughout the early childhood field.
-Continuous communication with various departments and administration to "sell" the benefits as of using the CDC as a teaching tool.
-My primary role is to keep lines of communication open with other departments and find purposeful ways for us to work together. For example, if the children are interested in teeth a visit to the dental clinic for further investigation can be arranged.
-Providing updates to the college faculty and staff and encourage faculty and staff involvement in planning.
-Open lines of communication.
-Outreach & communicating program outcomes and potential for opportunities that departments, students, and faculty can access.
-Communicating our value.
-Keeping open lines of communication doing what is expected.
-Seek ways to communicate mission and work of center.
-Huge! I have to keep the college leaders and students informed of our services and the great role we play in the college operation.
-Effectively communicating the program's role and need it fulfills for all members of university community.
-Open lines of communication.
-Keeping the VP I report to in the know about what is going on at the center.
-Giving good information to the Child Care Services Coordinator, who reports to the higher level campus administrators and other departments. Make contacts of my own. Uphold the Center's reputation for excellence.
-My primary role is to go to the different high level administrators of the University and share the work that we do and it's importance...time, unfortunately, is a huge factor with that.
-Communication! I am not the director; I am the liaison between the univ and the centers.
-Currently sharing basic factual information about the center, our financial outlook and our mission.
-Constant communication, PR, involvement on committees and community outreach.
- Communicating with the departments and involving the college departments in helping the center and the children.
- On going communication with departments and administration. They need to know that they need us...and what we do for them.
- Network and communicate often about the importance of the center.
- Keeping the admin. informed and involved so they feel we are important enough to "keep around" even though we do not generate income for the institution
- Being pro-active and using my voice to share the importance of what we do, as well as to continue to support the university's mission.
- Communicating our mission and representing the families we serve.
- Communicating at every opportunity how our centers support the overall mission of the University by our service to student both directly through providing care for students children and secondly by providing research opportunities and practical experience for students, undergraduate and graduate.
- To ensure that the service we provide to families is aligned with the vision and mission of the College
- The primary role of the director is to establish, identify and communicate the connection of the center to the college mission and vision to center staff and college administrators.

**Relationships (departments)**

- I believe I need to cultivate the relationship by engaging in projects that bring distinction to the college. This helps me when I need to ask for things. I also believe I need to maintain full enrollment so as to remain in good standing with the Business Office.
- Developing relationships, advocating for the center, educating about quality.
- Continue to reach out, be aware of the mission of the university and work to support it, actively work with families to keep them engaged at the university
- Developing and maintaining a relationship through the students we service.
- I think it is a major role for me, as the director to maintain the relationship with the college
- Getting to know department heads of departments that can use our facility and encouraging them to do so
- I need to be out and intermixing with the university community so that people know about us and our mission.
- The Director of the program has a primary role in developing/maintaining the relationship with the University - and it helps tremendously if the Vice Chancellor is an advocate for the program too.
- Seek new connections with academic departments. Nurture existing relationships. Continually identify roles the children's center can play in enriching College Student experience.
- Building bridges and making the admin. see the overall value of early care and education
- Working with the Service Learning and the Education/Humanities departments. Attending meetings of various committees and departments. Good relations with parents who are students, as well as staff. They are our best advertisement!
- Continuing to strengthen relationships with other departments and schools within the University
- Making contacts and forging relationships
- Strong leadership skills in building working relationships. Modeling those skills within my own operation to gain the respect necessary to advocate outside my own program. Being respected and valued for the work and accomplishments. Being included in campus projects/meetings where I could use those leadership skills to help other departments and become a "campus" team player.
- Continually encouraging the relationship
- Currently as a new Director I am trying to sustain former relationships while implementing new ideas that will support our relationship.
- I work directly with the Human Resources Department, and have constant interaction with them. We also have a child care committee made up from six people from different departments in the college. We meet ever other week to discuss different topics and concerns with the child care center.
- Working with various college departments to find ways that our center can be utilized as a resource for college students. Also, providing regular updates (enrollment, financial data) with Administrators and Board of Trustees.
- My role is to be the leader and model ways to connect us to the rest of the campus. Encourage and promote attendance at college wide event, etc.
- I am totally responsible for maintaining the relationship as is all staff.
Provide/Providing (high quality care, opportunities, service, information)

- Providing high quality child care so parents can have piece of mind while at work. Being as open as possible to having any kind of research and study happen here. Accommodating work study students schedules. Being fiscally responsible.
- Providing accurate and current information as to what services we are providing and how these services are necessary for the success of many students.
- Primarily, I need to provide an exemplary program, state of the art practices and quality care for the children. These things build a reputation that spreads.
- Provide opportunities for students, increase visibility on campus, educate campus on what we do.
- The primary role is to continue providing a service to the students as well as improving the quality of care.
- Administering a high quality program for parents and families that provides teacher education, training, service to the community and opportunities for research.
- Running a model program with excellent feedback from our clients- families and students
- As Director, my primary role is to direct the center as a model for development, demonstration and dissemination of early childhood education.
- Running an exemplary program, being visible on campus, being available to many different departments for meeting course requirements - student teaching, field placements, projects, observations etc. while maintaining the quality and integrity of our child care setting; by participating as much as possible as a center in campus grant opportunities, and functions such as Arbor Day tree planting, etc.
- Recruiting students and faculty by providing high-quality and affordably-priced child care.
- Providing high quality early education that reflects well on the college.
- Encouraging professors to use the center for research and observation
- Focusing on student retention and success; offering high-quality program that receives recognition in the community and therefore projects a positive image for the university
- Continue to work with the department and administration to serve as a lab school. Attend meetings or serve on committees when student child care concerns are addressed by the college.
- We are a very active component of our Early Childhood Education department but also our primary service is to the students, faculty and staff of the college as a learning and caring facility for their children.
- Supporting student parents in their education. Providing a place for Education students to get experience through employment, provide a place for students to do observations, practicums and internships
- Unding and support of the center and college goals
- Staying informed about institutional priorities, and making sure the center fulfills its mission to serve students, both by providing childcare and by offering learning opportunities.

Visibility

- Increasing the visibility of the center through internal and external communications, participating as fully as possible in appropriate campus events, and consciously building relationships with people throughout the campus.
- Enhancing our visibility through various on campus marketing techniques and by myself being active in campus affairs.
- Being visible, keeping up contacts, making use of all opportunities, being available and cooperative, establishing professional credibility, doing PR quite relentlessly
- Keeping the Center in their view at all times
- Visibility. I try to attend every function possible, bringing posters, art work, etc. I also include the children whenever possible...we send cards to the Chancellor, make and hang decorations on the tree in the Administration building, sing at the staff and faculty open house and attend free concerts in the fine arts building.
- To provide opportunities for the main campus to connect with us, such as through an open house. Finding ways to increase this visibility is one of our roles.
- Being involved with the campus and the local community. Keeping the center out there.
- Finding ways to make the Child Care Program and the abilities of its staff noticed by key leaders.
- Visibility and soliciting opportunities to work with departments. Being a new director at the center it has been hard to do this to the capacity necessary at this point in time. This is a goal to reach out more and increase visibility on a regular basis.
-To be out there and make sure that the different echelons of the college understand the importance of child care on the campus.
-keeping the center 'in the news' and on the minds of university members - publicizing our activities and benefits to families
-Making everyone more aware that we are here and that we serve a viable purpose, that we are very important to the families that we serve and that if we could expand, we'd be able to attract more students and faculty/staff to our campus.
-contact, visibility, information sharing
-Be visible (known by many on campus), be helpful (committees, functions, etc.)
-Visibility and accessibility - willingness to serve on committees, etc
-Keeping work of program in public eye within the campus and wider community/state via public relations and interdisciplinary collaborations on projects.
-developing the presence of the program to top level administrators and present outcomes that ties in directly with the strategic goal of the campus, the administrators do not necessarily want to hear about the children's accomplishments, they want to hear about recruitment, retention and accomplishments of the student parents

**Promotion/Promoting/Public Relations & Advocating**

-My role is to promote the center throughout the university and the community.
- Very important to promote what is going on in our department. Being the Leader
- Continually reinforcing our importance and welcoming student participation.
- tooting my own horn
- I promote the information that is requested of me. But most of our information has to go out through the Marketing Department, or at least be approved through them.
- I look for many types of opportunities to promote our NAEYC accredited center, our excellent staff, and all the programs and services we provide.
-to send proposals and encourage faculty to send students to observe as part of syllabus
-Constantly promoting the vision and mission of the center, and finding ways to promote the goals and learning objectives of the university in all we do.
-We need to do a better job of promoting our center and the research and training opportunities that we can provide to our own department as well as other related departments in the University. We need to do a better job of showing our relevancy to the University through bringing in grant money, publishing articles based on research conducted at the center and integrating cutting-edge pedagogy into our daily curriculum.
-I think it is a PR function - not a topic that I learned in my ECE classes.
-public relations to make center known
-Maintaining an open welcoming environment--always available for tours and information sharing with administrators and community leaders
-To continue advocating for the quality care of children and to provide opportunities for various departments to see quality care in action (placing pre-service teachers in environments that will enable them to do some practice teaching).
-Advocating for the program; representing the program; partnering to serve academic department needs
-advocating for on-campus childcare
-As an educator and advocate for what families need and how important we are to children's self image.
-Advocating for the importance of quality care on campus.
-show administrators how we help contribute to the university mission.

**Collaborating/Cooperate/Partnership**

- Collaborating with Child Development department and showing our value as a placement site for their students
- Partnership with Departments to find mutual benefits for the center and the departments. ie, we are partnering with the Department of Nutritional Sciences to get a new kitchen and to participate in a childhood obesity studies. The Art Department sends student to the Center to do sketchbook with the children and they are getting experience with young children and collecting data for their department research.
- Active participation in campus events, communication of information at all levels, involvement as a faculty member and management team member on campus
- Encouraging partnerships with departments and making the center a necessary part of the university.
- I like to invite and involve more departments provide/ conduct more researches opportunities at our center
- Being an activity staff of the college campus and participating and encouraging partnership with other departments when possible
- open-doors and collaboration
- collaborative work with departments
- participating in both faculty and staff events and meetings and including them in our activities
- Being pro-active in finding ways to involve my staff and the children in campus activities for students and other staff.

**Education/Educating**

- Teaching them what are work is all about! It is a never-ending story...they do not get what we do and how critical our roles are in keeping children safe and ensuring quality care.
- There are so many! Mostly to keep us here. My primary role is one of education, cheerleading, and advocating
- Educating college administrators and being aware and knowledgeable about the importance of campus child care in both functions as a child care service and 'lab.'
- change the way of thinking that we are babysitters. invite them to a parent night or other activities we made a quilt...we are going to travel it thru the campus
- Educating all about what we do. When all college employees know what we do, we can build give and take relationships that will promote student learning, student engagement, and student retention.
- Educating the University personnel about the business and value that early care and education has on recruitment, retention, and graduation as well as the impact on the broader community.
- I think it is extremely important for me to continue to help educate the Board and other administrative departments about what we do, why we do it, and the importance of early care and education.
- Making faculty and administrators aware of how we might be useful to them—they have no history with child development centers on campus.
- My role is the Education Coordinator. Our director is the Associate Dean of the School of Education. My role is student support for practicum students at the SOE. I attend campus meetings and events to talk about the center.

**Integration**

- I feel it is my primary role because I would like the teachers to be able to focus on the children and families. My schedule allows me to educate the college community, to be able to be present in campus meetings and explore various opportunities to develop and maintain a relationship.
- I believe to continue to encourage integration and always let the campus know what our center is doing and the accomplishments that it has made.
- --Helping us to become integrated with the University
- Yes
- It is one of my top priorities.
- I believe that I should be working toward fuller integration and recognition throughout the college.
- I believe it is important, but not the primary role.
- The University designates the Director as a Dept Head within the Student Services dept and does integrate this dept in various ways.
- I have been here a year now and new to the larger community. After getting adjusted and learning about my new community, the college, and my program it is time for me to follow up and integrate myself within this institution. In other universities my role was to advocate for the needs of my program, educate administrators about the unique needs of young children and the programs that provide their care, and keep the community informed about how our work contributes to the wider mission and goals of the college.

**Liaison**

- champion, educator, liasion, visionary, resource manager, making the institution proud, taking really good care of children, families, and employees
- I gap the bridge between the campus and the center. I am a part of the Administrator assembly group and other various groups on campus. These groups do not always pertain the the Center but I do have a vote in decision that are made on the campus level involving campus issues.
- Liaison between University administration and program; making sure University recognizes our contributions.
- I am the liaison and spend significant time and effort on university relations. My primary role at this point involves being a liaison between the center, our administrators and the university. This involves passing along information, bringing concerns, pairing families with support, etc.
- I represent the center and serve as a voice for the center.
- I am the liaison person between the university and the program. I meet with university administrators and directors of other student affairs departments.
- To serve as a liaison between the college and the center and to note at every opportunity how the child care center supports the university's goals of access and excellence, as well as recruitment and retention goals.

**Maintaining financial stability...**
- Maintaining a budget that is not a huge deficit.
- Maintaining financial stability without their support; and communicating all aspects of the program with them.
- To operate self sufficiently, financial
- I feel it is my first job to run a profitable, accessible center that meets the needs of the children, families and employees of the center. By doing this well, we represent the University well.
- To insure the financial support of the institution.

**Committees and Meetings**
- Participating in committees related to campus child care; supporting parents who are faculty; providing a research and training site.
- I sit on committees throughout the campus and I have joined several organization that support the college mission.
- Attending university committee meetings, maintaining website, attending supervision meetings and training, working with all the departments as opportunities are available.
- Keeping us as involved in the whole campus as possible. I serve on recruitment committees, conference committees, and we encourage the teachers to get the children physically out there for events and even just walking around the campus.
- Staying involved with committees and college events.
- Taking part in committees associated with the university and keeping them aware of the impact we have on students.
- Being willing to serve on committees across campus.
- Meetings with the leadership e.g. 1x per month I meet with the Dean and Associate, they alternate monthly coming to my Center and on the off month I go to the Dean's offices. Also, as aforementioned I attend the CEHD leadership mtgs. every other week CEHD leadership means dept. chair. This is just terrific!
- Attending meetings and advocating on behalf of the center. Bringing more activities on campus to advertise and recruit potential parents.

**Other**
- Make sure we are available to students for class assignments and support research.
- This always seems to be changing.
- Balancing early care program administration and making center available for student studies.
- When I compare the number of university students to the number of slots we have for children, there is great disparity. Our community has many centers and we work with the other centers to service the university. It is difficult to encourage more awareness amongst the university when we have continual waiting lists of over 200-300 children.
- One of my main roles (goals) is to be viewed as part of the University's strategic plan.
- Establishing a center on campus.
- Unsure at this time.
- My primary role is to "run" the Center as well as possible in order to serve the needs of multiple departments on campus while serving our young children and families.
- My hours are limited as I complete an average of 50 hours per week on site completing operational tasks (this does not include hours spent during the years of accreditation).
- This is a difficult question because we have affiliations with two colleges. They support us by providing the building rent free and by giving limited financial aid to faculty and staff. My advocacy for further funding has fallen on deaf ears because we are financially sound as we are, have very little teacher turnover, and are always fully enrolled. Again, because we are not part of an academic department (there is a part time nursery school on campus that has a departmental affiliation) it is difficult for them to find where to put us.
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*Note: Responses were typed verbatim, including misspellings or grammatical errors.

Survey Question 23. Please include any additional comments you would like regarding your center and its role within your university.

-Supported by upper management but somewhat an 'unknown' to a large population of faculty
-We are extremely fortunate. Our staff are paid well, we have low turnover. Our center was recently renovated. The campus is small (5,000 students) and so I have access to principal administrators. I have a GREAT HR Director, and that really helps
- None
- as long as things are running along smoothly I rarely hear from the administration of the college but if there is something they think is better for students or faculty regardless it is the best thing for us they push push push to get what they want without understanding how it impacts the center
- As a center, we need to consciously act to increase our visibility with the administrators as well.
- We invite and try to include the entire campus whenever possible for all events happening at the center.
- Our college has changed the whole focus of our center by concentrating on the $$ and the number of children served...not the quality of staff and care of the children!
- I wish I had better documents and arguments for why we are important. The other things is that when they do see us as important, it's just to recruit and retain students - not what we are accomplishing with children
- they do not care about the "early childhood education" part.
- We are fortunate to have tremendous support!
- We have a great reputation on campus but I would like more consistent involvement in campus wide administrative events and programing.
- An advocate for the children, families and the field.
- We are the only university in our state that has a child care center on campus for staff and faculty. It is a huge recruiting tool and results in administrative support (program, advocacy, and financial)
- I know we are benefiting from the general attention that is now given to early childhood programs.
- Our college has built us a new 6,000 sq. ft. building because of our importance to the community and college...and "gosh darn it", we are good at what we do through the dedication our staff. We have a 2 year waiting list and most parents know to get on our waiting list before they get pregnant. It takes that long to get into the program. WE work hard at community relations and it shows.
- the Center's existence began under a different administration than today's. We have had very involved presidents and currently not. It is difficult to communicate when the higher ups are not really listening. On the other hand, we do receive many in-kind services which we are grateful for.
- We are well supported, however, have a limited impact on supporting students due to our small size. But have extended our programs to offer evening and weekend to support the college various initiatives
- Our center is a lab for Family and Consumer Sciences we are not part of the Education department so that gave me some pause as I was answering the above questions it did not cover our department.
- We are critical for the support of the dual licensure of Pre-K-3 and Special Ed at our university. With our birth to 5 year old children and a collaboration program with the county schools to support 3-5 year old children with special needs we fulfill a necessary role in the community.
- we do not have an educational department or psychology department.
- Accreditation was an expectation (and was difficult - but accomplished)!
- we give back to the university much more than they realize or return
- We have had a very stable group of professionals in our program as teachers over a 20+ year period....then cancer and retirements caused turn over. Last year 3 out of 4 lead teachers left and we are scrambling. (All left for better paying jobs last year)
- College give in-kind services but teaching staff and center director's salaries are under the Auxilliary Services Corporation of the Community College. Main concern is staff wages and benefits.
- The staff on campus cannot afford us so we're trying to find a discount for them to utilize our services
- While child turnover is frequent, one to four years per child, this affects our program only in relationship to the number of special needs children who may be in attendance that year. I would like to be able to say we are open to special needs children and take each child at their current developmental level and work with them. I feel a personal mission to meet the needs of our University community in this way. Our enrollment is steady, but not our steady in the area of inclusion.
- We are very fortunate to have a high level of support and a very visible program. This has not always been the case. Three years ago the University merged the full time child development center with the part time infant and preschool lab programs and included the Human Development and Family Studies facult, the Capstone Marriage and Family Clinic as well as the regional childcare mangement agency all into one new exceptional facility.
- Our staff are highly qualified and I couldn't ask for a better group of teachers. The main thing we struggle with in our center is making it known how important Early Childhood is. Also why our teachers should be better compensated for the work they do. Early Childhood professionals are laying the foundation for each child in their care and they are helping that child to succeed more greatly then they would without that early education.
- We also have a full-day center on campus that is run out of human resources for faculty and staff. We collaborate very well with them and help each other with university relations.
By the way, the buttons on this survey don't change when they are clicked so it's hard to see what's been done or not. Perhaps you can enhance that for others.
- No matter what efforts we make, we still always feel like a low priority.
- It is always challenging to lead a "school within a school". there are many variables to consider. We try to remain positive and remember all of the benefits we receive from being a part of a larger institution both personally and professionally.
- Question #8 of this survey is limiting. There are "lab schools" that serve children through the early childhood years i.e through 3rd grade
- We also provide care for faculty and staff parents, but our priority is student parents.
- We will be celebrating the 20th anniversary of the center, and we are hoping to be recognized as an integral part of the campus, not just its' little child!
- In our strategic planning meetings for 2009-2010, a great deal of focus is on the child care center for the purpose of attracting the non-traditional students.
- Thank you for creating this survey. I am very interested in who else participated and your results. Thank You.
- The Center is a department within Student Affairs.
- I have felt very fortunate in what has been accomplished in our small southwest campus program. We are truly a model site in New Mexico and larger institutions seem to have more difficulty in working through systems.
- We are appreciated adn supported at this institution
- we operate as an auxiliary (income producing opportunity) of the Institution
- We are hopeful that we will play a more cohesive role in the future as our campus implements changes.
- Our Center has earned much respect from many departments on campus because we seek to serve them in whatever way we can to benefit both children and university students.
- An excellent place to get high quality training (40 part time student employees)
- It's a wonderful setting for Child Care centers and personnel because of the professional setting/program opportunities, and university financial and program support, as well as being able to be part of the salary/benefit structure for our staff
- It has taken us several years to develop a relationship with administration on this campus. It takes work to maintain it as well. Attending meetings and social activities, providing annual reports, etc. Time, attention to detail and ongoing communication is a must! As department chairs and administrators move on...the director must be ready to start all over again with communication and selling the program.
- we feel we have a much better position now than ever in the past - yet threatened as we all are by current economic conditions
- We need full-time care offered at our university. We are qualified to do so. We do not have the facility.
- With the hiring of top level administrators that have dealt with individual child care needs themselves it has been easier to get the support that we have needed
- Our center continues to struggle with our role in with our college. However, in the past year, we have seen more positive partnering with departments that has created a more rich environment and further the opportunities for the college students, children and families.
- Universal positive support
- We support the practicum students from the SOE. We also work with faculty with research. We are part of an innovative relationship with a local hospital. The SOE is expanding into nursing so our center will be an important research site in the future as well.
- Currently because of our extensive waiting list - there are at times strained relationships with departments as no preference is given to faculty etc.
- It has been difficult getting this program started and the economic climate will have an negative effect on the new program if funding is limited.
- I have been in the early childhood field for over 25 years. I have seen positive change with regards to early childhood programs importance and image. I anticipate our program taking on a greater role in the future with the growth of our campuses.
- Various surrounding college and university faculty have chosen our program when their school does not provide such services.
- On our campus, we are clearly the child care option of choice. On other campuses, administrations have done better jobs of recognizing the importance of both a lab school and full time childcare program. That is not the case on this campus and while we have the respect of a great number of faculty and staff, not being a part of the college in a formal way makes it difficult for people to know where to place us. On the other hand, we like our autonomy and independence. We would like more financial support so teachers could be better paid. All of our teachers have degrees in early childhood or related majors and yet if we compare their starting salaries to almost any other position on campus, they are significantly lower. This is a particular problem in this society and is certainly not the fault of the college - although providing more support would go a long way towards raising salaries.