

Facilities Inventory Project Data Report

March 9, 2011

Nancy L. Marshall, Ed.D., Wendy Wagner Robeson, Ed.D. and Georgia Hall, Ph.D.

Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley College

Stacey Tomasetti and Bruce Hutchinson,

On-Site Insight, a Recap Real Estate Advisors Company

Sponsored by

The Children's Investment Fund

With Thanks To

The Facilities Inventory Project Advisory Committee and

Our Funders

An Anonymous Foundation, The Boston Foundation, and the Massachusetts Department of
Early Education and Care

Suggested citation: Nancy L. Marshall, Wendy Wagner Robeson, Georgia Hall, Stacey Tomasetti and Bruce Hutchinson. *Facilities Inventory Project Data Report*. March 9, 2011. Wellesley Centers for Women & On-Site Insight.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Background	1
The Facilities Standards and Criteria	2
The Facilities Standards	3
The Statewide Survey Methodology	4
Findings	8
Sample Description	8
Program Identified Needs	10
Results from the Site Visits	11
Strengths	11
Problem Areas	12
FACILITIES STANDARD 5. ENVELOPE & SYSTEMS	12
FACILITIES STANDARD 6. CHILD ACTIVITY SPACE	14
FACILITIES STANDARD 7. ADULT ACTIVITY SPACE	16
FACILITIES STANDARD 10. OUTDOOR SPACE & ACTIVITIES	18
ACCESSIBILITY	20
Estimated Costs	23
Appendices	27

Acknowledgements

The report authors would like to thank The Children's Investment Fund for the opportunity to participate in this important project. We would also like to recognize the support of the project funders, An Anonymous Foundation, The Boston Foundation, and the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care. Finally, we thank The Facilities Inventory Project Advisory Committee; their comments on the study at various stages were invaluable. However, any errors in this report are solely the responsibility of the authors.

FACILITIES INVENTORY PROJECT DATA REPORT

Introduction

In 2009, The Children's Investment Fund (The Fund) contracted with Wellesley Centers for Women and On-Site Insight (OSI) to assess the quality of facilities housing early care and education (ECE) and out-of-school-time (OST) programs for children across Massachusetts. Facilities influence children's educational outcomes, staff effectiveness, and the health and safety of everyone in a program, yet the condition of these facilities is largely unknown, because there has never been a broad assessment of ECE and OST facilities. The results of the study will be used to document the current state of ECE and OST facilities and what is needed to improve facilities to an established quality standard. The Fund will use the study to help plan our training, technical assistance and financing services to programs throughout the Commonwealth. In addition, we will use the findings to build support for new public and private financing of facilities for ECE and OST programs.

This Report provides the results of a statewide survey of ECE and OST program facilities. The study focused on community-based non-profit programs in low-income communities across the state. The sample included center-based programs serving infants, toddlers, preschoolers and/or school-age children through the age of 13. The Fund was interested in assessing all aspects of the built environment – the building envelope and systems, vehicular access and parking areas, the building entry, child activity spaces/classrooms, administrative and support areas, and outdoor space.

Background

Children's development is supported by contexts that promote their learning and growth, including early care and education and out-of-school-time programs. Considerable research has examined the importance of *psychosocial* environments, including relationships with caring adults. *Physical* environments are also important contexts for children's development. The physical environment is "the stage or setting upon which social transactions take place."¹ Physical environments can affect children's outcomes in two ways, by suggesting "a range of activities that can or cannot occur," and by eliciting emotions, such as feelings of comfort, self-worth or anxiety.²

Facilities quality is significantly related to program quality for children in infant, toddler and preschool classrooms and in out-of-school time programs. Preschool-age children exhibit more social withdrawal and more off-task behavior under crowded conditions. In a 2004 study, Kantrowitz and Evans found that, the more children there were per activity area, the greater the amount of time spent off-task.³ Crowding in child care centers has also been associated with attention deficits, behavior problems, and reduced interactions between children.⁴ In a study of

¹ Theodore Wachs, 1989. The development of effective child care environments: Contributions from the study of early experience. *Children's Environments Quarterly*, 8 (4) 4-16.

² Olds, A.R., 1989. Psychological and physiological harmony in child care center design. *Children's Environments Quarterly*, 6 (4) 8-16.

³ Kantrowitz, E.J. & Evans, G.W. 2004. The relation between the ratio of children per activity area and off-task behavior and type of play in day care centers. *Environment and Behavior*, 36 (4), 541-557.

⁴ Maxwell, L. 1996. Multiple effects of home and day care crowding. *Environment and Behavior*, 28(4), 494-511, cited in *Evans op. cit.*; Maxwell, L.E. 2003. Home and school density effects on elementary school children. *Environment and Behavior*, 35 (4), 566-578.

cortisol levels among 18-40 month old children, LeGendre found higher cortisol levels among children in more crowded classrooms, and in group sizes of more than 15 children.⁵ Higher cortisol levels indicate greater stress.

In a study of programs serving 4-year-olds in 10 countries, Montie and colleagues found that children who attended programs that offered a wide range of equipment and materials showed greater improvement in cognitive performance than children in less resource rich programs.⁶ In a study of 202 Colorado child care centers, Perlman and colleagues found that classrooms with varied materials and activities, adequate space and appropriate furnishings had higher quality interactions between staff and children, including developmentally appropriate interactions during personal care routines and encouragement of language development.⁷

The *Cornerstones*⁸ report on early childhood settings in Massachusetts highlighted concerns about hygiene and sanitation. It found that 39% of preschool sites had too little indoor space, poor ventilation, poor lighting, or inadequate activity spaces; 51% of infant-toddler programs lacked appropriate furnishings or made use of furnishings that were in poor repair. Fewer than half the programs had space and materials for active physical play.

While there is less research on OST program facilities, there is some information. Research on schools has found that students in poorer quality facilities have poorer test scores, poorer attendance and higher dropout rates.⁹ Technical design features, such as acoustics, climate control, lighting and warm colors, have been found to be correlated with positive child outcomes.¹⁰ In addition, the Massachusetts After-School Research Study¹¹ found that appropriate space led to positive staff engagement, which in turn led to positive youth engagement, challenging activities and high-quality homework time.

The Facilities Standards and Criteria

While there are multiple sets of standards offered through varying professional and accrediting organizations that address some components of the physical environment, there is no single set of standards which pays comprehensive attention to facility quality and functionality and none that address standards for both ECE and OST programs. The Children's Investment Fund recognized the need for standards that identify those elements that support good educational environments for children, work environments for staff, and the health and safety of all occupants – standards that go beyond the interior to assess the general condition of a building, the building envelope, mechanical systems, and the grounds. The Fund, with consultants from Wellesley Centers for Women and On-Site Insight, has developed standards for physical environments that support children's learning, safety and healthy development.

⁵ LeGendre, A. 2003. Environmental features influencing toddlers' bioemotional reactions in day care centers. *Environment and Behavior*, 35 (4), 523-549.

⁶ Montie, J.E., Xiang, Z. & Schweinhart, L.J. 2006. Preschool experience in 10 countries: Cognitive and language performance at age 7. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 21, 313-331.

⁷ Perlman, M., Zellman, G.L. & Le, V. 2004. Examining the psychometric properties of the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R). *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 19, 398-412.

⁸ Washington, V., Reed, M., and Cowden, M. 2007. *Cornerstones: Strengthening the Foundation of Health and Safety in Early Education and Care*. Cambridge, MA: Schott Fellowship in Early Education and Care at Cambridge College.

⁹ Evans, op. cit.

¹⁰ Moore 2001. op. cit.

¹¹ Intercultural Center for Research in Education and National Institute on Out-of-School Time, 2005. *Pathways to Success for Youth: What Counts in After-School*, p. 26

The Facilities Standards

1. **INSPECTIONS:** The facility meets all local and state inspection, licensing and code requirements to ensure the health and safety of all persons who occupy the space and to support basic program operations. All inspections are current.
2. **SITE LOCATION, ORIENTATION AND LAYOUT:** The facility is located on a site that supports the program activities and the health and safety of children and staff. The location is convenient to transportation and basic community services, and makes best use of the features of the site.
3. **VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKING AREAS:** The facility drop-off/pick-up and general parking areas are accessible, easy to navigate, safe for vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and adequate to address parking needs.
4. **BUILDING ENTRY/LOBBY:** The entrance to the facility is visible, secure and accessible. It welcomes children and adults into the center while providing an appropriate level of security.
5. **ENVELOPE & SYSTEMS:** The facility is safe, secure and accessible. The external and internal envelope and structures (roof, ceilings, doors, walls, floors, windows, exits, stairways) are in good repair and well maintained. There is sufficient capacity in the electrical, heating and cooling, plumbing, fire, ventilation, lighting and water systems to meet all regulations and ensure the comfort and safety of building occupants.
6. **CHILD ACTIVITY SPACE:** The facility provides sufficient child activity space designed to support program activities, including educational activities, hygiene and routine care. The space is divided into zones for messy, quiet, and active activities. It welcomes and engages children and youth and makes them feel secure and comfortable.
7. **ADULT ACTIVITY SPACE:** The facility includes space for reception and administrative offices, staff needs for meeting, planning and relaxation, and space for parents. It is equipped with furnishings, appropriate technology and other resources to support a professional staff.
8. **SUPPORT SPACE:** The facility includes sufficient space for all functions that support program operations, including food preparation, cleaning and maintenance, laundry and long-term storage.
9. **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** The facility meets environmental health standards in the management of hazardous materials, provisions for safe drinking water, recycling and refuse, temperature and humidity, and storage of potentially toxic substances.
10. **OUTDOOR SPACE & ACTIVITIES:** The facility provides sufficient outdoor space and equipment suitable for the ages of the children in the program. The space and equipment offer access to nature and natural materials, opportunities for healthy physical activities and learning.

In addition to the ten standards, the Facilities Standards include an appendix that provides a summary of key regulations governing accessibility in ECE and OST program facilities.

The Specific Criteria for the Facilities Standards. Each Standard has one or more criteria. For each criterion, we identified Regulatory Standards, Professional Standards, and Best Practices Standards, whenever possible. A program that meets *Regulatory Standards* complies

with Massachusetts state regulations (licensure, building codes, etc); a program that meets *Professional Standards* meets professional association standards and guidelines; a program that meets *Best Practices Standards* follows best practice guidelines from a variety of sources.¹²

The Statewide Survey Methodology

Sample. The sample for the study was limited to community-based non-profit programs in low-income communities across the state.¹³ Programs that were for-profit centers or family child care homes were not included in the study. In addition, programs that were run by schools or other public agencies, or that were worksite programs, were not included in the study, because those programs are likely to have access to other capital resources from their sponsoring entity. The sample included center-based programs serving infants, toddlers, preschoolers and/or school-age children through the age of 13. More than three-quarters of all eligible ECE (76%) and OST (78%) programs agreed to participate in the study. The final sample included 73 ECE programs and 57 OST programs and is representative of other, similar ECE and OST non-profit programs in low-income communities in Massachusetts.

Assessment Protocol. The objective of this study was to inspect the physical space occupied by a wide range of early childhood education and out-of-school-time programs and various systems/components utilized by these programs to see how well they met Regulatory Standards, Professional Standards and Best Practices Standards. Where an inspected component did not meet one of these standards, a cost to bring it into compliance was developed. The assessment measure was adapted from OSI's standard inspection protocol, which is focused primarily on visually inspecting all major systems and components at various types of real estate assets and then projecting future needs and related costs for these systems and components in the form a long-range capital needs assessment. This protocol was adapted to assess a subset of the Facilities Standards selected by The Fund as of particular interest, and limited to those standards that could be assessed effectively.

Upon identification, the standards were entered into an excel spreadsheet and arranged according to type of standard (regulatory/professional/best practices) and grouped by location within the facility (i.e. classroom, kitchen, storage, etc.). Each standard was entered with its category in the survey, a brief description of the standard, the reference to the full standard, and the full standard in an input box. In addition, each standard was evaluated to determine whether or not it applied to all age groups. At the beginning of each facility visit, the inspector would enter the age group(s) served within that program and the spreadsheet/checklist would then

¹² Standards item numbers follow this format: the first digit represents the Standard (1 -10); the second digit represents the Area under that Standard, the third digit represents the source or level (Regulatory Standards =1, Professional Standards=2 or Best Practices=3), and the final digit represents the item number. For example, Standard 4, Area 1, Best Practices, item b would be written 4.1.3.b.

¹³ Using 2000 Census data, we identified the ten Massachusetts communities with the largest populations of families living below the poverty line. These communities – New Bedford, Fall River, Lawrence, Lynn, Holyoke, Springfield, Lowell, Brockton, Boston, Worcester – are home to 50% of Massachusetts families living in poverty. To ensure that the survey also represented smaller communities, we selected 14 additional communities with the highest rates of family poverty – all above the Massachusetts statewide rate of 6.7% of families living in poverty in 2000. These communities – North Adams, Pittsfield, Gosnold, Monroe, Hawley, Greenfield, Montague, Chicopee, Everett, Cambridge, Chelsea, Revere, Southbridge, and Fitchburg – are home to an additional 10% of Massachusetts families living in poverty. These communities are located in ten different counties. To further expand the representativeness of the sample, we selected communities that had poverty rates above the state average of 6.7%, and were located in either of two additional counties (Barnstable and Hampshire) – Provincetown, Ware, Middlefield and Amherst. This community selection procedure did not generate communities in only 2 counties, Nantucket and Norfolk, where fewer than 3% of families are living below the poverty line. An estimated two-thirds of programs in these communities were non-profit, and met the other eligibility requirements of the study.

display only those standards that applied to those group(s). Answers on the checklist were restricted so they would be consistent for analysis. Space for notes/free responses as well as quantitative information on modifications to be made were also included in the assessment tool.

The inspection protocol tool for the accessibility portion of the study was based on OSI's standard accessibility inspection checklist, which was developed approximately fifteen years ago and has been continually refined over time. The checklist was previously used for two separate reviews of all housing developments included in the portfolio of the Boston Housing Authority. The checklist references both Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS) and Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (Mass AAB) standards.

A pilot study utilizing the identified standards was completed by OSI at nine facilities, including four early childhood programs and five OST programs. Based upon completion of the pilot study facility visits, the inspection tool was revised to include prompts for the inspector for better quantitative information if a standard was not met. Additionally, the application of standards to some age groups was revised in a few cases, and the standards were re-ordered to be chronological and ease the inspection process.

Recruitment of Programs. WCW selected the sample programs. OSI and The Fund screened the list for eligibility. Based upon the final list, letters were mailed to the selected programs in batches (at the start, one batch at a time was mailed out per region; as the study progressed, letters were sent out as needed). Approximately one week after mailing the letters, the program/site was called to recruit the program and schedule a visit.

Data Collection. OSI conducted site visits at each participating program; in addition, programs were asked to complete a brief survey of program information. After scheduling the site visit, OSI emailed a confirmation letter to the program director and/or other program staff that included the date and starting time of the facility visit, a list of the information/documents that OSI would like to have available for review during the visit, and a list of the areas/spaces that we would need access to (if possible). The program information form was sent as an attachment to each of these confirmation emails. At the time of each site visit, the inspector brought along a printed copy of a blank program information form that could be completed at that time, if necessary. If the program information form was still not completed by the time the site visit concluded, the inspector asked that the form be sent directly to OSI's office as soon as possible.

Four OSI staff completed the site visits; between them, these staff have completed approximately 700 capital needs assessments for a wide variety of real estate asset types over the past eleven years, prior to this survey. The staff have backgrounds in historic preservation and residential construction, commercial real estate appraisal and residential construction and remodeling, landscape design with experience in site review/reconnaissance, design/layout, and cost estimating, real estate development and inspections of public housing. Each inspector involved with the study received both in-house and field training. In-house training covered background and goals of the study, explanation of the standards, inspection protocol, and use of the various tools. Field training consisted of visiting a facility as a group to become familiar with the protocol and tools. Individually, each new inspector then shadowed the trainer during one facility visit and subsequently had the trainer shadow them on one facility visit to help reinforce understanding of protocol and use of the inspection tools. Telephone and/or email communication was available between the inspectors and the trainer throughout the course of the facility visits to answer questions specific to protocol and/or other inspection-related matters.

At the start of each facility visit, the inspector typically met with the director, and briefly went

over the background about the program. Additionally, the director (or other staff member) was asked if there were any major concerns or issues with the program's physical space. The director or other staff member then led the inspector on a brief tour of the spaces (interior and exterior) utilized by the program and introduced the inspector to the teachers, so that they would not be surprised by a stranger. As part of the tour, the director or other staff member described to the inspector how the various spaces were used (if something was just an art room, or snack room, etc). During this time, the inspector asked questions about items that could not be seen because of the season or because of access (asked about air conditioning in the winter, heating in the summer, outdoor lighting levels and controls, etc). After the brief tour, the inspector then went back to each space on his/her own to take measurements, photographs, and fill out the inspection checklist. To the greatest extent possible, the inspector tried to go into classrooms when the children were not present so as not to be a distraction. Specific care was also taken by each inspector not to include children in any of the photographs.

Many times the inspector was not able to get on the roof or in the boiler room. Where access was not available or possible, the inspector looked for evidence of the condition of these items – water stains, draft guards, auxiliary electric heaters – and asked if there were problems keeping the building warm/cool enough or with active leaks. These answers sometimes provide better information than just visual observation. Also, since this survey was limited to a simple assessment of the general condition and/or level of performance of these systems/components; the answers provided by the program director or other site staff, typically provided adequate information for purposes of the survey.

Cost calculations. Based upon the responses gathered for each program in the sample, costs were estimated to make modifications to meet *The Facilities Standards and Criteria*. Two assumptions were made in calculating costs:

1. Modifications are feasible (disregarding the potential structural, site logistic and permission/use/occupancy limitations of individual locations), and
2. Standards could be met by reconfiguring space within the existing footprint of the program.

However, reconfiguring the program space may reduce the amount of child activity space and lead to decreases in licensed capacity. Few, if any, of the programs in the sample could afford the loss of revenue from a reduced enrollment of children, but the alternative, small scale additions to the building would be costly, inefficient, and likely infeasible.

Cost calculations for new space for gross motor activities or elevators were calculated based on constructing an addition to the building. Creation of a gross motor space could require a large enough addition to be feasible from a construction contracting basis, and the alternative, partitioning existing interior space, would in most cases, displace an entire classroom. Due to the variability of interior layouts and building types, costs for a new elevator assumed the addition of a new elevator shaftway outside the existing footprint of the building.

Many programs in the study were located in spaces without fire sprinkler systems. Current building codes do not require sprinklers in all buildings. Therefore, costs to install fire sprinkler systems were not included in the study's cost estimates.

Each item in the assessment was analyzed to create a scope of work for necessary repairs, replacements, and/or modifications. In some instances, several scopes of work were created to

address different issues found within one standard, or to address differences in cost due to building type (i.e. repairs to exterior walls of masonry versus siding or adding a bathroom above or below grade). After costs for each of these scopes were determined, they were combined as a weighted average resulting in a single average modification cost for a particular standard.

For example, standard 6.4.1.e states that there should be one toilet and one sink for every twenty children. Through the course of the study, fourteen sites were identified as not having adequate facilities. The modifications needed varied from adding an additional sink in an existing bathroom, adding an additional toilet in an existing bathroom, expanding an existing bathroom to create space to add an additional sink and toilet, and partitioning space to create a new bathroom with two toilets and two sinks. Full scopes of work (demolition, framing, supply and drain line plumbing, fixtures, lighting, painting, etc) for each of these scenarios were then developed and priced, resulting in estimates for the four modifications. These four estimates were then combined in a weighted average according to the frequency of each modification, to result in a single average modification cost for this standard.

Quantities/scales of scope of work used here are averages and were determined using information from the individual programs. However, when quantitative information could not be reasonably gathered, (i.e. linear footage of ductwork within a program) a conceptual prototype was used. The prototype was defined based on the average enrollment of the sample (sixty-nine children), and application of the necessary square footage ratios and ancillary spaces (hallways, bathrooms, office, storage, etc). Costs were estimated only for the program space and may not include an entire system. For example, standard 5.9.C.1.a was used to determine if ventilation systems were in a safe, operable condition. Ventilation systems at several programs did not meet this standard and costs were estimated to clean only that ductwork serving the program space, although the same ductwork might continue or extend beyond the program space to serve other portions of a building or facility.

In some instances, a finding of 'does not meet the standard' during the physical review of the program space resulted in no subsequent scope of work or cost estimates being developed. Compliance with the standard in these situations typically involved organizational or housekeeping issues such as the rearrangement of furniture within a classroom or improvements/modifications that were viewed as being easily addressed by program staff.

In order to avoid duplication of costs, each scope of work was analyzed to determine if there were instances where making the modifications required for one standard would also result in a subsequent standard being met. Where this occurred, no separate cost was included for modifications for that subsequent standard. For example, Standard 5.18.3.b1 was used to determine whether programs had windows from the activity rooms to the outside. Standard 5.18.3.a quantified this by saying that there should be a direct line of sight to the outdoors from 70% of the floor areas of classrooms. We found that programs that did not have windows in all activity rooms also did not meet the day lighting threshold. Therefore, if modifications were made to meet standard 5.18.3.a, standard 5.18.3.b1 would also be met, so a separate cost estimate was not required.

When the same scope of work was determined to be necessary for two separate standards, costs were only applied once. For example, there are Regulatory and Professional Standards (5.9.1.a and 5.9.2.a, respectively) that address the condition of flooring. If the flooring in a program did not meet both 5.9.1.a and 5.9.2.a, only the Regulatory Standards cost was shown, as replacing the flooring would be the necessary modification to meet each standard. However, where it was found that flooring did meet the Regulatory Standards but not the Professional

Standards, a cost was shown in Professional Standards for that program.

In other cases, the modification of one standard could be included in the specifications of another standard. For example, accessibility item number 84 states that there are to be two 42 inch long grab bars at the water closet in an accessible children's restroom. Item number 85 states that the side grab bar should be no more than 12 inches from the corner of the wall. If both standards were not met (no grab bars in place) it is assumed that the installation required for Item 84 would also specify the distance required for compliance with Item 85 and therefore no cost would be shown for Item 85. Costs for Item 85 would only be shown if grab bars were already in place (Item 84 was met) but not located in the correct position.

The estimates per standard shown in Appendix A and B represent the average cost, as derived from an analysis of the sampled program spaces, to complete a specific scope of work in order to comply with a specific standard and do not include regionalization factors. When costs were applied to individual programs, scopes of work that included labor had a regionalization factor¹⁴ applied to the average cost. The regionally-adjusted costs were totaled to create the numbers used in the Findings section of this report. Excluded from the totals in the findings are costs for items such as design fees, permits, and bonding.

The study calculated current costs for the programs/facilities, as they were at the time of the visit, to meet the standards evaluated in this study. Costs were not calculated for a reserve or maintenance fund for items that will need eventual replacement – furniture, heating systems, roofs, etc. Primary sources referenced as part of the cost development for the study include R.S. Means, Lakeshore Learning, Kaplan Early Learning Company, and Playworld Systems.

As average costs for repairs, replacements, and/or modifications needed to comply with a specific standard, the projected costs presented here are not meant to be, nor should they be viewed as being, specific to any particular program space contained in the sample. The variability of retrofit work coupled with the existing location and condition of the specific program spaces included in the sample could add to the actual costs for any indicated scope of work. Furthermore, site conditions and/or adaptability of the program space may prevent the completion of many of the anticipated scopes of work, although the cost to complete a specific scope of work at that particular program space has still been included as part of the study.

Findings

The findings are organized into three sections: a description of the sample, the results of the site visits, and cost estimates to address identified problem areas.

Sample Description

The sample included 73 ECE programs and 57 OST programs. Of the 73 ECE programs, 69 programs (94.5%) accepted preschoolers, 45 programs (61.6%) accepted toddlers, and 34 programs accepted infants (46.6%). The average capacity was 57.5 preschoolers, 19.3 toddlers and 10.4 infants. Among OST programs, the average capacity was 64.25 school-age children. The ECE programs had been located at their current location for an estimated 17.8 years and

¹⁴ From *RS Means 2009*, regionalization factors were calculated as follows: Region 1 urban communities (such as Springfield, Chicopee, and Holyoke) 1.01 and "rural" communities (Pittsfield and Greenfield) 0.9875, Region 2 – Fitchburg, Worcester – 1.0555, Region 3 – Lawrence, Lowell – 1.094, Region 5 – Brockton, Fall River, New Bedford – 1.075, and Regions 4 and 6 – Cambridge and Boston, 1.154.

the OST programs for an estimated 17.0 years.

Programs can be located in a range of buildings or properties (see Table 1). The majority of OST programs were located in community buildings, such as YMCAs (58%), while ECE programs were equally likely to be found in each of the property types.

Table 1. Property Type (unweighted data)

Property Type	ECE	OST
Community Buildings	12.1%	58.2%
Former School Buildings	16.7%	7.3%
Housing Developments	9.1%	-
Residential Property	13.6%	1.8%
Commercial Property	16.7%	9.1%
Religious Buildings	16.7%	14.6%
Buildings Designed for Child Care	15.2%	9.1%

Early childhood programs were more likely than OST programs to be part of a multi-site child care organization, while OST programs were more likely to be part of a larger organization that also provides goods and services other than child care, such as a YMCA (see Table 2).

Table 2. Organization Type (weighted data)¹⁵

	ECE	OST
Part of a larger child care organization that delivers child care in more than one site	40.91%	18.82%
Part of a larger organization that provides goods and services other than child care (such as a YMCA)	31.59%	55.56%
Single site (Located at one site or address only; only provides child care)	27.50%	25.62%

The differences between ECE and OST are significant at $p < .001$, $\chi^2 = 43.20$.

OST programs are more likely to be located in buildings owned by the program or its larger organization, while ECE programs are equally likely to own as to rent (see Table 3). In addition, 12% of ECE programs and 15% of OST programs are in rent-free space, that is, they do not own the building and they do not pay rent to the owner. Among programs paying rent, the majority of programs were in buildings owned by a religious organization (40% of ECE programs, 34% of OST programs) or by a government agency (22% of ECE programs, 37% of OST programs). One-fifth (20%) of ECE programs paying rent, and 13% of OST programs paying rent, were in buildings owned by a non-profit organization.

Table 3. Building Ownership (weighted data)

	ECE	OST
Own	44.75%	58.74%
Rent	43.24%	25.88%
Rent-free	12.02%	15.37%

Programs providing OST care are more likely to own their own buildings, less likely to rent, than are ECE programs ($\chi^2 = 15.05$, $p < .001$).

¹⁵ Weighted data provides estimates that are weighted to reflect the population of all eligible programs (non-profit, center-based) in the study communities in each region. To calculate the weights, we first estimated the size of the population of all eligible programs, based on EEC licensing lists and the proportion of eligible programs in our sample. We then weighted the sample data to match these numbers. For example, Region 1 has an estimated pop of 71 eligible ECE programs. We visited 17 of these programs; therefore, each program in the Region 1 sample represented 4.18 programs (71 divided by 17). Therefore, the data from each of these programs was multiplied by the weight of 4.18 ($17 * 4.18 = 71$).

Programs were asked about their revenue sources. Based on responses from 58 ECE programs and 39 OST programs, we developed four revenue profiles: [1] government child care subsidies, including vouchers, contracts and Head Start funds, contribute more than 75% of revenues; [2] other government funds (such as food program subsidies or quality improvement grants) make up 40% or more of revenues, and program receives less than 75% of revenues from subsidies; [3] parent fees contribute more than 25% of revenues, and program receives less than 75% of revenues from subsidies, and less than 40% of revenues from other government funds; and [4] the program relies on a mix of revenue sources and does not fit any of the other profiles.

The majority of programs relied heavily on government subsidies, or other government funds (see Table 4). However, 14% of ECE programs and 23% of OST programs received at least 25% of their revenues from parent fees.

Table 4. Revenue Profiles (unweighted data)

Profile	ECE	OST
N	58	39
Govt subsidies (vouchers, contracts, Head Start)	65.5%	43.6%
Other govt funds (food program, quality improvement grants)	5.2%	15.4%
Parent Fees	13.8%	23.1%
Mixed revenue sources	15.5%	18.0%

When we examined differences in revenue profiles by property type, we found that programs with more than 75% of revenues from government subsidies were located in community centers, religious buildings, buildings designed for child care or in residential properties, and not in other property types.

Table 5. Revenue Profiles by Property Type (unweighted data)

Profile	Community Bldg	Former School Bldg	Housing Development	Residential	Commercial	Religious Bldg	Designed for Child Care
Govt subsidies	32%			14%		24%	17%
Other govt funds	25%	33%				24%	8%
Parent Fees	11%				10%	12%	8%
Mixed revenue sources	32%	67%	100%	86%	90%	42%	67%
N programs	28	12	4	7	10	17	12

Program-Identified Needs

While three-quarters (76%) of ECE programs and 70% of OST programs have made some repairs in the past year, over half of programs reported that they have put off repairs in the past year because of lack of funds. Fewer than half of the programs reported that they included an item in their budgets for replacement reserve and maintenance. When asked about the types of facilities costs they currently pay, or about other

New carpet is needed in hallway and infant room. HVAC unit needs to be replaced (8-10 thousand dollars). We have roof problems, and our elevator doesn't work.

recommended improvements to the facility, programs offered a variety of individual responses (see boxes). Among the most common concerns were problems maintaining the temperature in children's rooms because of faulty windows or problems with heating/ventilation/air conditioning (HVAC), problems with the outdoor playground, the need for more storage, concerns about the maintenance and repair of doors, walls, ceilings and roofs and concerns about accessibility.

All windows need to be replaced for energy efficiency; driveway and walkways need to be repaved. Floors need to be replaced (old & worn); heat is uneven (some rooms too hot; some too cold); kitchen cabinets need refinishing.

Results from the Site Visits

The site visits assessed 76 *Regulatory Standards* items (complies with Massachusetts state regulations, including licensure, building codes, etc), 60 *Professional Standards* items (meets Professional Association Standards and guidelines) and 132 *Best Practices* items (follows best practice guidelines). Each item was rated as to whether it was not observed at the visit, not applicable to this particular program, met the standard or did not meet the standard.

Strengths

Among the 76 *Regulatory Standards* items, the majority of programs (56%) met all or almost all (90% or more) of the items, and almost all programs met 80% of the items (see Table 6). For example, all programs provided egress doors or in other ways complied with Standard 5.5.1.b, "Except as specifically permitted by 780 CMR 1008.1 egress doors shall be readily openable from the egress side without the use of a key or special knowledge or effort. (780 CMR 1008.1.8)." All programs provided adequate classroom space to accommodate a variety of activities, and to accommodate all children who are present playing individually, together, and in small or large groups (Standard 6.1.1.a) and appropriate eating space for all children (Standard 6.12.1.a). All programs provided provide a separate mat, cot, etc. for each child (Standard 6.17.1.a), and, in programs with infants, cribs with firm, properly fitted mattresses with clean coverings (Standard 6.17.1.f), and with slats on cribs are no more than 2- 3/8 inches apart (Standard 6.17.1.g). Two-thirds (66%) of ECE programs provided play equipment and structures that were free of entrapment hazards (Standard 6.13.1.b).¹⁶

Among the 60 *Professional Standards* items, all of the programs met at least half of the relevant *Professional Standards* items, and one-fifth (21%) of the programs met almost all (90% or more) of the items. Almost all programs provided a welcoming setting (Standard 6.1.2.h), clear classroom pathways that allowed children to move from one area to another without disturbing other children's work and play (Standard 6.6.2.a). Almost all programs had a minimum of three interest areas in the classrooms (Standard 6.1.2.b) and provided places for displaying children's work (Standard 6.11.2.a). Almost all programs provided toilets, drinking water, and hand-washing facilities within 40 feet of the indoor areas that children use (Standard 6.4.2.a).

Among the 132 *Best Practices* items, almost all (96%) of the programs met at least half of the

¹⁶ The problem areas are described in the following sections; common problems were electric outlet covers that were a choking hazard, exterior walls, floors or roofs in need of maintenance or repairs, windows in need of screens in good repair, children's bathrooms that were not readily accessible by all children, chairs and other equipment that posed entrapment hazards, and separate space for administrative duties and educator-parent conferences.

Best Practices standards. For example, 91% of ECE programs, and 63% of OST programs provided windows from activity rooms to the outside (Standard 5.18.3.b). In addition, 62% of ECE programs provided a minimum of two toilets and two child-height hand washing sinks within each classroom area (Standard 6.4.3.a).

Table 6. Proportion of Programs Meeting Standards on Items (weighted data)

	Met Standards on 95% or more of Items	Met Standards on 90% or more of Items	Met Standards on 80% or more of Items	Met Standards on 50% or more of Items
Regulatory Standards	17%	56%	95%	100%
Professional Standards	3%	21%	83%	100%
Best Practices	-	-	2%	96%

Problem Areas

While this is good news, there are problem areas that need to be addressed to ensure the high quality facilities necessary for ECE and OST programs; the problem areas are found in aspects of the building envelope and systems, the child activity space, the adult activity space and the outdoor space and activities. We address the problem areas under each of the relevant Standards.

FACILITIES STANDARD 5. ENVELOPE & SYSTEMS: *The facility is safe, secure and accessible. The external and internal envelope and structures (roof, ceilings, doors, walls, floors, windows, exits, stairways) are in good repair and well-maintained. There is sufficient capacity in the electrical, heating and cooling, plumbing, fire, ventilation, lighting and water systems to meet all regulations and ensure the comfort and safety of building occupants.*

Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations (licensure, building codes, etc).

We found that more than one third of ECE programs did not meet Regulatory Standards on safety measures for electrical outlets (see Table 7). In addition, 10%-20% of ECE programs and 8%-15% of OST programs did not maintain exterior walls, floors, windows and roofs “in a safe, operable and sanitary condition.” Windows are a particular area of concern, with 21% of ECE programs and 33% of OST programs in buildings that did not have screens in good repair on all windows used for ventilation, and 24% of programs were in buildings whose windows did not meet safety standards for window design to prevent injury to children (see Table 7).

Current building codes do not require sprinklers in all buildings and some older buildings may not have to install sprinklers unless undertaking a large scale renovation. Over half (56%) of the programs included in the study were found to be located in spaces without fire sprinkler systems (data not shown in Table 7).

Professional Standards: Professional association standards. The Professional Standards for building security requires that, “If emergency exits lead to potentially unsafe areas for children (such as a busy street) alarms or other signaling devices shall be installed on these exit doors to alert the staff in case a child attempts to leave. (NHSPS 5.023).” Over half (55%) of all programs were in buildings that did not provide signaling devices on emergency exits that lead to potentially unsafe areas.

Best Practices. Best Practices standards for ventilation require that programs locate air returns

over diaper and toilet areas and that the ventilation system be sufficient to prevent indoor CO² levels from exceeding outdoor levels by more than 700 parts per million (ppm), as described in Leadership Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Version 2.0. Over half of ECE programs did not have air returns over diaper and toilet areas; 30% of ECE programs did not have adequate ventilation of CO².

Table 7. ENVELOPE and SYSTEMS. Percent of all programs that did not meet standards on specific items. Weighted Data.				
Assessment Items	% did not meet standard			X²
	All	ECE	OST	
N programs (unweighted)	130	73	57	
5.4 Electrical System and Electrical Outlets				
Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations (licensure, building codes, etc)				
a. All electrical outlets within the reach of children younger than school age must be made inaccessible by use of a safety device or covering that prevents access to the receptacle openings. If the covering is a shock stop, it must be of adequate size to prevent a choking hazard. (606 CMR 7.07 (10o))	N/A	37.98%	N/A	N/A
5.6 Exterior Walls				
Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations (licensure, building codes, etc)				
a. All buildings and structures and all parts thereof, both existing and new, and all systems and equipment therein, which are regulated by 780 CMR shall be maintained in a safe, operable and sanitary condition (780 CMR 103.1)	14.33%	18.39%	7.89%	13.25***
5.8 Floors				
Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations (licensure, building codes, etc)				
a. ... All buildings and structures and all parts thereof, both existing and new, and all systems and equipment therein, which are regulated by 780 CMR shall be maintained in a safe, operable and sanitary condition. (780 CMR 103.1)	11.71%	9.68%	14.93%	3.92*
5.11 Roof				
Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations (licensure, building codes, etc)				
a. All buildings and structures and all parts thereof, both existing and new, and all systems and equipment therein which are regulated by 780 CMR shall be maintained is a safe, operable and sanitary condition. (780 CMR 103.1)	17.32%	20.0%	13.08%	4.93*
5.13 Security				
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
a. If emergency exits lead to potentially unsafe areas for children (such as a busy street) alarms or other signaling devices shall be installed on these exit doors to alert the staff in case a child attempts to leave. (NHSPS 5.023)	55.31%	54.25 %	56.99%	NS
5.9C Ventilation				
Best Practices				
b. Locate air return over diaper and toilet areas. (GSA 10.9.2)	35.77%	53.23%	8.12%	130.7***
c. ... prevent indoor CO ₂ levels from exceeding outdoor levels by more than 700 parts per million (ppm), as described in LEED Version 2.0. (GSA 10.1.16)	21.85%	29.25%	10.12%	31.66***
5.18 Windows				
Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations (licensure, building codes, etc)				
a. All windows used for ventilation must include screens in good repair. (606 CMR 7.07 (10h))	25.96%	21.44%	33.11%	10.45**

Table 7. ENVELOPE and SYSTEMS. Percent of all programs that did not meet standards on specific items. Weighted Data.				
Assessment Items	% did not meet standard			X²
	All	ECE	OST	
b. Windows and glass doors must be constructed, adapted, or adjusted through the use of window guards or other means to prevent injury to children (606 CMR 7.07 (10h))	23.88%	29.45%	15.07%	16.79***
c. All buildings and structures and all parts thereof, both existing and new, and all systems and equipment therein which are regulated by 780 CMR shall be maintained in a safe, operable and sanitary condition. (780 CMR 103.1)	13.95%	13.19%	15.16%	NS
Best Practices				
b. Provide windows from activity rooms to the outside [b1] (DOD 7-1.3)	19.48%	8.7%	36.53%	72.91***
b. Provide windows from ... activity rooms to corridors.[b2] (DOD 7-1.3)	48.11%	41.4%	58.72%	17.75***

Note: Base for percents includes N/A items and Not Seen items.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

FACILITIES STANDARD 6. CHILD ACTIVITY SPACE: *The facility provides sufficient child activity space designed to support program activities, including educational activities, hygiene and routine care. The space is divided into zones for messy, quiet, and active activities. It welcomes and engages children and youth and makes them feel secure and comfortable.*

Indoor Activity Space. State regulations require a minimum of 35 square feet of activity space per child. (606 CMR 7.07 (15c). Almost all programs (96%) met this Regulatory Standards (data not shown). The Professional Standards for indoor activity space size for OST programs require approximately 45 square feet per child or youth for small group and enrichment activities such as woodworking, arts and crafts, and science experiments, and approximately 35 square feet per child or youth for quiet activities such as homework, reading, or holding club meetings. Two-thirds of OST programs did not meet these standards (see Table 8).

Bathrooms. State regulations (Regulatory Standards) require adequate bathrooms for programs. We found that more than 17% of OST programs did not have enough toilets and sinks for the number of children in the program and 10% of OST programs did not have bathrooms within 50 feet of children's activity space. In addition, 23% of ECE programs did not have toilet facilities that provided age-appropriate privacy for the children enrolled in the program. Finally, 61% of ECE programs and 49% of OST programs did not have bathrooms that were readily accessible to all children, including children with disabilities.

Best Practices standards for bathrooms recommend a minimum of two toilets and two child-height hand washing sinks within each classroom area for toddlers and preschoolers, with never less than one toilet, one lavatory and one drinking fountain for every 12 children who will use them. One-third (38%) of ECE programs did not meet this Best Practices standard.

Classroom Sinks. The Professional Standards for classroom sinks requires that the hand-washing sinks are accessible to staff and children, with step stools provided if needed. Sixteen percent of OST programs did not meet this standard.

Diapering. The Professional Standards for diapering requires that each changing area be separated by a partial wall or located at least three feet from other areas that children use and

that it be used exclusively for one designated group of children. Eleven percent of ECE programs did not meet this standard.

Table 8. CHILD ACTIVITY SPACE. Percent of all programs that did not meet standards on specific items. Weighted Data.				
Assessment Items	% did not meet standard			X²
	All	ECE	OST	
6.2 Activity Space Size				
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
b. (OST only) Approximately 45 square feet per child or youth for small group and enrichment activities such as woodworking, arts and crafts, and science experiments. (COA ASP-PS 6.02)	N/A	N/A	67.0%	N/A
c. (OST only) Approximately 35 square feet per child or youth for quiet activities such as homework, reading, or holding club meetings. (COA ASP-PS 6.02)	N/A	N/A	68.0%	N/A
6.4 Children's Bathrooms				
Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations (licensure, building codes, etc)				
e. The licensee must maintain a ratio of at least one toilet and sink in one or more well-ventilated bathrooms for every 20 children. (606 CMR 7.07 (16 d1))	10.09%	5.42%	17.48%	23.69 ***
f. Toilet facilities must afford adequate privacy appropriate to the ages of children enrolled in the program. (606 CMR 7.07 (16 d3))	15.34%	22.87%	3.41%	43.03 ***
g. Bathrooms must be in close proximity to children's activity space. (606 CMR 7.07 (16 d4a)) ¹⁷	6.85%	5.06%	9.68%	4.95 *
h. Bathrooms must be readily accessible to all children, including children with disabilities. (606 CMR 7.07 (16 d4a))	56.65%	61.2%	49.44%	8.32 **
Best Practices				
a. [for toddlers and preschoolers] A minimum of two toilets and two child-height hand washing sinks within each classroom area that uses the toileting facility, with never less than one toilet, one lavatory and one drinking fountain for every 12 children who will use them (where allowed by licensing). Note: two classrooms may share one toilet area. (GSA 7.6.4)	N/A	38.38%	N/A	N/A
6.7 Classroom Sink(s)				
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
c. The hand-washing sinks are accessible to staff and children (step stools if needed). (NAEYC 9C.05)	9.33%	5.35%	15.63%	18.42 ***
Best Practices				
a. ...Provide an adult height art sink in all toddler and preschool classrooms at 865 mm [34 inches]. (GSA 7.6.3)	N/A	72.01%	N/A	N/A
a. For pre-school and school-age children the [children's art] sink height should be 650 mm [25.6 inches]. (GSA 7.6.3)	67.70%	68.94%	65.75%	NS
a. Provide sheet impervious floor coverings with sealed seams and using a floor drain in this [art] area, if feasible. (GSA 7.6.3)	62.16%	64.67%	58.17%	NS
b. Provide one paper towel dispenser per sink area. (DOD 7-2.1.2.4)	10.41%	9.41%	12.01%	NS

¹⁷ "close proximity" was defined as less than 50 feet from activity space for the assessment. The Professional Standards Standard for 6.4 Children's Bathrooms sets a stricter standard, "6.4.2.a. Toilets, drinking water, and hand-washing facilities are within 40 feet of the indoor areas that children use. (NAEYC 9C.05)." Four additional programs did not meet the 40-foot standard.

Table 8. CHILD ACTIVITY SPACE. Percent of all programs that did not meet standards on specific items. Weighted Data.				
Assessment Items	% did not meet standard			X²
	All	ECE	OST	
6.10 Diapering (ECE only)				
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
b. Each changing area is separated by a partial wall or is located at least three feet from other areas that children use and is used exclusively for one designated group of children. (NAEYC 5.A.08h).	N/A	10.86%	N/A	N/A
6.13 Furniture and Built-Ins				
Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations (licensure, building codes, etc)				
b. All play equipment, and structures must be free of entrapment hazards. (606 CMR 7.07 (13d)) [defined as no openings between 3.5" – 9" in width for the assessment]	N/A	36.09%	N/A	N/A
6.15 Multi-Purpose or Gross Motor Room				
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
a. When outdoor opportunities for large-motor activities are not possible because of conditions, the program provides similar activities inside. (NAEYC 5.A.06b)	45.34%	54.29%	31.16%	31.87 ***

Note: Base for percents includes N/A items and Not Seen items.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Furniture and Built-Ins. State regulations (Regulatory Standards) require that all play equipment and structures be free of entrapment hazards. We found that more than one-third of ECE programs had equipment with entrapment hazards.

Multi-Purpose or Gross Motor Room. The Professional Standards for a gross motor room requires that, when outdoor opportunities for large-motor activities are not possible because of conditions, the program provides similar activities inside. Over half (54%) of ECE programs, and about one-third (31%) of OST programs did not have a separate indoor room for gross motor activity.

FACILITIES STANDARD 7. ADULT ACTIVITY SPACE: *The facility includes space for reception and administrative offices, staff needs for meeting, planning and relaxation, and space for parents. It is equipped with furnishings, appropriate technology and other resources to support a professional staff.*

Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations (licensure, building codes, etc). The Regulatory Standards for a staff room requires a separate space designated for administrative duties and educator-parent conferences. We found that more than one third (34%) of OST programs and 15% of ECE programs did not provide such space.

Professional Standards: Professional association standards. The Professional Standards for a staff room recommends that the program provide a secure place for staff to store their personal belongings; one-third of programs did not do so. The Professional Standards also recommends an area for planning or preparing materials that is separate from the children's areas; 30% of OST programs and 18% of ECE programs did not have separate space for planning and preparation. Finally, 18% of OST programs and 10% of ECE programs did not provide an adult-size bathroom for staff in program space.

Table 9. ADULT ACTIVITY SPACE. Percent of all programs that did not meet standards on specific items. Weighted Data.				
Assessment Items	% did not meet standard			X²
	All	ECE	OST	
7.3 Staff Room				
Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations (licensure, building codes, etc)				
a. There must be designated space, separate from children's play or rest areas, for administrative duties and educator and parent conferences. (606 CMR 7.07 (16c2))	22.24%	14.53%	34.43%	33.81***
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
a. The work environment for staff ...is comfortable and clean and is in good repair. (NAEYC 9C.02)	10.70%	11.07%	10.12%	NS
b. The work environment includes: a place for adults to take a break from children [b1]. (NAEYC 9C.02)	24.10%	16.82%	35.64%	28.60***
b. a secure place for staff to store their personal belongings [b2].	32.58%	32.38%	32.88%	NS
b. an administrative area for planning or preparing materials that is separate from children's areas [b3].	22.36%	17.52%	30.02%	13.28***
b. an adult sized bathroom [b4].	13.32%	10.13%	18.38%	8.70**
Best Practices				
a. Buffer visually and acoustically from children's activity rooms and public area and provide a vision panel in the door. (DOD 7-5.2)	28.47%	28.67%	28.14%	NS
c. Provide space for comfortable seating (e.g., sofa and lounge chairs) for about 25 percent of staff. (DOD 4-5.4)	25.14%	27.60%	21.24%	NS
d. Provide bulletin boards. (DOD 4-5.5)	22.21%	21.16%	23.87%	NS
f. Provide a sink and space for a coffee machine, refrigerator and microwave. Use solid surface counter tops. (DOD 4-5.7)	51.08%	51.84%	49.88%	NS
g. Provide space for staff work, development of program materials, and utilization for staff training library and resources. (DOD 4-6)	24.61%	21.82%	29.03%	4.14*
h. Provide work counter with storage above and below counter. Coordinate location of electrical receptacles with counter heights. (DOD 4-6.3)	46.44%	49.43%	41.70%	NS
l (or L). Provide shelving and closet space for staff training resources. (DOD 4-6.4)	25.21%	23.20%	28.40%	NS
j. Provide additional equipment including: Personal Computer(s) With Internet Access [1/4 staff, unless computers in classrooms], Printers and scanners [1/20 staff], Telephone, Wall clock. (DOD 4-6.9)	50.39%	50.96%	49.50%	NS
o. Provide storage for training materials and AV cart. (DOD Youth Table 4-3.2)	39.28%	43.99%	31.81%	9.19**
p. Adult toilet outside toddler and preschool classrooms. (Head Start 7.7.2). q. Adult toilet in or near infant classrooms. (Head Start 7.7.2)	N/A	20.79%	N/A	N/A

Note: Base for percents includes N/A items and Not Seen items.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Best Practices. About one-quarter of programs did not provide space for staff work, development of program materials, and utilization for staff training library and resources, or provide shelving and closet space for staff training resources, bulletin boards or enough comfortable seating for about 25% of staff. Best Practices standards for the staff room also recommend that the staff room provide additional resources, including a sink and space for a coffee machine, refrigerator and microwave, a work counter with storage above and below counter, additional equipment including personal computer(s) with internet access (unless

computers in classrooms), printers and a telephone. About half of the programs did not offer a staff room with these resources. Finally, Best Practices standards recommend adult toilets located outside of toddler and preschool classrooms, and in or near infant classrooms; 21% of ECE programs did not meet this standard.

FACILITIES STANDARD 10. OUTDOOR SPACE & ACTIVITIES: The facility provides sufficient outdoor space and equipment suitable for the ages of the children in the program. The space and equipment offer access to nature and natural materials, opportunities for healthy physical activities and learning.

Age-Appropriate Design and Activities. Professional Standards professional association standards require that there be a clear separation for the play areas for children of different ages; 20% of programs did not meet this standard.

Active Outdoor Play. There were 60 ECE programs (82%) and 35 OST programs (61%) with on-site outdoor play space.¹⁸ Other programs may have used public playgrounds; these outdoor play spaces were not assessed as part of this survey.

Professional Standards for OST programs require that programs provide a large field area, for structured sports activities such as kickball; 46% of all OST programs did not have a large field area. Professional Standards also require that OST programs have an outdoor play area with a hard surface for basketball, rollerblading, bike riding and other activities; 34% of OST programs did have a hard surface play area.

Sand and Water Play. Professional Standards professional association standards require that sand play areas shall be distinct from landing areas for slides or other equipment; 14% of OST programs and 7% of ECE programs did not have separate sand play areas. Professional Standards also require that sandboxes be covered with a lid or other covering when they are not in use; 12% of ECE programs and 5% of OST programs did not meet this standard.

Fencing and Barriers. Professional Standards professional association standards require that fencing be constructed to discourage climbing; 61% of ECE programs and 42% of OST programs did not meet this standard. Best Practices standards recommend that gates be self-closing and latching, and that children's fingers be protected from pinching or crushing on gate hinge spaces; 49% of ECE programs and 35% of OST programs did not meet this standard.

Natural Elements and Landscaping. Professional Standards professional association standards require that outdoor play areas accommodate exploration of natural environment, including a variety of natural and manufactured surfaces, and areas with natural materials such as nonpoisonous plants, shrubs, and trees. About one-fifth (22%) of all programs did not meet this standard.

Size, Layout, Circulation. State regulations (Regulatory Standards) require that, "The licensee must maintain, or have access to, an outdoor play area of at least 75 square feet per child who is outside at any one time;" 19% of OST programs and 9% of ECE programs did not meet this requirement.

Outdoor Surfacing. State regulations (Regulatory Standards) require that, "The use zones

¹⁸ Included in these numbers are four ECE programs and three OST that just used a lawn or a partitioned section of the parking lot and did not have play equipment.

under and around swings, slides and climbing structures must be covered with an adequate depth (9 inches) of an impact absorbing material, in accordance with EEC policy; 13% of ECE programs did not meet this requirement.¹⁹

Table 10. OUTDOOR SPACE AND ACTIVITIES. Percent of all programs that did not meet standards on specific items. Weighted Data.				
Assessment Items	% did not meet standard			
	All	ECE	OST	X²
10.2 Age-Appropriate Design and Activities				
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
c. There should be a clear separation for the play areas for children ages 0-2, 2-5, and 5-12. (NPPS and CPSC 2.2.2)	19.80%	18.50%	21.87%	NS
10.4 Active Outdoor Play				
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
c. OST only: There is a large field area, for structured sports activities such as kickball. (COA ASP-PS 7.01)	N/A	N/A	45.74%	N/A
d. OST only: There is a hard surface for basketball, rollerblading, bike riding and other activities. (COA ASP-PS 7.01)	N/A	N/A	33.89%	N/A
10.6 Sand and Water Play				
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
a. Sand play areas shall be distinct from landing areas for slides or other equipment. (NHSPS, 5.180)	9.82%	7.43%	13.61%	6.37*
c. Sandboxes shall be covered with a lid or other covering when they are not in use. (NHSPS, 5.180)	9.01%	11.86%	4.5%	9.74**
10.8 Fencing and Barriers				
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
b. The fencing shall be constructed to discourage climbing. (NHSPS, 5.178)	53.55%	61.13%	41.55%	22.76***
Best Practices				
d. Gates must be self-closing and latching. Children's fingers must be protected from pinching or crushing on gate hinge spaces. (GSA 6.7.1)	43.42%	48.63%	35.16%	10.90**
10.10 Natural Elements and Landscaping				
Professional Standards: Professional association standards				
a. Outdoor play areas... accommodate exploration of natural environment, including a variety of natural and manufactured surfaces, and areas with natural materials such as nonpoisonous plants, shrubs, and trees. (NAEYC 9B.01c)	21.77%	20.36%	23.99%	NS
10.11 Size, Layout, Circulation				
Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations				
a. The licensee must maintain, or have access to, an outdoor play area of at least 75 square feet per child who is outside at any one time. (606 CMR, 7.07 (7))	13.14%	9.47%	18.93%	11.58***
10.13 Outdoor Surfacing				
Regulatory Standards: Complies with State regulations				
c. The use zones under and around swings, slides and climbing structures must be covered with an adequate depth (9 inches) of an impact absorbing material, in accordance with EEC policy. (606 CMR 7.07 (16e))	8.04%	13.12%	0.0%	34.37***

Note: Base for percents includes N/A items and Not Seen items.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

¹⁹ This item was not applicable for 82% of OST programs, and for 37% of ECE programs.

Property Type

As noted above, programs were located in a variety of property types, including community buildings, former schools, housing developments or residential property, commercial property, religious buildings, and buildings designed for child care. We examined whether certain building types were more likely to meet, or not meet, assessment items at Levels 1, 2 or 3. We found that there were no significant differences across property types at Levels 1 and 2. However, programs in buildings that were designed for child care were more likely to meet the Best Practices items than were programs in religious buildings, housing developments or residential property ($F = 2.74, p < .05$).

Table 11. Proportion of Items Met, by Property Type: Means (weighted data)

	Community Bldg	Former School Bldg	Housing Develop- -ment	Residential	Com- mercial	Religious Bldg	All Types
Regulatory Standards	91%	89%	87%	91%	88%	91%	90%
Professional Standards	83%	83%	85%	82%	80%	86%	83%
Best Practices	64%	63%	60%	66%	60%	69%	63%

ACCESSIBILITY

The Children's Investment Fund seeks to ensure that children with differing abilities have access to high quality early care and education facilities as well as after school and out of school time facilities. We support the intent of the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board "... to provide persons with disabilities full, free and safe use of all buildings and facilities so that all such persons may have the educational, living and recreational opportunities necessary to be as self-sufficient as possible and to assume full responsibilities as citizens." (521 CMR 2.2).

While neither federal nor Massachusetts regulations require that all early care and education and out-of-school time facilities be fully accessible, these regulations do require compliance with certain standards depending on the extent of the facility work and whether it is new construction/additions, or alterations to existing buildings. The relevant requirements are found in UFAS 4 and 521 CMR. The Americans with Disabilities Act requires that businesses make reasonable accommodations to individuals with a disability, unless the entity can demonstrate that the accommodation would impose an undue hardship on the operation of the business, (Title 42, Chapter 126, Section 12112). The Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care also requires that "The licensee must accept applications and make reasonable accommodations to welcome or continue to serve any child with a disability" (606 CMR 7.04 (13)). Early education and out-school-time providers should consult with an architect to determine which, if any, accessibility requirements apply to their particular project.

The Accessibility Appendix of the *Program Facility Standards For Early Care and Education & Out-of-School-Time Programs* contains accessibility standards, taken from the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS), which were developed under the Architectural Barriers Act, and used by the Department of Defense and other federal agencies, and are required for all facilities

designed, built, or renovated with federal funds.²⁰ The UFAS standards are also generally consistent with the standards published by the non-governmental American National Standards Institute (ANSI).

As part of the statewide facilities survey, On-Site Insight also surveyed accessibility of each facility, using their *Section 504/Mass AAB Facility Review Book*, which is based on the UFAS. A summary of the results of the Accessibility Survey of the 130 programs can be found in Appendix B. We examined specific accessibility items of interest for this report; the numbers refer to the numbers used in Appendix B.

Parking and Doors

One-quarter of programs did not have enough accessible parking, and almost one-quarter did not have an accessible interior route through the building. Three-quarters of programs did not have a sign indicating the location of an accessible entrance to the building. Almost half of programs had interior doors with the wrong types of handles, and about half of the buildings did not have adequate signage on interior doors.

Table 12. Accessibility: Parking and Doors. Percent of all programs that did not meet standards on specific items. Weighted Data.				
	% did not meet standard			X ²
	All	ECE	OST	
Parking				
13. one accessible space for every 25 spaces up to 500.	26%	27%	24%	NS
Entrance Doors				
51. Any entrance/exit of a facility not accessible by persons in wheelchairs shall have a sign clearly indicating the location of the accessible entrance/exit.	73%	67%	81%	13.68***
Interior Circulation				
54. At least one accessible route complying with 4.3 shall connect accessible building and facility entrances with all accessible spaces and elements within the building or facility. (UFAS 4.1.2(1))	23%	24%	20%	NS
Interior Doors				
68. Lever operated, push-type and u-shaped handles are acceptable designs. (UFAS 4.13.9). Hardware must be located 36-48 in above the floor. (521 CMR 26.11.2)	46%	43%	50%	NS
73. Must have signs clearly indicating the location of accessible entrance/exit. (521 CMR 25.6)	48%	41%	58%	15.92***

Elevators

Two-thirds of the programs in the sample were in buildings that were not required to have elevators. Fewer than 10% of programs were in buildings with elevators that did not meet the standards for the location of hall lanterns and the presence of an audible signal.

²⁰ The Massachusetts standards from the Architectural Access Board (AAB) are closely aligned with the federal standards; the Program Facilities Standards include those Massachusetts standards that differ from or supplement the UFAS standards.

Elevators	% did not meet standard			X ²
	All	ECE	OST	
191. Hall lantern fixtures shall be mounted so that their centerline is at least 72 inches (1830mm) above the lobby floor. Visual elements shall be at least 2 ½ inches (64mm) in the smallest dimension. (UFAS 4.10.4 (1 and 2))	9%	8%	11%	NS
192. audible signal shall be provided at each hoistway entrance to indicate which car is answering a call. (UFAS 4.10.4)	8%	5%	11%	7.18**

Adult Toilets

Ten percent of ECE programs and 18% of OST programs did not have adult-sized programs in the program space (see Table 9). Almost half of programs had adult toilets that did not have grab bars at the appropriate height (45%), or inadequate knee clearance at the sink (40%) – see Table 14. About one-quarter of programs had adult toilets that did not have entrance doors that were fully accessible. About one-quarter of ECE programs did not have adult toilets on an accessible route and did not have enough space inside the toilet for wheelchairs to make a 180 degree turn.

Public Toilet Rooms- Adults	% did not meet standard			X ²
	All	ECE	OST	
133. Accessible toilet rooms shall be on an accessible route. (UFAS 4.17.1 and 4.22.1)	19%	27%	7%	37.50***
134. [Entrance] Doorways shall have a minimum clear opening of 32 inches (UFAS 4.13.5) & f. Handles, pulls, latches and other operating devices on accessible doors shall have a shape that is easy to operate with one hand ... (521 CMR 26.11.1 and UFAS 4.13 9))	24%	25%	21%	NS
136. The space required for a wheelchair to make a 180 degree turn is a clear space of 60 inches (15235mm) diameter. (UFAS 4.2.3)	17%	22%	7%	24.14***
136. Standard accessible stalls shall be 60 inches (60" = 1524mm) wide and 72 inches (72" = 1829mm) deep.(521 CMR 30.6.1)	12%	9%	16%	6.71**
141. Grab bars located at Bars located on the back and side wall.	45%	44%	46%	NS
154. Knee Must provide a knee clearance of at least 29 in from the floor to the bottom of the apron.	40%	37%	43%	NS
156. Lever-operated faucets are an acceptable design. (UFAS 4.19.5)	16%	13%	20%	4.90*

Children's Bathrooms

More than three-quarters of programs had at least one accessible toilet and sink in each children's bathroom; however, one-in-five programs did not (see Table 15). Three-quarters of programs did not have grab bars of the appropriate length. About one-third of programs did not have accessible doorways with unobstructed turning space, or accessible stalls and sinks.

Table 15. Accessibility: Children's Toilets. Percent of all programs that did not meet standards on specific items. Weighted Data.				
Public Toilet Rooms- Children	% did not meet standard			X²
	All	ECE	OST	
76. Where children's toilet rooms are provided, at least one water closet and one sink in each location shall be accessible to children in wheelchairs, or a separate <i>accessible</i> unisex toilet room shall be provided at each location. (521 CMR 30.1.b)	21%	23%	16%	3.96*
78. All doorways and openings that are required to be accessible shall have a clear opening of not less than 32 inches (32" = 813mm). (521 CMR 26.5) Handles, pulls, latches and other operating devices on accessible doors shall have a shape that is easy to operate with one hand ... (521 CMR 26.11.1 and UFAS 4.13 9))	31%	31%	30%	NS
80. An unobstructed turning space complying with 521 CMR 6.3 shall be provided within an accessible toilet room. (521 CMR 30.5)	35%	47%	16%	62.29***
84. The water closet shall have two grab bars, 42 inches (42" = 1067mm) long. (521 CMR 201.15)	74%	78%	68%	8.43**
94. Sinks shall be mounted with the rim no higher than 30 inches (30" = 762mm) above the finish floor. (521 CMR 30.16.2)	66%	56%	81%	39.08***
95. A clearance of at least 25 inches (25" = 635mm) above the finish floor to the bottom of the apron shall be provided. (521 CMR 30.16.2)	43%	50%	32%	18.89***

Estimated Costs

After the responses were gathered for each program/facility, we estimated the costs for programs to make modifications to meet the guidelines set forth by the study. Meeting some of the standards may be infeasible in existing buildings due to structural issues, site logistics, and permission/use/occupancy of the site. Costs were calculated for modifications based on the assumption that they were feasible and that new spaces would be able to be defined within the existing program space (except for the construction of elevators and new gross motor space). In most instances, this would result in decreased enrollment in order to meet minimum square footage requirements. The costs calculated here are average costs and may not be appropriate for any one particular site. Some standards were not met but costs for modification were not calculated because those modifications should be handled by site staff. The study calculated current costs for the programs/facilities, as they were at the time of the visit, to meet the standards evaluated in this study. Costs were not calculated for a reserve or maintenance fund for items that will need eventual replacement – furniture, heating systems, roofs, etc.

Bringing Programs Up to Regulatory Standards

Seven of the programs visited for the study had no costs identified for modifications to meet licensing and building code regulations in the Program Facility Standards Regulatory Standards inspection protocol. However, the cost to bring several programs into full compliance with Regulatory Standards was over \$60,000, with an average cost across the sample of nearly \$18,000.²¹ Factors that drove these costs were repairs to exterior walls, repairs or replacements of roof coverings, installation of appropriate indoor or outdoor equipment, creation of

²¹ An item of concern that was noted, but not priced, was five programs that lacked the required minimum square footage per child. One program appeared to be licensed to have the children in two rooms but appeared to be using one room for the director's office/storage space. Another appeared to have several classrooms designed for use as childcare facilities but the children were instead in small office spaces.

administrative and staff space, and addition of bathroom facilities. At many facilities, children's chairs, including those constructed of wood, metal/plastic, and molded plastic had head entrapment hazards and thus, replacement costs for those chairs were included. Another common safety hazard identified was the absence of (non-choke) electrical outlet covers in early childhood classrooms.

If modifications are limited to specific high priority items²², the cost to bring programs into full compliance on priority items on Regulatory Standards was a maximum of \$61,097, with an average cost of \$12,819 per program. Chart 1 provides the costs for two actual programs with typical costs. Note that these programs, like the other programs in the sample, met the standards on many items (identified as “—”).

Chart 1. Estimated Costs of High Priority Modifications for Actual Programs with Typical Costs: Regulatory Standards

Location	ECE program	OST program
	1 st Floor	Basement
Windows: Screens (5.18.1.a)	—	—
Windows: Breakage Protection (5.18.1.b)	—	—
Windows: Good Condition (5.18.1.c)	—	—
Electrical: Outlet Covers (5.4.1.a)	630.08	—
Floors: Good Condition (5.8.1.a)	—	—
Furniture: Free of entrapments (6.13.1.b)	1,343.65	1,343.65
Toilets for children: Proximity (6.4.1.g)	—	—
Toilets for children: Privacy according to age (6.4.1.f)	2,964.05	—
Toilets for children: Number of toilets (6.4.1.e)	8,601.22	—
Staff Room: Separate space (7.3.1.a)	—	3,976.91
Roof: Good Condition (5.11.1.a)	—	—
Exterior Walls: Good Condition (5.6.1.a)	—	—
Surfacing: Fall zone (10.13.1.c)	—	3,781.94
Total estimated cost of modifications	\$13,539.00	\$9,102.50

Bringing Programs Up to Professional Standards

Costs for full compliance with Professional Standards at some facilities exceeded \$200,000, with an average cost of almost \$90,000. Commonly needed modifications for Professional Standards compliance included upgrading heating and cooling systems, constructing indoor gross motor space as described earlier, paying for a certified playground safety inspection, and modifying playground fencing to discourage climbing.²³

If modifications are limited to specific high priority items²⁴, the cost to bring programs into full

²² Regulatory Standards priority items are: Windows: Screens (5.18.1.a); Windows: Breakage Protection (5.18.1.b); Windows: Good Condition (5.18.1.c); Electrical: Outlet Covers (5.4.1.a); Floors: Good Condition (5.8.1.a); Furniture: Free of entrapments (6.13.1.b); Toilets for children: Proximity (6.4.1.g); Toilets for children: Privacy according to age (6.4.1.f); Toilets for children: Number of toilets (6.4.1.e); Staff Room: Separate space (7.3.1.a); Roof: Good Condition (5.11.1.a); Exterior Walls: Good Condition (5.6.1.a); Surfacing: Fall zone (10.13.1.c)

²³ There were three programs that did not have any costs identified for Professional Standards modifications. However, it should be noted that none of these three facilities fully complied with the Regulatory Standards guidelines included as part of the inspection protocol.

²⁴ Professional Standards priority items are: Security: Door Signal (5.13.2.a); Classroom sinks: Accessible sinks (6.7.2.c); Diapering: Running water (6.10.2.b); Staff Room: Separate space (7.3.2.b); Staff Room: Storage (7.3.2.b); Staff Room: Comfortable seating (7.3.2.a); Staff Room: Space and surface for work (7.3.2.b); Staff Room: Adult toilet

compliance on priority items on Professional Standards was a maximum of \$16,284, with an average cost of \$4,864 per program. Chart 2 provides the costs for two actual programs with typical costs. Note that these programs, like the other programs in the sample, met the standards on many items (identified as “—”).

Chart 2. Estimated Costs of High Priority Modifications for Actual Programs with Typical Costs: Professional Standards

Location	ECE program		OST program
	1 st , 2 nd and 3 rd Floors		Basement
Security: Door Signal (5.13.2.a)	—	—	367.71
Classroom sinks: Accessible sinks (6.7.2.c)	—	—	63.75
Diapering: Running water (6.10.2.b)	—	—	—
Staff Room: Separate space (7.3.2.b)	—	—	—
Staff Room: Storage (7.3.2.b)	—	—	—
Staff Room: Comfortable seating (7.3.2.a)	—	—	—
Staff Room: Space and surface for work (7.3.2.b)	—	—	—
Staff Room: Adult toilet (7.3.2.b)	—	—	3,976.91
Natural Elements and landscaping: Exploration (10.10.2.a)	—	—	—
Age appropriate design: Separate areas (10.2.2.c)	84.44	—	—
Fencing: Discourages climbing (10.8.2.b)	3,510.00	—	—
Sand and water play: Separate area (10.6.2.a)	634.97	694.22	—
Sand and water play: Covered (10.6.2.c)	—	—	—
Total estimated cost of modifications	\$4,229.41	\$5,102.59	—

Bringing Programs Up to Best Practices Standards

Costs for full compliance with Best Practices Standards reached over \$360,000 at some facilities, with an average cost of almost \$154,000. It should be noted that many of the Best Practices standards would require modifications that involve extensive, and often, intrusive construction. Existing conditions may prohibit full compliance with these standards at many facilities/programs. Among those Best Practices modifications that may be infeasible at some programs/facilities is the repositioning of windows to have varying windowsill heights based on children's ages, installing a restroom with a minimum of two toilets and two sinks within each classroom, creating direct exits to the exterior from each classroom, and adding additional storage space.

If modifications are limited to specific high priority items²⁵, the cost to bring programs into full compliance on priority items on Best Practices was a maximum of \$59,176, with an average cost of \$27,078 per program. Chart 3 provides the costs for two actual programs with typical

(7.3.2.b); Natural Elements and landscaping: Exploration (10.10.2.a); Age appropriate design: Separate areas (10.2.2.c); Fencing: Discourages climbing (10.8.2.b); Sand and water play: Separate area (10.6.2.a); Sand and water play: Covered (10.6.2.c)

²⁵ Best Practices priority items are: Ventilation: CO2 Level (5.9C.3.c); Storage: SF of Storage (5.15.3.a); Windows: View from 70% of floor (5.18.3.a); Windows: Windows to halls (5.18.3.b); Classroom sinks: Adult Art Sink (6.7.3.a); Classroom sinks: Child Art Sink (6.7.3.a); Classroom sinks: Impervious flooring (6.7.3.a); Ventilation: Air return over diaper/toilet areas (5.9C.3.c); Staff Room: Separate space (7.3.3.a); Staff Room: Storage (7.3.3.b); Staff Room: Bulletin boards (7.3.3.d); Staff Room: Appliances (7.3.3.f); Staff Room: Work Counter (7.3.3.h); Staff Room: Equipment (7.3.3.j); Staff Room: Resource storage (7.3.3.i); Fencing: Gate latch (10.8.3.d)

costs. Note that these programs, like other programs in the sample, met the standards on many items (identified as “—”).

Chart 3. Estimated Costs of High Priority Modifications for Actual Programs with Typical Costs: Best Practices

Location	ECE program	OST program
	1 st Floor	2 nd Floor
Ventilation: CO2 Level (5.9C.3.c)	—	—
Storage: SF of Storage (5.15.3.a)	—	4,137.43
Windows: View from 70% of floor (5.18.3.a)	—	—
Windows: Windows to halls (5.18.3.b)	—	3,022.24
Classroom sinks: Adult Art Sink (6.7.3.a)	5,307.61	—
Classroom sinks: Child Art Sink (6.7.3.a)	9,877.40	9,241.05
Classroom sinks: Impervious flooring (6.7.3.a)	3,662.06	—
Ventilation: Air return over diaper/toilet areas (5.9C.3.c)	1,277.16	—
Staff Room: Separate space (7.3.3.a)	—	—
Staff Room: Storage (7.3.3.b)	3,141.17	2,938.80
Staff Room: Bulletin boards (7.3.3.d)	—	—
Staff Room: Appliances (7.3.3.f)	—	2,607.35
Staff Room: Work Counter (7.3.3.h)	—	1,919.70
Staff Room: Equipment (7.3.3.j)	1,061.50	1,061.50
Staff Room: Resource storage (7.3.3.i)	—	122.00
Fencing: Gate latch (10.8.3.d)	240.31	—
Total estimated cost of modifications	\$24,567.21	\$25,050.07

Accessibility Costs

Of the visited programs, only one was found to be fully compliant with the assessed accessibility standards, and it was constructed within the past year. Estimated costs for full compliance exceeded \$225,000 at some facilities/programs, with an average cost of over \$68,000. A large factor in these costs would be installation of elevators and/or chair lifts at many of the facilities. Many programs have elements that are located on several different stories or levels within the facility – therefore requiring an accessible route between floors. Another common deficiency was accessible restrooms sized appropriately for the age groups served.