The Quality Issues in For-Profit, Nonprofit, and Municipal Child Care

Michael Krashinsky
Professor of Economics
University of Toronto

Summary:

- 1. Quality Matters
- 2. Municipal Centres provide best quality Nonprofits tend to beat For-profits in quality
- 3. Theory and Practice reinforce each other
- 4. Careful monitoring of quality is critical if you use for-profits
- 5. Large chains operations pose special problems

Theory:

- 1. We all "contract out" most of the things we need to for-profit corporations (so profit itself is not a dirty word).
- 2. Contracting out works well when we can judge quality at low cost (easily specify quality in contracts and monitor the performance of suppliers).
- 3. Child care quality is hard (expensive) to monitor.
- 4. Corporate care is harder to monitor in some ways than small independent for-profits.
- 5. When monitoring is hard, we often do it ourselves (municipal care) or rely on nonprofits.

Some Data:

1. 1986 Consultants Study (47 consultants, 927 Centres): For-Profit

| Quality | Municipal | Nonprofit Nonprofit | <u>Indep</u> | <u>Chain</u> |
|----------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Very Poor | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| Poor | 2 | 9 | 19 | 15 |
| Adequate | 18 | 40 | 43 | 56 |
| Good | 46 | 33 | 22 | 29 |
| Excellent | 34 | 17 | 10 | 0 |
| "Average" | 4.12 | 3.53 | 3.11 | 3.14 |

Note: reported as column percentages

2. 1998 "You Bet I Care!" (YBIC) Study (234 Centres, 325 classrooms, on site observations, 6 provinces {incl Ont} and 1 territory, ITERS & ECERS-R scores)

| Quality | Nonprofit | Commercial |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Inadequate (low) | 3 (1%) | 2 (2%) |
| 2. Inadequate (high) | 10 (4%) | 9 (10%) |
| 3. Mediocre (low) | 50 (22%) | 25 (27%) |
| 4. Mediocre (high) | 70 (30%) | 33 (35%) |
| 5. Good (low) | 73 (31%) | 20 (22%) |
| 6. Good (high) | 26 (11%) | 4 (4%) |
| Total | 232 | 93 |