

# Early Care and Education in Industrialized Countries

## Sheila Kamerman's Research - Summary

### Continental European Model

- Publicly funded preschool program for 3-6 year olds
  - Preschool provided under ministries of education
  - Universal (all children regardless of income/parental employment), free, and voluntary
  - Covering normal school day and year
  - Supplementary services (at government subsidized and income-related fees) fill the gap between school and parents' work day, as well as school holidays.
- Separate program for 0-3 year olds
  - Typically under separate administrative agency (health or social welfare)
  - Services provided in centers or family day care homes
  - Covering full work day with income-related fees
  - Begins when paid maternity and/or parental leave ends; parental leaves an important component.
- Largely publicly funded and delivered.
- *Examples:* France, Italy, Belgium

### Nordic Model

- Integrates care and education
- Universal programs serving all children under compulsory school age, covering the usual work day (10-12 hours) and year, usually in centers; family day care a component especially for the very young
- Infant care is largely by a parent home on a paid/job-protected leave from employment.
- Programs begin at the end of the paid parental leave (1-3 yrs depending on country)
- High emphasis on quality; high standards for group size, child-staff ratio, caregiver qualifications; educational philosophy stressing psychological and social development
- Largely publicly funded and delivered
- Heavily subsidized, parents pay income-related fees
- *Examples:* Denmark, Sweden

### Anglo-American Model

- Two parallel systems, historically separate and fragmented:
  - Social welfare system provides day care and preschool for children with low-income and/or special needs
  - Part day educational programs for middle/upper class, charging market fees
- Private non-profit and for-profit services a significant component
- High variation in quality
- Family day care common
- *Examples:* Britain, United States

### Sources:

- Sheila B. Kamerman, "Early Childhood Education and Care in Industrialized Countries", Prepared for Conference on Building a Comprehensive Early Child Development System, Quebec, Canada, May 25, 2004.
- Sheila B. Kamerman, "Early Childhood Education and Care: International Perspectives", Testimony Prepared for the United States Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, March 27, 2001
- Sheila B. Kamerman, "Early childhood education and care: an overview of developments in OECD countries" *International Journal of Educational Research*, 33 (2000), p. 7-29



The Clearinghouse on International Developments in Child, Youth and Family Policies at  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

**Table 1.22: Early Childhood Education and Care Policy Dimensions and Programs in Selected Countries**

Country	Locus of Policy Making - National or Local	Admin. Auspice - Ed., Health, Welfare	Age Group Served	Eligibility Criteria - Universal, Poor, With special needs, Working parents	Funding strategies (Government, Employer, Parent fees, Combination)	Delivery strategies (Supply, Demand)	Locus of Care	Quality	Access/Coverage (%) <sup>(a)</sup>
Austria	State/local	Welfare	3 - 6	Working parents	State and local govt and parent fees.	Supply	Preschool	No national standards. Vary by state: Staff:child ratios 3:20.	80%
			0 - 3				Centers	1:7-14 FDC Home, max 7 staff	3%
Belgium	State	Education Welfare (Center and FDC)	2 1/2 - 6 under 3	Universal With working parents, With special needs, Poor	Govt.-free to parents. Multiple incl. govt, employer, parent fees, income-related.	Supply Mixed	Preschool	2.5:7 (incl. .5 nurse) in centers; 3-4 ch. max in FDC Homes.	97% 30%
Canada	State	Education Welfare	5 - 6 under 5	Universal With special needs, Poor, Working parents	Govt.-free. Mixed, largely parent fees	Mixed	Preschool Centers and FDC Homes	Set by province	50% 45%
Denmark	National and local (primarily)	Education Welfare	5 - 7 6 mos. - 6 years	Universal Working parents	Govt. Govt (local) Parent fees income-related - max. 20-30% of costs.	Supply	Preschool Centers and FDC Homes (esp. for under 3s)	Set locally, generally, 1:5, 3:6 1:2.7, under 3	80% 73% <sup>(b)</sup>
Finland	National and local	Education Welfare	6 1 - 7	Universal Universal - Priority for working parents	Nat'l and local govt Parent fees income related @ 10% of costs.	Mixed	Centers and FDC Homes (also for under 3s)	1:7, 3-7 year olds 1:4, under 3s FDC/Homes, max 4 preschoolers	3-6: 1-3: 48%

<sup>(a)</sup> The age of entry and access/coverage need to be seen in the context of the duration of the maternity/parental leave.

<sup>(b)</sup> All children under 7 with working parents, now guaranteed a place in subsidized care if they wish.

## The Clearinghouse on International Developments in Child, Youth and Family Policies at COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Country	Locus of Policy	Admin. Auspice	Age Group Served	Eligibility Criteria	Funding strategies	Delivery strategies	Locus of Care	Quality	Access/ Coverage (%) <sup>(a)</sup>
France	National (primarily) and local	Education	2 - 6	Universal	Govt-free to parents.	Supply	Preschool	National health, safety, and staffing standards.	3-6: 99%
		Health/welfare	3 mos. - 3 years	Working parents, With special needs	Mixed local govt, family allowance funds, and parent fees income related, max 25% of costs.	Mixed	Preschool, centers and FDC Homes	1:10 2 year olds 1:27 others staff = teachers 1:8 toddlers; 1:5 infants 1:3 FDC	2-3: 35% 0-3: 29%
Germany	State	Education	3 - 6	Universal	State and local govt plus parent fees (income related, max 16-20% of costs)	Supply	Preschool	1:10-14	85% <sup>(e)</sup>
		Welfare	under 3	With special needs, Poor, Working parents			Center and FDC (largely)	1:5-7.5	5% (West German States) 50% (East German States)
Israel <sup>1</sup>	State/Voluntary	Welfare	0-3	Universal-priority for working parents	Combination	Demand + Supply +	Centers	No national standard	Age 2: 49.7% 3: 69.7% 4 5
	State/Local	Education	4-6	Universal	Parents and Government Subsidy	Supply	Preschool	National Supervision	95%
Italy	National	Education	3 - 6	Universal	Nat'l govt, free.	Supply	Preschool	3:25	
	Local	Health/welfare	under 3	Working parents	Local govt and parent fees, income related, average 12% of costs, max 20%.		Center	no national standards 1:3 under 3s is customary in most regions.	6%
New Zealand	National	Education	Under 5	Universal	National govt and parent fees.	Supply			

<sup>(a)</sup> The age of entry and access/coverage need to be seen in the context of the duration of the maternity/parental leave.

<sup>(e)</sup> Coverage in kindergarten for all children 3-6 is the goal.

<sup>1</sup> Source: Center for Research and Public Education at the National Council for the Child, Israel (2000).

## The Clearinghouse on International Developments in Child, Youth and Family Policies at COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Country	Locus of Policy Making - National or Local	Admin. Auspice - Ed, Health, Welfare	Age Group Served	Eligibility Criteria - Universal, Poor, With special needs, Working parents	Funding strategies (Government, Employer, Parent fees, Combination)	Delivery strategies (Supply, Demand)	Locus of Care	Quality	Access/Coverage (%) <sup>(a)</sup>
Spain	State/Local	Education	0-6	Universal (3-6)	Govt. free	Supply	Preschool	National standards 1:2.5 3-6 year olds	3-6: 84%
			Under 3		Govt and parent fees, Income related, max 20% of costs.	Modest tax Benefit for low Income parents For under 3's.	Center	1:1.8 2-3 year olds 1:1.10 toddlers 1:7 infants 1/3 staff "trained"	0-3: 5%
Sweden	National and local (primarily)	Education	0-6	Universal, Working parents, With special needs	National and local govt. Parent fees, income related; about 13% of costs.	Supply	Center	No national standards; local government sets standards.	3-6: 79%
							Centers and FDC Homes	2: 3 1/2 children 3-6	1-3: 48% <sup>(a)</sup>
								1:3-5 children under 3	
								FDC: 1:4-8	
U.K.	National/local	Education	3-4	With special needs, poor	Govt. free	Supply and demand.	Preschool	2:26	3-4: 60%
		Welfare	0-4		Free or income related fees		Centers and FDC Homes	National standards 1:4 for 2-3s 1:3 for under 2s 32 states require :4	
U.S.	National/local	Education	5	Universal	State and local govt.	Largely demand, also supply.		Half the states have 1:5 or lower ratios for toddlers	95% of 5 year olds @50% of 3-4 Year olds in either preschool or center care 0-3: 26%
		Education and welfare	0-4	With special needs, Poor, Welfare, Working parents	Federal/state/local govt. Parent fees cover @ 76% of costs.				

Source: Adapted from: Sheila B. Kammenman (2000). *Early childhood education and care: an overview of developments in the OECD countries*. International Journal of Educational Research, 33, pp 7-29. New York: Elsevier Science Ltd.

<sup>(a)</sup> The age of entry and access/coverage need to be seen in the context of the duration of the maternity/parental leave.



**Table PF7.1: Calculating full-time equivalent of paid maternity, paternity and parental leave, 2005/2006.**

	Maternity Leave	% rate of allowance*	FTE paid maternity leave	Paternity leave	% rate of allowance*	FTE paid paternity leave	Parental leave	% rate of allowance*	FTE paid parental leave	Parental leave (unpaid)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Australia	x(6)	..	..	x(6)	..	..	..	..	..	52
Austria	16	100	16	0.4	100	0.4	104	21	21.84	..
Belgium	15	82/75 <sup>1</sup>	11.53	2	100	2	12	20	2.4	..
Canada	17	55	9.35	..	..	..	35	55	19.25	..
Czech Republic	28	69	19.32	..	..	..	156	10	15.6	..
Denmark	18	100	18	2	100	2	32	90	28.8	..
Finland	18	65	11.7	3	100	3	26	60	15.6	..
France	16	100	16	2	100	2	156	25.8	40.2	..
Germany	14	100	14	..	..	..	104	11	11.4	52
Greece	17	100	17	0.4	100	0.4	..	..	..	28
Hungary	24	70	16.8	1	100	1	..	70	56	52
Iceland	13	80	10.4	13	80	10.4	13	80	10.4	..
Ireland	13 (8)	80 <sup>2</sup>	14.4	0.4	100	0.4	..	..	..	28
Italy	21	80	16.8	..	..	..	12	30	3.6	24
Japan	14	60	8.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Korea	12	100	12	..	..	..	36	17	6.12	..
Luxembourg	16	100	16	0.4	100	0.4	26	62	16.12	..
Mexico	12	100	12	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Netherlands	16	100	16	0.4	100	0.4	..	..	..	24
New Zealand	12	50	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Norway	9	80	7.2	6	80 <sup>3</sup>	3.2	42	100	42	..
Poland	16	100	16	2	100	2	156	14.6	22.7	..
Portugal	17	100	17	1	100	1	..	..	..	24
Slovak Republic	28	55	15.4	..	..	..	156	24	37.44	..
Spain	16	100	16	0.4	100	0.4	..	..	..	156
Sweden	15	80	12	11	100/80 <sup>4</sup>	9.2	51	80	40.8	..
Switzerland	16	100	16	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	12	66	7.92	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
United Kingdom	26 (26)	90 <sup>5</sup>	12	2	25	0.5	..	..	..	26
United States	12	0	0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

1. Paid at 82% for first 4 weeks and 75% for the remaining 11.

2. Paid at 80% for first 18 weeks + 8 weeks unpaid.

3. 2 weeks unpaid + 4 weeks paid at 80%.

4. Calculated at 100% for the first 2 weeks and then at 80%.

5. Calculated at 90% for initial 6 weeks and then flat rate (aprox 33% of average wage) for 20 weeks, 26 weeks is unpaid.

### *Comparability and data issues*

Another way of assessing generosity of leave systems in international comparisons is to consider the amount of leave-related family payments and relate these to the number of children being born. In this manner, a more comprehensive picture is obtained of the different roles of lump-sum payments on birth and the number of parents (and children) that are actually entitled to paid parental leave benefits across countries.

## PF7: Key characteristics of parental leave systems

### *Definitions and methodology*

**Maternity Leave (or pregnancy leave):** Employment-protected leave of absence for employed women at around the time of childbirth, or adoption in some countries. The ILO convention on maternity leave stipulates the period of leave to be at least 14 weeks. In most countries beneficiaries may combine pre- with post-birth leave; in some countries a short period of pre-birth leave is compulsory as is a 6 to 10 week leave period following birth. Almost all OECD countries provide for specific public income support payments that are tied to the maternity leave period.

**Paternity Leave:** Employment-protected leave of absence for employed fathers at the time of childbirth. Paternity leave is not stipulated by international convention. Periods of paternity leave are much shorter than for maternity leave, and are 3 weeks at maximum. Because of the short period of absence, workers on paternity leave often continue to receive full wage payments.

**Parental Leave:** Employment-protected leave of absence for employed parents, which is often supplementary to specific maternity and paternity leave periods (as above), and usually, but not in all countries, follow the period of maternity leave. Entitlement to the parental leave period is individual, while entitlement to public income support is often family-based, so that only one parent claims such support at any one time.

In most countries it is up to parents to decide amongst each other as to who takes leave and claims income support. In practice this means that mothers rather than fathers use leave entitlements. To pursue gender equity objectives some countries (Norway, Iceland and Sweden) have introduced father quota in parental leave systems: a period of leave that is reserved for the exclusive use by fathers on a "use it or lose it" basis. This period can be as long as 3 months in Iceland.

Chart PF7.1, Panels A, B and C show the duration (in weeks) of employment protected leave maternity, paternity and parental leave periods, respectively, (regardless of payment status). To get a better view of cross-national comparisons of systems with different payment rates and durations of paid leave periods, the entitlement to paid leave is also presented as the full-time equivalent of the proportion of the duration of paid leave if it were paid at 100% of last earnings. This full-time equivalent (FTE) has been calculated as

$$\text{FTE} = \text{Duration of leave in weeks} * \text{payment (as per cent of APW earnings) received by the claimant}$$

Table PF7.1 shows these calculations for each country. Tables PF7.2, PF7.3, PF7.4, and PF7.5 below present key characteristics of national maternity, maternity allowance, paternity and parental leave benefits.

Please note that the information shown in tables below refer to entitlements, benefits and payment rates applicable as of January 1<sup>st</sup> 2006.

Other relevant indicators: Family-friendly workplace practices (LMF14); Public spending on family benefits (PF1); Typology of family benefits (PF3); Take-up of leave benefits (PF8); Additional leave entitlements of working parents (PF9); Public spending on childcare and early education (PF10) and; Enrolment in day-care and pre-schools (PF11).