

EMPLOYER EMPLOYEE SURVEY PROJECT

SITUATION ANALYSIS

FINAL REPORT

FEBRUARY 2012

Prepared for the Child Care Human Resources Sector Council

by Kathleen Flanagan and Jane Beach

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SITUATION ANALYSIS	1
3. ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN FOR THE SITUATION ANALYSIS.....	2
4. THE CHANGING ECEC ENVIRONMENT	4
5. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION	13
6. DEFINING THE EMPLOYER	15
7. DEFINING THE EMPLOYEE	18
8. CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION TO INFORM THE METHODOLOGY	19
9. Survey Design	22
10. NEXT STEPS	24
BIBLIOGRAPHY	28

APPENDIX 1 LIST OF FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS AND KEY INFORMANTS

APPENDIX 2 PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL REGULATORY AND POLICY CHANGES SINCE YBIC

APPENDIX 3 TRAINING/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORTS AVAILABLE AS OF 2010

THE EMPLOYER EMPLOYEE SURVEY PROJECT SITUATION ANALYSIS

1. INTRODUCTION

The Child Care Human Resources Sector Council is undertaking a survey of employers and employees in the regulated early childhood education and care (ECEC) sector in Canada. The rationale for the project is based on recommendations from the panel of experts convened as part of the CCHRSC *Labour Market Information Research Agenda* project (2009). At that time, the panel worked collaboratively to identify and prioritize initiatives designed to begin to address data gaps in ECEC. The development of employer-employee surveys similar to those in the 1998 *You Bet I Care!* study was identified as a top priority.

The purpose of the *Employer Employee Survey* project is to build on previous Canadian data by conducting a survey with similar questions – where appropriate and feasible – to the *You Bet I Care!* study. The current project is intended to produce evidence that will provide employers working in the ECEC sector with essential data to address HR challenges such as recruitment and retention, training and professional development, opportunities for career advancement and job satisfaction.

The project aims to receive survey responses from 1,000 employers and 4,000 of their employees. Specific objectives include:

- Collect and compile quality, HR-related data on the ECEC workforce, in order to identify: current characteristics of employers and employees with respect to their educational qualifications, duration of employment, job satisfaction and terms/conditions of employment.
- Confirm the extent to which HR practices and workplace characteristics are tied to retention rates within the ECEC workforce.
- Identify HR strategies and recommendations and identify trends based on the quantitative findings, broken down by province/territory and respondent category.
- Use the data collected to develop an Action Plan, identifying future CCHRSC initiatives.

Given that the most recent available information concerning human resources in the ECEC sector was provided by the 1998 survey conducted for *You Bet I Care!* (YBIC), the first task in preparing for the 2012 Employer Employee Survey is to prepare a Situational Analysis in order to understand the current context of human resources in the ECEC sector in Canada, as well as to build on lessons learned from Canadian and international literature.

2. SITUATION ANALYSIS

Guided by the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Employer Employee Survey Project (EESP), and in consultation with the Project Steering Committee, it was agreed that the purpose of the Situation Analysis is to:

- Provide an overview of the current environment and key HR-related changes to ECEC regulation, policy and contextual factors that have taken place since the *You Bet I Care!* (YBIC) study; this information will be to be used to confirm the overall survey approach

- Define “employers” and “employees” in full day regulated ECEC programs for children from birth to six years of age
- Identify characteristics of respondent categories (e.g., auspice, size, language, etc.)
- Inform the development of the survey questionnaires
- Confirm the overall survey approach.

In addition to the above, the Situation Analysis:

- Describes the methodology used in the YBIC and *Caring for a Living* (CFL) studies and the characteristics of directors and staff examined
- Incorporates the findings from the activities undertaken throughout the document
- Provides recommendations and rationale to inform the survey methodology and design.

Sections 4 through 7 of this report each include a sub section “What we heard.” These sections include relevant information and comments from the focus groups and key informants. It is important to note that they reflect the views of opinions of the participants, and were used to look at trends, identified priorities and contextual issues that might inform the survey and/or the data analysis. They do not necessarily reflect the views of all in the sector, nor was it within the scope of the work to verify the accuracy of each statement.

3. ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN FOR THE SITUATION ANALYSIS

As described in the RFP and as agreed by the members of the Project Steering Committee, activities undertaken to inform the Situational Analysis included focus groups, key informant interviews, and a literature/document review.

3.1 Focus Groups: A total of three focus groups were conducted to inform participants about the project objectives, explore changes in the ECEC environment since 1998, and seek opinions and perspectives regarding characteristics of employers and employees to be studied. See Appendix 1: *List of Focus Group Participants and Key Informants*.

- **Provincial Territorial Directors of Early Childhood Education and Care:** November 9, 2011 in Toronto, ON. Kathleen Flanagan facilitated the focus group; Jane Beach was recorder (via teleconference). Participants included representatives from all provinces and territories except Quebec. See Appendix 1 for list of participants.
- **CUPE National Child Care Working Group:** December 5, 2011 (virtual focus group via teleconference and Adobe Connect). Jane Beach facilitated the focus group; Kathleen Flanagan was recorder. The Working Group members were in a face to face session, with additional participants joining via teleconference (e.g., project researchers, some CUPE working group members and CCHRSC staff). Members of the Working Group represented individuals involved either in ECEC or school based programs in approximately 6 jurisdictions from across Canada. See Appendix 1 for list of participants.

- **Francophone Organizations:** January 24, 2012 (Virtual focus group via teleconference and Adobe Connect). Linda Lowther facilitated and was recorder. Participants included Executive Directors from Francophone ECEC organizations in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. See Appendix 1 for list of participants and organizations.

3.2 Key Informant Interviews: Nine key informant interviews were conducted, seven of which were with child care leaders from key child care organizations across the country, selected in consultation with the project steering committee. These interviews focused on:

- Identifying recent trends that have had an impact on HR
- Current HR issues in child care
- Views on defining the employer for purposes of the survey
- Priority areas for survey questions
- Centre and staff characteristics for purposes of survey analysis

Two key informant interviews were conducted with experts in other fields; one from the Non-Profit Human Resources Sector Council and the second with a labour market expert familiar with human resource issues in the early childhood education and care sector. See Appendix 1: *List of Focus Group Participants and Key Informants*.

3.3 Literature and Document Review The literature search was conducted in English and French languages, and included:

- Canadian and international literature published in scholarly journals and electronic databases (e.g., ERIC) between the period 2000 – 2011¹
- Relevant Provincial Territorial (PT) Government reports concerning human resource studies and initiatives, including evaluation of current initiatives
- Research reports undertaken by Sector Councils
- Relevant literature published by provincial, territorial, or national organizations

The English and French literature searches used the SUMMON Index. Key word searches included:

1. child care **AND** (employee benefits and compensation **OR** employment **OR** turnover **OR** wages & salaries **OR** workers **OR** working conditions **OR** employee turnover **OR** providers **OR** training & development **OR** wages **OR** work **OR** accreditation **OR** human resource management **OR** human resource planning **OR** teachers)

¹ In some cases, literature published prior to 2000 was included if it was deemed to be particularly relevant to this project.

2. early childhood education **AND** (employee benefits and compensation **OR** employment **OR** turnover **OR** wages & salaries **OR** workers **OR** working conditions **OR** employee turnover **OR** providers **OR** training & development **OR** wages **OR** work **OR** accreditation **OR** human resource management **OR** human resource planning **OR** teachers)
3. day care **AND** (employee benefits and compensation **OR** employment **OR** turnover **OR** wages & salaries **OR** workers **OR** working conditions **OR** employee turnover **OR** providers **OR** training & development **OR** wages **OR** work **OR** accreditation **OR** human resource management **OR** human resource planning **OR** teachers)

As agreed, results of the literature review that are relevant to the situation analysis are referenced throughout this document. These and additional findings will be used to inform the analysis of the survey data, and will be cited in the final report. French literature findings have been translated in order to be referenced in this report.

3.4 Provincial/Territorial Government Child Care Website Review: Each provincial/territorial (PT) website was scanned to identify:

- Current operating funding programs that may be used to support wages in the child care sector
- Grants, bursaries or other mechanisms to support training and education of child care staff
- Any initiatives or strategies to support recruitment or retention of child care staff
- Any published HR-related evaluation or research studies (since 2000)
- Any recent policy changes that likely have an impact on HR in child care

4. THE CHANGING ECEC ENVIRONMENT

The research activities conducted for the Situation Analysis explored changes in the ECEC environment since the You Bet I Care! study that would have a bearing on human resource factors. New developments relevant to the 2012 study include:

4.1 Involvement of the Education Sector in ECEC

Both focus group participants and key informants emphasized that perhaps the most significant trend in the ECEC sector in recent years has been the growing involvement of the Education sector in ECEC programs and activities. Examples of such involvement ranged from administrative responsibility for all ECEC services, introduction and management of school based ECEC programs, development and implementation of early learning curriculum frameworks (see 4.2), and active recruitment and employment of ECEs in education programs.

What We Heard

- A significant number of jurisdictions have transferred responsibility for ECEC programs to ministries of Education (PT Directors of ECEC; Key Informants) and more are considering the policy implications of such a decision.
- Programs operated by school boards and/or provincial ministries of Education have recruited and employed qualified ECEs, creating shortages of such staff in licensed ECEC programs (PT Directors of ECEC; CUPE National Working Group; Key Informants)
- Employment in programs operated by school boards/education ministries brings higher wages, and generally is seen as more attractive by ECEs (PT Directors of ECEC, Key Informants)
- The province of British Columbia has introduced Strong Start programs in schools for preschool children, who must be accompanied by a parent/adult. (PT Directors of ECEC; CUPE National Working Group; Key Informant). These programs employ early childhood educators, and although they are half-day programs, the wages are significantly higher than those paid in licensed/regulated ECEC programs.
- In three provinces, the recent introduction of full day kindergarten has resulted in instability within the ECEC sector. (BC, ON, PE)
- The transition to full-day kindergarten in Ontario and Prince Edward Island has resulted in the most qualified and experienced ECEs leaving child care, leaving a significant void. Directors have also been leaving, resulting in a leadership gap. (PT Directors of ECEC)
 - The introduction of full day early learning and kindergarten in Ontario has resulted in a large number of ECEs seeking and obtaining employment in school based programs. Given that the full roll out of this initiative will not be accomplished for several years, the full impact of this initiative on the ECEC sector is not yet known. (PT Directors of ECEC; CUPE National Child Care Working Group; Key Informants)
 - In Prince Edward Island, ECEs were given first option on the newly established kindergarten teachers' positions in the school system as a result of the September 2010 introduction of full day kindergarten in the school system. ECEs were required to complete a Bachelor of Education degree; the University of Prince Edward Island agreed to an articulation agreement that recognized ECE diplomas as equivalent to two years of academic credit toward the degree. (CUPE National Child Care Working Group; Key Informants)
- It is estimated that by 2015, there will be 6000 new ECEs working in the school system in Ontario. (CUPE National Child Care Working Group)
- The increase in the number of ECEC centres locating in schools and paying no occupancy costs has had a positive impact on viability of small centres. (PT Directors of ECEC)
- In New Brunswick, the concept of "duality" in Education (i.e., separate French and English divisions within the same ministry) has created new and unique challenges for the ECEC sector, which has historically operated as a bilingual system. (Francophone Focus Group)

Considerations

There has been a notable increase in the level of interest and involvement of the Education sector in ECEC. In April 2008, the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) released a joint declaration *Learn Canada 2020* encompassing four pillars of lifelong learning, including “early childhood learning and development” as one of the key pillars (Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, 2008, p.1). In February 2011, Ministers of Education in Canada participated in a national meeting coordinated and facilitated by the CMEC secretariat on the topic of early learning. At that time, ministers discussed governance models, curriculum and quality issues, teacher training, and access to ECEC programs. As a result of that meeting, an interprovincial/territorial group of officials in education ministries has established a working group to explore issues specific to the delivery of early childhood education in school settings, and matters specific to the education sector’s involvement in early childhood education and care.

In recent years, there has been a trend to integrate ECEC programs and services within education ministries. In 1986, New Zealand was the first country to assign full responsibility for ECEC to its education ministry. Kaga, Bennett, and Moss (2010) report that internationally, ECEC services have now been integrated in education ministries in Botswana (1994), Brazil (1996), England (1998), Iceland (1986) Jamaica (1998), New Zealand (1986), Norway (2005), Romania (2009), the Russian Federation (1998), Scotland (1998), Slovenia (1996), Spain (1990), Sweden (1996), Viet Nam (1986) and Zambia (2004).² In Canada, six jurisdictions have transferred responsibility for ECEC to Education. These include NWT (1996), Nunavut (1999), Saskatchewan (2006), PEI (2008), Ontario (2010) and New Brunswick (2010). In addition, the ministries of education in two provinces (British Columbia and Newfoundland/Labrador) have mandates for early learning for children from birth onwards.

The literature suggests that integration of ECEC within the Education sector has the potential to bring benefits to the ECEC sector for children, families, and educators. Bennett and Kaga (2010) noted that “...education stresses the importance of lifelong learning and a recognition that children are learners from birth.” (p.36), and that there are significant advantages in locating responsibility for ECEC within education, including a greater focus on access, affordability, teacher qualifications, and curriculum. In *Starting Strong II*, the OECD concluded that fundamental differences in goals and strategies to achieve those goals can characterise the “child care” and “early education” sectors in countries that are operating split or two-tiered early childhood systems. The result can be a lack of coherence for children and families, with a confusing variation in objectives, funding streams, operational procedures, regulatory frameworks, staff-training and qualifications (OECD, 2006, p.6). Barnett (2010) notes that variations among the many types of programs (e.g., public pre-kindergarten, Headstart, child care) with respect to teacher qualifications, wages and benefits, and access to early learning curriculum frameworks contribute to inconsistent and uneven developmental outcomes for children.

On a practical level, however, there may be professional challenges raised as early childhood educators attempt to reconcile guidelines for professional practice for early childhood educators with school based

² The early childhood education and care systems in Denmark and Finland are integrated systems (within one ministry) within the social services/welfare system.

policies for teachers that are often in stark contrast in their stated intentions and delivery. (Herry & Maltais, 2002; Gananathan, 2011) In a study of the implementation of a full-day francophone preschool program into Ontario public schools, researchers identified that the integration of school and early childhood services had advantages for children in the program, including benefiting from a francophone environment and having access to more learning opportunities, and advantages for parents in that this full-day program meant more affordable child care. At the same time, the study also identified some disadvantages, in that there were organizational differences between school teaching staff and incoming early childhood educators; different educational requirements for their respective jobs; and that a lack of communication between these two groups contributed to some issues of distrust between the two groups (Herry & Maltais, 2002).

In the United States, the *Leadership to Integrate the Learning Continuum* (LINC) project (2009) identified specific challenges in developing a seamless continuum between the early childhood and school sectors, including:

- Misperceptions of the nature and value of the work performed within organizations and schools providing care and education
- Complex systems of care and education with communication systems that are rudimentary (or non-existent) among the organizations and sectors, thereby creating silos, service duplication, and/or services not rendered to children and families in need
- Inconsistent cross sector collaboration, leading to misalignment of various essential elements of a learning continuum: standards, curricula, assessments, instruction, and preparation and professional development of leaders and teachers in early childhood and K-12 systems
- Incompatible policies, practices, and funding streams that do not promote or sustain collaboration and seamless and integrated learning environments and experiences for children
- Insufficient family and community involvement to become essential partners in their children's development and education. (p.7)

4.2 Governance Models

Focus group participants and key informants noted that there has been a shift in emphasis on the nature of governance models for ECEC. While the debate about auspice dominated the discourse during the 1980s and 1990s, in recent years there has been an increasing emphasis on the value of public management for ECEC services.

What We Heard

- The ECEC sector faces similar challenges as the non-profit sector in its heavy reliance on public funding, subject to political will, public policy, and fluctuating financial pressures on different levels of government. (Key Informant)
- The ECEC sector is unique in that even though most government agencies state that the sector is private, and that parents are responsible for decisions regarding their child's participation, and the choice of a program, the sector is highly regulated by government, and is highly influenced by market disruptions introduced by governments. For example, governments influence the demand for the

service (capital grants, parental subsidy, etc.) as well as the supply (licensing requirements, wage enhancements, operating grants). (Key Informant)

- There is considerable concern across Canada regarding the emergence of publicly traded corporations involved in purchasing ECEC centres in a number of provinces, including British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario as well as the expansion of corporate chains in a number of provinces. (CUPE National Child Care Working Group; Key Informants)
- A number of PTs are experiencing a growth in the number of centres operated by large non-profit organizations and are uncertain about the impact on quality and on HR-related matters (Key Informants)

Considerations

There are examples of public operation/management of ECEC programs in several jurisdictions. In Ontario, municipally operated centres (e.g., City of Toronto) provide approximately 5% of regulated full day child care spaces in the province. In Quebec, school age child care is publicly operated (by the education sector) and that province's \$7/day parental fee in non-profit centres indicates a high level of public management. In Alberta and Saskatchewan, there are a few examples of publicly operated programs; in British Columbia, the network of *Strong Start* programs is part of a public system. In Prince Edward Island, the new Preschool Excellence Initiative provides for a system of community based, publicly managed Early Years Centres – with regulated parent fees and a provincially mandated wage grid for ECEs based on their qualifications and level of responsibility.

While the OECD has consistently emphasized the benefits of a publicly managed system (OECD, 2001; OECD, 2006; OECD, 2012), there are now calls for a publicly managed ECEC system for Canada. (CUPE, 2009; Mustard, McCain & McCuaig, 2011). Projected benefits of a public system include a systematic and consistent approach to planning, accountability, and evaluation; better wages, benefits, access to training and professional development opportunities; and great emphasis on high quality programs for children. (CUPE, 2007; CUPE, 2009)

4.3 Introduction of Early Learning Curriculum Frameworks

Focus group participants and key informants highlighted the introduction of early learning curriculum frameworks as a significant development in the ECEC sector since 1998. While some jurisdictions had included broad program guidelines as part of their regulatory frameworks, the introduction of early learning curriculum frameworks is a recent phenomenon.

Specifically, we learned:

- Ministries of Education are very supportive of the concept of an early learning curriculum framework for ECEC programs. (PT Directors of ECEC)
- The introduction of curriculum frameworks has had an impact on the workload of ECEC directors and ECEs, both in terms of in-service training on the new curriculum frameworks, and in the additional time needed for documentation. (CUPE National Working Group; Key Informants)

Considerations

The introduction of a new curriculum model – especially where no model existed before – is a challenge for any educator. Madden (2010) suggests that all teachers need encouragement, support, guidance, knowledge, and encouragement in order to effectively implement new curriculum. With new expectations placed on educators, the availability of professional development and/or in-service training on the new curriculum not only takes time, but also may determine the success of the new initiative (Burgess, Robertson, & Patterson, 2010). The availability of a curriculum framework to guide pedagogy is considered an indicator of quality in an early childhood education and care system (Bennett, 2005; Flanagan, 2010; Langford, 2010; OECD, 2001; OECD, 2004; OECD, 2006). The OECD's Canada Country Note (2003) recommended that "A broad pedagogical guideline should be further detailed and developed at provincial/territorial level, and finally, be translated by staff and parents into detailed professional learning and care programs at the level of each centre. At this level, curriculum is able to incorporate local concerns, languages and traditions, in line with the broad vision set out in the national or provincial framework." (p. 79). In the following years, seven provinces have introduced early learning curriculum frameworks, including Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, and Manitoba. Interestingly, four of these provinces have also designated ministries of education as having full responsibility for ECEC programs (Ontario, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island) As well, British Columbia's Ministry of Education has been mandated to address early learning of children from birth onwards. During 2011/2012, several additional provinces have commenced the development of such early learning frameworks. (Key Informant)

4.4 Compensation and Wage Enhancement

There has been a long standing acknowledgement that wages in the early childhood sector low given the type of post secondary education required and the level of responsibility for the work. The topic of compensation was raised by all focus groups and key informants. At the same time, it was noted that several jurisdictions provide some type of wage enhancement, whether directly through wages, or through some other type of supplement.

What We Heard

- In some regions, average wages paid in other occupations discourage individuals from entering or staying in the ECEC profession. For example, average wages in the North are – relative to the rest of Canada – high. A secretary with no post secondary credentials may earn \$50,000 annual salary, which is significantly higher than the wage for an ECE, and without the responsibility of working in a highly regulated profession, or for the care and education of young children. (Key Informant)
- Although wage grants are in place in many jurisdictions, this practice provides a disincentive for employers to raise wages, as they depend on the government grant to supplement the income of ECEs. (PT Directors of ECEC; CUPE National Child Care Working Group; Key Informants)
- In some jurisdictions, employers recruit for ECE positions by advertising wages that already include the government subsidy for wage grants or supplements. (National CUPE Child Care Working Group; Key Informants).

- Low compensation is an issue across the non-profit sector, with lowest wages in small organizations. All employers in the non-profit sector depend on government funding for budgets, and therefore for wage levels for employees. At this time, there is great uncertainty within the sector regarding continued levels of funding. (Key Informant)
- In some regions of Quebec, there are employer associations being created to collaborate on negotiations, to harmonize collective agreements, and to work together on benefits.

Considerations

The issues of low compensation and lack of benefits in the ECEC system have been widely documented and have often been the subject of ECEC organizational advocacy in Canada and internationally. Torquati, Raikes, & Huddleston-Casas (2007) report that low wages in the ECEC sector are detrimental to both early childhood professionals and to the children for whom they care. A number of studies show that low wages are associated with higher staff turnover, which is known to be harmful to the development of children (Torquati, Raikes, & Huddleston-Casas, 2007; Whitebook, 2002). Conversely, higher wages are associated with increased staff retention, and higher levels of quality in the program itself (Drouin et al., 2004; Ghazvini & Mullis, 2002; Goelman, Doherty, Lero, LaGrange, & Tougas, 2000; Helburn, 1995; Tougas, 2002; Whitebook & Sakai, 2003).

YBIC studied quality measures in centre-based programs in six provinces and one territory, collecting similar information from the first study with a different sample of centres, and including on-site observations, to identify factors most important for predicting and maintaining high-quality child care. YBIC found that direct predictors of quality (in order of strength) were wages, use of centre as practicum site, job satisfaction, and child:adult ratios (Goelman et al., 2000).

Québec's *Grandir en qualité* found linkages between quality and relationships between staff and directors, and specific relationship between quality and some types of staff benefits. For example, researchers found the quality of an infant (0-18 months) care program to be higher when, among other factors, educators are allowed time off for family obligations, noting that data does not specifically show whether this is because staff are more satisfied in their jobs, or because infants sense tension between staff and directors when this time off is not allowed (Drouin, Bigras, Fournier, Desrosiers, & Bernard, 2004, p. 147).

Since 1998, almost all jurisdictions have attempted to address these issues by providing some type of operating funding to support those employed in the ECEC sector, although in 2010 Prince Edward Island eliminated wage enhancement through operating grants in favour of a provincially mandated wage grid for ECEs in Early Years Centres. PT Directors of ECEC commented that there is a need for research and evaluation to determine the effectiveness of these types of incentives. One key informant noted that the formula for calculating wage enhancement was having a negative impact on participation in professional development activities, since staff time spent away from direct contact with children reduced the level of their wage enhancement.

In the United States, research to determine the effectiveness of a wage enhancement program indicated some positive results, with the most significant benefit experienced among lower paid staff (Bridges, Fuller, Huang, & Hamre, 2011). However, the general conclusion of an evaluation of the educational supplement in Newfoundland and Labrador was that the supplement did not offset the disincentives to entering the field and recommended that “no further changes take place in the absence of a larger policy review to address the nature of public support” (Atlantic Evaluation and Research Consultants, 2009).

4.5 Regulatory Requirements for ECE Qualifications and Training Supports

Across Canada, despite the ongoing challenges in recruitment of qualified early childhood educators, a number of jurisdictions are in the process of increasing the required qualifications of educators, along with an increase in the number/percentage of educators who are required to hold some type of certification. At the same time, provincial governments have introduced a variety of measures to support individuals to earn the required credentials.

What We Heard

- Nova Scotia, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island have all indicated additional requirements for staff qualifications or ongoing professional development. (PT Directors of ECEC; CUPE National Child Care Working Group; Key Informants)
- Ontario government is now giving grants to some people already in the ECEC system to get a diploma (CUPE National Child Care Working Group)
- Nova Scotia has introduced financial support for post secondary credentials, but educators must pay their tuition up front and then get reimbursed (CUPE National Child Care Working Group)
- Manitoba has a workplace training model; staff who are currently employed and have at least two years of work experience in an ECEC program are eligible). Staff must pay their own tuition. Staff work three days/week, and attend school 2 days/week. They continue to receive their regular weekly wages; centres are reimbursed for cost of substitutes. Courses are now also being video streamed to rural, remote, and First Nations communities. (CUPE National Child Care Working Group)
- In Prince Edward Island, the provincial ECEC organization negotiated funding through Skills Canada to fund entry-level courses for educators (at no cost to educators) employed in the province's new Early Years Centres (where entry level is a requirement). Three post secondary courses (90 hours of study) were funded at two colleges (English and French); approximately 200 educators completed these courses and now have met requirements for entry level. Negotiations continue for supports for additional courses leading to a one-year certificate. (PT Directors of ECEC; Key Informant)
- Nova Scotia has funded a provincial university to adapt their leadership program for women to include directors of ECEC programs. (Key Informant)
- In New Brunswick, there is some consideration being given to regulating the practice of prior learning assessment for early childhood educators. (Francophone Focus Group)
- There is an increased interest in professional development in some jurisdictions, with at least one provincial organization supporting on-site professional development opportunities through electronic media and resources. (Key Informant) In other jurisdictions, required participation in professional development activities has either increased in duration (number of hours) or in the nature of the activities, e.g., requirement for staff to develop professional development plans. (Key Informants)

Considerations

There is a wealth of evidence to suggest that in general, higher levels of teacher education are associated with higher overall classroom quality (Barnett, 2004; Drouin et al., 2004; Mustard, McCain & McCuaig, 2011; Pascal, 2009; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000), more positive teacher behaviours in the classroom (Canadian Council on Learning, 2006), and greater gains in cognitive and social development in children (Barnett, 2004; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). However, with respect to the specific levels of education required (degree vs. diploma) to achieve these outcomes for children, findings from the existing research are less consistent (Kelley and Camilli, 2007).

The Canadian Council on Learning reports that child care providers with college diplomas or university degrees in early childhood education are more responsive to the needs of children in their care, and suggests that their training helps them to provide the children in their care with activities that are both stimulating and appropriate to their levels of development (Canadian Council on Learning, 2006). Ontario's Expert Panel on Human Resources notes "the single most critical factor affecting the quality of early learning and care programs is the knowledge, skills, and stability of the early childhood workforce." (Government of Ontario, 2007, p.7).

Barnett (2004) suggests that "the knowledge and skill required of an effective preschool teacher have increased as science has revealed more about the capacities of young children, how they learn best, and the importance of early learning for later school success." (p. 7). The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) in describing the rationale for post-secondary standards for early childhood program accreditation notes that "Children benefit most when their teachers have high levels of formal education and specialized early childhood professional preparation. Teachers who have specific preparation, knowledge, and skills in child development and early childhood education are more likely to engage in warm, positive interactions with children, offer richer language experiences, and create more high-quality learning environments." (Standard 6: NAEYC Accreditation Criteria for Teachers Standard).

In the European Union, there are specific professional titles emerging within the ECEC sector. Oberheumer (2011) outlines the distinctions between early childhood professional, pre-primary professional, pre-primary and primary professional, and social pedagogy professional (p. 58). She notes that a new "infant toddler" profession appears to be emerging, and suggests that there needs to be consensus on how these various types of professionals may work together to build on each other's expertise.

The compelling evidence supporting the importance of post-secondary credentials specific to early childhood development places provinces and territories in a position of trying balance their focus on supporting good outcomes for children against the pressures of providing greater access to regulated ECEC programs for parents, especially those parents in the labour force who rely on ECEC programs to support their labour force attachment. Raising standards for ECEs serves to benefit children, while lowering standards (in order to lower the cost of ECEC or to increase access) serves to benefit parents in the labour force (Personal communication with senior director in PT government). Internationally, emphasis has shifted from the issues of access and availability of ECEC (in consideration of the labour force benefits of regulated child care) to a focus on the quality of the early learning experience. (Council of the European Union, 2011; Flanagan, 2010; Moss, 2006; Pascal, 2009; Council of the European Union, 2011) As noted by the Council of the European Union, "Providing high quality ECEC is just as important as ensuring its availability and affordability, and attention needs to be

devoted to issues such as environment and infrastructure, staffing, the curriculum, governance and quality assurance.” (2011, p.3).

Several provinces (NL, PE, BC) have legislated requirements for ongoing participation in professional development for early childhood educators. Québec’s *Grandir en qualité* found that participation in some professional development activity (workshops, trainings, courses, etc.) is associated with higher program quality for children aged 18 months – 5 years (Drouin et al., 2004, p. 193). The *Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux* recommends increased support for initial and ongoing training for early childhood educators in order to continue to offer high quality early childhood services in Québec (Confédération des syndicats nationaux, 2010).

As in Canada, requirements for professional development vary across the United States (Zaslow, Tout, Halle, Whittaker, & Lavelle, 2010). Researchers for the U.S. Department of Education have found that while specific types of professional development are often not mandated, participation in such activities appears to have more impact when teaching practice is the explicit focus of the training, when ECEs in the same program collaborate in their professional development activities, and when the intensity and duration of the professional development is consistent with the content being conveyed (Zaslow et al., 2010).

Kipnis, Ryan, Sakai & Whitebook (2011) suggest that the professional development needs of directors of ECEC programs are unique, and should be considered differently than the needs of educators. They suggest that directors often bring varied backgrounds to their positions, and often have either experience in teaching or in administration. They suggest that directors need guidance in their interactions with colleagues in the school system; and that a needs assessment should be completed to determine the most relevant professional development experiences for directors.

4.6 Implications for the Employer Employee Survey

The above described trends in the ECEC sector have implications for both data collection and analysis for the 2012 Employer Employee Survey. Specifically, these trends suggest the need to collect data regarding:

- Involvement with the Education sector
- Introduction/implementation of early learning curriculum frameworks
- Types of centre governance models
- Wage enhancement initiatives
- Access to training incentives
- Regulatory requirements concerning qualifications, training, and professional development.

5. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

The issues of recruitment and retention are long standing challenges in the ECEC sector, both in Canada and internationally. These issues have been identified in numerous Canadian (Beach, Bertrand, & Cleveland, 1998; Caring for a Living, 1990; You Bet I Care!, 1998); American (Gable, Rothrauff, Thornburg, & Mauzy, 2007; Holochwost, DeMott, Buell, Yannetta, & Amsden, 2009; Whitebook, Sakai, & Kipnis, 2010); and other international (Fenech, Waniganayake, & Fleet, 2009) studies.

What We Heard

- There is a general sense that the workforce is aging and that significant recruitment efforts will be likely be necessary in the near future. (PT Directors of ECEC, Key Informants)
- There is a need for research and evaluation to understand the impact of various individual PT initiatives such as the introduction of pension plans, wage enhancement grants, wage grids, training bursaries, etc. (PT Directors of ECEC)
- Recruitment and retention of qualified ECES are the most important issues/challenges for francophone ECEC programs. In addition to the issues cited above, new employees do not stay in the ECEC sector and tend to quickly change their profession. (Francophone Focus Group)
- In Quebec, it has been very difficult to recruit and retain people in the position of “conseiller pédagogique” (pedagogical advisor) (Francophone Focus Group)

Considerations

Recruitment and retention of qualified early childhood educators are perhaps the most persistent human resource challenges in Canada. Provincial/territorial plans to increase access to regulated ECEC programs for parents have compounded the issues, as recruitment of staff for new programs creates a level of turnover in existing ECEC centres. Expansion of service within existing centres or agencies also creates a level of job and/or position turnover, creating confusion and instability for children and families.

The francophone community reports unique challenges in recruitment. Several provinces or territories (NL, PE, NS, MB, SK, AB, BC) report difficulty in hiring qualified French-speaking educators, despite some having early childhood education programs offered at the provincial French-language college (Langlais, 2002; Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 2012). According to the *Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux*, one of the reasons behind the difficulty with recruitment and retention of qualified staff is the lack of full-time working hours in the field (Roy, 2010).

While employers in low paying industries expect a degree of turnover, the issue of turnover becomes more problematic in a profession such as those in the early childhood education and care sector, where turnover has a direct impact on the quality of the program, and therefore on the development outcomes of the children who participate (Whitebook and Sakai, 2003). Over the past decade, researchers have explored the issues of recruitment and retention in the ECEC sector in order to better understand the factors at play (Ritchie and Howes, 2003; Torquati, Raikes, & Huddleston-Casas, 2007; Whitebook and Sakai, 2003). (*Confédération des syndicats nationaux*, 2010).

Whitebook and Sakai (2003) described three different aspects of staff turnover:

1. **Job turnover** occurs when a teacher or director leaves a child care center, but does not necessarily leave the child care field. Job turnover may be involuntary (in the case of a lay-off or dismissal) or voluntary, as when a teacher or director leaves a program for a better-paying job or in response to a pregnancy or family move.
2. **Position turnover** occurs when a teacher moves to a different classroom within a center, or when a teacher or a director moves to a different site within an agency, resulting from a

promotion; expansion of the program resulting in new opportunities; or perhaps a desire to work with another age group of children. Position turnover is typically viewed as positive for the individual or even the agency, although it may still involve some disruption for children, families and other staff.

- 3. *Occupational turnover*** occurs when a teacher or director leaves a job at a center and also departs from the child care field. The consequences of job turnover are felt most directly in centers when directors and co-workers struggle to meet required adult–child ratios in response to a staff departure. (p.274)

Both the Caring for a Living and the YBIC studies examined reasons for staff leaving one position for another, and asked directors about the reasons for staff turnover. It will be crucial for the Employer Employee Survey to also differentiate the types of turnover, in order that the distinctions between and among the different types of turnover are able to be analyzed and inform future retention strategies.

6. DEFINING THE EMPLOYER

Defining the employer for the purpose of addressing HR issues in child care is not a straightforward task. A previous project of the CCHRSC the Supporting Employers in Canada’s ECEC Sector examined the various governance models in child care and definitions of employers. The project found that the person who could best speak to HR issues and needs varied. In some instances it was found to be the legal employer, that is the entity that employed the work force, and in other cases it was a director, manager, supervisor or board member.

For the purpose of the Supporting Employer project, the employer was defined as “the person directly involved in HR issues, such as recruitment and retention of staff, training, setting workplace standards, etc.” Two sections of the *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators* were examined as part of determining the definition of employer. They were:

Key human resource tasks:

- Recruits staff
- Manages staff
- Manages professional development
- Manages labour relations
- Manages external human resources

Key governance tasks

- Participates in organizational policy development
- Plans for the organization
- Relates to relevant governing authority

What We Heard

Key informants (KIs) provided mixed responses as to who should receive the employer survey in both non-profit and commercial centres; however, members of the Francophone focus group were unanimous in their responses.

In non-profit programs, most key informants suggested the survey should go to the supervisor/director rather than the board chair. One key informant indicated that the board is responsible for establishing HR policies, approving the budget, and hiring the director – but that the director is typically responsible for everything else. A majority of key informants agreed, indicating that the supervisor/director is the individual:

- Who implements board policy
- Who is usually responsible for hiring and managing the day to day HR functions
- Is most likely to have certain information on centre characteristics, such as staff turnover and enrolment, as well as the HR challenges and issues
- Is likely to provide more valuable information than the board chair.

Most KIs who were of this opinion suggested that the survey include some questions about the role of the board in HR issues, and that the supervisor/director consult with the appropriate board member if they need information on cash flow or some other item about which they may not have the full details necessary to answer specific questions.

One KI who suggested the employer survey be sent to the board chair indicated that the board of a non-profit organization is the license-holder and is the legal employer; PTs may not have contact information for the director.

For on-reserve Aboriginal programs it was recommended that the employer survey be sent to the appropriate Band Council

There was less consensus about who should receive the employer survey in a private/commercial centre

- A number of key informants indicated the survey should be sent to the owner if they own one or two centres, but to the on-site director if the program was part of a larger chain
- Some were of the opinion the survey should go to the owner as they are responsible for labour relations. All of the members of the Francophone focus group held this opinion.
- Others indicated the survey should go to the on-site supervisor or director, but with questions about the role of the owner and the level of autonomy of the director.
- Some indicated that in a number of programs the owner would be unlikely to send the survey to the director
- Questions were also raised as to who the license is issued to, and who would be listed on the provincial/territorial data base of regulated programs.

Considerations

- Both Caring for a Living and You Bet I Care studies collected information from child care directors; in some instances this included individuals who were also owners.

- Sector Councils have a focus on employers, and that is the language now used by the CCHRSC. Board members of the CCHRSC who are considered employer representatives include directors of non-profit programs and owners of commercial programs.
- If consistency with CFL and YBIC is a consideration, then efforts will need to be made to have individuals functioning as the on-site supervisor/director receive the employer survey.
- YBIC analyzed completed director questionnaires by three categories: head supervisor, teacher-director and administrative director.
- In a number of Provinces and Territories there are educational requirements for centre directors; there are no such requirements for owners who do not act in the capacity of director, or for administrative directors of large agencies who have responsibility for programs in addition to child care.
- Provincial Territorial contact information is likely to be for the license holder and not necessarily the director; it may be challenging to get email addresses of on-site supervisors/directors
- HR surveys sent to organizations in the non-profit sector (outside of child care) are typically sent to program directors
- The objectives of the EESP are to:
 - Collect and compile quality, HR-related data on the ECEC workforce, in order to:
 - Identify current characteristics of employers and employees with respect to their educational qualifications, duration of employment, job satisfaction and terms/conditions of employment.
 - Confirm the extent to which HR practices and workplace characteristics are tied to retention rates within the ECEC workforce
 - Identify HR strategies and recommendations, and identify trends based on the quantitative findings, broken down by province/territory and respondent category.

Recommendation

That the employer survey be completed by the individual:

- Responsible for the day to day HR recruitment and management of centre staff
- Who is designated as the centre supervisor/director for licensing purposes for the particular centre, and
- That the survey include a question about the individual's position, in order to examine differences in responsibilities and characteristics of administrative directors, owner/operators and other types of supervisor/directors.

Reasons for the recommendation include:

- Board members and owners who are not on-site directors are not considered part of the ECEC workforce.

- Directors of ECEC programs (similar to chief executive officers of corporations, or executive directors of non-profit agencies) are representatives of the employer.
- Comparability with Caring for a Living and You Bet I Care will require information from supervisors/directors.
- In order to develop HR strategies and address issues of leadership, characteristics of supervisors/directors will be needed to inform these activities.

7. DEFINING THE EMPLOYEE

In addition to defining the employer for purposes of the survey, the situation analysis is to define the employee, that is, to determine which occupations to include.

What we heard

Among key informants and focus group participants there was general consensus that it is important to include all staff that work directly with children. This includes:

- Full- and part-time permanent staff
- Temporary staff
- Staff working with children with special needs who are employees of the centre

There was less consensus among key informants as to whether or not casual staff should be included in the survey; however, a majority thought it important to include anyone directly working with children in the centre. In the Francophone focus group, participants commented that due to the extreme difficulty in recruiting substitute staff, occasional staff are often employed on a frequent basis. Participants suggested that the survey identify casual staff by specific criteria guidelines, considering such examples as 5 years experience, minimum 21 hours a week or a total number of work hours per year. The participants in this focus group argued that casual staff often have a broader perspective of human resource issues given that they work for different employers, and often are able to reflect on issues with a different perspective.

Staff working with children are typically part of the child-staff ratios, but may include individuals working with children with additional support needs who are outside the ratios.

The rationale given for including all types of staff was that it would be useful to:

- Examine to what extent centres employ other than permanent full-time staff
- Determine how many part-time staff are working reduced hours by choice
- Examine differences in wages, education, job responsibilities and job satisfaction by employment type

It was suggested that it would be useful to know how many permanent staff had started employment at the centre as a casual or temporary staff.

Considerations

The *You Bet I Care* study included only permanent staff in the survey. It will be important to include analysis by employment type in order to be comparable to YBIC findings, as well as examine differences across positions.

There was strong support among participants in the CUPE National Child Care Working Group to expand the scope of the survey to include recently unemployed ECEs, recently retired ECEs, clerical staff, cooks and cleaners. Neither YBIC nor CFL included such staff and it is beyond the scope of the study to collect and analyze such data.

Recommendation

That employers be asked to distribute the link to the employee survey to all staff working as part of the child-staff ratio, whether they are full- or part-time, permanent, temporary or casual staff, as well as inclusion staff who are employees of the centre, whether or not they are part of the child-staff ratio.

Rationale

All staff working with children are considered part of the child care workforce, the focus of this study. Hearing from all staff will help create a complete picture of the workforce, including similarities and differences in wages, working conditions, education and job satisfaction and inform any future HR strategy.

8. CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION TO INFORM THE METHODOLOGY

This project follows on three previous pan-Canadian surveys of child care wages – each with similar aims and approaches.

The Bottom Line: Wages and Working Conditions of Workers in the Formal Day Care Market (1985)

The first study was conducted in 1984, as part of the Task Force on Child Care led by Katie Cooke. The study was done by Patti Schom Moffatt of Karyo Communications, and examined wages and working conditions of individuals working in both centre-based and family child care. The study did not survey staff on a provincial territorial basis, but by region. The study contained a single questionnaire, based on the Child Care Worker Salary and Working Conditions survey from *Salary Surveys: How? Why? Who? When? Where? How to Conduct One in Your Community*. (Whitebook and Pettygrove 1980. p. 27)

Caring for a Living

In 1991, the Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association (now the Canadian Child Care Advocacy Association – CCCAC) and the Canadian Child Day Care Federation (now the Canadian Child Care Federation CCCF) contracted with Karyo Communications to conduct a follow up, national survey of child care employees. The study, *Caring for a Living* (CFL) was limited to staff in full-day licensed group centres, and not family child care or school age staff as had the initial study. The goals of the CFL study were:

- To collect baseline information in a provincial and national basis on the wages, working conditions and experiences of caregivers in licensed child care centres
- To develop a database of information that lays a foundation upon which future research can be built
- To enhance the profile of early childhood educators and an understanding of the conditions under which they work.

One of the major considerations that guided the CFL survey design was comparability to the 1984 study.

The initial mailing list of full-day centres was provided by the CCCF and updated with information from PT officials. A total of 4,428 centres were identified Canada-wide. Karyo consulted with Statistics Canada to establish sample sizes needed of both centres and staff in each jurisdiction.

The sample was developed taking into account the total number of centres, the auspice and the numbers of staff at each centre. Auspice information was not available at a centre-level in a number of PTs and estimates were made using the Government of Canada's 1990 Status of Day Care in Canada Report.

For Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, the sample size needed was greater than the population size so all were surveyed. Simple random sampling was used for most other jurisdictions. The sample was built assuming a 50% response rate for other jurisdictions; in total 969 centres were in the sample.

An initial telephone survey was conducted with centre directors in the sample; 15 declined to participate. Following the initial telephone survey, questionnaires were mailed to all directors who agreed to participate, followed a week later by questionnaires to be distributed to all staff. Follow up reminders were mailed two weeks later. All directors who had not responded were then telephoned and encouraged to respond. Directors were sent a questionnaire about centre and staff characteristics and both directors and all staff were sent the same questionnaire that gathered information about the individuals working in the centres.

502 centre surveys were received from directors and 2,383 staff surveys, which included both teaching staff and directors. This represented an overall response rate of 52% from centres (ranging from 33% in the NWT to 71% in Saskatchewan) and 34% of staff, including directors (ranging from 21% in Alberta to 42% in Saskatchewan). The response rate from non-profit centres was 60% compared with 43% for commercial centres and 41% for municipal centres

You Bet I Care!

Conducted in 1998, *You Bet I Care! A Canada-wide Study on Wages, Working Conditions, and Practices in Child Care Centres* (YBIC)³ was a replication of *Caring for a Living* (CFL), with the addition of some additional data collected on centre practices. Like CFL, YBIC included only staff in full-day licensed group centres, but only included full-time staff.

The YBIC study collected information through three surveys: one on child care centre characteristics, and two on personal information and views from child care directors and staff.

The goals of YBIC were to:

- Collect information on wages, working conditions, practices and staff perceptions of child care as a career from all 10 provinces, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon

³ In addition to the study on wages, working conditions and practices in child care centres, *You Bet I Care!* included additional studies of quality in child care centres and regulated family child care homes. For purposes of the Employer Employee survey, only the YBIC study on wages and working conditions is relevant.

- Compare the information collected to that obtained by the *Caring for a Living* study in 1991
- Explore and comment on changes, if any, that have occurred in wages, working conditions, centre practices, and staff perceptions between 1991-1998
- Explore the impact of variations in provincial and territorial regulations and funding
- Explore the impact of auspice

The list of child care centres was collected from provincial territorial officials and included the centre name, address and telephone number, auspice, age of children served, whether the program operated for at least 6-hours/day, and total licensed capacity. All but two jurisdictions provided the name of the license holder or the director.

The sample frame excluded all centres that were on-reserve, those that did not serve children 0-6 or operated for fewer than six hours/day; where it was possible to identify multi-site centres all but one was removed from the list; as well, 15 centres that participated in the pre-test and 50 centres that were to be used for the quality study were also excluded from the sample frame. There were a total of 4,699 centres in the final sample frame.

The total sample size was driven in part by budget considerations, which allowed for the mail out of approximately 1,800 packages. In jurisdictions with 100 or fewer centres, all were included in the sample; in other jurisdictions approximately one third of the centres in the sample were selected using simple random sampling, with over sampling of commercial centres, based on the response rates from CFL. In total 1,861 centres were included in the sample.

Following initial telephone contact 1,805 directors agreed to participate. Once centres that did not meet the basic eligibility criteria were eliminated, the final sample was 1,798 centres. It should be noted that there was a discrepancy in auspice information provided by PT officials and by the centre directors in 467 cases (approximately 25%).

The centre, director and staff questionnaires were sent at the same time in one package. Reminder letters were sent three weeks after the initial mailing; two weeks after the reminder letters were sent, follow up phone calls were made to non-responding centres. A second call was made four weeks later to centres from which at least one staff questionnaire had been received, but not the director or centre questionnaires.

A total of 863 centre questionnaires were received, 848 of which were usable, and 4,154 staff questionnaires. The overall response rate for centres and directors was 47.9%, ranging from 16.7% in the Yukon to 59.8% in BC. The overall response rate for staff is unknown, as it was not possible to verify the number of teaching staff who were actually given a questionnaire by their directors, and when directors were asked the total number of staff in the initial screening call it included school age staff, who were not eligible for participation.

Implications and considerations for the Employer Employee Survey Project

The child care centre lists provided by the PT officials for the YBIC study contained a high number in which there were discrepancies in reported auspice as reported by PT officials and by directors. It is anticipated that there will be even greater challenges for the 2012 survey as some jurisdictions no longer distinguish programs by auspice. Alberta, for example, categorizes programs by those that are accredited and those that are not.

Both CFL and YBIC studies involved initial telephone contact with every centre director in the sample as well as multiple follow up phone calls aimed at increasing response rates. The EESP does not have the resources to make telephone contact with individuals, but will make initial and follow contact via email. However, it is unlikely that this contact will be able to undertake the type of screening that took place with CFL or YBIC to clarify auspice and characteristics such as centre size, number of staff, full-time operation, etc.

One of the advantages of an on-line survey is that costs do not increase in proportion to the numbers included in the survey. As a result, we are proposing that in provinces and territories where full lists of all centres with relevant contact information are available that we conduct a population survey rather than create a sample. There would be some additional cost with the amount of data cleaning that would be required, but this would likely be offset by the savings in the work involved in creating a representative sample, given the experiences of CFL and YBIC, and the challenges in getting accurate auspice information. In jurisdictions where getting a list of all centres is not possible, we propose to still work with those officials to create a valid sample.

Another advantage to a population survey is the ability to screen out ineligible programs with the first few questions of the survey, rather than having to replace them in a sample. For example, Ontario is not able to provide information separately for full- and part-day programs. Should any part-day programs respond to the survey, it will be easier to screen them out through the questionnaire than attempting to identify them as part of a sampling process.

Other reasons to attempt a population survey include the following.

- A number of key informants for this situation analysis indicated that they have observed a growth in multi-site centres, both non-profit and commercial. YBIC included only one centre from multi-site operations in its sample.
 - With the growth of such programs it is not always possible to readily identify which centres operate under one organizational structure.
 - There is considerable interest in the implications of the expansion of multi-site programs – on staffing, on quality, on sustainability, on funding – and it will be useful to include multi-site centres, more readily done as part of a population survey.
- Defining what constitutes a child care centre is not necessarily comparable across all jurisdictions. For example, in British Columbia, individual licenses are given for each age group of children. A program for children 0-6 at one location is usually licensed as two separate infant/toddler centre and a 3-5 centres. A very large operation may in fact have many separate licenses, and it is not clear if this would be one large centre or several small centres. This has implications both for sampling and for providing data comparable to other jurisdictions. A population survey can more readily identify such programs and combine the data as appropriate.

9. SURVEY DESIGN

Comparisons between CFL and YBIC

The YBIC report primarily reported data only from that study, with a few comparisons with CFL. For example, of the 108 tables and figures in the YBIC report, 17 drew comparisons with the 1991 CFL data. The CCHRSC and

EESP steering committee may wish to consider if those items are priority areas for the 2012 survey. 1991-1998 comparisons were made for the following categories.

- Demographic profile
- Highest level of ECE Education of all teaching staff
- Overall level of education of directors
- Mean gross hourly wage for assistant teachers, teachers and directors
- Real annual income and change in purchasing power
- Benefits and daily working conditions of full time staff
- Benefits that assist with professional development for full time staff
- Benefits that provide a measure of long term security
- Teachers satisfaction with career choice
- Centres providing full- and part-time care to children in four age categories
- Proportion of average centre's revenue from main revenue sources, from parent fees, from fee subsidies and from government sources other than subsidy
- Changes in proportion of revenue from various sources
- Changes in the proportion of budget allocated to staff wages
- Percentage of centres with all spaces filled.

Priorities identified by key informants and focus group participants

Key informants identified a range of priority areas to be addressed through the survey. Across all key informants and focus group participants the priority areas mentioned most frequently were:

- Examining the gaps between required and existing skills
- Leadership development
- Recruitment and retention

Additional topics mentioned by key informants included:

- Addressing workplace conflict (in the employer survey)
- Recruiting substitutes
- Access to credentials/work by internationally trained ECEs/teachers

The CUPE National Child Care Working Group suggested including survey questions about:

- Intent to stay in the sector
- Duration in the centre and in the field
- Amount of regular non-contact time available for planning and administrative tasks
- Views on respect for the job
- Perceived burnout/stress and causes
- Unpaid overtime
- Whether or not they would choose ECE as a career again

Research team members of both the YBIC and CFL studies indicated that the most problematic questions in their surveys were those related to wages and benefits. As well, the HR Council for the Nonprofit Sector recently conducted an HR survey and found questions about benefits to be problematic. While wages and

benefits are important component of the survey, particularly as it impacts recruitment and retention, it will be important to keep the questions as clear and simple as possible and limit the number to those that provide essential information.

The YBIC and CFL questionnaires were both paper-based and both were extensive in length. The instructions in the YBIC director survey indicate that it takes about 45 minutes to complete. In addition to the director questionnaire, directors were asked to complete a centre questionnaire, which contained eight sections on various characteristics of their centre and staff, and about policies and finances. Web-based surveys have been found to appear longer than they are to respondents and completion rates drop off for anything longer than 20 minutes. It will be important to focus the questions on key areas of comparison with YBIC and priority areas identified by the sector.

10. NEXT STEPS

There are four main considerations in developing the survey questions for the EESP. The questionnaires are intended to:

- Build on the YBIC study (which in turn builds on the *Caring for a Living* study) and ask similar questions
- Produce evidence that will provide employers working in the ECEC sector with essential data to address HR challenges such as recruitment and retention, training and professional development, opportunities for career advancement and job satisfaction
- Incorporate new questions as needed in order to examine the impact of significant policy changes on HR issues
- Combine the former director and centre surveys into one employer survey and ensure both employer and employee surveys are of reasonable length to maximize both response and completion rates.

Following is an overview of the main categories and approximate number of questions contained in *Caring for a Living* and *You Bet I Care!* Questionnaires, and some of the implications for the questionnaire development for the Employer Employee project.

Centre Questionnaire Categories CFL⁴ and YBIC		
Caring for a Living	YBIC	Implications/Considerations for EE Survey
Children at the Centre	A: Children at your Centre: 9 Qs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Estimated time to complete YBIC questionnaire not given; questions are more complex than director questions, so estimate at least 45 minutes for completion ▪ Centre and director questions will need to be combined into one employer questionnaire with a completion time of no more than 30 minutes ▪ Recommend limiting questions to statistical information and exclude opinion questions from YBIC wherever possible ▪ Recommend reducing the number of questions about children and families ▪ The questions on wages and benefits were identified as the most problematic in both CFL and YBIC; recommend simplifying and reducing the number of related questions ▪ Recommend adding questions about multi-site operation and recent/planned expansion ▪ Recommend adding questions to address possible impact of PT policy changes ▪ It is unlikely that priority areas recommended by KIs and in focus groups will be able to be addressed satisfactorily
Centre Organization	C: Centre organization: 13 Qs– 2 multi-part	
Financial Organization	B: Financial organization: 9 Qs– 1 multi-part	
General Staff Characteristics	Note: some staff characteristics are included in Section C	
Staff turnover	F: Staff turnover: 5 Qs – all multi-part	
Wages and benefits	G: Benefits and working conditions: 3 Qs – 2 complex, multi-part	
Salaries for Full time staff	E: Salaries: 6 Qs – all multi-part	
Salaries for part time staff		
Issues and Opinions	H: Issues and opinions: 2 – 1 multi-part	
	D: Changes in policies and practices: 5 Qs – 4 multi-part	

⁴ The questionnaires used in the *Caring for a Living* study were not included in the report and so only specific questions in the *You Bet I Care!* study were examined

Staff and Director Questionnaire Categories CFL and YBIC				
Caring for a Living questionnaire categories	YBIC questionnaire categories		Number of questions and similarities in YBIC staff and director questionnaires	Implications/Considerations for EE Survey
	Staff	Director		
Educational background	F: Educational background	E: Educational background	Same 7 questions in both – 1 multi-part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Time to complete YBIC staff survey estimated at 40 minutes ▪ Time to complete YBIC director survey estimated at 45 minutes ▪ Relevant questions from director and centre surveys will need to be combined into one employer survey ▪ Time to complete 2012 employee survey: recommended maximum 20 minutes ▪ Time to complete 2012 employer survey: recommended maximum 30 minutes ▪ Need to consider additional questions related to PT policy trends and changes ▪ Will need to minimize number of questions that are included in YBIC director questionnaire in order to ensure adequate information collected about centre characteristics and staffing in the employer questionnaire
Child care experience	A: Child care experience	A: Child care experience	Staff questionnaire(SQ) has 16 questions; director (DQ) has 9	
Other paid work	C: Other paid work	B: Other paid work	Same 4 questions in both	
Professional orientation	G: Professional development	F: Professional development	Same 11 questions in both – 1 multi-part	
Wages, benefits and working conditions	B: Wages, benefits and working conditions	No section	SQ: 11 questions; 1 multi-part DQ: no section	
Feelings about the child care field	D: Feelings about the child care field	C: Feelings about the child care field	Both have 11 questions; 8 are the same	
Satisfaction with the centre	E: Feelings about your centre	D: Feelings about my centre	SQ: 10 questions- 3 multi-part; DQ: 6 questions – 3 multi-part 2 questions are the same	
Personal background	H: Personal background	G: Personal background	Same 9 questions in both	
Recommendations for the child care field	J: Recommendations for the child care field	H: Recommendations for the child care field	Same 3 questions in both – 1 multi-part	

Prior to developing draft questionnaires for the two surveys, it is proposed that the research team address the following considerations and confirm with the Steering Committee:

- Any entire categories that may be eliminated from the three YBIC questionnaires
- Key areas for comparison with YBIC survey data
- Specific questions from YBIC that might be replicated as is, revised or eliminated
- Priority categories and elements for inclusion in both surveys
- A list of major categories for each survey
- Items for data collection under each category

Following discussion with and approval from the Steering Committee, the draft questionnaires would be developed for the February 27-28, 2012 meeting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atlantic Evaluation and Research Consultants. (2009, June). *Follow Up Evaluation of the Early Learning and Child Care Supplement*. Retrieved January 2012, from http://www.gov.nl.ca/cyfs/publications/cyfs_aerc_report.pdf
- Barnett, W. (2004). *Better Teachers Better Preschools: Student Achievement Linked to Teacher Qualifications*. Rutgers University. New Brunswick, New Jersey: National Institute for Early Education Research.
- Barnett, W. (2010). Universal and Targetted Approaches to Preschool Education in the United States. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy* , 4 (1), 1-12.
- Beach, J., Bertrand, J., & Cleveland, G. (1998). *Our child care workforce: From recognition to remuneration: More than a labour of love*. Child Care Human Resources Steering Committee. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Child Care Federation.
- Bennett, J. (2005). Curriculum issues in national policy-making. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal* , 13 (2), 5-23.
- Bennett, J., & Kaga, Y. (2010). The Integration of Early Childhood Systems within Education. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy* , 4 (1), 35-43.
- Bennett, J., & Neuman, M. (2004). Schooling for Early Childhood? Early Childhood, Major Challenges: Review of Early Childhood Education and Care Policies in OECD Countries. *Prospects* , XXXIV (4), 423-433.
- Bridges, M., Fuller, B., Huang, D., & Hamre, B. (2011). Strengthening the Early Childhood Workforce: How Wage Incentives May Boost Training and Job Stability. *Early Education and Development* , 22 (6), 1009-1029.
- Brooks, F. (2003). What Differences Unionizing Teachers Might Make on Child Care in the USA: Results from an Exploratory Study. *Child & Youth Care Forum: Journal of Research and Practice in Children's Services* , 32 (1), 3-22.
- Burgess, J., Robertson, G., & Patterson, C. (2010). Curriculum implementation: Decisions of early childhood teachers. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood* , 35 (3).
- Canadian Child Day Care Federation, Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association of Canada (1992). *Caring for a Living: A Study on Wages and Working Conditions in Canadian Child Care*. Ottawa: Canadian Child Day Care Federation.
- Child Care Human Resources Sector Council. (2009). *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators*. Ottawa ON.
- Child Care Human Resources Sector Council. (2009). *Supporting Employers in Canada's ECEC Sector: Main Report* . Ottawa: Child Care Human Resources Sector Council.

- Choi, S. (2002). *Integrating Early Childhood Into Education: The Case of Sweden*. Section for Early Childhood and Inclusive Education, Division of Basic Education. Paris: United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.
- Choi, S. (2006). Integration of Care and Education: The Challenge in Brazil. *UNESCO Policy Briefs on Early Childhood*, 32.
- Confédération des syndicats nationaux. (2010). *Des services de garde éducatif de qualité: un droit pour chaque enfant*. www.csn.qc.ca.
- Council of Ministers of Education of Canada. (2008). *Learn Canada 2020*.
<http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/187/CMEC-2020-DECLARATION.en.pdf>.
- Council of the European Union. (2011). Council conclusions on early childhood education and care: providing all our children with the best start for the world of tomorrow. *3090th EDUCATION, YOUTH, CULTURE and SPORT Council meeting, 19 and 20 May 2011*. Brussels: press.office@consilium.europa.eu.
- Doherty, G., Lero, D., Goelman, H., LaGrange, A., & Tougas, J. (2000). *You Bet I Care! A Canada-Wide Study on Wages, Working Conditions, and Practices in Child Care Centres*. Centre for Families, Work, and Well-Being. ON: University of Guelph.
- Drouin, C., Bigras, N., Fournier, C., Desrosiers, H., & Bernard, S. (2004). *Grandir en qualité 2003: Enquête québécoise sur la qualité des services de garde éducatifs*. Institut de la statistique du Québec.
- Fenech, M., Waniganayake, M., & Fleet, A. (2009). More than a shortage of early childhood teachers: looking beyond the recruitment of university qualified teachers to promote quality early childhood education and care. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 37 (2), 199-213.
- Flanagan, K. (2010). *The Early Years Report: Early Learning in PEI: An Investment in the Island's Future*. Charlottetown, PEI: Government of Prince Edward Island.
- Gable, S., Rothrauff, T., Thornburg, K., & Mauzy, D. (2007). Cash incentives and turnover in center-based child care staff. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22, 363-378.
- Ghazvini, A., & Mullis, R. (2002). Center-Based Care for Young Children: Examining Predictors of Quality. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, 163 (1), 112-125.
- Goelman, H., Doherty, G., Lero, D., LaGrange, A., & Tougas, J. (2000). *You Bet I Care! Caring and learning environments: Quality in child care centres across Canada*. Guelph, ON: Centre for Families, Work and Well Being, University of Guelph.
- Helburn, S. E. (1995). *Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers - Technical Report*. Centre for Research in Economic and Social Policy, Department of Economics. Denver: University of Colorado.

- Herry, Y., & Maltais, C. (2002). Intégration des services offerts par l'école et par les services de garde au sein d'un programme préscolaire "quatre ans à temps plein". *Nouvelles pratiques sociales*, 15 (2), 137-152.
- Holochwost, S., DeMott, K., Buell, M., Yannetta, K., & Amsden, D. (2009). Retention of Staff in the Early Childhood Education Workforce. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 38, 227-237.
- Howes, C., Phillips, D., & Whitebrook, M. (1992). Thresholds of Quality: Implications for the Social Development of Children in Center-Based Child Care. *Child Development*, 63 (2), 449-460.
- Kaga, Y., Bennett, J., & Moss, P. (2010). *Caring and Learning Together: A cross-national study on the integration of early childhood care and education within education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Kipnis, F., Ryan, S., Sakai, L., & Whitebrook, M. (2011). Professional development needs of directors leading mixed delivery preschool systems. (A. O. 2012, Ed.) *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, 13 (1).
- Langford, R. (2010). *Innovations in Provincial Early Learning Curriculum Frameworks Occasional Paper No. 24*. Ryerson University. Toronto: Childcare Resource and Research Unit.
- Langford, R. (2007). Who is a Good Early Childhood Educator? A Critical Study of Differences within a Universal Professional Identity in Early Childhood Education Preparation Programs. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 28 (4), 333-352.
- Langlais, O. (2002). *Portrait national des services à la petite enfance offerts en français en milieu minoritaire*. Centre interdisciplinaire de recherche sur la citoyenneté et les études minorités. Ottawa: Université d'Ottawa.
- Leadership to Integrate the Learning Continuum (LINC) Advisory Group. (2009, March). *Building a seamless learning continuum: the role of leadership in bridging the gap between early childhood and the K-12 education systems*. Retrieved January 16, 2012, from http://www.leadershiplinc.ilstu.edu/downloads/FINAL_LINCreport.pdf
- Madden, M. (2010). *Implementing a new curriculum: Reflections of a physical education teacher*. Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, College of Natural and Health Sciences.
- McCain, M., Mustard, J., & McCuaig, K. (2011). *Early Years Study 3: Making Decisions, Taking Action*. Toronto, ON: Margaret and Wallace McCain Family Foundation.
- Moss, P. (2006). Farewell to Childcare? *National Institute Economic Review*, 195, 70-83.
- Neuman, M. (2007). Good Governance of Early Childhood Care and Education: Lessons from the 2007 EFA Global Monitoring Report. *UNESCO Policy Briefs on Early Childhood*, 40.
- Oberheuer, P. (2011). The early childhood education workforce in Europe - Between divergencies and emergencies? *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy*, 5 (1), 55-83.
- OECD Directorate for Education. (2003). *Canada Country Note*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

- OECD Directorate for Education. (2004). *Starting Strong Curricula and Pedagogies in Early Childhood Education and Care: FIVE CURRICULUM OUTLINES*. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Directorate for Education. Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development. (2012). *Encouraging Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care*. Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2006). *Starting Strong II: Early Childhood Education and Care*. Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2001). *Starting Strong: Early Childhood Education and Care*. Paris, France: OECD.
- Pascal, C. (2009). *With Our Best Future in Mind: Implementing Early Learning in Ontario*. Toronto, ON: Government of Ontario.
- Roy, M. (2010). Paroles d'acteurs: Garde des enfants, congés parentaux et service aux personnes: alternatives ou complémentarité des mesures. *Revue Interventions économique*, 41, 2-10.
- Schom Moffat, P. (1984) *The Bottom Line: Wages and Working Conditions of Workers in the Formal Day Care Market*. Background Paper prepared for the Task Force on Child Care, Series 1: Financing Child Care: Current Arrangements. Catalogue no. SW43-1/1-985E. Ottawa: Status of Women Canada
- Shonkoff, J., & Phillips, D. (2000). *From Neurons to Neighbourhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development*. Washington, D.C., USA: National Academy Press.
- Tougas, J. (2002). *La restructuration des services éducatifs et de garde l'enfance au Québec: Les cinq premières années*. Child Care Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies. Toronto: University of Toronto .
- Whitebook, M., & Pettygrove, W. (1980) *Salary Surveys: How? Why? Who? When? Where? How to Conduct One in Your Community*. Child Care Employee Project. Berkeley, CA. retrieved January 25, 2012 from: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED238571.pdf>
- Whitebook, M., & Sakai, L. (2003). Turnover begets turnover: an examination of job and occupational instability among child care center staff. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 18, 273-293.
- Whitebook, M., Sakai, L., & Kipnis, F. (2010). *Beyond Homes and Centers: The Workforce in Three California Early Childhood Infrastructure Organizations*. Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, Institute for Research on Labor and Employment. Berkeley: University of California at Berkeley.
- Zaslow, M., Tout, K., Halle, T., Whittaker, J., & Lavelle, B. (2010). *Toward Identification of Features of Effective Professional Development for Early Childhood Educators*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS AND KEY INFORMANTS

PT Directors of ECEC

- Christine MacLean, NL (via teleconference)
- Virginia O'Connell, NS
- Carolyn Simpson, PE
- Diane Lutes, NB
- Jill Vienneau, ON
- Rupert Gordon, ON
- Margaret Ferniuk, MB
- Lois Zelmer, SK
- Lynn Jerchel, AB
- Lenora Angel, BC
- Keva Glynn, BC
- Debbie Mauch, YK
- Gillian Moir, NT
- Susan Hopkins, NT
- Leslie Leafloor, NU
- Ashley Stewart, CCHRSC
- Diana Carter, CCHRSC

CUPE National Child Care Working Group

- Jamie Kass
- Shawna Quinn, PEI
- Christina Gilligan, ON
- Gail Brinston, NL
- Lori Schroen, MB
- Randi Gurholt - Seary, BC
- Shellie Bird, ON
- Karen Wright, NS
- Margot Young, research officer
- Darcie Beggs, equality officer

Francophone Focus Group

- Jean Francois Belleau, Association des garderies privées du Québec
- Kathy Chambers, Association québécoise des centres de la petite enfance
- Anastasia DesRoches, Fédération des parents de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard
- Maryline Dion, L'Association francophone à l'éducation des services à l'enfance de l'Ontario
- Marjolaine St. Pierre, Soins et Education à la Petite Enfance du Nouveau-Brunswick
- Lise Parent, Centre provincial de ressources préscolaire (NS)

Key Informants

Robert Fairholm
The Centre for Spatial Economics

Corine Ferguson, Executive Director
Alberta Resource Centre for Quality Enhancement

Mary Goss Prowse, Registrar
Association of Early Childhood Educators, Newfoundland and Labrador

Sonya Hooper, Executive Director
Early Childhood Development Association, PEI

Karen Isaac, Executive Director
BC Aboriginal Child Care Society

Gillian Moir
Department of Education, Culture and Employment
Government of the Northwest Territories

Bonnie Schiell, Research Manager
HR Council for the Non-Profit Sector, Ottawa

Eduarda Sousa, Executive Director
Association of Early Childhood Educators, Ontario

Pat Wege, Executive Director
Manitoba Child Care Association

APPENDIX 2: PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL REGULATORY AND POLICY CHANGES SINCE YBIC

1. Training requirements for staff in full-day child care centres

PT	Directors 1998	Staff 1998	Directors 2011	Staff 2011
NL	1-year ECE certificate plus 1 year experience, or 2-year diploma, or related degree	No requirements ; if more than 25 children are present a second person with supervisor qualifications is recommended	2-year ECE diploma plus 2 years experience	One per group requires 1-year ECE certificate plus one year's experience (all staff in infant programs must have 1-year certificate) All other staff require orientation course of 30-60 hours depending on age of children
NS	1-or 2-year ECE certificate or diploma or 2 years experience plus one course and 35 hour workshop on child development and curriculum	Two-thirds of staff must have same qualifications as director	As of May 2012, a 2-year ECE diploma is required	As of May 2012, two-thirds require a 2-year ECE diploma; others must have orientation training or an ECE certificate, or be granted equivalency status
PE	At least a 1- year Early Childhood Development Diploma or equivalent	One full-time staff member must have same qualifications as director	In Early Years Centres: phasing in of post-diploma credential in ECE administration Other centres: 1-year ECD diploma or equivalent	One staff must have 1-or 2-year ECE credential ; in EYCS, phasing in requirement for 90-hour training requirement for other staff
NB	None required	None required	Director or designate or 1 in 4 staff require 1-year ECE certificate	Director or designate or 1 in 4 staff require 1-year ECE certificate
QC	Not specified	One-third must have college diploma or university degree in ECE or 3 years experience, plus a college "attestation"	Not specified	Two-thirds must have college diploma or university degree in ECE or 3 years experience, plus a college "attestation"
ON	2-year ECE diploma or equivalent plus 2 years experience	One staff per group must have a 2-year ECE diploma or equivalent	2-year ECE diploma or equivalent plus 2 years	One staff per group must have a 2-year ECE diploma or equivalent

APPENDIX 2: PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL REGULATORY AND POLICY CHANGES SINCE YBIC

PT	Directors 1998	Staff 1998	Directors 2011	Staff 2011
MB	2-year ECE diploma and a recognized post-diploma certificate, or an approved degree from a recognized university	Two-thirds of full-time staff must have a 2-year ECE diploma or satisfactory completion of the child day care competency-based assessment program	2-year ECE diploma and a recognized post-diploma certificate, or an approved degree from a recognized university plus one year experience	Two-thirds of full-time staff must have a 2-year ECE diploma or satisfactory completion of the child day care competency-based assessment program
SK	1-year ECE certificate or equivalent	All staff must complete a 130hour child care orientation or equivalent. This is waived for staff with an ECE certificate	Two year ECE diploma	50% of staff require 1-year ECE certificate; all others 120 orientation course
AB	2-year ECE diploma or equivalent	One in four staff must have 1-year ECE certificate or equivalent All others require a 50 hour orientation course	2-year ECE diploma or equivalent	One in four staff must have 1-year ECE certificate or equivalent All others require a 45 hour orientation course
BC	Not specified	One staff in each group of 30 mo-5 year olds requires a 1-year certificate One staff in each group of infants/toddlers requires a 2-year credential (basic ECE plus i/t specialization), plus one staff with 1 year certificate.	Not specified	One staff in each group of 30 mo-5 year olds requires a 1-year certificate One staff in each group of infants/toddlers requires a 2-year credential (basic ECE plus i/t specialization), plus one staff with 1 year certificate
YT	Not specified	50% require completion of a 60-hour orientation course	Not specified	30% require 1-year ECD certificate; 20% require 2-year ECD diploma; all others require 60-hour orientation course
NT	None required	None required		None required
NU	None required	None required		None required

APPENDIX 2: PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL REGULATORY AND POLICY CHANGES SINCE YBIC

2. Wage/educational/operating grants

PT	1998	2011
NL	None	Early learning and child care supplement of \$3,330/year for Level 1 certified; \$6,660/year for Level IV certified staff; entry level supplement of \$500/year to those taking courses to upgrade to level I. All supplements paid directly to individuals
NS	Salary enhancement grant to non-profits of \$3,25/day/space up to the maximum number of families whose income falls below subsidy eligibility guidelines	Early childhood enhancement grant: formula based – [required educators x per diem] x [annual operating days] x [centre type] (also factors in FT and PT average enrolment) Per diems of \$40/day for those with ECE diploma - \$24/day for untrained to a maximum of 260 days/year Established province-wide wage scales for Early Years Centres
PE	\$.91/day/space	EYCS: funded to deliver program in accordance with provincial wage scales and maximum parent fees, based on unit funding model Other centres: operating grants \$1.20/day/space
NB	None	Quality improvement funding support program (QIFS) to increase wages of child care workers of \$4.50/hour for eligible employees with an ECE Certificate, and \$2.75/hour for eligible employees who do not have a recognized ECE Certificate Pay equity process initiated for child care staff – analysis conducted, gov't announced commitment to provide financial support to achieve pay equity for Child Care Staff, starting in 2010-11
QC	Operating grants to non-profit centres with a parent majority on the board (amount not specified)	Combination of basic and supplementary allowances providing for approximately 80% of operational costs that enables staff to be paid a recommended province-wide salary scales Group insurance, maternity leave, pension plan
ON	Wage grants, based on formula of spaces, ages of children, hours and months of operation (amounts not specified)	Wage subsidies available to some centres; amounts not specified

APPENDIX 2: PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL REGULATORY AND POLICY CHANGES SINCE YBIC

PT	1998	2011
MB	Per space operating grants of \$1,804/yr/infant space; \$1,220/yr/preschool space for fully-funded non-profit programs	Per space operating grants of \$9,620/yr/infant space; \$3,562/yr/preschool space for fully-funded non-profit programs; funding to meet MCCA provincial wage scales In 2008/09 implemented a workforce stability strategy including a 3% funding increase for higher wages, a wage adjustment fund to assist facilities in raising the wages of ECEs to at least \$15.50 per hour and child care assistants-in-training to at least \$12.25 per hour
SK	Operating grants of \$40/month/infant space; \$30/month/toddler space; \$35/month/preschool space	Early childhood service grants: \$610/month/infant space; \$366/month/toddler space; \$183/month/preschool space; equals 2010, the ECS grant rate was set at \$1,830/month per required staff. Purpose of the grant is “to assist boards of directors with the cost of delivering child care services” – no specific amount must be allocated to wages
AB	\$58/month/0-12 mo; \$43/month/13-18 mo; \$29/mo/19-35 mo; \$22/mo/3-4 yrs; \$17/mo/4 yrs + Note: discontinued April 1999	Accreditation funding for eligible centres: staff support funding ranging from \$1.44/hr for Level I staff - \$4.42/hour for Level III staff in pre-accredited centres; \$2.14/hr for Level I staff - \$6.62 for Level III staff in accredited centres Benefit contribution grant of 16% of staff support funding
BC	Child care compensation contribution program – formula-based grant to enhance wages and assist with i/t care. Amounts vary	Child care operating funding, for full-day programs: \$12/day/children 0-35 mo; \$5.48/day/children 3-5 yrs
YT	Operating grants available to centres open before 1995; freeze lifted in April 1999. Amounts not specified	Unit funding: between \$720 -\$820/staff/month
NT	Operating funding ranging from \$1.25-\$14.25/occupied space/day depending on age of child and location of the program	Operating funding ranging from \$3.00-\$29.80/occupied space/day, depending on the age of the child and the location of the program.
NU	N/A	Operating funding of between \$2.42-\$17.25/occupied space/day depending on the age of the child and the location of the program

APPENDIX 2: PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL REGULATORY AND POLICY CHANGES SINCE YBIC

Certification

- Since YBIC:
 - NL and ON introduced certification and registration respectively
 - BC has added additional types of Licence to Practice
 - PE is increasing classification levels and requirements in Early Years Centres
 - NS is introducing certification effective March 2012
- NB, QC, NT and NU do not have requirements for certification

APPENDIX 3: TRAINING/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORTS AVAILABLE AS OF 2010

PT	Training Supports 2010
NL	<p>Funding is provided to the Association of Early Childhood Educators of Newfoundland and Labrador (AECNL) to provide orientation courses. Participants pay a registration fee that is reimbursed upon course completion.</p>
NS	<p>The early childhood education assistance program introduced in 2008 provides debt reduction incentive to eligible ECE graduates with a student loan. Graduates are eligible for a maximum of \$5,000 for each year of attendance, to a maximum of four years</p> <p>Continuing education program for child care staff provides financial support to child care staff working in licensed child care centres to continue their education.</p>
PE	<p>Skills Canada funds the two community colleges to deliver entry level course employed in Early Years Centres and no cost to the participants.</p> <p>The Department of Education and Early Childhood Development provides support to supervisors and staff of Early Years Centres in curriculum development and documentation, through Early Childhood coaches who are part of the Bridges Resource Team. Supervisors participate in evaluations of their centres with their Early Childhood Coach; together they identify areas needing support and then work cooperatively to make improvements</p>
NB	<p>Up to \$3,000/staff for employed individuals who have completed ECE courses or a 1-year ECE certificate after 2007</p> <p>Early Childhood Care and Education New Brunswick (ECCENB) receives funding from the Dept of Education and Early Childhood Development and the ELCC Trust Fund to provide professional learning to support reflective practice and curriculum implementation through onsite support and professional learning events</p>
QC	-
ON	<p>Early Childhood Educators Qualifications Upgrade Strategy :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Education grants are available to cover tuition fees related to a recognized Early Childhood Education diploma ▪ Travel Grants are available up to a maximum of \$2,500 per academic year to assist Education Grant recipients with daily commute expenses incurred to attend classes and/or complete the placement component of their program.

APPENDIX 3: TRAINING/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORTS AVAILABLE AS OF 2010

PT	Training Supports 2010
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training Allowance of up to \$5,000 per semester for full-time studies and up to \$300 per course for part-time studies to assist with living expenses and other additional costs incurred while pursuing a recognized Early Childhood Education diploma. ▪ Applicants must have worked in the field for at least 12 months
MB	<p>2009/10 annual training grant of \$350; scholarships of \$1,500 to high school students enrolling in the ECE diploma course at University College of the North and Collège Universitaire de Saint-Boniface</p> <p>Funding provided to centres for substitute replacement costs for employees participating in workplace training; employees receive their full salary while participating in the training.</p>
SK	<p>Tuition reimbursement of \$150 per class, or \$450 per orientation course per centre staff</p> <p>The Early Years Branch’s Mentorship Initiative is a customized, on-site learning experience that matches experienced mentors with child care centres wishing to increase their understanding and implementation of <i>Play and Exploration</i></p>
AB	<p>Professional development grant of up to \$1,000/staff/year</p> <p>Child care bursary program to train for a leadership position – up to \$10,000/person</p>
BC	-
YT	<p>Training funds allocated on hours worked; range from \$1.85/hour/Level I staff - 9.00/hour/Level III</p>
NT	-
NU	<p>Effective April 1’ 2010, the early childhood program has an annual budget of \$200,000 for supporting the cost of post-secondary courses in early childhood education within Nunavut.</p>