NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

ISBN 0-315-55385-5

The University of Alberta

Alberta Early Childhood Services Branch, 1973-1987: An Analysis of Its Goals and Achievements

by

Linda Shirley Wisniewski 

Submitted to the faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Education in the History of Education

Department of Educational Foundations

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 1989

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Linda Shirley Wisniewski

TITLE OF THESIS: Alberta Early Childhood Services Branch, 1973-1987: An Analysis of Its Goals and Achievements

DEGREE: Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1989

Linda Wisniewski
(Student's signature)

4819 Tuck Ave
(Student's permanent address)
Terrace, B.C. V8G 4L8

DATED: May 16 1989

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled Alberta Early Childhood Services Branch, 1973-1987: An analysis of Its Goals and Achievements submitted by Linda Shirley Wisniewski in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in History of Education.

.....

Supervisor

.....

.....

Date...May 16, 1989.....

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my grandmother, Ethel Prokopchuk, who exemplifies life-long learning and to my grandfather, Metro Prokopchuk, who has mastered the art of 'learning by doing.'

Abstract

Prior to 1973 universal public funding was available for kindergarten programs in all Canadian provinces except Alberta. In Alberta all non-compulsory preschool programs were provided by private agencies or community organizations. No regulations existed regarding building conditions, staffing qualifications, staff/child ratios or health, fire and safety conditions. A wide range of attendance fees plus a shortage of available programs resulted in only one quarter of Alberta's eligible three, four and five year olds attending a preschool.

During the 1960s and early 1970s a number of Alberta's early childhood interest groups and individuals petitioned the government to become involved in the education of young children. After considerable public debate the government agreed in 1973 to start providing public funding for early childhood programs.

Along with this decision came the establishment of the Early Childhood Services (ECS) Branch within the Department of Education. The initial responsibility of this branch was to establish and administer policies and regulations for granting public funds to early childhood programs. This branch was also responsible for developing philosophical principles and goals upon which early childhood programs could be designed.

The ECS Branch functioned from 1973 to 1987. This

thesis examines the circumstances that led up to its establishment; its organization, operation and philosophy and the affect it had on the lives of children, parents and teachers in Alberta.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank the members of my examining committee, Dr. Brian Titley, Dr. Robert Carney and Dr. Al McKay for their direction and support during the writing of this thesis. As a result of their input, this final draft has changed and improved considerably from the first draft and I have developed better research and writing skills in the process.

I will be forever grateful to my husband, Joe Wisniewski, for his technical assistance and his unwavering support and determination to see this project through to completion.

I would also like to thank Dr. Caroline Acosta-Gonzalez, Professor of Early Childhood Education at Brandon University in Manitoba, for being my inspiration in this endeavor.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Early Childhood Services (ECS) in Alberta: An Introduction

Prior to 1973 universal public funding was available for kindergarten programs in all Canadian provinces except Alberta.[1] Some public funded programs were available for Alberta's native children and children with special needs. Private and community run programs were also available but they did not provide enough affordable spaces to enroll all children of kindergarten age in the province. This situation often caused inequalities of developmental skills at the grade one entrance level.

Increased public awareness of the importance of quality programs for children below grade one occurred during the 1960s and early 197ʊs. Increasingly the general public realized that quality programs required professional teachers. Public concern also increased over the delivery

of these programs in safe and healthy learning environments furnished with appropriate materials to promote maximum child development. However, quality programs exhibiting characteristics such as these were expensive to operate and in the case of private programs, expensive to attend. In order for all eligible children to have the opportunity to attend quality programs, government funding was needed to help cover operational costs and eliminate or reduce enrollment fees. Consequently, various interest groups organized to petition the government for universal public funding of programs for children below school age.

The strongest support for such a movement during this time period came from the educational field and paralleled the rise of professionalism occurring in education at this same time. In the late 1960s and early 1970s teachers were increasingly university graduates and many were specializing in areas of education such as early childhood. As members of various public interest groups, these educators often provided the groups with professional guidance and an educational rationale for universal public funded kindergartens.

After a decade of public debate the government of Alberta agreed to provide universal public funding for kindergarten programs and intervention programs for younger children with special needs, starting March 1973. At this same time, the **Early Childhood Services (ECS) Branch** was established as part of the Department of Education. This

branch was responsible for coordinating all services for young children. "These services involve(d) all those providing for the physical, social, emotional and intellectual well-being and development of children up to the age of eight years."[2]

The work of the Early Childhood Services Branch is the subject of this thesis.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the structure, operation and philosophy of the Early Childhood Services Branch and to determine what affect this branch had on the lives of young children, parents and teachers in Alberta.

A secondary purpose was to describe the circumstances which led up to the establishment of the Early Childhood Services Branch in the Department of Education in 1973.

Both these purposes will be accomplished through an examination of the following topics:

a) social trends in Canada during the 1960s and 1970s which encouraged the institutionalization of early childhood programs in Alberta and the rise of professionalism in the field of education.

b) pre-1973 early childhood services in Alberta.

c) the public debate between early childhood interest groups and concerned individuals that resulted in the

establishment of the Early Childhood Services Branch in 1973.

d) the organization and administration of Early Childhood Services in Alberta from 1973 to 1987 with comparisons to the United States' Project Head Start organizational model.

e) the historical foundations of the philosophy and goals established for the Early Childhood Services Branch in the province of Alberta, and

f) the emergence of early childhood professionals and their influence on program development.

Limitations

The first limitation of this study is that it did not examine the actual manner in which early childhood centres implemented the curriculum guidelines set out by the Early Childhood Services Branch. Instead statistics such as enrolments, staff/child ratios, and staff qualifications were gathered from the Department of Education to demonstrate the degree of influence of the provincial government on the lives of children, their families and their teachers.

A second limitation is that no attempt was made to prove one system of program delivery more beneficial than the other. Equal recognition was given to both the private and public systems using only statistical comparisons and speculative statements.

A third limitation is that no attempt was made to

evaluate early childhood programs such as Project Head Start and the British Infant System. Parallels were drawn between these programs and Alberta's Early Childhood Services in order to determine the foundations of the organizational structure and philosophy of the Early Childhood Services.

Justification for the Study

The transfer of the Early Childhood Services from the Department of Education Act to the new 1987 School Act established Early Childhood Services as an integral part of both public and separate school systems in Alberta.[3] In order to facilitate the incorporation of Early Childhood Services into the school systems, the Alberta Department of Education decided to incorporate the ECS Branch into the Elementary Curriculum Branch. As of June 1987 personnel from these two branches will work together to alter the basic elementary curriculum requirements, incorporating the goals and philosophy of the Early Childhood Services into all grades up to and including grade six.[4]

With the closing of the ECS Branch in June 1987, it seemed appropriate to investigate the goals and accomplishments of the Branch during its years of operation from 1973 to 1987. In order to appreciate fully the effect of the ECS Branch on the lives of children, their families and their teachers, this study also investigated early

childhood programs in Alberta prior to government involvement for comparative purposes.

Summary

Although the main purpose of this study was to describe the work of the Early Childhood Services Branch from 1973 to 1987, an investigation was also needed into the social trends that prompted the involvement of the Alberta government in Early Childhood Education. The next chapter will describe social trends which may have influenced the thinking of citizens in Alberta during the 1960s and 1970s.

Endnotes

[1] Dr. Walter Worth, A Choice of Futures: Report of the Commission on Educational Planning, 1972, p. 65.

[2] Dr. M. Affleck and Naomi Hersom, "Early Childhood Services," Early Childhood Education Spring 1974, p. 5.

[3] Policy Advisory Committee for the School Act Review, Partners In Education: Principles For A New School Act, Alberta Education, 1985, page 11.

[4] Dr. R. Bosetti, (Deputy Minister of Alberta Education) Interview, June, 1987.

Chapter II

Social Trends in Canada During the 1960s and 1970s

During the 1960s the importance of early education became recognized across Canada through the extensive growth of kindergartens, nursery schools and day care centres. The following quote reflects this attitude:

> In a sense, we institutionalized what we have known for many decades - that the development of a curious mind takes place in the first years of life and if a delight in discovery can be encouraged in those years, then the educational future of the person is largely assured. Otherwise, education becomes rehabilitation.[1]

This thesis will specifically deal with the institutionalization process of early childhood services that began in the province of Alberta during the 1960s. However, no major social change or movement occurs in isolation. Every social change is affected and influenced by other major changes in a society. A useful way to explain the motivation behind the movement to institutionalize early education, is to look at the influence of general social trends that were active in Canada during this time.

One trend during the 1960s was an increased interest in and recognition of the value of education at all levels of a student's growth and development, starting with the early

experiences of a kindergarten program. It was generally perceived by the average Canadian family that responsible, well-paid jobs were awarded to those students who had remained and excelled in school beyond the compulsory attendance requirement of age sixteen. In fact the perception included the notion that the longer students stayed in school, the higher their financial rewards would be after graduation.[2]

These perceptions were fostered by the actions of the Canadian business community and the Canadian government during the 1960s. Both of these groups began directing large sums of money towards the education and hiring of knowledgable Canadian youth who were capable of advancing Canadian technology to world competition levels. The need for such 'human capital investment' was mainly the result of an event in 1957 which touched off a race between world powers for higher technology.[3] This event, the launching of the first space ship by the Soviet Union, forced all world powers including Canada, to examine the capabilities of their own technologists and scientists to perform or participate in similar feats. Finding their technological developments lagging, a commitment was made by Canadian government leaders to increase the intensity and quality of educational and training programs.[4] Both the government and the business community felt that well-educated people would then be better prepared to contribute to the advancement of technology through intensive research and

development.

Steps were taken by the federal government to encourage more students to enter post-secondary institutions. The number of low interest student loans and government bursaries were increased. Additional grants were provided to educational institutions.

> A cross-cultural comparison of proportional spending on education reveals that Canada closed the decade of the 1960s with the highest proportion of its GNP devoted to education of any of the major industrial nations in the world, including both the United States and Russia.[5]

Although all educational levels received additional funds, post secondary institutions received the greatest amount of government assistance.[6] This additional funding allowed post secondary institutions to lower tuition fees, expand facilities and update technological equipment. Across Canada new universities and a system of community colleges were built to accommodate the influx of students who could now afford to attend post-secondary institutions because of decreased tuition fees and government assisted student loans and bursaries. Comprehensive high schools were also designed and funded, incorporating basic technical training programs.

Expanded facilities to accommodate increased and prolonged school attendance required an expanded and more competent teaching profession. This need intensified a trend towards professionalism within the teaching field. By

increasing the standard of teacher qualifications from a Teaching Certificate to a four year Bachelor of Education Degree, teachers were able to classify themselves as professionals alongside other long-standing professions such as law, medicine and engineering. The occupation of teachers in the 1960s began to exhibit the characteristics associated with 'professionalism,' that is, the provision of a service to the community that is generally regarded as essential; a lengthly theoretical and practical education as a prerequisite to the occupation; membership in a professional association and the power of self-regulation illustrated by the individual's right to decide curriculum content.[7]

The increase of professionals during the 1960s was accompanied by an increase in bureaucracies.

> the contemporary increase in the proportion of professionals in the labor force is almost entirely constituted by professionals who work within large organizations.[8]

This trend towards bureaucratization and the employment of professionals by the state is often referred to as the rise of the Welfare State.[9] The 1960s was a time of growing public demand for the expansion of human services to improve the welfare of families especially in the areas of health and education. As a result of wide-spread public demand for services, bureaucratization was seen as the most efficient manner of organizing services by employing salaried specialists and by centralizing coordination and

administration.

There was a tendency in the 1960s for the public to rely on professional expertise to eliminate economic and social problems through advice, programs and education. In the field of teaching, professionals were trusted to provide students with a superior education which could lead to well paid, meaningful employment within society. According to advocates of the human capital theory, Canada needed well educated people if it was to maintain and extend its economic prosperity.[10] It followed that everyone in Canada should have an equal opportunity to contribute to this progress. With the increased availability of post-secondary institutions, reduced tuition fees and the flexibility of entrance requirements, the usual barriers to attendance at this level of formal education were reduced considerably. According to many, the opportunity to improve one's status in life by attending school was affordable and attainable by any Canadian citizen with ambition. As stated earlier, graduates were not only led to believe that Canadian bureaucracies would hire them but that the longer they stayed in school, the higher the financial reward they would receive.[11]

In Alberta's educational field, this kind of thinking increased significantly after the 1972 report of the Commission on Educational Planning. This report, A Choice of Futures, targeted September, 1973 as the start of the four year Bachelor of Education Degree for all "new entrants

to Alberta's teaching force at the early and basic educational levels."[12] The acceptance of a B.Ed. Degree as the basic qualification not only affected prospective teachers, but also affected educators employed in the teaching field. The trend of professional development was intensified in the 1970s as educators returned to universities in the evenings and during the summer holidays to increase their qualifications to the four year Bachelor of Education level. The Alberta Teachers' Association negotiated increased salaries to compensate teachers for their efforts towards professionalism, thus providing even further incentive for professional development.

The pursuit of education as the means to a secure comfortable way of life was not only perpetuated upward but also downward to the early preparation of young children for a head start in the race for knowledge. During the 1960s public pressure in Alberta increased for government funded kindergartens so that as a minimum, all five year olds could have the opportunity to attend such schools and get an equal start. Professionals in the fields of education and social services provided theoretical arguments about the long understood value of early childhood education for all children and especially for those who were disadvantaged and/or handicapped. They also argued for extended and specialized education for the teachers of young children in order to maximize the potential of children by using the latest and most effective child development theories in

their programs. They argued that the importance of child development should not be left in the hands of caring but poorly prepared teachers.

Many citizens in Alberta joined with professionals in the demand for publicly funded kindergarten programs. For some citizens their reasons for supporting such a movement paralleled the reasons stated by professionals, namely that early education was an invaluable asset in the facilitation of maximum human development and this education should be provided by professionally trained early childhood teachers. For other Albertans, public funded kindergartens meant an opportunity for mothers to re-enter the labor market, at least part time during kindergarten hours. The 1960s was a decade of economic growth and expansion, providing plentiful employment opportunities at every level of the economic ladder for both men and women. Women were encouraged by feminist activists and others, to demand and seize equal employment opportunities. They were encouraged to cast aside the role of homemakers which increasing numbers saw as demeaning, unpaid and unappreciated.

Whatever the reason for supporting public funding for kindergartens, citizens of Alberta exercised political pressure during the 1960s and 1970s until finally the government of Alberta relented and established the Early Childhood Services (ECS) Branch in 1973.

Summary

The institutionalization of early childhood programs in Alberta in 1973 occurred during a decade of economic, technical and educational growth and expansion in Canada. Funds were available for the expansion of educational programs at all levels. Funds were also available to prospective students in the form of bursaries and low interest loans in order to encourage increased post-secondary attendance. Canadians began to increase their investment in education and educators were expected to utilize their expertise to direct students of all ages towards the end goal of prosperity and personal fulfillment.

In order to meet public expectations, educators began assuming the characteristics of professionals by acquiring education degrees with an area of specialization; by forming professional associations and by taking control over the specific curriculum content to be taught in classrooms.

During the 1960s and early 1970s professional educators in the early childhood specialty area provided theoretical evidence to support the general public demand for government funding of kindergarten programs in Alberta. These educators argued for the benefits of early childhood programs; the right of every child to attend such programs and the need for professional early childhood teachers. Educators were supported in their efforts by various interest groups and opposed by others, resulting in a general public debate over the issue of government

involvement in early childhood programming. In the next chapter the pre-1973 early childhood services in Alberta will be examined.

Endnotes

[1] Walter Pitman, "Unrealistic Hopes and Missed Opportunities - The ´60´s in Canadian Education," in J.Donald Wilson (ed.) Canadian Education in the 1980´s p. 21.

[2] J. Donald Wilson, "From the Swinging Sixties to the Sobering Seventies," in E.Brian Titley and Peter J. Miller (eds.) Education In Canada: An Interpretation, p. 198.

[3] Alexander Lockhart, "Educational Opportunities and Economic Opportunities - The ´New´ Liberal Equality Syndrome," in John Allan Fry (ed.) Economy, Class And Social Reality: Issues in Contemporary Canadian Society. p. 229.

[4] Ibid, p. 234.

[5] Ibid, p. 226.

[6] Ibid, p. 238.

[7] Philip Slayton, "Professional Education and the Consumer Interest: A Framework for Inquiry," in Philip Slayton and Michael Trebilcock (eds.) The Professions and Public Policy. p. 131.

[8] Magali S. Larson, The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis, p. 190.

[9] Rodney F. White, "The Professions and Collective Action: Responses to State Control and Public Criticism," in A. Wipper (ed.) The Sociology of Work

[10] Lockhart, p. 226.

[11] J. Donald Wilson, p. 198.

[12] Walter H. Worth, A Choice of Futures: Report of the Commission of Educational Planning, 1972, p. 245.

Chapter III

Pre-1973 Early Childhood Services in Alberta

In this chapter early childhood services in Alberta prior to the provincial government's involvement in 1973 are examined. This background information will be used throughout the thesis to analyze the accomplishments of the Alberta government by comparing pre- and post- 1973 conditions.

As indicated in the previous chapter, the 1960s were times of expansion at both ends of the educational scale. Public funded kindergarten programs were established in every province except Alberta by the end of the 1960s. Alberta's resistance to such universal sponsorship was largely due to the political dominance of the Conservative parties in the province. The philosophy of the Social Credit and Progressive Conservative Party was to encourage private enterprise wherever possible, which included non-compulsory educational programs such as kindergartens. The number of early childhood programs experienced a slow but steady increase in the Province of Alberta. Initially some kindergarten programs had been available in the school systems of both Edmonton and Calgary but when faced with classroom shortages, kindergartens were eliminated in 1921

and 1954 respectively.[1]

Assuming the responsibility for kindergartens, private agents set up preschools as profit-making businesses. Profits were made by making enrollment fees high, keeping staff/child ratios high and by paying staff poorly. Profits could also be made by making minimal investments in building renovations, learning supplies, furnishings and equipment. Private kindergartens were housed in a wide range of facilities ranging from the basements of homes to commercial buildings, depending on the size of the business.

In spite of the cost of sending young children to preschools, the public demand for more preschool programs increased. This 'demand' came largely from middle-class women who were active members of Local Councils of Women, Home and School Associations and various other Women's organizations. The main purpose of these organizations was to improve the quality of family life in areas of health and education.[2] It was this sector of society that became aware of the benefits of an early educational start.

This awareness was aided and encouraged by the massive production of home journals such as Chatelaine, Family Herald and Redbook, each containing advice from doctors, psychologists, nutritionists, sociologists and educators. Each described research results in every aspect of living and advised women on ways of changing and improving child raising. In the 1960s, these publications related improved health and the early stimulation of the mind to the notion

of human capital investment. The message, based on research, was that an early educational start would result in a long-lasting head start in the ability to master all levels of knowledge, including the demands of higher education. Because everyone was encouraged during the 1960s to invest in education as the guarantee to full and meaningful employment with an accompanying high standard of living, it was only natural that parents would seek every available means to provide their children with these opportunities, including a head start on the educational ladder in the early years.

The 1960s and early 1970s were times of steady economic growth. During these years, when employment was plentiful, the 'two-income family' trend extended from the working class into the middle class. It became culturally acceptable for middle class mothers to work part time for extras. Two-income middle-class families not only had the desire to improve the quality of their children's lives, but they could also afford to pay the extra cost. One of the problems they encountered was a shortage of preschool programs in which to enroll their children.

Their response to this problem was to organize community kindergartens through their various women's organizations. These community kindergartens were funded and operated by members of the community. The fact that members of the organization came from both the two-income family unit and the one-income family unit influenced the fee schedule for

these preschools. Fees were kept low in order to allow all members to enroll children in their community kindergarten. Parents participated in administration and fund raising and served as teacher aides. This volunteer participation was non-paid. Enrollment fees were used to pay a teacher, purchase supplies and pay rent and utilities. Usually most community centres or churches donated space for these kindergartens thus eliminating the cost of rent and utilities. However, the suitability of the facility to provide a safe and healthy learning environment for young children depended entirely on the resources of the sponsoring community agency. Quite often the expense of a teacher's salary was not extreme because most preschool teachers during this time possessed a one year teacher training certificate. Sometimes these teachers were middle class mothers seeking part time work and thus were willing to work for pin money. The satisfaction of staying involved with children, being respected in the community and simply getting away from housework was reward enough. Teaching supplies and equipment were usually donated and therefore were often neither abundant nor suitable for use by small children.

Community kindergartens were also established by women's organizations in core areas of cities. Such efforts were made in order to fulfill the organizations' goal of civic responsibility and community improvement. The organizations usually bore the full or major cost of the project in order

to allow children from low-income families to attend. One such project was the Tom Thumb Kindergarten which operated in Calgary during 1939.[3] This kindergarten was founded by a voluntary social service group of young women called the Calgary Stagette Club. The school was established in the downtown area of Calgary in the James Short School and was for underprivileged children living in the area. A certified teacher was hired from the Calgary Normal School and her wages were paid by the Stagette Club.

Taking direction from these local community organizations, several government departments became active in providing early childhood programs in the 1960s, especially after the passing of the Preventive Social Services Act in 1966. These programs usually required both parent and child involvement which resulted in nominal fees because of parental assistance. Independent of each other, the departments of Education, Health and Social Development and Culture, Youth and Recreation all developed preschool programs. Because of the specific interests of professional staff involved, these programs aimed at not only enhancing the development of the child while at preschool, but also aimed to assist parents with the task of extending program goals into the home.

Table 1 (Appendix, p 157) demonstrates the wide range of early childhood programs available in the province in 1972.[4] Full-day programs were available at day nurseries (day cares) and institutions or residential care centres.

Day care centres charged fees on a sliding scale base according to income, while Institutions such as the Centre for the Care of the Mentally Handicapped, Our Lady of the Atonement Home and The Edmonton Children's Centre received full funding from the Department of Health and Social Development.[5] In these instances no fees were charged.

The remaining agencies listed in Table 1 provided half-day programs with attendance fees ranging from very nominal amounts for parent-cooperative programs such as play schools, public kindergartens and community kindergartens, to full-cost fees charged by private kindergartens and commercial nursery schools. Usually no attendance fees were required for government sponsored parent/child programs, programs for native children, educational projects or programs for the handicapped. The majority of these half-day programs depended on parental participation.

School boards in both Edmonton and Calgary began to re-establish experimental kindergartens in schools during the 1960s through special grant funding programs so that by 1972, seventy-one kindergartens were being operated by the four school boards in these two cities.[6] In spite of the steady increase in the number of available early childhood programs, there were still not enough affordable programs to accommodate all the eligible preschoolers in Alberta. A 1971 study showed that only one quarter (25,422) of the 91,432 children ages three, four and five years old, were participating in preschool programs. (Tables 1 and 2,

Appendix p. 157 and 158)[7]

Table 3 (Appendix, p 158) represents the educational backgrounds of program staff employed in Edmonton's kindergartens, day nurseries (day cares) and nursery schools as of 1973.[8] Of the 481 staff, only 105 or 21.8% of the staff working directly with the program content for preschool children had training in early childhood education beyond one year. Seven and a half percent of the staff had less than one year of training in early childhood education and 70.7% of the staff had no training in early childhood education. Only 110 of the 481 staff, or 20.8% had teacher training which may or may not have been in the area of general elementary training. This lack of specialization among the majority of early childhood teachers resulted in inevitable program inconsistencies. These inconsistencies existed because early childhood teachers lacked a common basic philosophy from which to develop curriculums.

Summary

Prior to 1973 the government of Alberta did not provide its citizens with a universal kindergarten program as did other Canadian provinces. Instead, all programs for children below the compulsory school age of six were left to private enterprise and community organizations with the exception of special programs sponsored by various government departments such as Health and Social Welfare.

Kindergartens and nursery schools could be found in commercial buildings, church basements, private homes, community halls and during the 1960s, in some Calgary and Edmonton schools. The condition of the facility as a safe and healthy learning environment for young children depended entirely on the resources of the sponsoring agency. The availability of appropriate child development equipment and supplies was also subject to the resource base.

Consistency of basic philosophy between early childhood programs was unattainable due to the lack of common educational backgrounds amongst teachers. Under these circumstances, children attending the various programs were inconsistently prepared for their entrance to grade school.

The lack of program consistency between the various early childhood centres was not as detrimental to the children of Alberta as the lack of attendance by three-quarters of the eligible children in the province. Elementary school teachers believed that children having attended a preschool or kindergarten of any description were likely to have acquired certain basic readiness skills that were beneficiary in grade school. Those children who had not attended a preschool or kindergarten program often lacked skills such as socialization, coordination, color and number recognition, attention to tasks and others.

At a time of rising professionalism and increasing public awareness of the importance and value of quality early childhood programs, a number of interest groups began

to campaign for changes and improvements in this area. The specific lobby efforts of these interest groups and individuals will be discussed in the next chapter.

Endnotes

[1] Jean Seguin, Public Policy Planning in Education: A Case Study Of Policy Formation For The Early Childhood Services Program In Alberta, 1977, p. 395.

[2] Neil Sutherland, Children In English-Canadian Society, 1982, p. 15.

[3] Seguin, p. 55.

[4] Ethel King, Jack Fotheringham and Pat Shanahan, A Statistical and Descriptive Study of Services Available for the Education of Three, Four and Five Year Olds In the Province of Alberta, 1972, p. 3.

[5] Michael Day, Lynn Fogwell and Isabelle Reid, A Descriptive Overview of Services to Preschool Children In the City of Edmonton, 1973, p. 20.

[6] Seguin, pp. 252-262.

[7] King, p. 3.

[8] Day, p. 20.

Chapter IV

The Public Debate Between Early Childhood Interest Groups and Concerned Individuals Prior to 1973

Public debate during the 1960s and early 1970s was often focused on the issue of government involvement in funding of early childhood programs. The debate was launched by various groups and individuals concerned about early childhood programs. They began an active campaign to have the Provincial Government provide quality services for young children under the guidance of professional early childhood educators. Their campaign took various forms - policy statements, research studies, pilot projects, forums, debates, meetings, press coverage, even radio talk-shows. Generally they campaigned for government funds to encourage the development of more affordable early childhood programs; guidelines to ensure program quality and regulations in the area of staff qualifications. Above all they recognized the need and advantage of coordination and collaboration of all the agencies sponsoring early childhood programs.

The specific demands, activities and positions postulated by concerned proponents of early childhood programs will be reviewed in this chapter starting with those of the Alberta Federation of Home and School Association (AFHSA). A summary chart of the key issues for each interest group has been included on pages 159 to 162 of

the Appendix. It should be noted that the majority of summarized information in this chapter has been derived from the research work of J. Sequin[1] with some additional information from J. Slack.[2]

Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations (AFHSA)

The members of this association were parents and teachers whose intent was to maintain active communication between home and school. At the provincial level, the Association was represented on various boards in the Department of Education. This representation provided the Department of Education with parent and teacher perspectives on educational issues and changes. These perspectives of the AFHSA were communicated through the presentation of briefs, survey results and through the participation on committees such as curriculum development.

In the 1960s this association was mainly responsible for the establishment of community kindergartens, especially in the city of Calgary. These kindergartens, many of which are still presently operating, were mainly governed by a community parent board responsible for hiring staff, developing curriculum, establishing fees and participating within the kindergarten itself.

Public funded kindergarten classes had been provided by the Edmonton Public School Board from 1912 to 1921 and the Calgary Public School Board from 1941 to 1954.[3] Edmonton's

decision to cancel kindergarten classes was made by five trustee members in February 1921.[4] The reasons given were the shortage of classroom space and the deficit budget situation. The elimination of kindergarten teachers and supplies added $6,100 to the general budget and the fact that kindergartens were not an integral part of the school system meant the school board was not compelled to provide such services. Trustee Mrs. B.T. Bishop, the only female member of the board, commented that the school board was not in the business of providing day nurseries to families incapable of raising their own children.

With the elimination of kindergartens from Edmonton's public school system, private or community operated kindergartens became the only alternatives. In the city of Edmonton very few community operated kindergartens were organized whereas a large number were formed in Calgary. Dr. M. Affleck, a retired professor of Early Childhood Education from the University of Alberta, explained that the AFHSA in Edmonton did not receive any assistance from the Edmonton School Board whereas the Calgary AFHSA was given support and encouragement by the Calgary School Board to organize community kindergartens as an alternative to public school kindergartens.[5] As a result, the organization of community kindergartens in Edmonton lagged behind developments in Calgary. Consequently in 1961 the AFHSA in Edmonton presented a paper to the government calling for an interim measure of establishing public school supervised

community kindergartens similar to what had already existed in Calgary since the mid 1950s.[6] In this same paper, the Edmonton council argued that at least this interim measure would counteract the affects of badly housed, sparsely equipped and poorly trained staff of the profit-based kindergartens. Reference was also made to the results of a survey conducted by the Toronto Board of Education which found that school kindergartens were present in all major urban centres in Canada except Calgary and Edmonton.

When Calgary's School Board decided to cancel kindergarten classes within the school system, the reason given was the same as Edmonton's. Classroom space was needed for the 'baby boom' children of World War II veterans. Parent members of the AFHSA demanded the continuation of government funds for kindergartens, but discovered from Dr. W.H. Swift, the Deputy Minister of Education, that Calgary had never received kindergarten grants.[7] To obtain funds, Calgary had been recording kindergarten students as grade one students, then transferring the funds to kindergarten classes. Responding to parental indignation, the Calgary School Board offered to support any non-profit, community based kindergarten program by providing consultative and supervisory services plus teaching materials at wholesale cost.

Although the AFHSA in Calgary had organized 76 community kindergartens by 1965, using the services provided by the Calgary Public School Board, the association continued

pressuring the government to provide universal funded kindergarten services.[8] The AFHSA recognized that in spite of their efforts, less than half the eligible children in Calgary were being served by the community kindergartens because disadvantaged families could not afford the fees.

The teacher membership of the AFHSA was very conscious of the benefits of a preschool experience. They were well aware of the long-range effects of selective services for the elite and therefore they provided leadership in the organization's campaign for universal kindergarten opportunities and the need for professional development of kindergarten teachers. The association passed resolutions calling for a kindergarten curriculum, school classroom space, and grants to school boards to establish kindergartens. They submitted a brief to the 1958 Alberta Royal Commission on Education (the Cameron Commission) asking for a universal program for all five year olds, and in 1969, they asked the Department of Education's Committee for Rewriting the School Act to include legislation allowing the establishment of kindergartens in schools.[9]

Although the Edmonton council of the AFHSA was willing to accept an interim measure of public school supervised community kindergartens, they were united with the Calgary council in their ultimate demand for government funded 'readiness' kindergartens, preferably operated through public school boards under the guidance of professional teachers.[10]

Supporting the AFHSA on this issue was the Alberta Teachers' Association and its Early Childhood Education Council.

Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA) and **The Early Childhood Education Council (ECEC)**

Briefs were submitted to the government on a regular basis by both the ATA and the ECEC from 1958 to 1973 advocating a compulsory preprimary program for all five year olds and selective opportunities for disadvantaged three and four year olds. The reason for imposing compulsory attendance on all five year olds was to ensure grade one readiness. Teachers reported that children lacking kindergarten experience often suffered a set back in grade one, sometimes having to repeat grade one due to the lack of readiness.

Their position was also very firm that all early childhood programs be administered by school boards and be operated in schools under the supervision of qualified professional teachers with extensive and specialized training in early childhood. School readiness was not a simple downward extension of grade one subjects as was the method employed by many commercial kindergartens such as the chain of Happy Hour Kindergartens in Calgary. According to Mrs. B. Leadbeater, Community Kindergarten Supervisor for the Calgary area from 1955 to 1985, the owners of this

kindergarten chain, Mrs. Houstin and Mrs. Rousing, utilized mimeographed work sheets extensively until they closed their operation in 1976.[11] By the 1960s, this method of 'school readiness' was viewed by the majority of early childhood educators as ineffective in terms of meeting the developmental needs of preschool children. Using the research studies of Jean Piaget and others, early childhood educators promoted a program of active exploration and manipulation of the environment in order to acquire pre-academic skills of fine motor control, increased attention span, problem-solving skills, perception skills and a sense of curiosity for further learning. It was felt only professionally trained early childhood teachers could design and implement a program that would foster this type of readiness.

As of 1971, with the release of the ECEC's Position Paper on Early Childhood Education, the nature of the proposed program was changed from a traditional readiness kindergarten focus, to a broad-based program focusing on all areas of child development.[12] This new philosophy was an important influence in 1973, when a philosophy for the Early Childhood Services was adopted.

There was also strong representation from this association in the 1969-72 Nursery-12 (N-12) Task Force, part of the Commission of Educational Planning.[13] This task force examined educational issues of significance to children age 3 to 18. In January 1972, the Minister's

Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education was formed.[14] Various interest groups were represented, but the majority of representation was from the ATA. Having the majority voice in the committee put the ATA in a powerful position to influence the writing of the first major document, Operational Plans for Early Childhood Services, outlining government plans for the development of services. Their influence was not only in terms of numbers represented, but also in terms of consistency of professional views. Membership of the ATA and its ECEC were professionals from the teaching field, Department of Education and the Universities of Alberta, all of whom were interested in the improvement of teacher qualifications and the promotion of early childhood educational opportunities for the children of Alberta. The degree of professional consistency was an influential factor in determining the direction of early childhood programs.[15]

Crossmembership also contributed to a unified view of early childhood programs. Dr. M. Horowitz from the University of Alberta was a good example of how similar ideas were fostered by various interest groups. Simultaneously, Dr. Horowitz was a member of the following organizations and committees: ATA's ECEC, the World Association for Preschool Education (OMEP), N-12 Education Task Force, Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education, and a representative of the University of Alberta.

The next section will describe the contributions to the early childhood movement by two representatives from the University of Alberta - Dr. W. Worth and Dr. M. Horowitz.

Faculties of Education - Alberta Universities

Although no position papers were submitted from the universities directly, a pro-kindergarten position was evident through program directions and through the actions of individual university personnel such as Dr. M. Horowitz and Dr. W. Worth.

Early childhood teacher education programs were initiated at both the University of Calgary and the University of Alberta during the mid-sixties. In 1968 a demonstration kindergarten class was installed at the Corbett Hall Teacher Training facility at the University of Alberta.[16] A number of kindergarten teacher graduates from the university assumed leadership roles for various associations interested in improving the services for young children. The formulation of position papers and lobbying strategies by the various organizations was undoubtedly assisted by these early childhood graduates.[17]

Dr. W.H. Worth was chairman of the University of Alberta's Department of Elementary Education from 1961-1965, and vice-president of the University from 1967 to 1969.[18] Dr. Worth was influenced by the 1964 studies of B.S. Bloom which emphasized the effect of environment during periods of

rapid human growth, namely from conception to age eight.[19] After several speaking engagements on this topic, Dr. Worth was commissioned by the Alberta School Trustees' Association to do a study related to this age group. The resulting 1966 study, known as the Before Six report, became the basis for discussion among educators until Dr. Worth's second commissioned study, A Choice Of Futures, was released in 1972. The findings of this study were an important influence on the government's decision to formulate policy for early childhood programs. In both reports Dr. Worth recommended universal, public funded, non-compulsory programs for five year olds. In 1972, Dr. Worth advised that selective experience be extended to handicapped three and four year olds. In 1966, he perceived the program as an academic readiness opportunity delivered by school boards, whereas in 1972, he perceived a broad based, self-development program, delivered by various agencies. In both reports he advised that programs be placed under the jurisdiction of a separate Division of Early Education within the Department of Education. In 1972, he advised that all early childhood programs, such as day cares, nursery schools and playschools, be governed by the Department of Education and be taught by teachers with a minimum of a four year Bachelor of Education Degree.[20]

Dr. M. Horowitz was also a strong advocate of publicly supported early childhood programs and he availed himself of every opportunity to contribute to the movement. As

chairman of the Department of Elementary Education from 1969 to 1972, and dean of the Faculty of Education from 1972 to 1975, his opinion was often sought in the form of speaking engagements; membership in organizations concerned about young children; participation on committees and task forces and the submission of briefs.[21] Specifics of his participation in the movement for early childhood services will be outlined throughout this section, however a summary of activities can be found on pages 178-179 of the Appendix. His deliberate efforts to work with the ministers of Education, Social Services and Culture, Youth and Recreation, resulted in a clearly articulated policy direction which Lou Hyndman, minister of education in 1972, "had the courage to present to a majority caucus who believed kindergartens were substitute babysitting services."[22] All of the recommendations made by Dr. Horowitz for implementing an early childhood services system were carried out by the government except for the creation of an independent Early Childhood Ministry. Dr. Horowitz had set as a priority an independent ministry for early childhood services but if this was impossible, he recommended that one authority be established to consolidate all services. The government adopted the latter recommendation.[23]

In an interview with Dr. Horowitz, he admitted that his dedication to this project was countered by the strong verbal opposition to public funding of early childhood

services presented by Harold Gunderson, president of the Alberta School Trustees' Association and some members of the Conservative caucus.

Alberta School Trustees Association (ASTA)

Unlike the ATA, the Alberta School Trustees Association (ASTA) was not united in its view of Early Childhood Education. The difference in opinion seemed to be between the Association's urban and rural membership, with rural trustees opposed to the idea of public funded programming for preschoolers. Calgary trustee, Harold Gunderson, and president of the ASTA from 1971 to 1973, was also a major opponent. He publicly denounced all aspects of the 'kindergarten bandwagon.'[24] He felt the demand for universal public funded kindergartens was not so much a benefit to the child, but actually a benefit to the mothers who could take advantage of the free babysitting service to pursue other interests. He was not convinced that young children needed schooling before age six.

The support for universal kindergartens operated by school boards, was fostered to a large extent by the ASTA Education Council through the selection of themes for conventions and workshops. The topic of early childhood education was introduced regularly. Due to the difference in opinion, resolutions resulting from these meetings on the topic of early childhood education barely obtained a

majority. Briefs to the government stating the ASTA position supporting public funded preschools did not reveal the internal controversy within the organization, yet media coverage of statements by trustees in opposition did make it clear there was division in the ranks.

The ASTA commissioned a number of studies including: Before Six (1966) by W.H. Worth, et al.; An Integrated Approach to Early Childhood Education (A Feasibility Study) (1971) by M. Horowitz; and Integrated Services Approach to Early Childhood Education (1973) by Mrs. J. Krysowaty.[25] This latter paper was presented at the last meeting of the Minister's Advisory Committee, and was considered an indication of the ASTA's support for public funded early childhood education.[26]

Several important independent studies were commissioned by the Alberta government and conducted by Dr. L.W. Downey of the L.W. Downey Research Association Ltd., a private consulting firm. Dr. Downey was also a continuing member of the academic staff at the University of Alberta's Faculty of Education.

Dr. L.W. Downey

In 1972 Dr. Downey was commissioned by the Alberta government to conduct three separate studies dealing with the early childhood issue. These reports included: Organizing a Province-Wide System of Education to

Accommodate the Emerging Future; Alberta 1971:Toward a Social Audit; and Opportunities for Infants. His document, ..Social Audit, accused the provincial government of having the poorest early childhood system in Canada. This document gained extensive press coverage.[27]

However it was the third document, Opportunities For Infants that had the most impact on the plans made by the Alberta government for early childhood services. This report was submitted in 1972 to the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education. The committee utilized this report to formulate and propose policy to the Alberta government concerning the direction of government involvement in early childhood education.

Opportunities For Infants was an evaluation follow-up to the experimental inner-city core kindergarten projects in Edmonton and Calgary. These projects were initiated by the Alberta Department of Education for the purpose of providing the provincial government with information about the alternatives available in the operation of early childhood programs. It was decided that experimental projects should be directed at children with the greatest need living in the inner-city areas of Calgary and Edmonton. In order to evaluate the effect that different systems of operation had on the development of children, one contract was awarded to a public school based kindergarten operation in the city of Edmonton and another contract was awarded to a community based kindergarten operation in Calgary. Both programs were

awarded $50,000.00 for operating expenses during the 1970-71 school year with the option for renewal at the discretion of the minister of education.[28]

Downey's evaluation of these pilot projects strongly supported government involvement in early childhood programs but recommended a phased-in enrichment service, starting with needy children. He recommended that early childhood programs should be provided by both public and private agencies in order to provide parents with alternatives. He also recommended that the provincial government establish an Early Childhood Authority with inter-departmental involvement to coordinate services already being provided by a number of government departments.[29]

Encouraged by public interest and government experimentation and inquiry into the feasibility of a universal early childhood system, the school boards in Edmonton and Calgary re-entered the area of early childhood programming in the early 1970s.

School Boards in Calgary and Edmonton

Between 1961 and 1971 the cities of Edmonton and Calgary experienced a steady growth in population and the four school districts in Calgary and Edmonton became responsible for more than fifty percent of the total pupil enrollment in Alberta.[30] The fact that the four school boards in these two cities represented the parents of half the school aged

children in Alberta, made their initiatives very important. MLAs in Calgary and Edmonton would probably have viewed any studies, projects or proposals by these school boards as an indication of general public opinion.

Initiatives by the public and separate school boards in Calgary and Edmonton took the form of experimental kindergartens with funding from various sources such as the Principal's Leadership Program, the Preventive Social Services Act, federal funds, local taxation and parental fees. By 1972, seventy-one kindergartens were being operated by the four school boards including four provincially funded programs in Edmonton called the Inner Core Preschool Pilot Project and one project shared by the Edmonton Public and Separate School Boards called, Cooperative Early Childhood Education Project (CECEP). This project was funded through the provincial government's Innovative Project Fund.[31]

Feasibility studies were conducted by the Edmonton and Calgary Public School Boards showing that universal kindergartens could be implemented in their districts because facilities and teaching personnel were available. Although many teachers at this time still only had a basic teaching certificate, most were actively pursuing a professional B.Ed. Degree with majors in specialty areas such as Early Childhood Education. In 1972 an Alberta Teachers' Association feasibility study revealed that 1,400 classrooms were available in the province due to declining

birth rates and the subsequent decreasing enrollments at the lower elementary levels.[32]

Parent groups such as the Parent Co-Operative Kindergarten Association of Greater Edmonton were encouraged by the willingness of the school boards to assume responsibility for kindergarten education. They launched their own lobby campaign for government involvement in early childhood services.

Parent Co-Operative Kindergarten Association of Greater Edmonton (PCKA)

In the Edmonton area parents who were dissatisfied with the preschool programs provided by private kindergartens and playschools, began forming parent-co-operative kindergartens. By 1972 twenty such cooperatives involving approximately 1,600 parents were organized.[33] In order to exchange problems and ideas these twenty cooperatives formed an association, the Parent Co-operative Kindergarten Association of Greater Edmonton (PCKA). Essentially this association was formed to foster mutual support. However, the long range goal of the organization was to pressure the Provincial Government into providing publicly funded kindergartens within the public school system. The PCKA intended to relinquish its responsibility for kindergartens to the school boards when public funding was established. These parent co-operatives saw themselves as temporary

kindergarten operators until public school kindergartens were available.[34] The majority of those parents who became involved in the establishment of co-operative kindergartens did so because there was no acceptable alternative at the time. Many of these parents had relocated to Alberta from other provinces and were accustomed to the availability of publicly funded kindergartens within the school systems. Some of these relocated parents, including Mrs. B. Youck, the president of the Association, were teachers from other provinces. These former teachers provided the leadership for the development of co-operative kindergartens and directed the activities of the PCKA in its lobby campaign for publicly funded kindergartens.

The timely formation in 1972 of the PCKA and its consistent lobby campaign directed at MLAs helped persuade the government to formulate an early childhood policy.[35] Lobbying included a closed door meeting with MLAs; participation in open-line radio shows; television appearances; press releases of activities as well as a steady flow of letters to government officials. They also met directly with Lou Hyndman, minister of education, and participated in a panel discussion on alternatives in early childhood education held by the Canadian College of Teachers. They advocated universal, government funded school board operated kindergartens for all children ages 4.5 to 5.5 on an optional attendance basis. Although this

organization recognized the need for guidance from professionally trained early childhood teachers, they insisted that parental involvement be an integral program element. After operating their own kindergartens these parents felt they could contribute to the operation of public kindergartens and they wanted that opportunity. Program content emphasizing grade one readiness was probably reflective of the elementary teacher training of leaders such as Mrs. Youck who was a former grade one teacher in Saskatchewan.[36]

Grade one readiness was not the concern of the Canadian Committee on Early Childhood (CCEC) or the Alberta Association for Young Children.(AAYC) A much broader programming focus was advocated by both organizations as will be explained in the following discussions.

Membership of the World Association for Preschool Education (OMEP) and the **Canadian Committee on Early Childhood** (CCEC)

Membership of the World Association for Preschool Education (OMEP - Organisation Pour L'Education Prescolaire, Inc.) and its Canadian Committee on Early Childhood (CCEC) consisted of professionals from various disciplines. Under the chairmanship of Dr. M. Horowitz, the CCEC submitted the following recommendations to the Alberta Commission on Educational Planning in 1970. The CCEC recommended that publicly-funded programs be universally available for

children ages three and up. The Committee also recommended that a separate government unit, headed by a minister, be set up to administer a broad-based early childhood program which integrated health, education and social development. The CCEC felt that teachers with specialized training in developing such broad-based programs were needed. The rationale for this recommendation was based on the holistic approach to child development which recognized the need for equal emphasis in the areas of health, education and social concepts.[37] The CCEC believed that by placing the responsibility for early childhood programs under a separate department with representatives from each area of child development, the holistic development of children would be reflected in policy and practice. However, if the responsibility was to be given to the Department of Education, there would be a strong possibility that the education component would receive undue emphasis. This proposed organizational model and integrated program approach was also reflective of the United States' Project Head Start model which will be described later.

The CCEC also took its concerns for early childhood programs to the politicians. During the provincial election campaign in 1971, the CCEC held a panel discussion on the topic of early childhood programs and invited the four major political parties to send representatives. After the election Lou Hyndman, the new minister of education, and Neil Crawford, the minister of health and social

development, were invited to a CCEC conference to explain their intentions regarding early childhood programs. At this conference Hyndman stated that in comparison with Great Britain and Europe, Alberta did not measure up in the field of early childhood education and the government intended to change this over the next four years. He stated that a special priority for the government was to integrate the Department of Education preschool programs with similar programs sponsored by the Department of Health and Social Development. He promised to fight in the legislature for early childhood programs. Crawford also agreed with Hyndman on the need for cooperation among various government departments involved in preschool programming.[38]

In 1972 the CCEC submitted a brief to the Federal Government and all Provincial Governments calling for the establishment of Bureaus of Child Development, similar to those established in the United States for the purpose of coordinating all early childhood services.[39]

The idea of government coordination and support for all early childhood services was also the main lobby campaign of the Alberta Association for Young Children. (AAYC)

The Alberta Association for Young Children (AAYC)

Workers in fields of health, welfare and day care, formed the Alberta Association for Young Children (AAYC) in October 1971.[40] Briefs were submitted to the government

calling for government funded, universally available programs for all young children not just kindergarten classes. Members felt that the Government should invest in the development of every child, regardless of age or program. All children should have the benefit of developmental experiences, not just five-year olds in kindergarten classes. They proposed the establishment of a separate department to coordinate services across all government departments. They specifically requested that the task of coordination not be assigned to the Department of Education because education was only one component in their holistic model of child development. They were in favor of maintaining the existing variety of services and sponsorship, but with government funding, all children could attend the program best suited to their needs without fee barriers.[41]

Although the AAYC was helpful in influencing the government to formulate plans for the coordination of all early childhood programs, their insistence on government sponsorship for all early childhood programs fueled the already existing elements of public suspicion and caution concerning the 'real' motives of the supporters for public funded kindergartens. The issues of babysitting, increased tax burden and the discontinuation of existing parent-initiated programs were investigated and reported by the media in Alberta.

Media Reports

Editorials in the press from 1960 to 1973 increased general public awareness about the issue of public funded early childhood programs. Both major papers in Calgary and Edmonton were in support of extensive investigation by the government into the proposal for universal public funded early childhood programs. This view may have influenced the government's decision in 1973 to financially support early childhood programs through a phased-in plan, thus not over-burdening the tax payer with substantial increased costs in one year. The decision to phase in programs for preschool children also gave educational agencies a chance to plan and prepare for the added responsibilities.

The Calgary Herald approved of governmental caution in implementing services to preschool children. Its opinion was that the province should attend to more pressing social needs and leave the organization of kindergartens to interested parents, who had in the past successfully operated and funded cooperative programs for their children. Although the paper agreed with the Calgary School Board's decision to provide kindergartens for disadvantaged children, it questioned the fairness of providing services to any one group over others. It also questioned the use of local tax revenue to fund such programs and suggested a referendum to assess public opinion on this issue. In 1971 the paper reacted strongly to an independent study

commissioned by the Alberta Human Resources Research Council. The study was conducted by the L.W. Downey Research Association Ltd. and was entitled Toward a Social Audit. The Herald objected to the report's assessment of Alberta having the worst early childhood system in Canada. The paper pointed out that the cost of setting up universal kindergartens at the expense of other social needs seemed irresponsible, especially when evidence of long-range educational value of kindergartens was lacking.[42]

Two positions on the issue of public funded kindergartens were expressed by the Edmonton Journal. From 1960 to 1967, editorials strongly supported government funding for school operated kindergartens under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. From 1968 to 1973, editorials supported selective compensatory programs for disadvantaged children, under the jurisdiction of the Department of Social Welfare. This change in position is reflective of how controversial the issue was and how opinions were often sharply divided, depending on the view held by the authors of the editorials. During the first period, 1960 to 1967, the Journal applauded the transfer of kindergartens from the Department of Welfare to the Department of Education because kindergartens were not to be merely a baby-sitting service. In the second period, 1968 to 1973, the paper took the opposite view, stating that parents demanding universal kindergartens were really only seeking a government funded baby-sitting service. Limited

government funds, limited educational value, and evidence of successfully operated parent cooperatives were given as reasons for not launching a universal kindergarten program. The Journal issued a warning to the Edmonton Public School Board that operating experimental kindergartens for disadvantaged children would only result in wide spread public demand for universal kindergarten programs.[43]

Despite such warnings a number of experimental early childhood projects were not only launched by school boards, but also by various provincial government departments.

Government Departments

Three government departments had been providing various services to young children and their families during the 1960s and early 1970s. The Department of Health and Social Development became involved in programs for preschoolers in 1966 when the Preventive Social Services Act was passed. By 1970 fifty preventive Parent-Child Development programs for culturally deprived children had been formed throughout the province.[44] The Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation also became involved in preschool programs in 1966 through its Alberta Service Corps. It set up summer Head Start Kindergartens for five year olds in underprivileged communities and hired university students to deliver the programs. Students were given a two week training course to prepare for these assignments. This

training was also available to anyone wanting to operate a play school during the year.[45] The Department of Education was involved in special preschool projects, usually for the purpose of educational research. It also sponsored some preschools for native children.

In 1971 these three government departments decided to plan, deliver and evaluate two early childhood projects with funds from the provincial government's Innovative Project Fund. The purpose of this initiative was to test the feasibility of inter-departmental collaboration and coordination in early childhood programming. The two projects were the Cooperative Early Childhood Education Project (CECEP) launched in Edmonton through the cooperation of the Public and Separate School Boards, and the High Prairie project called Early Childhood Development Through Use of Environmental Control Centres.[46] All three government departments submitted evaluative reports to the corresponding ministers for consideration and discussion within the legislature.

Before making any decision about getting involved in the education of young children below the compulsory school attendance age, the Alberta Conservative government wanted to examine the outcomes of special preschool projects such as ones just mentioned. The government took into account all the recommendations submitted by the interest groups described in this chapter but special attention was paid to the report submitted by the Ministers Advisory Committee on

Early Childhood Education.

Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education

This committee was established by the Minister of Education, Robert Clark, just prior to the 1971 provincial election. The Alberta Teachers' Association, Alberta School Trustees' Association, Alberta Federation of Home and School Association and the universities were represented in this body. The initial purpose of the committee was to recommend a course of action if the government should become involved in the funding of early childhood programs after the election. A number of significant reports became basic reference documents for the Committee including two reports from the Commission on Educational Planning - the 1971 Nursery to Grade 12 Education Task Force Report, and the 1972 A Choice of Futures; the L.W. Downey Report, Opportunities For Infants and Dr. Horowitz's paper, An Integrated Approach to Early Childhood Education.
Referring specifically to Dr. M. Horowitz' paper, the committee recommended the formation of an independent Office of Early Childhood Development to oversee and fund integrated programs for children ages three to six. This committee recommended that initiatives for programs should come from the public instead of the government launching specific programs for specific groups. In other words the

committee recommended that the government not set up a universal kindergarten program, but funds should be made available to any approved agency wishing to set up a kindergarten program. Agreement was also reached that the minimum qualifications for early childhood teachers should be the four year Bachelor of Education Degree although paraprofessionals with one or two years of early childhood training could assist the professional teacher.

After the election, concrete plans were made for the extension of provincial funding to early childhood programs. The Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education then acted as a pane of reactors to drafts for the organization, administration, philosophy and goals of a government sponsored early childhood services program. The final draft contained all these components and was called Operational Plans for Early Childhood Services.[47] The implementation of these plans was assigned to the newly created Early Childhood Services Branch, established under the Department of Education in March 1973.

Summary

The public debate on the issue of government funded early childhood programs was mainly focused on the question of equal opportunity for all children in Alberta to acquire a preschool experience under the guidance of professionally trained early childhood teachers within a provincially

approved facility. The interest groups and individuals who became involved in this debate petitioned the government of Alberta for public funding of early childhood programs in order to accomplish the objectives of equal attendance opportunity, professional teaching standardization, consistency of program philosophy and standardization of facilities. Opponents of public funds being directed towards early childhood programs argued against the value of formal early childhood experiences. These arguments were ineffective against the volume of documented research that supported such experiences. This evidence was usually provided by professional educators actively involved in the debate as members of various organizations.

The public debate was finally resolved after the 1971 provincial election when the objectives and guidelines for the public funding of early childhood services, outlined in the document Operational Plans for Early Childhood Services were accepted in 1973 by the legislature. The beginning of equal attendance opportunity for all eligible children in Alberta and the standardization of teacher qualifications, program philosophy and building standards started with the establishment of the Early Childhood Services Branch in the Department of Education, in March 1973.

In selecting an organization structure for the ECS in Alberta, the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education chose to closely follow the organization

of the United States of America's Project Head Start program. In the next chapter the organization and administration of both programs will be explained. The similarities between these programs will be evident.

Endnotes

[1] Jean Seguin, Public Policy Planning in Education: A Case Study Of Policy Formation For The Early Childhood Services Program In Alberta, 1977.

[2] Janet Slack, Kindergarten: A Part of the Educational System, 1986.

[3] Seguin, p. 395.

[4] Edmonton Public School Board, Board Minutes, February, 8, 1921, p. 8

[5] Dr. Muriel Affleck, (Retired University of Alberta Professor of Early Childhood Education), Interview October 1986.

[6] Seguin, p. 64-65.

[7] Ibid, p. 60.

[8] Ibid, p. 396.

[9] Seguin, p. 62 and p. 94.

[10] Ibid, pp. 236-241

[11] Mrs. Beulah Leadbeater, (Community Kindergarten Supervisor for Calgary), Interview, Nov. 1986.

[12] Seguin, p. 219.

[13] Slack, p. 18.

[14] Seguin, p. 220.

[15] Ibid, pp. 217-227.

[16] Dr. Muriel Affleck, Interview November, 1986

[17] Ibid, pp. 262-266.

[18] Ibid, p. 266.

[19] Dr. Walter Worth. Before Six, 1966, p. 14.

[20] Seguin, pp. 266-270.

[21] Ibid, p. 272.

[22] Dr. Myer Horowitz, (President of University of Alberta) Interview, June 1987.

[23] Seguin, pp. 270-276.

[24] Ibid, p. 83.

[25] Ibid, p. 235.

[26] Ibid, pp. 227-236.

[27] Ibid, p. 286-289.

[28] Alberta Education, An Early Childhood Education Pilot Project in Calgary and Edmonton, 1972, p. 6.

[29] Slack, p. 20.

[30] Seguin, p. 261.

[31] Ibid, pp. 252-262.

[32] Ibid, p. 212.

[33] Ibid, p. 251.

[34] Mrs. B. Youck, (Past President of the Parent Co-operative Kindergarten Association), Interview, May 14, 1987.

[35] Seguin, p. 247.

[36] Ibid, pp. 247-252.

[37] Dr. W.H.O. Schmidt, Human Development: The Early Years, 1984, p. 2.

[38] Seguin, p. 120.

[39] Ibid, pp. 241-244.

[40] Ibid, p. 399.

[41] Ibid, pp. 244-247.

[42] Ibid, pp. 276-278.

[43] Ibid, pp. 279-282.

[44] Ibid, p. 329.

[45] Ibid, pp. 333-334.

[46] Ibid, p. 330.

[47] Seguin, pp. 320-328.

Chapter V

The Organization and Administration of Early Childhood Services in Alberta (1973-1987)

The Influence of the U.S.A.'s Project Head Start (PHS)

The timely conception in 1964 of a massive preschool project for disadvantaged children in the United States had a major influence on the organizational model for Alberta's ECS.

Project Head Start was conceived in the United States as part of the federal government's social, political and intellectual campaign against poverty, commonly referred to as the War on Poverty.[1] The purpose of Project Head Start was to prepare disadvantaged children for equal participation in school with more advantaged children through early cognitive and language experiences. From 1965-1969 the project was the responsibility of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). As of 1969 jurisdiction for the project was transferred to the newly created Office of Child Development (OCD) within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.[2] This office was renamed as the Agency for Children, Youth and Families in 1977.

Initially federal funding for early childhood programs was awarded to local non-profit organizations with preference being given to Community Action Agencies (CAA)

which had been set up by the OEO to promote community control and participation in self-help projects. If a CAA was not available grants were awarded to local school boards provided they agreed to the OEO's conditions of "accepting direction from community elected boards and providing employment and career development for community residents."[3] These community boards were called Policy Advisory Committees (PAC) and were composed of fifty percent parents and fifty percent Head Start staff and community representatives.[4] The PAC was expected to provide direction in program goals, program implementation and selection of personnel. Parent involvement in the program and decision making was a key element of the project. The role of professionals on these committees was to provide parents with guidance in their efforts to develop a quality early childhood program for their children.

The general program guidelines for an agency requesting grant approval were set by the OEO in 1965. Programs were expected to address the following objectives:

> a) to prevent low-income children from becoming dropouts and non-readers in elementary school, while at the same time develop a strategy that would dramatically change the elementary schools to serve the needs of children.
> b) to hire low-income people to work with the young children and their families in their own neighborhoods, thus providing much-needed employment, as well as a bridge between school and home.
> c) to provide support services to young children and their families in ways that the 'welfare' approach had been unable or unwilling to do in the past.
> d) to act as a base for organizing community

action around a wide variety of issues.[5]

Along with the conception of this project came the opportunity for early childhood professionals to assume positions of leadership and to be recognized for their professional expertise. Not only did they serve on local PACs, but they also assumed positions in regional offices as program specialists and were given the responsibility of monitoring the wide variety of programs.

The major components of a Head Start program included the provision of immunizations and periodic medical, visual, hearing and dental examinations. At least one hot, nutritional meal and snack were provided each day. All Head Start programs were to employ one professional teacher, one aide and have one volunteer for every fifteen children.[6] No specific curriculum model was ever drafted; however a general philosophy existed of incorporating cognitive and language goals into the program. As a result, a wide variety of programs were developed across the country each reflecting the needs of local Head Start families.

The services of social welfare workers was another important component of the program. Welfare workers acted as advocates in helping the families of Head Start children obtain any necessary assistance that could make family life for the child more stable. Psychological services were also available to analyse child development problems and to provide consultative services to teachers and parents.

As mentioned earlier, parent involvement, an important component of a Head Start program, merits further explanation. In 1964 when the project was conceptualized to combat the effects of poverty on young children, a plan to train and employ poor adults was also conceived. "The original Head Start hiring policy suggested that two-thirds of the staff should be nonprofessionals from these ranks."[7] Training programs were set up with a vision characteristic of the sixties of helping the poor obtain professional careers and upward mobility.[8] Parents enrolled in these training programs were given academic credits for all courses which eventually could lead to a four year college degree in teaching. However, as the availability of professional jobs decreased in the 1970s, so did the scope of the training programs. Instead of the direct open-door route to professional credentials, an intermediate step was inserted in the form of the Child Development Associate Program (CDA) to train paraprofessionals. This two year competency-based training program became compulsory for all new Head Start trainees before being considered for a college degree program, if indeed any openings existed. Parents could still proceed to the professional level, but the encouragement was to stop at the paraprofessional level because of positive job market possibilities for such training in early childhood programs. Jobs as professional teachers were much harder to obtain during the 1970s. At that time a teacher surplus had

occurred due to increased enrollments in the teaching field during the 1960s. Finding employment as professional teachers was difficult for all graduates during the 1970s. The other detriment was the fact that a person with a CDA credential was no longer guaranteed a college placement. These became clear signals to parents that a professional career was no longer the promised pot of gold at the end of the rainbow!

Despite the de-emphasis on the professional manpower training aspect of Head Start, the value of parent involvement for the sake of the child was still a strong component of the Head Start project. Paid or volunteer, professional or paraprofessional, parents participating with their children in programs resulted in increased and extended parenting skills with obvious benefits for their children.

In 1965 Project Head Start programs were eight week summer seasons for children starting school in the fall. The following year Head Start programs for 3 to 5 year olds started operating for the full year. However, Project Head Start was conceived to be more than a centre-based preschool educational program.

> Head Start is, rather, a 'family' of programs that provides a comprehensive and interdisciplinary approach to fostering the child's development. As a multidimensional effort, Head Start has developed programs that reach out to the entire family and community in which the child lives.[9]

Project Head Start developed the following list of programs.

a. Parent and Child Centres.

b. Parent and Child Advocacy Centres.

c. Follow Through Program.

d. Planned Variation Program.

e. Head Start Handicapped Children's Effort.

f. Health Start.

g. Home Start.

h. Head Start Improvement and Innovation Effort.

i. Head Start Developmental Continuity Effort.

j. Child and Family Resource Program.

k. Child Development Associate Program.

l. Education for Parenthood Program.[10]

These program initiatives became the basis for the development of programs by the Alberta ECS and will be described in chapter seven, however a description of the general organizational components of Alberta's model will follow.

Alberta's ECS Organization Model - Comparisons to U.S.A.'s Project Head Start Model

The development of an organizational model for Alberta's ECS became the responsibility of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education (MAC on ECE) in 1973. This model was outlined in the document, Operational

Plans for Early Childhood Services. Many aspects of Alberta's organizational model closely resembled the U.S.A's Project Head Start (PHS) model. The similarities between these two models will be explained throughout the following description of the organization and administration of Alberta's ECS. It should be noted that much of the information is derived from Alberta Education's Annual Reports from 1974 to 1986.

The American influence on the development of Alberta's ECS model was only to be expected given the physical, economic and cultural similarities between Canada and the United States of America. However, another influencing factor was the immigration of large numbers of U.S. teachers to Alberta during the 1960s and 1970s (Table 5, Appendix p. 163). Among those United States teachers was Dr. B. Cutler, who joined the Department of Education at the University of Alberta during the 1960s. Dr. Cutler and other U.S. teachers were probably involved in the development of position papers for various early childhood interest groups therefore directly communicating knowledge of U.S. models to Alberta citizens. Using the accumulated suggestions submitted to the government prior to 1973 by interest groups and individuals, the MAC on ECE decided that government involvement should constitute more than kindergarten services. Although PHS in the United States addressed the needs of disadvantaged families with children ages 3 to 5, it was decided that Alberta's ECS would address the needs of all families with

children ages 0 to 8. Services for children would cover the areas of health, social, intellectual, emotional and physical development. Services for families would involve assisting parents in their child raising efforts at home by providing parents with information about child development. PHS went one step further in assisting parents by offering paraprofessional and professional teacher training opportunities so they could become gainfully employed while working with their children in early childhood programs.

In keeping with the Alberta Conservative Party's policy of support for private enterprise in lieu of universality, the government encouraged the continued involvement of private operators in the delivery of programs for young children. In spite of strong recommendations from stakeholder groups such as the Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA), to award public schools sole jurisdiction over kindergartens, private non-profit kindergartens would be included in the publicly funded system of educational services.

The organizational structure that was set up to carry out the policies for early childhood services reflected the belief that "the care and education of young children must be a joint and continuing responsibility of the home, the school, and society."[11] Based on this belief a three tiered organizational structure was designed with a provincial, regional and local level. Each level was given specific directives for fulfilling its role in the delivery

of ECS programs.

Provincial Organization

In the United States, Project Head Start was first awarded to the Office of Economic Opportunity but from 1969 the project was the responsibility of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. In Alberta the Early Childhood Services Branch was added to the Department of Education with representation from various government departments on coordinating committees. The primary responsibility given to the ECS Branch was the "general monitoring of ECS."[12]

> The Government has the responsibility for establishing the initial conditions of the ECS and for carrying out at least enough planning to ensure that all essential services develop as needed.[13]

The director of the ECS Branch was directly responsible to the associate deputy minister of education and was responsible for implementing cabinet approved policy changes by coordinating personnel within the ECS Branch and coordinating the efforts of government departments involved in the change. From 1973 to 1982 the core personnel within the ECS Branch included a director, an administrative assistant, a coordinator of program development, a coordinator of program approval and field consultants. When the Alberta government implemented a policy of general decentralization in 1982, the field consultants in the ECS

Branch were transferred to Regional Offices and the position of program approval coordinator changed to consultant program services. From 1973 to 1986, the ECS Branch employed at various times the following personnel: program development specialist, access consultant and a librarian. The pattern for hiring personnel can be found in Table 6 (Appendix p. 164) The effect of the 1982 regionalism is evident as the number of ECS Branch personnel was sharply reduced after 1982. As of June, 1987 the personnel decreased to the director and his administrative assistant. Plans were being formulated to amalgamate the ECS Branch with the Elementary Education Department in order to facilitate program development for children age 4.5 to age twelve.

A special Coordination Council was created at the provincial level,

> ...to coordinate effectively the services provided by government departments and related agencies in helping to meet the needs of young children and their families.[14]

Coordination plus policy and guideline development for ECS was accomplished through the Coordinating Council until 1982 and through the Policy Advisory Council until 1986. Membership included non-voting representatives from various government departments and voting representatives from stake-holder groups and individuals such as ATA, AHSA, ASTA, Alberta Health Units, Regional Coordinating Committees and private and public operators.[15] The chairperson of the

Council was the associate deputy minister of education who reported recommended changes directly to the deputy minister of education. Before submitting any recommendation to the Provincial Cabinet for approval, the deputy minister of education consulted directly with the deputy ministers of other government departments who shared an interest in early childhood. These deputy ministers had all been informed of the recommended changes by their respective representatives on the Coordinating Council. Each department was prepared to assume responsibility for changes affecting areas under their jurisdiction. However, to avoid the pre-1973 independent functioning of government departments, all activities were to be coordinated by the director of the ECS Branch, who established and maintained a continuous communication link with the department(s) involved in the changes.

Since 1973 the ECS Branch has worked closely with the Departments of Social Services and Community Health, Education and Advanced Education and Manpower.[16] These three departments were consistently represented at the Coordinating and Policy Advisory Council meetings providing direction on education, health and social services for young children. The Department of Advanced Education and Manpower also provided direction in the area of staff qualifications and training.

The 1973 Operation Plans recommended that the ECS Branch also form a close association with the Department of

Culture, Youth and Recreation because of their pre-1973 sponsorship of the play group programs. However because the department withdrew from such sponsorship when the ECS Branch was formed, only a functional relationship was established.

The ECS Branch also established functional relationships with the Department of Agriculture for nutritional guidance and the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for licensing purposes.

From 1973 to 1982 a Proposal Review Committee received and evaluated proposals for operating ECS programs "from school boards, private institutions, agencies and individuals."[17] The committee consisted of the director of the ECS Branch, the coordinator of program approval from the ECS Branch and representatives of the Social Services and Community Health Department. As of 1982, ECS program approval was transferred to the Regional Level.

Regional Organization

In 1973 seven early childhood consultants were employed in regional offices located in Edmonton, Calgary, Red Deer, Grand Prairie and Lethbridge. Like the regional offices of the U.S.A.'s Project Head Start, the responsibility of the Alberta regional offices was to coordinate the delivery of programs for young children by conducting regular inter-agency meetings; by meeting with community groups and parents and by assisting new early childhood operators with

program proposals and program implementation. They also recommended early childhood staff for letters of authority or interim early childhood permits and assisted the provincial office with evaluations of programs, staff, buildings, etc.

During the 1982-83 decentralization period, ECS field consultants were transferred from the ECS Branch to the Regional Offices. Along with their regular duties of coordinating services, organizing inservices and monitoring programs, these consultants were given the additional responsibility of approving early childhood program proposals. This 'grass roots' approach allowed for closer working relationships between program delivery agencies and program support and approval agencies. Direct communication between these two agencies within a region usually resulted in a more efficient system of service and consequently an improvement of programs for children.

In order to facilitate the coordination of services within a community, ECS consultants were given the responsibility of establishing Regional Coordinating Committees (RCC). In 1980 five RCCs were established in Edmonton, Calgary, Red Deer, Grand Prairie and Lethbridge.[18] Funding was provided through a Regional Coordinating Grant paid directly to ECS operators who in turn transferred the fund to the RCC of which they were members. This grant was for the organization and promotion of quality programs for children and parents in the

community. Membership was voluntary and consisted of anyone interested in early childhood services - public and private ECS operators, primary teachers, parents, grandparents, social workers, retired teachers, Sunday School teachers, health unit personnel and anyone from community organizations or town councils interested in sponsoring programs for young children. Discussions dealt with perceived needs of the community, parents and children; how to meet those needs and who best to meet those needs.

A 1983 evaluation conducted by the ECS Branch generally found "that the level of coordination activities increased significantly for four committees and very significantly for one committee as a result of the Coordination Grant.[19] The recommendation that funding should be available to other ECS RCCs resulted in the establishment of 25 additional coordinating committees in 1983. Again the resporsibility of forming these committees and initially guiding their activities was given to the ECS consultants. According to Dr. D. Jeffares, Acting Director of the ECS Branch, a wide range of successful coordinating activities had been undertaken throughout the province by the regional committees. Examples of typical activities included the collection and publication of resources for parents, a calendar of community events, the operation of toy-lending libraries, fund raising events and quality conferences.

Local Organization

The local level of Alberta's ECS organizational structure was designed to promote local responsibility for the development of ECS programs. Parent, schools and community organizations shared in this task through joint membership on Local ECS Advisory Committees. (LAC) This arrangement was similar to the Policy Advisory Committees (PAC) of the U.S.A.'s Project Head Start. The primary responsibility of Alberta's LACs was to initiate and submit program proposals to the appropriate provincial or regional levels for approval. Like the PACs of Project Head Start, these committees also had to assist in the planning and operation of an ECS program. Project Head Start also required that the initiation of early childhood programs come from the community and that these proposals be submitted to a regional office for approval by professionals specializing in early childhood. The Alberta LAC's might also be involved in the recruitment of volunteer parents as teacher aids in the classroom, developing toy and book lending centres or organizing fund raising events for 'extras' in the program. PHS required fifty percent of the PAC be parents while Alberta's ECS required that the majority of the committee should be parents of children registered in the program. Representation from the community could constitute any of the following:

> the School Principal and/or Superintendent, members of the ECS staff, the District Home Economist, the Medical Officer of Health, the Public Health Nurse, the Early Childhood Development Consultant, the Preventive Social

> Services Director, district youth representatives and membership from other community agencies, such as Y.M.C.A., Church and service clubs.[20]

When establishing an ECS program, the Local ECS Advisory Committee had a choice of three alternative forms of organization. They were:

> Alternative #1
> the ECS is provided by the school board. Staff is employed by the school board including the Coordinator.
>
> Alternative #2
> the ECS is provided by a licensed private operator under contract by a school board. The private operator is responsible for coordination and implementation of services, while the school board is responsible for administration and supervision of the program.
>
> Alternative #3
> the ECS is provided by a licensed private, non-profit operator. Evaluation of the program is performed by the Local ECS Advisory Committee.[21]

Alternative three was considered a private school. In order to receive approval and funding the LAC's plans for operation had to accompany the application. Profit making private schools were not eligible for provincial funding.

All three alternatives must employ a project coordinator with suitable qualifications in Early Childhood. The coordinator's responsibilities included planning and evaluating the ECS program as well as communicating with parents and consultants. The coordinator's position could be a paid position by a school board to oversee several programs within the division, or the position could be a

volunteer parent. In very small programs the teacher was the coordinator.

The involvement of parents and community permitted "maximum use of family and community resources and provided for the development of more flexible and imaginative programs to meet parent preferences."[22]

Jurisdiction

From March 1973 to June 1987 Alberta's ECS was under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education Act, section six.[23] The ECS Branch was given the responsibility of coordinating the "health, educational and social services or activities on behalf of children between 0 to approximately 8 years of age and their parents."[24]

In order to establish a starting point for the delivery of services, the Alberta government applied a 'needs assessment' planning strategy where a 'need' was defined as:

> the difference between what is the desirable state or condition[25] and what is the present state or condition.

Based on these factors it was decided that initially, early childhood services would be directed towards children from birth to less than 5 years 6 months and their parents.[26] Government supported programs would be phased in according to the priority of children's needs. Priority was to be given to children in the following order:

First - to Handicapped

Second - to Disadvantaged

Third - to 'Kindergarten'

Fourth - to Day Care[27]

Support for the first three priorities began in September 1973 while consultative services for day cares remained the responsibility of the Social Services and Community Health Department. Consultants, employed by this department, had been supervising day cares and nursery schools for many years before the ECS Branch was established and they were willing to continue this responsibility. The ECS Branch was in agreement to such arrangements because the task of implementing the first three priorities would be challenging enough to the ECS staff.

Recognizing the importance of early intervention for children with "physical, sensory or emotional handicaps which limit their normal growth and development," ECS lowered the program entrance age for these children.[28] From 1973 to 1978 handicapped children could attend an ECS program from age 3.5 to 5.5. From 1979 to present ECS made a distinction between 'severely handicapped' and 'mildly handicapped,' allowing severely handicapped children age 2.5 and up to enter an ECS program, while the entrance age of mildly handicapped children remained at 3.5.[29] The distinction between the two categories was as follows:

Severely Handicapped children are ones assessed as being blind, deaf, deaf-blind, dependent disabled

(including severe mental retardation and brain trauma), severely multiply disabled, severely physically disabled (including arthritis, spina bifida, epilepsy and delicate health), severely emotionally disturbed (including autism) and/or severely expressively/receptively aphasic.[30]

Mildly Handicapped children are ones assessed as mildly or moderately mentally retarded, visually impaired, learning disabled, emotionally disabled or physically handicapped.[31]

In 1976, ECS jurisdiction was extended to 'Developmentally Immature' children ages 5.5 to 6.5 which is usually the compulsory first year of primary education. 'Developmentally Immature' children are those "who in the opinion of parents or guardians, staff and school board, would benefit from an ECS program."[32] These children would be either emotionally immature, intellectually immature or physically handicapped.[33] This jurisdictional extension allowed children who had never attended an ECS program, but were assessed not developmentally ready for grade one, to attend an ECS program instead of grade one. Extending this policy to other children meant severely handicapped children could continue in an ECS program for a maximum of four years; mildly handicapped children could attend for three years and regular children could attend for two years.

ECS also addressed the regular needs of children who are 4.5 to 5.5 years old but gave extra financial encouragement to agencies developing programs for culturally or educationally 'disadvantaged' children. These children often resided in a particular area designated by the Province as

being 'disadvantaged.'[34]

All programs were half-day Child Development Programs before entering basic education.[35] Programs were either home based or available at public, private or community operated centres.

Although initially ECS was to attend to the needs of children before their entrance into basic primary education, ages 0 to 5.5 or 6.5 in 'developmentally immature' cases, ECS had been awarded responsibility for children ages zero to eight in the 1973 Operational Plans. In 1984 ECS began to attend to the needs of children enrolled in basic primary education. The reason for this extension was to enable:

> continuity of developmental experiences for children during their participation in ECS and Primary Education with the primary focus on children 4.5 to 8 years of age, but including children with special needs as early as 2.5[36]

As of June 1987 the jurisdiction for ECS was transferred to the Elementary Education Branch whose jurisdiction was then extended from ECS to grade six.[37] This transaction was for the purpose of implementing a policy of articulation which will be discussed in the next two chapters.

Sponsorship of ECS programs was provided by either School Boards or Community/Private operators. The major purpose of the ECS Branch was to assist these operators "in developing, implementing and evaluating programs to meet social, emotional and intellectual needs of young children."[38] Although attendance at an ECS program was

voluntary, attendance increased over the years so that as of 1986/87 the majority of Alberta's eligible young children, approximately 95 percent, were enrolled in programs (Tables 7 and 8 Appendix pp.165-166). Compared to the first available attendance figure of 66 percent in the 1975/76 year, enrollment steadily increased over the years. These tables also show school boards experienced significant increases in enrollments while community/private operators maintained approximately the same number of children each year. Government funding of early childhood programs has filled the void for those families who could not afford to send children to private or community based programs.

General Regulations

In 1973 the Provincial ECS Coordinating Council and an Ad Hoc Committee reviewed standards and regulations in the areas of health, fire, safety, staff-child ratio, staff qualifications, buildings, equipment and financial records. The resulting standards and regulations were based on the following principle:

> Programs which do not meet the specific needs of pupils, do not have the commitment of parents and do not meet adequate program standards are usually quite ineffective and should not receive approval and financial support.[39]

Regulations concerning staff qualifications will be discussed in chapter seven. Generally however, regulations on staff-child ratios called for a ratio of 1:22 before

adding paraprofessional help for regular needs children and a ratio of 1:18 for disadvantaged children. The ratio for disabled children depended on the degree of disability.[40] In Project Head Start one professional, one paraprofessional and one parent volunteer was required for every 15 children.

General regulations existed concerning nutritional guidelines and space requirements of at least three square meters per child.[41] Another general regulation was that attendance in an ECS program was optional. Parents could choose to enroll their child directly in grade one at age six, without an ECS experience. All operators were required to submit Audited Financial Statements, Budget Report Forms and Enrollment Reports to the ECS Branch.

Non-profit community or private schools were required to incorporate under the Societies Act. This was done through application to the Corporate Registry stating the objectives and by-laws of the society. These objectives and by-laws must also be compatible with the ECS Philosophy, Goals and Dimensions. A society wishing to continue operating an ECS program had to obtain a Letter of Status each year from the Registry stating they were an incorporation of good standing.[42] It was also necessary for the incorporated non-profit society or private school to obtain special insurance and bonding. The operator had to have a minimum of $1,000,000 comprehensive third party liability insurance to cover the operator and its employees in the event of "damages arising from death, personal injury and/or property

damage."[43]

The private operator was also required to carry fidelity (bonding) insurance in case of fraudulent acts by its Treasurer.[44] Fire and theft insurance on contents was required of operators who owned the building in which the program occurred. Insurance for transporting children in vehicles not owned by the operator was obligatory and parents were advised to obtain additional insurance if transporting children other than their own.

Funding Regulations

In terms of funding regulations, financial support was available to "public and separate school districts and non-profit private institutions, agencies or individuals that offered approved Early Childhood Programs."[45] Since 1973 the maximum allocation for ECS funding has been three percent of the Department of Education budget (Table 9, Appendix p. 167). Table 10 (Appendix p. 168) demonstrates that the ECS budget has experienced an increase every year except during the 1984/85 budget year. This table also demonstrates that as a rule increases to the ECS budget were higher than increases to the overall Education budget. This was probably due to the phased in expansion of the ECS since its conception in 1973.

All approved operators were entitled to a Basic Instruction Grant for each registered child. This grant was paid on the number of hours of program activities and/or

in-home visits to a maximum of 400 program hours and 18 home visits.[46] Operators were to use this grant to "enhance individual abilities and future educational opportunities and to address the learning needs of each child before entrance into school."[47] This grant could be used for teachers' salaries, purchasing equipment or instructional aids and providing programs for parents to enhance child-rearing skills. Operators providing instruction in languages other than English for at least fifty percent of each program day were able to apply for additional funds through the Language Program Grant.[48]

Table 11 (Appendix p. 169) shows the amount of money spent on instruction by both public and private operators and Table 12 (Appendix p. 170) shows the per capita instructional costs. Up until 1981/82 community and private programs spent less per capita on instruction than school boards. This situation was probably reflective of lower teacher salaries typically paid by private centres. Although Table 12 shows private centres spending more on instruction after 1981 than school boards, it is doubtful that these increases were due to increases in teacher salaries. Instead it is more likely that these expenditures in private programs were due to their independent operating status which did not allow the efficient practice of sharing resources and supplies.

All operators with handicapped children in their program were entitled to the Basic Instruction Grant plus an

additional grant to cover the cost of delivering a specialized and individualized program which addressed or compensated the particular handicap. This Handicapped Children's Grant could be used for specialized equipment or furniture and special services such as speech therapy. As of 1979 the Handicapped Children Grant was redefined and divided into two grants that more specifically addressed the needs of handicapped children. Depending on the degree of handicap, operators were entitled to one of the following two grants for each individual child, but could not apply for both grants for the same child. These grants were the Program Unit Grants (PUG) for severely disabled children and the Special Needs Grant for mildly and moderately disabled children. Table 13 (Appendix p. 171) shows the number of handicapped children served by these grants. The maximum PUG was awarded if the operator provided a minimum of 800 hours of program activities or 36 in-home visits.[49] The maximum Special Needs Grant for mildly and moderately handicapped children was awarded to operators providing a minimum of 400 hours of program activities or 18 in-home visits.[50]

Tables 14 and 15 (Appendix pp. 172-173) show the involvement of School Boards and Community/Private operators in the provision of services for severely handicapped children. Although more private/community centres provided services to severely handicapped children than school boards, they generally received less funding than school

boards; therefore they must not have provided as many program hours. Table 16 (Appendix p. 174) shows that the Province has increasingly spent more of its ECS grant on severely handicapped children so that as of 1986/87 10.1% was being spent for children in this category.

In addition to the Basic Instruction Grant and the Handicapped Children Grant, a number of extra grants were available to qualifying operators. These grants were created to encourage the development of quality ECS programs throughout Alberta so that all children would be able to attend.

Grants such as the Renovation Grant aimed to help new operators with the costs of upgrading buildings to meet health and safety standards. From 1973 to 1982 this special 'one time' only renovation grant was available to both public and private operators.[51] As of 1983 only private operators were entitled to apply for this grant to upgrade existing buildings. However, both public and private operators were still entitled to apply for another 'one time' only grant, the Capital Equipment Grant.[52] This grant was for purchasing equipment to establish a new instructional area, but not for increasing the resources of an existing instructional area. One important stipulation was attached to both the Capital Equipment and Renovation Grant. That was, if an operator should discontinue the ECS program before the three year term, the operator must repay all or part of the Equipment and Renovation Grant.

In order to assist operators in rural or northern areas of Alberta with the higher cost of operating and obtaining resources, a Disadvantaged Area Grant was available. A 'disadvantaged area' was defined as:

> a geographical area or a centre in an area which is designated by the Deputy Minister of Education upon recommendation by the Assistant Deputy Minister (Program Delivery), Alberta Education, as having health, cultural, economic and social conditions adversely affecting children and their families.[53]

A Small Centre Assistance Grant was made available to operators of small centres "to offset higher costs associated with the operation of necessary small centres."[54] Usually these centres were located in rural or northern areas.

Getting young children safely to and from ECS programs created the need for a Transportation Grant. This grant was initially available to transport all handicapped children and all children in rural areas.[55] As of 1974 this grant was extended to include urban children being transported to an official minority/immersion language program, a church-oriented alternative program or to an ECS program not within reasonable walking distance.[56]

Operators were also able to apply for grants that off-set administrative expenses such as providing teacher inservice training and hiring teaching interns.

Summary

The 1973 Operational Plans for Early Childhood Services (ECS) proposed an organizational model similar to the model used by the United States for Project Head Start.(PHS) Both were organized to promote strong parental and community involvement in the education of children below school age. This involvement was in the form of shared membership on local advisory committees. Early childhood program proposals had to come from advisory committees representing non-profit agencies in the community. Early childhood professionals were available to provide leadership to parents and community at both the local level and the government levels. Professionals assisted parents in the planning and delivery of their early childhood program. They also helped parents learn more about raising their children by offering parent's courses on the topic of child development. Project Head Start however, also provided parents the opportunity to attend professional teacher training programs. Both the ECS and PHS were designed to serve the needs of young children and their families however PHS was directed at disadvantaged three to five year old children while ECS was directed at all children ages zero to eight. Both programs addressed all aspects of child development but PHS put more emphasi.. on the areas of cognitive and language development in order to prepare disadvantaged children for an equal start in grade school with more advantaged middle class children.

The Alberta ECS Branch certainly did not ignore the disadvantaged and handicapped during its years of operation. In fact the 1973 Operational Plans set the needs of handicapped children and disadvantaged children as the two top priorities. Extensive services were provided these two areas including extra funding and the provision of programs for children as early as age 2.5 and up to age 6.6 if children were not ready to enter grade one at the normal age of 5.5.

The needs of regular kindergarten aged children were also addressed through government funding to all non-profit programs. This provision of government funding allowed the public schools to re-enter the area of kindergarten programs thus increasing the number of available and affordable kindergarten spaces. As a result attendance in kindergarten programs increased to nearly one hundred percent by 1987. Regulations passed by the Alberta ECS also ensured that children attended programs that were housed in approved buildings that met government health and fire safety standards. Standardization of professional qualifications was established so that mutual understanding of early childhood philosophy was developed and utilized in programs. This professional development will be discussed in chapter seven.

Although Alberta closely followed the United State's organizational system for Project Head Start, Alberta chose to go a different route in terms of adopting a philosophy.

Whereas PHS allowed each program to select its own philosophy when planning an early childhood program, Alberta organizers preferred to develop a basic philosophy for the province. The organizers wanted to facilitate relatively consistent developmental skills among all children entering grade school. The development of this philosophy will be explained in the next chapter.

Endnotes

[1] Edward Zigler and Jeanette Valentine (Ed.), Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty, 1979, p.3.

[2] Ibid, p. 381.

[3] Ibid, p. 387.

[4] Ibid, p. 304.

[5] Ibid, pp. 175-176.

[6] Office of Child Development, Head Start: A Child Development Program, 1970, p. 4.

[7] Edward Zigler and Jeanette Valentine (ed.). p. 315.

[8] Ibid, p. 333.

[9] Ibid, p. 349.

[10] Ibid, p. 373.

[11] Muriel Affleck and Naomi Hersom, "Early Childhood Services," Early Childhood Education, Spring 1974, p. 5

[12] Government of Alberta, Operational Plans for Early Childhood Services, March 1973, p. 8.

[13] Ibid, p. 8.

[14] Alberta Education, Annual Report 1975/76, p. 65

[15] Alberta Education, Annual Report 1974/75, p. 56 and Dr. Judy Trudiver, Early Childhood Education/Services, 1986. p. 108.

[16] Alberta Education, Annual Report 1974/75. p. 56

[17] Government of Alberta, Operational Plans, p. 12.

[18] Alberta Education, Annual Report 1981/82, p. 29.

[19] Harvey Social Research Ltd., ECS Coordination Evaluation, 1983, p. vi.

[20] Government of Alberta, Operational Plans, p. 14.

[21] Ibid, p. 14.

[22] Ibid, p. 17.

[23] Dr. Judy Trudiver, Early Childhood Education/Services 1986, p. 13.

[24] Government of Alberta, Operational Plans, p. 3.

[25] Ibid, p. 8.

[26] Ibid, Forward, p. i.

[27] Ibid, p. 24.

[28] Ibid, p. 24.

[29] Dr. Judy Trudiver, p. 13.

[30] Alberta Education, School Grants Manual. 1986, Section 4, p. 1.

[31] Ibid, Appendix, p. 3.

[32] Alberta Education, Policy/Program Monitoring

Handbook 1986, Section 3, p. 3.

[33] Alberta Education, School Grants Manual. 1976, p. 34.

[34] Government of Alberta, Operational Plans, p. 24.

[35] Dr. Judy Trudiver, p. 13.

[36] Ibid, p. 115.

[37] Dr. R. Bosetti, (Deputy Minister of Education), Interview, June 1987.

[38] Dr. Judy Trudiver, p. 13.

[39] Government of Alberta, Operational Plans, p. 21.

[40] Dr. Judy Trudiver, p. 16.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Early Childhood Education, Advisory Manual on Early Childhood Services for the Incorporated Non-Profit or Private School, 1986, p. 7.

[43] Ibid, p. 15.

[44] Ibid, p. 16.

[45] Government of Alberta, Operational Plans, p. 5.

[46] Alberta Education, School Grants Manual, 1986, Section 1, p. 1.

[47] Ibid, Section 1, p. 1.

[48] Ibid, Section 7, p. 1.

[49] Ibid, Section 9, p. 2.

[50] Ibid, Section 11, p. 1.

[51] Ibid, Section 3, p. 1.

[52] Ibid, Appendix, p. 11.

[53] Ibid, Appendix, p. 2.

[54] Ibid, Section 10, p. 1.

[55] Government of Alberta, Operational Plans, p. 36.

[56] Alberta Education, School Grants Manual, 1986, Section 13, p. 2.

Chapter VI

Alberta's Early Childhood Services - Philosophy, Goals and Historical Foundations

Consistency of program philosophy was one of the major concerns of the early childhood interest groups during their campaign for government involvement. Prior to 1973 every early childhood program in Alberta independently developed curriculum based on a philosophy of its own choosing. This produced inconsistent school entering skills among those children who attended preschools.

It had been a long understood and accepted practice of the Department of Education to identify the necessary skills for every subject and every grade. These skills were compiled in documents known as Curriculum Guidelines. The development of these guidelines was based on an educational philosophy that dealt with what should be learned, when the learning should occur and how learning could be fostered. The exact interpretation of these guidelines was left to the discretion of the professional teacher. However, all potential grade school teachers enrolled in university courses, were provided the philosophy relevant to the existing curriculum guidelines. They were therefore well prepared to transform these guidelines into learning activities that produced relatively consistent outcomes in

accordance with the goals and objectives of the guidelines.

What was clearly missing from the area of early childhood education programs was this consistency of direction. A common set of guidelines based on approved early childhood philosophy was needed plus a common acquisition of this philosophy by early childhood teachers through a university degree program. If early childhood teachers were to assume the responsibility of preparing children for entrance to grade school, agreement had to be reached upon what, how and when to teach these children.

This task was given to the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education in 1972. It conducted extensive research into all the early childhood models and philosophies of the past and in 1973 produced the document Operational Plans for Early Childhood Services. This document outlined policy statements concerning the organization, administration, philosophy and goals of ECS. Later in 1982 and 1984, Alberta Education restated the initial 1973 philosophical statements into two publications titled Early Childhood Services: Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions. Later in this chapter the specific Early Childhood Services' philosophy and goals will be outlined as well as the major historical sources used to develop the program's overall orientation.

In general the philosophy and goals of ECS in Alberta display elements from all research bases and previous early childhood program models, but the strongest influence came

from the British Infant System model. The strong influence of the British system upon preschool programs in Alberta needs explanation.

The 1960s and 1970s were decades of increasing economic expansion for Alberta due to the high national and international demand for oil found in the province. Expanded employment opportunities resulted in a migration of workers to Alberta from other Canadian provinces and other countries, such as Britain and the United States. Table 5, (Appendix p. 163) shows the large numbers of British teachers incorporated into the Alberta education system during the 1960s.[1] Occupying positions at various levels of the education system and with knowledge of preschool systems in Britain, these British educators have affected the ECS policy decisions in 1973. For example, influential at the university level in Alberta during the 1960s was Dr. S. Gracy from England who, together with Dr. B. Cutler from the United States, shifted the university accreditation from a Primary-Kindergarten Certificate to a major in Early Childhood Education at the University of Alberta.[2] Together they imparted knowledge of early childhood models from their respective countries to the first group of early childhood graduates. These professors were also very active in the campaign for public supported early childhood programs. Dr. L. Everett-Turner, a professor of early childhood education at the University of Alberta and one of those early graduates, recalled the emphasis on British and

American texts and course content during her studies.[3] Her awareness of British early childhood philosophy was increased when she was given the opportunity to accompany ECS Consultants to Britain for a six week course during the early 1970s.

A number of other professionals employed by the ECS Branch during its years of operation from 1973 to 1987 were also influenced by the British educational system. The British influence was provided by ECS Consultants, Mrs. G. Leavitt and Mr. A. Rich, who had relocated from Britain and were in possession of first hand information concerning early childhood programs. Former director of ECS, Dr. H.I. Hastings, worked on a special project with Dr. Tizzard from Britain and Dr. E.A. Torgunrud, the last director of ECS, visited Britain for the purpose of viewing early childhood programs. The acting director during 1986/87 Dr. D. Jeffares, indirectly brought ideas from Britain through his experience with the Australian early childhood system.[4]

The next two sections describe the philosophy and goals that presently guide early childhood programs in Alberta. This information is derived mainly from the 1984 publication of Early Childhood Services: Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions. Most of the material in this document is still relevant in 1987 however some additional information from the 1986 Policy/Program Monitoring Handbook was used to reflect the recent extension of the ECS philosophy to the elementary level.

Early Childhood Services' Philosophy

The philosophy for ECS in Alberta is founded upon seven basic principles. These principles are identified in the 1984 publication, Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions. However as of 1986 the first principle states that **'human development is a continuous, sequential, interactive process through the articulation of ECS programs with elementary education.'**[5]

> Articulation is characterized by continuity in learning objectives, instructional practices, evaluation methods, program administration and the involvement of parents and community resource persons.[6]

In other words, it is believed that young children from the ages 0 to 12 are continuously developing and would benefit from exposure to similar learning environments in order to allow for maximum human development. It is generally understood that human development is a gradual yet continual refinement of skills from the simple to the more complex. It is also understood that the rate of human development is different for each individual but that at any given time an individual "is developing physically, emotionally, intellectually, socially and creatively."[7] These areas of development are related to and dependent on one another. For example, if a child's diet negatively affects his growth, physical appearance and ability to reason, then the child's

feelings about himself, his relationship with others and his ability to learn or be creative, will also be affected. In order for development to occur the child must interact with both the physical and social environment. It is therefore important that the preschool environment be carefully prepared to allow free experimentation with language, expression of feelings, formation of relationships, solution of problems, extension of physical limits and above all, experimentation with responsibility towards others.

The second principle is that **'early childhood is a particularly significant period in human development.'**[8] Research has shown that children are influenced by their environments, especially during the early years. A child needs a secure and stimulating environment if he is to develop to his fullest potential. If a child is raised in such an environment he will develop into an individual who is independent, creative, a decision-maker, a learner, has initiative, feels positive about himself and relates well to others.

A third principle is that **'the self-concept is important in human development.'**[9] Self-concept is formed during the early years by the way a child is treated by significant people such as family, peers and teachers. If significant people treat a child as a worthwhile, capable person, then the child begins to accept these qualities about himself and develops a high, positive self-concept. With a positive self-concept a child is not afraid to try

new experiences and approach social situations with ease and confidence, thus further developing his social skills.

A fourth principle is that **'children learn through interaction with their environment.'**[10] Young children learn best by exploring and experimenting with their environment. It is through first-hand manipulation of concrete materials in their environment that children come to understand fully such characteristics as size, color and shape. Children are then prepared at a later stage to deal with such abstract concepts as density and volume with a clearer understanding due to their early concrete exposure to materials. The use of the five senses: touch, smell, hearing, sight and taste is essential when children concretely explore their environments, adding new bits of information to what is already stored. By encouraging children to use their senses and their imagination as they explore their environments, children are also able to develop the ability to think creatively, whether it be to solve a problem or to express ideas through art, music, movement, drama or language.

A fifth principle is that **'structured and child initiated play is considered central to the learning that occurs as young children interact with their environment.'**[11] Child initiated play "includes any activity children have freely chosen, is under their control and is not dominated or imposed by an adult."[12] However an adult can use a play situation to provide children with

valuable learning experiences. For example objects of different weight can be placed near water inviting children to play with the objects in the water, discovering for themselves that some objects float while others sink. The selective comment, observation or question from an adult will reinforce, extend or clarify the learning experience for the child before he hurries off to experiment with a different media. Structured play is adult directed activities requiring children to participate. The activities chosen by the adult will still capitalize on the child's natural desire to play; therefore the child will usually be a willing and enthusiastic participant. An example of structured play is asking children to come together to sing a song or play a game in which the concept of numbers is being taught. Through play the child observes, discovers, reasons and solves problems as he learns new skills and practices familiar ones.

A sixth principle is that **'parents are primary agents in the child's development.'**[13] In other words parents are the child's first and primary teacher. It is therefore extremely important that parents provide a secure, loving stimulating environment for the child to develop "ideas, language and an understanding of the world and their place in it."[14] In order to prepare such an environment, parents need the opportunity to increase their knowledge of young children and improve their child-raising skills.

The seventh and final principle is that **'there is need**

for coordinated, responsive services.'[15] In order to maximize knowledge of available early childhood services, a network of cooperation and communication should be established to "collectively meet the needs of children, parents and staff."[16] Communication will allow health, educational, recreational and social agencies to exchange information about each others' programs and advise parents of the services available. Through open communication duplication of services can be avoided and cooperative programs may occur between several services such as education and health.

Building on these seven principles, Alberta Education formulated the following eight goal statements.

Early Childhood Services' Goals

The 1984 Early Childhood Services: Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions list the following goal statements:

1. To contribute to the development of a positive self-concept in young children so that they accept and appreciate themselves and others as individuals.

2. To enhance the physical development of young children by providing health, nutrition and dental care and developing gross, fine and perceptual motor skills.

3. To enhance the emotional, social and moral development of young children by encouraging self-expression of feelings, independent behavior and positive relationships with others.

4. To enhance the intellectual development of young children through thinking processes and language acquisition.

5. To enhance the creative development of young children by encouraging novel approaches to problems and self-expression through the arts.

6. To contribute to the involvement of parents in their children's education by encouraging participation in program development, implementation and evaluation.

7. To enhance the competence of staff by providing opportunities to acquire the knowledge, attitudes and skills to develop, implement and evaluate programs which are consistent with the philosophy of ECS.

8. To contribute to a comprehensive, coordinated system of early childhood services which includes:
   a) providing opportunities for individuals, families and communities to identify needs as they relate to young children and to work cooperatively toward meeting these needs.
   b) identifying gaps in services for young children and their families.
   c) using existing services for young children and their families.
   d) developing and providing required services
   e) planning and implementing a coordinated delivery of services.[17]

This section has identified the philosophical principles and goals that are presently used as guides in developing quality early childhood programs. The next section of this thesis will describe the philosophies of educators throughout history that have had direct influence on the development of Alberta's Early Childhood Services philosophy and goals.

Early Childhood Philosophers Influential to Alberta's ECS Philosophy and Goals

Early Childhood, as a field of study, has grown in importance due to the contributions of educators who recognized the unique learning style of young children and who experimented with materials and methods of teaching that enhanced their development. Such educators included Johann Comenius (1592-1670), who was the first known educator to recognize that the most important years of an individual's life are the early years.

> Let the foundations of all things be firmly laid, unless you wish the whole superstructure to totter...that only is firm and stable which is imbibed during the earliest years.[18]

This idea was reflected in the second principle of Alberta's ECS philosophy, which identified early childhood as a significant period in human development.

Since Comenius' time a number of educators recognized the value of allowing children to explore their environments with their senses - touching, smelling, tasting, hearing and seeing. Such educators included Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), Johann Pestalozzi (1746-1827) and John Dewey (1859-1952). These educators believed that learning occurred when a practical problem had been resolved. In other words, children 'learned by doing.' They also believed that exercise, good nutrition and fresh air were

very important to the physical and emotional well-being of all children. These ideas were reflected in the second goal of Alberta's ECS, which emphasized the physical development of young children by providing health, nutrition and dental care and developing gross, fine and perceptual motor skills.

The ECS's third goal of encouraging the self-expression of feelings was mainly based on research done by Susan Isaacs (1885-1948). She worked with emotionally disturbed children in England and proved that suppressed emotions and suppressed sexual curiosity could cause emotional disturbances in children.

Jean Piaget's developmental theory of intellectual growth and language development is the theory adhered to in the fourth goal of the ECS philosophy. This Swiss psychologist investigated the thought processes of young children and provided educators with general guidelines about the 'approximate' age that 'normal' children pass through the stages of intellectual development. Piaget also studied disadvantaged children and found an approximate three-year lag in development.[19] He emphasized that children do not magically progress through these stages. He advised that children should be provided with intellectual activities that are within their level of understanding in order to facilitate practise. Only after repeated problem-solving experiences at a particular level will the child be ready to function intellectually at the next stage. At each level children should be allowed to work out

problems actively and develop important concepts through play. As far as Piaget was concerned, educators should avoid teaching children academic facts because these facts are quickly forgotten. Instead educators should provide children with a wide range of environmental stimuli to enable them to establish their own conceptual framework through the process of play.

Piaget's theory was supported by Benjamin Bloom, an educator from the United States who conducted longitudinal studies of characteristics such as intelligence and personality traits. His studies supported Piaget's theory that environment can greatly affect developmental characteristics, especially during the first eight years of a child's life and therefore particular attention should be paid to the preparation of a learning environment.

It would be safe to say that every early childhood educator is familiar with Piaget's developmental theory of intellectual growth and Bloom's longitudinal studies proving that early childhood is the most rapid period of growth and change. The majority of early childhood educators adhere carefully to Piaget's theory when planning cognitive experiences for young children.

Most early childhood philosophers recognized that children should learn to master their environment through exploration and manipulation. However, mastery of environments containing adult-sized furniture and equipment was difficult. The Italian born educator, Maria Montessori

(1870-1952), was the first to create child-sized furniture and self-correcting learning materials which encouraged independence and self-confidence. Most educators in Alberta use her materials in their ECS programs.

The creator of the first 'kindergarten' was Friedrich Froebel (1782-1852), a German educator. It is obvious that many early childhood programs have incorporated certain aspects of his system such as 'circle time' discussions, music activities, child-centered initiatives through play, outdoor activities and many of his fine motor activities such as constructing with sticks, cutting and weaving, folding paper and sewing pictures.

The one component of the Froebelian System that the province of Alberta has incorporated in its ECS model, is the training of parents to work with children at home. Froebel believed kindergartens were an extension of the home and that school and home should support each other. His kindergartens were used as training centres for mothers so they could work with their children at home. The requirement of an attached Local Advisory Committee to each ECS program in Alberta has also provided a degree of parental involvement in their children's development.

Although Alberta's philosophy incorporated the ideas of many early childhood educators, the ECS program direction or philosophy more closely resembled the philosophy of the British Infant System which will be examined next.

The Influence of The British Infant-Nursery School System on Alberta's ECS Philosophy and Goals

The philosophy and goals of the Alberta ECS reflect aspects from all early childhood philosophies and programs prior to 1973. Although this philosophy is eclectic in nature, all the Alberta educators interviewed for this thesis confirmed that the dominating influence was the philosophy of the British Infant School System. This influence became even more evident after the 1984 adoption of a policy of integration called the Articulation Policy.[20] Although this policy will be thoroughly dealt with in the next chapter, its relevance to the British Infant System warrants the following brief summary. Literally, articulation is defined as "to form or fit into a systematic whole."[21] In Alberta this meant "providing continuity of experience for children according to their individual needs from ECS through the primary grades."[22] It was expected that kindergartens and the three primary grades manifest developmental experiences that allowed for the reorganization of children by interest and abilities across grades, rather than the continuation of four separate age-related groups. The concept of mixing different ages based on similar interests and abilities for the purpose of learning, has its origins in the British infant-nursery system.

The Infant School dates back to the days of **Robert**

Owen (1771-1858). Owen, an industrialist, socialist and reformer opened the first infant school in 1816 at the New Lanark cotton mills.[23] Appalled by the poor living conditions of workers, demoralized behavior and the practice of child-labor, Owen established a model factory settlement which included housing for workers, recreation facilities, an evening institute for adults and a school for children ages five to ten. By improving the overall living conditions, he believed that individuals would respond by casting aside habits of laziness, filth, dishonesty and intoxication.

His school was to provide a proper environment for children and "was to emphasize health, physical exercise and moral training for children of tender years."[24] The school was formally called the Institution for the Formation of Character and reflected Owen's belief that character is formed for not by the individual but also as a direct result of environmental influences.[25] His school, more commonly referred to as the infant school, provided young children with moral education, a healthy, clean environment and stimulating physical activities such as singing, dancing, marching and outdoor play. Having visited Pestalozzi's school, Owen adopted the latter's ideas of using realistic objects or events instead of books to teach curriculum subjects such as reading, writing, arithmetic, geography and history. However, unlike Pestalozzi, he did not use play as the method of teaching. Instead he used formal

instructional periods, but his lessons were child-centered instead of teacher-directed and were designed to match the interest and curiosity of the children. He used the method of arranging children into multiple-age groupings in order to facilitate teaching to individual interests. He arranged for children ages three to six and six to ten to work together with older children tutoring younger children.

Owen's infant school idea became part of the British public school system. As of 1870, when the statutory compulsory age for schooling was set at age five, the British Infant School System provided education to children age five to eight.[26] Owen's infant school concept was not only incorporated into the public school system, but was also influential in the nursery school system which became the initiative of American educational reformer, Margaret McMillan.

Margaret McMillan (1860-1931), a native of New York, continued Robert Owen's educational and social reform movement in England.[27] Assisted by her sister Rachel, McMillan began her campaign in the late nineteenth century for government support of programs to provide nutritional aid, medical care, dental care and education for poor children in the slums of the industrial cities of Deptford and Bradford. Her initial efforts were largely aimed at health rescue through school treatment clinics, however she turned her attention to the remedial education of these slum children when she realized that diagnostic intelligence

tests were categorizing many slum children as mentally retarded. It was her belief that these children suffered from environmental rather than mental limitations.

In 1913 she established an open-air nursery school in which the total development of the child was to be nurtured.[28] Influenced by Pestalozzi, Froebel and Owen, McMillan called the school a 'nursery' to symbolize a garden. The nursery had one side open to the fresh air to encourage free movement between indoors and outdoors thus resulting in the development of physically healthy bodies that could withstand the spread of tuberculosis, eye, ear and respiratory infections. The McMillans accepted children ages two to eight or nine and provided both physical care and education. Learning through play, sensory development and the development of imagination and language were key objectives. Nursery teachers were to prepare both indoor and outdoor environments to encourage responsible child-directed activities. They were to intervene only at teachable moments. Margaret McMillan also advocated close relationships with the home and encouraged parental involvement in the schools because she felt that nursery schools alone could not overcome the ills of society.[29]

Over time both Owen's infant school and McMillan's nursery school experienced degrees of change. Owen's infant school adopted more formal academic teacher-directed methods which replaced his idea of child-interest teaching. This put nursery schools and infant schools at odds with each

other. McMillan even advocated leaving children in nursery school until age seven to protect them from the dull, restrictive and repressive methods of infant schools.[30] However, the statutory compulsory age for schooling having been set in 1870 at age five, allowed children the opportunity to attend the state supported Infant Schools thus often reducing attendance at McMillan's private nursery schools to those children below age five.[31]

During World War II a war-time nurseries scheme was implemented to care for the preschool children of working mothers and evacuated families. Infant schools were obligated to accept children ages two and up and to incorporate nursery school teachers to help with the over-load. Working together in schools and bomb shelters, the child-centered activity methods of the nursery school gained respect and acceptance from the infant school teachers. Presently the infant schools in England implement curriculum in the same manner as the nursery schools and it is not uncommon to find nursery schools attached to infant schools in order to provide a continuity of experiences for young children.

This idea of continuity of experiences for children in their preoperational stage of development (Piaget), was identified by the Alberta Department of Education in 1984 as a major goal for the organization of early childhood experiences. As mentioned earlier, a policy of articulation was introduced in 1984 throughout the province. Teacher

inservice opportunities have been provided for Kindergarten to grade three teachers to acquaint them with ideas of working together as a team, sharing ideas; reorganizing children into interest and ability groups; preparing the environment for more child-centred activities and building an integrated curriculum around themes. Experimentation has begun at many schools to implement this policy of articulation.

In addition to the articulation policy, recommendations affecting early childhood education were made by the Policy Advisory Committee for the School Act Review in January, 1985. The recommendation made to the Minister of Education was to transfer the ECS Program from the Department of Education Act to the School Act, yet maintain the feature of optional attendance by individuals and optional provision by boards.[32] The committee gave recognition to the continued practice of providing early childhood services by both public and private organizations, but stated several expected outcomes of including early childhood services within school systems. These outcomes included the reorganization of age-based curriculums to incorporate principles of maturity and competencies; the use of alternative teaching methods; the use of an interdisciplinary approach and the upward extension of parental involvement as exemplified by ECS Local Advisory Committees.[33]

This proposed direction for ECS and primary education

closely resembles the modern British Infant System. The immediate similarities between the two systems include the continuity of experiences for children ages five to eight; the development of an integrated, theme-based curriculum; the use of mixed-age groupings or family groupings for learning experiences; the use of child-centred activities instead of the traditional teacher-centred activities and the practice of parental involvement on a planned or spontaneous drop-in basis. Other features of the British system that may also become characteristic of the Alberta system include flexible enrollment dates in January, April and September. This British practice allows individual children reaching their fifth birthday throughout the school year to join an existing, relatively well adjusted and happy group instead of arriving in September with thirty other scared children. Teachers can then devote individual attention to introducing the newcomer to a group of well-adjusted children who are enjoying their activities and to showing the newcomer that this is a safe place to come each day.

According to the 1984 study, Articulation Linkages: Children and Parents in Early/Basic Education, some Alberta schools already incorporate the undifferentiated or integrated timetable in order to facilitate the ideas of family groupings, child-centred activities, theme-based integrated curriculums, spontaneous communication, spontaneous learning and the free movement of individual

children and teachers within the learning environment.[34] In the British system very few fixed periods are timetabled during the day. Tabled group activities may include assembly, physical education, music and movement, yet the decision to participate remains with the children. The rest of the day is open for children to work individually or in child-selected groups on projects that usually relate to a teacher-initiated curriculum theme. Teachers circulate among the children providing guidance and suggestions. Children are also free to participate in any of the sensory or creative activities available. At all times the classrooms contain a water table, sand table, art corner, block centre, puppet corner, story corner and other activity possibilities which encourage small motor development, language development, spatial development, etc.

One feature of the British system which would have limited implementation in Alberta is the attachment of a garden to the school for the purpose of learning directly from nature. However a willing teacher in Alberta could care for the garden during her summer holidays so that in the fall children could have the benefit of harvesting what they had helped to plant in the spring.

One final possibility for the future provision of ECS in Alberta is the attachment of nursery schools and day cares to the school in order to provide the continuity of experience for children ages 0 to 8. Based on the fact that Britain, with its extensive early childhood experience is

only recently attaching nursery schools to infant schools, this move will probably not happen in Alberta for some time.

Summary

Having re-examined the philosophies of early childhood educators, one can trace the foundations for the philosophy of Alberta's ECS. Presently the ECS in Alberta is eclectic in nature, comprehensive in scope, yet incorporates much of the program direction of the British Infant System model.[35] If those responsible are successful in implementing this model, the application of child development theory for preoperational aged children will be maximized. If unsuccessful, five year olds and their teachers will either remain a segregated, alien component of the school system or because of the pressure to co-operate, teachers of five year olds will succumb to the formal academic teacher-directed methods of their primary counterparts.

In order to ensure the consistent interpretation of Alberta's philosophy and goals, the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education recommended that all early childhood teachers acquire as a minimum a Bachelor of Education Degree with a major in early childhood. The evolution of the early childhood professionalism and its affect on program initiatives for children and their families will be discussed in the next chapter.

Endnotes

[1] James Small, A Study of Selected Factors in the Immigration of British Teachers To Alberta, 1970.

[2] Dr. Muriel Affleck, (Retired Early Childhood Professor from University of Alberta). Interview, June 1987.

[3] Dr. Loreen Everett-Turner, (Early Childhood Professor at University of Alberta). Interview, June 1987.

[4] Dr. David Jeffares, (Acting Director of Early Childhood Services), Interview, June 1987.

[5] Alberta Education, Policy/Program Monitoring Handbook 1986, Section 3, p. 3.

[6] Ibid, Section 3, p. 3.

[7] Alberta Education, Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions. 1984, p. 2.

[8] Ibid, p. 2.

[9] Ibid, p. 2.

[10] Ibid, p. 3.

[11] Policy/program Monitoring Handbook, Section 3, p. 3.

[12] Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions, p. 3.

[13] Ibid, p. 4.

[14] Ibid, p. 4.

[15] Ibid, p. 4.

[16] Ibid, p. 4.

[17] Ibid, p. 5.

[18] Dr. Muriel Affleck and Dr. Pearl Turner, Early Childhood Education: Position Paper, 1971, p. 6.

[19] Iva Dene McCleary. Early Childhood Education. 1976, p. 13.

[20] Dr. E.A. Torgunrud, "Articulation: Why? What? When?" Early Childhood Education, Winter 1985-1986, p. 4.

[21] Dr. Kerrie Pain, Articulation Linkages: Children and Parents in Early/Basic Education, 1984, p. 1.

[22] Ibid, p. 1.

[23] Whitbread, pp. 8-10.

McCleary, pp. 18-20.

[24] Brubacher, p. 381.

[25] Whitbread, p. 9.

[26] Weber, p. 162.

[27] Whitbread, pp. 60-63.

McCleary, pp. 24-26.

Curtis, pp. 9-13.

Weber, pp. 1-251.

[28] Whitbread, p. 61.

[29] Curtis, p. 10.

[30] Ibid, p. 12.

[31] Weber, p. 162.

[32] Policy Advisory Committee for the School Act Review. Partners in Education: Principles for a New School Act 1985, p. 11.

[33] Ibid, pp. 11-12.

[34] Pain, p. 18.

[35] Jeffares.

Chapter VII

Professional Development and Early Childhood Services Program Development

Professional Development

The most important key to the successful implementation of any program is the skill level of the people responsible for the program. In the Early Childhood Services program, early childhood professional expertise was required at all levels of the organizational model.

In 1972 the Commission on Educational Planning recommended that the minimum professional level for educators be set at a B.Ed. Degree.[1] In 1973 the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education recommended the minimum professional level for early childhood educators be set at a B.ED. Degree with a major in early childhood or a valid Alberta Teaching Certificate plus an Early Childhood Services Diploma.[2] The ECS Diploma consisted of five full university courses in the areas of:

a) Child Development
b) Family Studies, Interpersonal Relationships, Community Relationships
c) Programming in ECS (method courses)
d) Curricular Areas (content courses)
e) ECS Practicum [3]

It was required that all ECS programs employ at least one teacher with these qualifications. However the ECS operator could employ a permit teacher instead of a diploma teacher if it could be shown that the permit teacher was needed. Such cases might be found in remote or rural centres. Interim ECS Permits were available to certified teachers who were working towards the completion of the ECS Diploma by taking one full course per year.

During the 1987/88 year, the Teacher Certification Branch was to conduct a study of the utility of the ECS Diploma; the number of teachers in possession of the Diploma and where these teachers were employed. Dr. David Jeffares, acting director of the ECS Branch in 1987 predicted that a committee would be formed to review the recommendations of the study.[4] If the committee should decide the ECS Diploma an unnecessary requirement then recommendations would be made for alternative methods of ensuring that knowledge and understanding of the ECS program intent was obtained by kindergarten to grade six teachers. It is possible that the ECS Diploma requirement will be replaced by a requirement of compulsory basic child development courses for the B.ED. degree program. Support of this study was expressed by Robin Stewart, acting coordinator for professional development in the Alberta Teachers' Association.[5] The ATA's policy on teaching certificates stated that only one teaching certificate was needed and

that all teachers should have the same certificate.[6] Increasingly since the creation of the ECS Diploma in 1973, members of the Early Childhood Specialist Council had been acquiring both the B.Ed. Degree and the ECS Diploma which resulted in double certification and higher pay for those particular teachers. This situation had been unique to the Early Childhood Council, yet had prompted other specialist councils to consider similar requirements in order to secure better pay for its members. Stewart felt that the review committee would probably recommend that all teachers acquire a certain number of early childhood courses within their certification program if the ECS Diploma requirement was dropped. Dr. Myer Horowitz, one of the key promoters of the need for early childhood specialists during the public debate on early childhood, was concerned that the elimination of the ECS Diploma would diminish the importance of early childhood within the school. Not having the designation of special qualifications due to knowledge of special methods would make it much easier for the downward extension of elementary methods to the kindergarten levels instead of the opposite effect, which was the intention of the 1984 Articulation Policy.[7] On the other hand, Dr. R. Bosetti, deputy minister of education, felt that the perceived need for teachers specializing in content at any level of the elementary grades should be replaced by the need for teachers capable of functioning as learning facilitators in all content areas. Therefore, Dr. Bosetti

viewed the elimination of the specialist requirement as a positive development for the next decade.[8]

Although most early childhood teachers have acquired the ECS Diploma since its introduction in 1973, a Letter of Authority was also available for staff who were not eligible to possess a teaching certificate or an Interim ECS Permit. These staff members could serve as instructional assistants under the supervision of a certified teacher with an ECS Diploma. However they could also serve as teachers for a one year period under special circumstances. Special circumstances may have involved the following conditions: a program with an enrolment of less than nine; remoteness of location; short-term emergencies such as illness, accident, maternity leave, etc. or special programs such as a language program. ECS operators had to re-advertise for qualified staff every year.[9] It was the responsibility of the ECS consultants to evaluate the qualifications of teachers in early childhood centres and recommend the awarding of an Interim ECS Diploma or Letter of Authority to those who met the requirements.

The training for instructional assistants was provided by the Department of Advanced Education through the Community Colleges and a distance education course offered by the Athabasca University. A two-year ECS Diploma and a one-year ECS Certificate for instructional assistants was available.[10] University credit for the college course was given to those who wanted to increase their early childhood

skills in a Teacher Certification University program.

Table 17 (Appendix p. 175) shows the number of ECS Diplomas issued from 1973 to 1985. However, Tables 18 and 19 (Appendix p. 176) demonstrate that there were still a number of permit teachers employed in both the public and private centres as of 1985. In the years 1982 to 1985 ninety-one percent of public school staff were diploma teachers and nine percent were permit teachers. In private centres, the percentage of diploma teachers steadily increased so that in 1985, eighty-seven percent of the teachers held ECS Diplomas. All teachers with an ECS Diploma or B.Ed with a major in Early Childhood Education were entitled to full membership in a professional organization. In Alberta this organization was the Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA).

The Alberta Teachers' Association is the largest professional organization in Alberta for educators. Twenty specialist councils function within the ATA including the Early Childhood Education Council(ECEC).[11] The ECEC was formed on November 19, 1966.[12] Regular membership with rights to vote or hold office was restricted to educators holding valid teaching certificates. Affiliated memberships with no voting privileges were available to all other citizens interested in early childhood education. Since its conception ECEC members were predominately kindergarten or grade one teachers but since the 1984 Articulation Policy, grade two and three teachers have increasingly become

members.[13] Membership has grown from 300 in 1966 to 2,043 in 1986.[14] "To date the ECEC has the largest membership of all twenty specialist councils."[15] If Articulation is successfully implemented upwards to grades four, five and six, the Early Childhood Council will probably have to split into two groups - kindergarten to grade three and grade four to grade six.[16] The ECEC provides its members with scholarly journals, newsletters, conferences, business meetings, school based workshops and sponsorship for regional activities in the area of early childhood. This council also provided the ECS Branch with feedback on proposals.

Negotiations for salaries and benefits is done by the ATA Annual Representative Assembly which acts on behalf of all specialist councils. ECS teachers employed by public school boards are members of the Alberta Teachers Association (ATA) and are paid according to a collective agreement. Although exact figures were not available, the 1987 estimate for the average annual salary of ECS teachers with school boards was $32,000.[17] Other benefits of the collective agreement include: dental insurance, several retirement pension plans, sick leave, life insurances, salary continuance insurance, sabbatical leave, maternity leave, compassionate leave, leave of absence and for remote areas isolation allowance, travel, transportation and moving expenses and housing subsidies.[18]

Job protection is also provided by the ATA which was an

important benefit to teachers employed in a non-compulsory, half-day program such as kindergartens. Usually kindergarten teachers deliver two half-day programs per day. Whenever kindergarten enrolments are considered by school boards to be too low, classes are reduced to one half-day program or entirely cancelled. Without ATA protection kindergarten teachers would be laid off immediately without any consideration for other available teaching positions. Instead ATA ensures that all efforts to provide continual full-time employment be made by the school division. The kindergarten teacher may be awarded two half-day kindergarten classes in two separate schools; an opportunity to fill a full time position within the basic education program or one half-day program as a minimum.

This job protection and salary negotiation is not available to early childhood teachers in private or community centres. This is why the ATA has always strongly disagreed with the delivery of ECS through various models.[19] As far as the ATA is concerned, kindergarten programs should be delivered by public schools only.

Teachers lacking professional certification often formed associations for the purpose of exchanging ideas and problems. Such organizations were the Association of Young Children and the Edmonton Preschool Association. With the help of government funding such as the Teacher Inservice grant and the Regional Coordination grant, such organizations can organize a quality conference, publish

resource materials and pay for substitutes.

Although a healthy competition for clients between private and public early childhood programs remains intact, professional teachers take advantage of dual memberships in associations to continue their professional growth. Both the members of ATA's ECE Council and the private associations extend invitations to each other for conferences and workshops. The opportunities for professional development in the early childhood area are thus doubled and most early childhood educators take advantage of these opportunities. Joint memberships, shared resources, shared experiences at conferences has resulted in mutual respect among members of private associations and the members of ATA.

Inservice for all ECS teachers was provided by staff of the ECS Branch, the Regional Education Offices and/or regional coordinating committees.[20] They were responsible for conducting "annual orientations on policies, guidelines and procedures, regulations and new initiatives."[21]

Professionals within the ECS Branch were also responsible for developing program guidelines for both children and parents.

Program Development

Program development in Alberta was similar to the programs developed by Project Head Start in the United States. Both organizations placed emphasis on designing

programs for both children and parents. According to a 1983/84 report Early Childhood Education/Services by the Council of Ministers in Canada, Alberta was the only province that established specific policies and programs for parent involvement and parent education including the provision of funds through the Parent Resource and Regional Coordination grant.[22] This grant was $11.35 per child for the September 1987 to August 1988 period.[23] It was paid directly to early childhood operators or Regional Coordinating Committees to help parents gain an understanding of child development. Parents could receive sponsorship to attend conferences, inservices, courses, membership in early childhood associations or the provision of educational resources.

The need for parents to acquire knowledge of early childhood was important for several reasons. First, parents could be more effective with the raising of their children and second, parents were expected to play a major role in the organization, administration, implementation and evaluation of the early childhood programs in which their child was enrolled.[24]

With this in mind, professionals within the ECS Branch were given the responsibility of assisting parents and early childhood operators in the following tasks:

> the development and implementation of comprehensive programs for young children which meet their physical, social, emotional and intellectual needs with the prime goal of strengthening the sense of dignity and

self-worth[25] within young children and their families.

At the provincial level the development of formalized guidelines for program content was awarded to six provincial development committees established in 1974.[26] These committees were under the guidance and direction of the provincial ECS Coordination Council which became the Policy Advisory Council in 1982.[27] Each committee had representation from participating departments, parents of young children and local ECS staff. The six committees were: Information Program, Children's Program, Parents' Program, Physical Resources Program, Community Resources Program and Evaluation Program. Because the government of Alberta had placed the onus on parents to form Local Advisory Committees for the purpose of organizing early childhood programs, these committees developed guidelines that could be used by both teachers and by parents who were actively involved with the establishment and administration of programs for their children. Based on the submissions from these committees the program development coordinator, hired in 1974, was able to produce a number of support materials to explain the ECS philosophy, goals and objectives to ECS operators and parents including the 1982 and 1984 Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions. All publications and audio-visual materials were listed in a catalogue which was available to ECS operators, primary educators, Regional Coordinating Committees and parents.

Most publications were available free to individuals and all audio-visual materials could be borrowed. The content of these support materials generally included information on organizing and evaluating an ECS program, child development theory, identification of special children, language development, the importance of play and parenting skills. It should be noted that a number of publication and audio-visual materials listed in this catalogue were produced by the Parent Resource Unit which was part of the Social Services Department until its closing in 1982.[28] The councillors associated with this unit were transferred to the ECS Branch along with their resources.

These councillors joined the seven regional early childhood consultants in providing assistance to parents and ECS operators. They gave inservices on the instruction and administration of child development programs during routine visits to centres, workshops and meetings. Regional consultants were also responsible for periodically evaluating ECS programs.

One feature of ECS evaluation that was unique to the province of Alberta was a policy of self-evaluation. Every operator in Alberta had to

> have in place program evaluation policy, guidelines and procedures which feature annual evaluation of at least one or more elements of the program.[29]

To assist parents and operators with this task the Children's Program Development Committee produced an

evaluation slide and tape in 1975 and in 1984 published two documents entitled How to Evaluate Your ECS Program and Self Evaluation: A Handbook for ECS Staff. Parents and operators also received a quarterly newsletter called the ECS Program Highlights in which new initiatives in program design were presented by both the ECS Branch and various ECS teachers throughout Alberta.

Another important aid to parents was the Parent Resources Inventory developed by the ECS Branch. Section One of this resource contained a catalogued list of articles on child development collected from various publications. The ECS Branch obtained copyright permission from the publishers and therefore was able to send copies of the requested articles to parents or operators. A second section of this inventory listed brochures, pamphlets and booklets which could be obtained from various sources. The complete address of the source and price was included. This inventory has also been translated into French. The entire project was the work of people employed under the Student Temporary Employment Plan (STEP) and the Priority Employment Plan (PEP). Although the ECS Branch has been dissolved, Dr. Jeffares assured me that the Parent Resources Inventory service will continue.

In 1977 the ECS Branch developed an In-Home Program designed to educate both parent and child in their home setting. The publication Organizing an ECS In-Home Program explained that this type of arrangement could be

used as an alternative program to a centre-based program or as one component of a centre-based program. The main focus of the program was on helping parents increase their understanding of child development and their abilities to enhance that development through every day activities in the home. The decision to start such a program was shared by community agencies, Local Advisory Committees and parents. The target recipients of this program were usually considered families in disadvantaged situations either due to weak home environments or due to the presence of a physically, mentally or emotionally handicapped child.

A home visitor could be a teacher, a child development specialist or a teacher-aid under the direct supervision of a teacher. It was preferred that the home visitor be someone from the community with a reputation for exceptional personal qualities such as flexibility, sensitivity, empathy, discretion and language facility. It was also desirable if the home visitor had successfully raised her/his own child. Home visitors were to meet regularly with an ECS consultant or coordinator who would provide workshops and problem exchange sessions.

Each home visit was to be at least one-and-a-half hours in length and include a demonstration of how to work with the child, a discussion time, during which parents could share their achievements or problems and a planning session of what next weeks visit would entail. Emphasis was placed on how to stimulate the intellectual development of the

child, the importance of good health, as well as information to help the parents seek support groups and become involved in the community. The home visitor provided information about community activities, meetings and workshops on the topic of child development, parenting or general interest activities that would possibly appeal to the parents.

The rationale for this type of program was based on the idea that if the parents improved their home environment and parenting skills they would be able to extend this knowledge to future members of the family and thus decrease the number of disadvantaged environments.

The last program development undertaken by the ECS Branch was called Articulation. In general terms it promoted continuity of learning experiences between home, ECS programs and elementary programs. This program initiative was for the purpose of fulfilling the original 1973 mandate of providing programs for all children ages 0 to 8. Up to 1984 the ECS Branch had concentrated on programs for children and their families age 4.5 to 5.5 and handicapped children age 2.5 to 6.5. The need to extend child development philosophy to programs for children age 5.5 to 8 had not been addressed.

The first step to addressing these needs was taken by the Early Childhood Services Policy Advisory Council in 1982 when it "chose integration or articulation of programming for children (0-8 years) and their parents as its first priority."[30] The second step occurred when Alberta

Education was reorganized in 1982, decentralizing early childhood services to regional offices for the purpose of improved coordination, cooperation and communication. At this same time the Department of Education "identified ECS-primary articulation as a priority over the next few years."[31] The third step was the passing of the following motion in 1984 by the Alberta legislature: "Be it resolved that the government consider the upward integration of ECS with Grade one."[32] In 1986 the integration or articulation policy stated:

> Alberta Education, in cooperation with school boards, Category 1 and 2 private schools and private ECS program operators, will ensure continuity from ECS through grade 6 in children's learning experiences which are consistent with principles of child development.[33]

In order to facilitate the implementation of this policy, the jurisdiction for ECS was transferred from the Department of Education Act to the School Act in 1987 making ECS an integral part of the school system.[34] In June, 1987 the ECS Branch was combined with the Elementary Education Branch for the purpose of reviewing the

> ECS Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions and the Program of Studies for Elementary Schools to identify discontinuities and/or incompatibilities and subsequently, to combine the documents to ensure that they adhere to the articulation policy and principles of child development.[35]

To assist ECS teachers, elementary teachers, principals

of schools, superintendents, regional coordinators and parents with the planning of continuous and sequential learning experiences, the ECS Branch issued a variety of policy statements through the ECS Program Highlights and the Alberta journal called Early Childhood Education. A number of support documents were also distributed though out the province including: Articulation Linkages: Children and Parents in Early/Basic Education, Human Development: The Early Years, and Bridges To Learning: A Guide to Parent Involvement. Since 1984, many inservices and workshops were organized including the presentation of articulation ideas in most of the seminars at the 1986 Early Childhood Education Council held in Calgary. All the teachers interviewed at this conference were involved with the articulation policy to some extent. Even private and community ECS teachers were attempting to find ways to integrate their programs with public schools in their district. They were being assisted by local members of the ECS/Primary Articulation Committee which was established in 1984.[36] Dr. D. Jeffares of the ECS Branch felt that although articulation between private ECS programs and public school programs would be difficult, successful integration would depend on the commitment of public school principals and superintendents to fostering articulation.[37]

Alberta's articulation policy was similar to the British Infant System in that it promoted a stronger continuum of

educational opportunities for children at home and at school.[38] Articulation and the new School Act both made recognition of the fact that school was only an extension of the home and that parents, the principal care givers, should be involved in their child's education.[39] With the help of parents, individual learning experiences could be developed to promote a balanced growth in the areas of emotional, intellectual, physical, and social development. This development is continuous and sequential, occurring at both the school and home thus a strong partnership between parents and school is beneficial to the child.

In terms of actual planning and implementation of learning experiences, teachers were advised to use language development and thinking skills as the basis for structuring curriculum and to eliminate grade or age related expectations.[40] Teachers were advised to plan for "a balance between learning activities which are achieved independently and those which occur in small and large group settings."[41] Extensive opportunities for exploration, manipulation and investigation of concrete objects without subject boundaries should also be available.[42] All ECS to grade six programs should become more child-directed to encourage individual learning styles and teachers were advised to base evaluations on these styles.[43] Above all, interaction and communication should increase significantly among children, teachers and parents as they actively pursue learning experiences within and between classrooms or

between private and public programs.

Summary

Lack of consistency among early childhood programs was a major concern of the organizers of Alberta's ECS. The first step taken to combat this problem was the development of a provincial philosophy. The second step involved the transfer of this philosophy to all ECS teachers. This was done informally by consultants from the ECS Branch and through newsletters, audio-visual materials and publications from the ECS Branch. In spite of these efforts there were no guarantees that every ECS teacher had taken time away from their jobs to attend workshops or read these documents. Therefore it was decided that the use of formal academic training would be the most effective method of achieving this transfer and guaranteeing that every teacher had been exposed to the philosophy was to utilize formal academic training. For this reason ECS teachers were required to obtain a B.ED. with a major in early childhood education or acquire an ECS Diploma to complement a Teaching Certificate. A Letter of Authority was issued in special circumstances to those people who were needed as teachers in a centre but did not possess the required qualifications. Since 1973 ECS teachers have continuously striven towards acquiring the required qualifications and in so doing have acquired the same professional status as other teachers in the

educational system. This professional status has gained them membership in the Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA) entitling all public school teachers to job protection and salary negotiations. Of all teachers in the public education system, ECS teachers were especially in need of this protection. The fact that ECS teachers work in a non-compulsory program made them especially vulnerable to lay offs. Professional ECS teachers employed in private or community programs have the right to belong to the ATA and participate in all professional development activities sponsored by the Early Childhood Education Council (ECEC) but they do not receive the benefits of job or salary protection.

In terms of program development, Alberta holds the unique position in Canada of being the only province that specifically developed programs for both children and parents. The rationale for this program direction was similar to the Project Head Start in the United States which was to provide parenting skills to parents. These skills would benefit all children in the family. With that goal in mind resources for parent use were developed by the ECS Branch and funds were awarded to centres on a per child basis to assist parents in their acquisition of child development knowledge. This knowledge was also beneficial to parents involved in the Local Advisory Councils which were responsible for organizing, administering and evaluating their child's ECS program.

A special parent-child program called In-Home Program was designed to help high risk families. Such families might be experiencing more difficulty than normal in the area of parenting due to additional family tensions and/or the presence of a handicapped child.

The most recent program development, called Articulation, has been initiated in order to meet the requirements of the 1973 mandate to develop programs for children beyond kindergarten. Articulation is basically the upward extension, in varying degrees, of the ECS program philosophy to grade six. To facilitate this development, ECS programs have been included in the School Act and are now considered part of the school system even though the programs may continue to be offered by private organizations on or off school property. In addition, professionals from the ECS Branch and the Elementary Branch will work together over the next few years to develop guidelines that incorporate child development principles into every elementary grade.

In the years of operation from 1973 to 1987, the ECS Branch accomplished many goals before being amalgamated with the Elementary Branch. The over all affect of their efforts on children, parents and teachers will be discussed in the next and concluding chapter.

Endnotes

1 Dr. W. Worth, Choice of Futures: Report of the Commission on Educational Planning, 1972, p. 245.

2 Government of Alberta, Operational Plans for Early Childhood Services, 1973, p. 23.

3 Early Childhood Services, Advisory Manual on ECS for the Incorporated Non-Profit or Private School, 1986, p. 8.

4 Dr. David Jeffares, (Acting Director of ECS Branch), Interview, June 1987.

5 Robin Stewart, (Acting Coordinator for Professional Development in Alberta Teachers Association), Interview, June 1987.

6 Alberta Teachers' Association, Alberta Teachers' Handbook, 1967, Section 2A3.

7 Dr. M. Horowitz, (President of University of Alberta), Interview, June 1987.

8 Dr. R. Bosetti, (Deputy Minister of Education), Interview, June 1987.

9 Advisory Manual on ECS for the Incorporated Non-profit or Private School, pp. 8 and 9.

10 Dr. Judy Trudiver, Early Childhood Education/ Services, 1986, p. 36.

11 Stewart.

12 Nadine Thomas, (President of Alberta Teachers' Association), Opening Address of the Early Childhood Education Council 20th Annual Conference, 1986.

[13] Dorothy Colbens, Ed. Celebration 20 Years of the ECEC Alberta Teachers Association, p. 24.

[14] Ibid, p. 22.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Stewart.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Pat Millar, (President Early Childhood Education Council), Interview, June 1987.

[19] Stewart.

[20] Trudiver, p. 22.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid, p. 43.

[23] Alberta Education, School Grants Manual, 1986, Appendix, p. 11.

[24] Government of Alberta, Operational Plans, p. 16.

[25] Early Childhood Services, A Progress Report from September 1, 1974 to August 31, 1975, 1975, p. 2.

[26] Alberta Education, Annual Report, 1974-1975.

[27] Alberta Education, Annual Report, 1982-1983, p. 9.

[28] Jeffares.

[29] Trudiver, p. 23.

[30] Dr. E.A.Torgunrud, "Articulation: Why? What? When?" Early Childhood Education, 1985-86, p. 4.

[31] Ibid, p. 5.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Alberta Education, Early Childhood Services Through Grade Six Education Program Articulation, Draft 10, 1986, p. 2.

[34] Bosetti.

[35] Early Childhood Services Through Grade Six Education Program Articulation, p. 4.

[36] Trudiver, p. 109.

[37] Jeffares.

[38] Early Childhood Services, Bridges to Learning: A Guide to Parent Involvement, 1985, p. 3.

[39] Policy Advisory Committee for the School Act Review, Partners in Education: Principles for a New School Act, 1985, p. 33.

[40] Torgunrud, p. 6.

[41] Early Childhood Services Through Grade Six Education Program Articulation, 1986, p. 1.

[42] Torgunrud, p. 6.

[43] Dr. D. Jeffares, An Update On Primary Articulation, Speech at the Early Childhood Education Council 20th Annual Conference, 1986.

Chapter VIII

Conclusion

The establishment of the ECS Branch and the provision of public funding for early childhood programs in Alberta brought about many changes which affected the lives of children, parents and teachers.

Public funding of ECS programs resulted in the increase of private programs and at the same time permitted school boards to re-establish kindergarten classes in schools. This situation then gave parents a choice between private and public early childhood programs, a common practice exercised by Alberta's parents when choosing other levels of school for their children. With school boards involved, the number of affordable kindergarten programs increased rapidly after 1973 so that as early as 1976 attendance involved 78.6 percent of the eligible kindergarten aged children in Alberta. (Table 8, Appendix p. 166) Attendance continued to increase to 95 percent by 1986. The opportunity for equal participation in early childhood programs had been established in Alberta.

The eradication of poorly equipped and poorly housed early childhood programs was accomplished through special provincial grants to off set the full cost of improvements. At the same time policies were set by the ECS Branch to ensure healthy learning environments for young children. The

ECS Branch would only provide operational funding to programs housed in buildings that met health, fire and safety standards and were furnished with safe equipment. These policies forced private operators to make a serious commitment to operating an early childhood program or go out of business. In spite of the special renovation grants, many small program operators refused to invest their own capital to upgrade their learning centres. As a result virtually all basement operated kindergarten programs were eradicated.

Policies were also implemented by the ECS Branch to address the problems created by the wide range of different program philosophies. Prior to 1973 grade school teachers were frustrated with the inconsistent preparation of children for entrance to grade school. From 1973 to 1987 the ECS Branch made extensive efforts to communicate the child development philosophy that had been formalized by the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education. The 1973 document, Operational Plans for Early Childhood Services and the 1982 and '84 documents, Early Childhood Services: Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions were distributed to every early childhood operator in Alberta. These documents, as well as numerous support documents dealing with specific areas of child development, contained the Alberta philosophy upon which operators could plan their programs. The ECS Branch also conducted countless workshops, meetings and made regular consultative visits to explain the

philosophy and goals of ECS. Early childhood operators throughout Alberta were expected to plan programs that reflected this philosophy. Periodic evaluations by the ECS Branch reinforced the requirement for consistency. Programs throughout Alberta adopted the ECS philosophy and as a result all Alberta children entering grade school have been exposed to similar child development experiences that promote school entrance skills.

Although the ECS Branch devoted much of its time to helping operators understand the philosophy and goals of ECS, the movement towards professionalism by ECS teachers was the most effective means of ensuring complete understanding. The 1973 policy requiring early childhood teachers obtain a B.Ed. Degree with a major in Early Childhood Education or the ECS Diploma, exposed all teachers to the child development theories upon which the Alberta ECS philosophy was formulated. Acquisition of these qualifications also equated ECS teachers with grade school teachers as professional educators, both in terms of ability to guide the learning of children and in terms of membership in the professional Early Childhood Education Council of the Alberta Teachers' Association. Tables 18 and 19 (Appendix p. 176) demonstrate that there was almost equal growth of professionalism among ECS teachers in both public and private programs.

However, only professional ECS teachers employed by public school divisions were entitled to the full benefits

of belonging to a professional organization. These professionals were entitled to pay equity with other professional teachers and job protection which was previously reserved for grade school teachers. Public ECS teachers also received the full measure of public respect for being a member of "a privileged society of 'knowers.'"[1] Because of the general trend during the 1960s and '70s for professionals to be employed in large bureaucratic organizations, the general public immediately regarded public ECS teachers as experts, with the skills and knowledge to effectively launch children on the path to a successful life.

With the exception of a few elite private centres, most privately employed ECS teachers worked for considerably less wages than their peers in the public system and were often still regarded by the general public as volunteer housewives or teachers lacking certain employment skills desired by the larger bureaucratic system. In spite of a general low public opinion, most private ECS teachers acquired professional status thus making them eligible for employment with the school board system if the opportunity occurred. Most private ECS teachers recognized that employment with the larger bureaucratic school board system would not only increase their personal benefits but also enhance their working conditions. For example, they realized that for the same amount of money, the larger centralized system of administration could purchase more supplies than the private

centre because the purchase price was considerably lower when volume was purchased. Public ECS teachers would then have the luxury of preparing programs with access to plentiful supplies making preparation easier and more creative.

Another benefit of employment with the larger bureaucratic systems was the fact that school boards, with large tax bases, could afford to employ more professional teachers per child than private programs, keeping child/staff ratios less than half the ratios in private centres. Tables 20 and 21 (Appendix p. 177) demonstrates these hiring practices. If one agrees with the theory that professional teachers are better prepared to work effectively with children, then children in school board programs received more individual professional attention than children in private programs due to the presence of more professional teachers for every child in the program. Even though private programs did not employ as many professionals as school board programs, the fact that professional teachers were on site was an assurance to parents that children were involved in a program developed on ECS child development philosophy. Prior to 1973, parents were lucky to find a program that had been developed by a teacher with a one year teaching certificate. Parents are now guaranteed that their child will be part of a program that was developed by a professional educator.

Parents not only relied on these professional educators

to plan appropriate programs for their children but also looked to them for guidance in fulfilling a condition of parent involvement required by the ECS Branch in order to receive funding for their child's ECS program. Parents were required to form the majority of Local Advisory Councils for the purpose of providing advice to operators of early childhood programs on such matters as policy recommendations and administrative procedures. Members of the LAC were also expected to assist in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the program. Guidance was provided to LACs by professionals from the ECS Branch in the form of meetings and publications. Teaching staff provided guidance to the LAC either directly as a member of the LAC or within the classroom when parents assumed their responsibility to participate in their child's early childhood education. The experience of working closely with parents is precisely the experience that the new School Act would like to incorporate into all levels of education. ECS educators will be expected to assume a leadership role in helping elementary educators and parents of elementary students to share responsibility for educating children in Alberta.

The ECS Branch was not only committed to helping parents understand child development through experiences within the classrooms and LACs but also funded special parent programs such as the In-Home Program. In addition the ECS Branch developed resources that could be easily used by parents in their efforts to maximize their child's development both at

school and at home. Alberta was the only Canadian province to fund programs directly for parents in an effort to extend child development theory from the classroom to the home.

The efforts of the ECS Branch resulted in many changes affecting children, parents and teachers. However, the most important overall affect made by the branch was the recognition and acceptance of ECS as an integral and necessary part of the school system.

From 1973 to 1987 the jurisdiction for providing early childhood services was placed under the Department of Education Act because such programs were not a compulsory part of the school program. However, in 1987 the Alberta government recognized the valuable relationship between early childhood programs and basic elementary programs by transferring ECS to the new 1987 School Act. Although ECS programs remain non-compulsory, this act changed the status of ECS from a preschool program to the new status of being an integral part of the school system. To ensure the concept of integration, the ECS Branch was amalgamated with the Elementary Branch for the purpose of revising both curriculums to more effectively reflect the ECS child development philosophy and the elementary curriculum requirements.

Joining the School Act and the Elementary Education Department was viewed by some educators, such as Dr. Jeffares and Dr. Bosetti from the Department of Education, as the achievement of the ultimate goal for the ECS Branch.

This goal was to provide early childhood services to children up to age eight. In fact the ECS Branch superseded this original mandate with a 1987 Articulation Policy proposal to integrate ECS philosophy into all elementary programs for children up to the age of twelve.

Educators involved in the establishment of the ECS Branch such as Dr. Horowitz and Dr. Affleck from the University of Alberta, were concerned that these integration policies would destroy the uniqueness of early childhood programs. They fear that the requirements of the elementary curriculum will be extended downward to the ECS program, destroying the concept of individual child development through the medium of play. They fear that regardless of changes made to the elementary curriculums, elementary teachers with little or no knowledge of early childhood philosophy will be incapable of changing their learning environments from teacher directed to child directed learning and therefore pressure will be put on the ECS teacher to adjust program delivery to match the delivery system utilized by the majority.

Whether the entrance of ECS to the school system will result in the upward extension of ECS's child directed philosophy or the downward extension of teacher directed activities is a topic for future research.

Summary

This research examined the organization, philosophy and operation of the ECS Branch from 1973 to 1987. Also examined were the changes in Alberta affected by the ECS Branch. This was accomplished by comparing early childhood conditions prior to 1973 with conditions in Alberta as of 1987. It is the conclusion of this researcher that children, parents and teachers in Alberta have all benefited from the existence of the ECS Branch. Affordable early childhood programs were designed by professional educators to prepare children for maximum participation within the school system. These programs exhibited consistent child development philosophy which was shared with parents while they participated in the planning, implementation and evaluation of their child's ECS program. Care was given to the organization of the ECS system so that parents were given a choice between private or public ECS programs which was consistent with the political philosophy of Alberta. ECS teachers gained equal professional status with other teachers by securing a B.Ed. Degree with a major in Early Childhood Education or an ECS Diploma. As professionals, public school ECS teachers have benefited from the protection of the Alberta Teachers' Association in terms of job protection and pay equity. As of 1987 these teachers will be expected to share with other public school teachers, their knowledge of child development and their experience of working with parents. The policy of Articulation and the

inclusion of ECS in the Alberta School Act required the integration of ECS with elementary education. This marked the end of the ECS Branch and the beginning of a new working relationship to promote a stronger continuity of child development experiences for children from the home to the school. Examination of this expanded Elementary Branch would be a worth while project for future researchers.

Endnotes

[1] Magali S. Larson. The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis, p. 231.

TABLES

Table 1

Services Provided for Three, Four and Five Year Olds in Alberta
(Enrollments as of 1971)

Due to the unavailability of copyright permission, the specific information provided by this table has been removed.

Generally this table provided a list of the various types of early childhood centres available in Alberta and the number of children enrolled in each type of centre during 1971.

Reference:

King, Ethel, Fotheringham, Jack and Shanahan, Pat. A Statistical and Descriptive Study of Services Available For the Education of Three, Four and Five Year Olds in the Province of Alberta. A study prepared for the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education. Edmonton: Government of Alberta, 1972.

Table 2

The Preschool Population in Alberta, 1971

Due to the unavailability of copyright permission the specific information provided by this table has been removed.

This table provided information about the number of children residing in Alberta age three, four and five.

Reference:

King, Ethel, Fotheringham, Jack and Shanahan, Pat. A Statistical and Descriptive Study of Services Available For the Education of Three, Four and Five Year Olds in the Province of Alberta. A study prepared for the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education, Edmonton: Government of Alberta, 1972.

Table 3

Educational Background
of Staff in Edmonton, 1973

Due to the unavailability of copyright permission the information from this table has been removed.

Generally the table provided information about the educational backgrounds of staff employed in early childhood centres in Edmonton during 1973.

Reference:

Day, Michael, Fogwell, Lynn and Reid, Isabelle. A Descriptive Overview of Services to Preschool Children In the City of Edmonton. Edmonton: Social Planning Unit Edmonton Social Services, 1973.

TABLE 4

Summary of Group / Individual Proposals for Early Childhood Services in Alberta, Prior to 1973

Group	Program No Program	Goverance	Nature of Program	Scope	Sponsorship
AFHSA	Favored program	Dept. of Education	Readiness Kindergarten	Universal - 5 yr. olds Attendance - optional	School Board, B.Ed. Certified Teachers Parent Volunteers
ATA (ECEC)	Favored program	Dept. of Education	Integrated	Universal - 5 yr. olds Attendance - Compulsory Selective - 3 & 4 yr. olds Priority - Disadvantaged	School Board, B.Ed. Certified Teachers
U of Alberta Dr. Worth	Favored program	Dept. of Education with an Early Ed. Division to admin. Kindergartens, Day Care, Playschools	Integrated	Universal - 5 yr. olds Attendance - Optional Selective - 3 & 4 yr. old Disadvantaged	Various Agencies B.Ed. certified Teachers
U of Alberta Dr. Horowitz	Favored program	Independent Ministry -Office of Child Dev. or Coordinating Auth	Integrated with strong education component	Universal - 5 yr. olds Selective - Disadvantaged younger children Attendance - optional	Various Agencies
ASTA	Bare majority favored program	Dept. of Education	Integrated	Universal - 5 yr. olds Priority - Disadvantaged	School Board, B. Ed. Certified Teachers

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Group	Program No Program	Goverance	Nature of Program	Scope	Sponsorship
Harold Gunderson (CPST)	No universal E.C.E. program	Dept. of Education	Limited Special Education	10-15% handicapped preschoolers	School Board
Downey Research Assoc.	Favored program	Early Childhood Authority - Inter-Dept. representation	Integrated	Universal - 5 yr. olds Phased-in Priority - Disadvantaged	Various Agencies
School Boards	Favored program	Dept. of Education	Readiness Kindergarten	Universal - 5 yr. olds Attendance - Optional Priority - Disadvantaged	School Board, B.Bl. Certified Teachers Parent Volunteers
PCKA	Favored program	Dept. of Education	Readiness Kindergarten	Universal - 5 yr. olds Attendance - Optional	School Board, B. Bl. Certified Teachers Parent Volunteers
CMEP (CCEC)	Favored program	Independent Ministry Integrating Health Education & Social Services	Integrated	Universal - 3 yrs up Attendance - optional	Regional Bureaus of Child Devel. reps from several agencies, B.Bl. Certified Teachers with E.C.E. Major
AAYC	Favored program	Independent Dept. (not Dept. of Bl.)	Integrated	Universal availability for all young children	Various Agencies
Press: Calgary Herald	Favored program - 'if' other prov. priorities met	Dept. of Education	Readiness Kindergarten	Universal - 5 yr. olds	School Boards

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Group	Program No Program	Coverance	Nature of Program	Scope	Sponsorship
Edmonton Journal	1960-67 - Favored	1960-67 Dept. of Bd.	Readiness Kind.	Universal - 5 yr. olds	School Boards
	1968-73 - Less Supportive	1968-73 Dept. of Social Welfare	Compensatory program for disadvantaged	Selective - Disadvantaged only	Social Welfare
Dept. of Bd. Mr. Hyndman (Min. of Bd)	Favored program	Inter-Departmental	Integrated	Universal - 5 yr. olds Selective - 3 & 4 yr. old Disadvantaged	Various Agencies
Dept. Health Social Devel Mr. Crawford Min. of Health	Favored program	Dept. of Bd. with Coordinating Inter-Dept. Council	Integrated	Priority - Disadvantaged Secondary - Universal - 5 yr. old	Parent-Child Develop. Programs
Dept. Culture Youth, Rec.	No formal position				
MAC on ECE	Favoured program	Independent Office of Early Childhood Development or Dept. of Education	Integrated	Eventual Universal Availability - 3-6 yr. old Attendance - optional	Various Agencies B. Bd. Certified Teachers
Early Childhood Services	Official Position	Dept. of Bd. with Coordinating Inter-Dept. Council (under Assoc. Min. of Instruction)	Integrated	Universal - 4.5-5.5 yr. olds Phased-in: Handicapped Disadvantaged Kindergarten Day Cares Attendance - optional	Various Agencies B. Bd. Certified Teachers

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Note: Integrated Program refers to equal emphasis on: Intellectual Development, Physical Development, Social Development, Creative Development, Emotional Development

Abbreviations

ATA (ECEC)	Alberta Teachers Association (Early Childhood Education Council)
ASTA	Alberta School Trustee Association
AFHSA	Alberta Federation of Home and School Assoc.
OMEP (CCEC)	World Organization for Early Childhood Education (Canadian Committee on Early Childhood)
MAC on ECE	Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education
CPST	Calgary Public School Board Trustee
U of A	University of Alberta
AAYC	Alberta Association for Young Children
PCKA	Parent Co-operative Kindergarten Association of Greater Edmonton

TABLE 5

Certification of Teachers
in Alberta

	Province of Alberta	Other Canadian Provinces	British Isles and Ireland	Remainder Common-wealth and Other Countries	United States
1960	2,959	372	82	28	29
1961	3,492	405	79	66	72
1962	3,557	488	48	41	70
1963	3,662	510	33	33	56
1964	4,245	609	36	51	47
1965	4,406	601	62	70	78
1966	4,800	578	126	62	124
1967	2,482	632	144	52	205
1968	3,035	743	327	246	343
1969	6,524	918	351	174	250
1970	6,072	782	267	149	238
1971	7,080	812	114	114	194
1972	6,944	337	18	22	186
1973	7,091	281	9	15	156
1974	6,475	358	28	23	165
1975	3,601	421	37	31	274
1976	5,917	783	29	33	326
1977	5,384	765	24	24	155
1978	4,737	729	21	17	148
1979	4,816	789	13	21	95
1980	4,335	936	12	15	102
1981	3,997	1230	31	23	119
1982	4,396	1620	34	42	186

Source: Alberta Education. Annual Reports.

TABLE 6

Personnel for ECS Branch

Dates	Positions Filled	Positions Vacant	TOTAL Positions Available
June 1973	2	6	8
June 1974	12	7	19
June 1975	21	4	25
March 1976	19	1	20
March 1977	17	2	19
March 1978	20	0	20
March 1979	19	2	21
March 1980	18	2	20
March 1981	17	3	20
March 1982	22	2	24
March 1983	9	3	12
March 1984	8	1	9
March 1985	5	1	6
March 1986	2	0	2
March 1987	2	0	2

Source: Alberta Education. Annual Reports.

TABLE 7

Enrollments of Early Childhood Students from 1973-1986

	Students Attending School Board Programs	Students Attending Community/ Private Pgms	Students not attending an E.C. Program * (est.)	Total Available E.C. Pop. ** (est.)	Combined Total of Comm./Pvt & Sch Brd Pgms
1973/74	n/a	n/a	n/a	33,009	n/a
1974/75	8,264	n/a	n/a	33,847	n/a
1975/76	14,870	8,457	12,053	35,380	23,327
1976/77	18,219	8,901	7,335	34,475	27,120
1977/78	18,212	9,793	6,259	34,264	28,005
1978/79	18,373	10,383	6,085	34,841	28,756
1979/80	18,699	10,671	7,089	36,459	29,370
1980/81	19,923	10,727	8,191	38,841	30,650
1981/82	23,596	10,624	4,330	38,550	34,220
1982/83	26,225	9,074	2,762	38,061	35,299
1983/84	27,572	8,579	1,929	38,080	36,151
1984/85	27,625	8,376	2,663	38,664	36,001
1985/86	29,414	8,165	1,845	39,424	37,579
1986/87	31,102	8,345	n/a	n/a	39,447

** Total available population was arrived at by using the enrollment figures for the following years Grade 1 students.
* Therefore any figures derived from this are also estimates.

NOTE: Figures in the first two columns include regular needs children (age 4.5-5.5) and special needs children (ages 2.5-6.5)

Source: Albert Education. Annual Reports
Alberta Education. School Business Administration Services

TABLE 8

Distribution of E.C. Students Attending Various programs as a percentage of the Total Potential Students in the Province of Alberta from 1973 to 1986

School Year	Percentage of Students Attending a Sch. Brd. Program in Alberta	Percent of Students Attending Comm/Pvt. Programs in Alberta	Percent of Students NOT Attending any Program in Alberta
1973/74	n/a	n/a	n/a
1974/75	24.4%	n/a	n/a
1975/76	42.0%	23.9%	34.1%
1976/77	52.8%	25.8%	21.3%
1977/78	53.2%	28.6%	18.3%
1978/79	52.7%	29.8%	17.5%
1979/80	51.3%	29.3%	19.4%
1980/81	51.3%	27.6%	21.1%
1981/82	61.2%	27.6%	11.2%
1982/83	68.9%	23.8%	7.3%
1983/84	72.4%	22.5%	5.1%
1984/85	71.4%	21.7%	6.9%
1985/86	74.6%	20.7%	4.7%
1986/87	n/a	n/a	n/a

** **Formula:** $\frac{\text{Actual Attendance}}{\text{Eligible Population}} =$

Note: These figures include both regular needs children (age 4.5-5.5) and special needs children (age 2.5-6.5)

TABLE 9

Expenditures for the Department of Education as compared to the expenditures on Early Childhood Services Department from 1973-1986

	Expenditures by Department of Education on all Services and Programs	Overall Expenditures on Early Childhood Services	E.C. Expenditure as a Percent of Department of Education Expenditure
1973/74	$ 441,112,634	$ 2,474,345	.6
1974/75	$ 498,573,721	$ 11,204,500	2.2
1975/76	$ 619,629,471	$ 13,972,500	2.3
1976/77	$ 694,957,456	$ 14,668,228	2.1
1977/78	$ 780,446,245	$ 16,475,961	2.1
1978/79	$ 861,000,208	$ 19,031,828	2.2
1979/80	$ 965,495,192	$ 22,551,444	2.3
1980/81	$ 1,084,765,678	$ 26,428,490	2.4
1981/82	$ 1,323,878,702	$ 32,148,890	2.4
1982/83	$ 1,608,300,883	$ 43,681,769	2.7
1983/84	$ 1,735,799,895	$ 52,070,559	3.0
1984/85	$ 1,823,712,234	$ 50,763,806	2.8
1985/86	$ 1,912,250,963	$ 55,524,407	2.9
1986/87	$ 1,996,274,816	$ 60,873,200	3.0

Source: Alberta Education. School Business Administration Services.

TABLE 10

Percent Increases/Decreases in Budget Figures for the Department of Education and the Expenditures on Early Childhood Services

	Department of Education Yearly Percentage Increases	Early Childhood Services Yearly Percentage Increases	Percentage Difference between E.C. Services and Dept. of Ed.	Department of Education Cummulative Percentage Increases	Early Childhood Services Cummulative Percentage Increases
1973/74	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1974/75	13.0	352.8	339.8	13.0	352.8
1975/76	24.0	24.7	.4	40.5	464.7
1976/77	12.2	5.0	-7.2	57.5	492.8
1977/78	12.3	12.3	0.0	76.9	565.9
1978/79	10.3	15.5	5.2	95.2	669.2
1979/80	12.1	18.5	6.4	118.9	811.4
1980/81	12.4	17.2	4.8	145.9	968.1
1981/82	22.0	21.6	-.4	200.1	1199.3
1982/83	21.5	35.9	14.4	264.6	1665.4
1983/84	7.9	19.2	11.3	293.5	2004.4
1984/85	5.1	-2.5	-7.6	313.4	1951.6
1985/86	4.9	9.4	4.5	333.5	2144.0
1986/87	4.4	9.6	5.2	352.6	2360.2

N.B. - Cummulative Percentages are based on 1973/74 Budget figures.

TABLE 11

Budget Figures for Instructional Costs in School Boards and Community / Privately Operated ECS Programs 1973- 1986

	Expenditures of School Boards on Instruction ONLY	Expenditures of Comm./Pvt. Programs on Instruction ONLY	Total Instructional Costs of Sch. Brds. & Comm./Pvt.	Percentage Increase in Instructional Costs Yearly
1973/74	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1974/75	$ 3,795,430	$ 2,539,430	$ 6,334,860	0.0
1975/76	$ 7,056,415	$ 3,186,070	$ 10,242,485	61.7
1976/77	$ 8,904,466	$ 3,720,224	$ 12,624,690	23.3
1977/78	$ 10,440,276	$ 4,822,146	$ 15,262,422	20.9
1978/79	$ 11,481,658	$ 5,858,036	$ 17,339,694	13.6
1979/80	$ 12,920,620	$ 6,833,079	$ 19,753,699	13.9
1980/81	$ 15,490,553	$ 7,898,979	$ 23,389,532	18.4
1981/82	$ 18,897,127	$ 9,187,200	$ 28,084,327	20.1
1982/83	$ 25,144,061	$ 9,524,041	$ 34,668,102	23.4
1983/84	$ 28,850,676	$ 10,529,947	$ 39,380,623	13.6
1984/85	$ 31,806,618	$ 10,403,799	$ 42,210,417	7.2
1985/86	$ 35,069,904	$ 10,649,979	$ 45,719,883	8.3
1986/87	$ 40,278,800	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: Alberta Education. School Business Administration Sevices.

TABLE 12

Per Capita Instructional Costs
for School Board and Community/
Private ECS Operated Programs 1973-86

	Per Capita Instr. Costs for Sch. Bd. Programs	Per Capita Instr. Costs for Comm./Pvt. Programs	Mean Per Capita Instr. Costs Sch. Bds. & Comm./Pvt.	Average Per Capita Instr. Costs for E.C. Programs
1973/74	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1974/75	$ 459.31	n/a	n/a	n/a
1975/76	$ 474.54	$ 376.40	$ 425.47	$ 439.08
1976/77	$ 488.75	$ 417.96	$ 453.36	$ 465.51
1977/78	$ 573.26	$ 492.41	$ 532.84	$ 544.99
1978/79	$ 624.92	$ 564.19	$ 594.56	$ 602.99
1979/80	$ 690.98	$ 640.34	$ 665.66	$ 672.58
1980/81	$ 777.52	$ 736.36	$ 756.94	$ 763.12
1981/82	$ 800.86	$ 864.76	$ 832.81	$ 820.70
1982/83	$ 958.78	$1,049.60	$1,004.19	$ 982.13
1983/84	$1,046.38	$1,227.41	$1,136.90	$1,089.34
1984/85	$1,151.37	$1,242.10	$1,196.74	$1,172.48
1985/86	$1,192.29	$1,304.35	$1,248.32	$1,216.63
1986/87	$1,295.05	n/a	n/a	n/a

TABLE 13

Population Distribution of Handicapped Children in ECS Programs

	AGE (4.5-5.5)	MILDLY HANDICAPPED AGE (3.5-5.5)	SEVERELY HANDICAPPED AGE (2.5-5.5)	TOTAL
1973/74	364			364
1974/75	750			750
1975/76	*700			700
1976/77	*1000			1,000
1977/78	*1500			1,500
1978/79	*1200			1,200
1979/80	*1200			1,200
1980/81	*1300			1,300
1981/82		1,463	287	1,750
1982/83		2,283	381	2,664
1983/84		2,239	513	2,752
1984/85		2,539	391	2,930
1985/86		n/a	n/a	n/a
1986/87		n/a	n/a	n/a

NOTE: - * Identifies approximations.

Source: Alberta Education. School Business Administration Services.

TABLE 14

Program Unit Grants (PUG) for Severely Handicapped Children allocated to School Boards with ECS Programs

School Year	Number of School Boards Receiving the (PUG)	Percent increase in PUG to School Boards	Amount of PUG Grants Given to School Boards
1973/74	n/a	n/a	n/a
1974/75	n/a	n/a	n/a
1975/76	n/a	n/a	n/a
1976/77	n/a	n/a	n/a
1977/78	n/a	n/a	n/a
1978/79	n/a	n/a	n/a
1979/80	15	0.0	$ 225,789
1980/81	21	40.0	$ 529,599
1981/82	28	33.3	$1,036,867
1982/83	38	35.7	$1,796,600
1983/84	48	26.3	$2,389,613
1984/85	50	4.2	$2,284,326
1985/86	58	16.0	$3,878,359
1986/87	54	-6.9	$3,549,172

Source: Alberta Education. School Business Administration Services.

TABLE 15

Program Unit Grants (PUG) for Severely Handicapped Children allocated to Community/Private ECS Programs

School Year	Number of Community / Private Schools Receiving the (PUG)	Percent increase in PUG to Community / Private	Amount of PUG Given to Community / Private Schools
1973/74	n/a	n/a	n/a
1974/75	n/a	n/a	n/a
1975/76	n/a	n/a	n/a
1976/77	n/a	n/a	n/a
1977/78	n/a	n/a	n/a
1978/79	n/a	n/a	n/a
1979/80	22	0.0	$ 436,633
1980/81	39	77.3	$ 762,148
1981/82	37	-5.1	$1,004,787
1982/83	49	32.4	$1,716,822
1983/84	65	32.7	$2,079,135
1984/85	57	-12.3	$1,898,308
1985/86	68	19.3	$2,312,746
1986/87	82	20.6	$2,573,251

Source: Alberta Education. School Business Administration Services.

TABLE 16

Percentage of the ECS Grants spent on Severely Handicapped Children (PUG)

School Year	Overall Expenditures of the Department of Ed. on E.C. Pgms.	Pug's Issued to School Boards and Community/Private Pgms.	PUG as a Percentage of Overall E.C. Grant to C/P & Sch. Brds.
1973/74	$ 2,474,345	n/a	n/a
1974/75	$ 11,204,500	n/a	n/a
1975/76	$ 13,972,500	n/a	n/a
1976/77	$ 14,668,228	n/a	n/a
1977/78	$ 16,475,961	n/a	n/a
1978/79	$ 19,031,828	n/a	n/a
1979/80	$ 22,551,444	$ 662,422	2.9
1980/81	$ 26,428,490	$1,291,747	4.9
1981/82	$ 32,148,890	$2,041,654	6.4
1982/83	$ 43,681,769	$3,513,422	8.0
1983/84	$ 52,070,559	$4,468,748	8.6
1984/85	$ 50,763,806	$4,182,634	8.2
1985/86	$ 55,524,407	$6,191,105	11.2
1986/87	$ 60,873,200	$6,122,423	10.1

Source: Alberta Education. School Business Administration Services.

TABLE 17

ECS Diplomas Issued

Dates	Diplomas Issued	Dates	Diplomas Issued
1973-1974	5	1980-1981	473
1974-1975	207	1981-1982	331
1975-1976	253	1982-1983	469
1976-1977	384	1983-1984	431
1977-1978	498	1984-1985	225
1978-1979	489	1985-1986	n/a
1979-1980	537	1986-1987	n/a

Source: Alberta Education. Annual Reports.

TABLE 18

Teacher Certification of Staff
Employed in School Board operated
ECS Programs

	Staff with ECS Diplomas	Staff with ECS Permits	TOTAL	Percent with ECS Diplomas	Percent with ECS Permits
1981/82	1,256	135	1,391	90	10
1982/83	1,595	166	1,761	91	9
1983/84	1,840	206	2,046	90	10
1984/85	2,166	184	2,350	92	8
1985/86	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1986/87	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: Alberta Education. Annual Reports.

TABLE 19

Teacher Certification of Staff
Employed in Community / Private
ECS Programs

	Staff with ECS Diplomas	Staff with ECS Permits	TOTAL	Percent with ECS Diplomas	Percent with ECS Permits
1981/82	184	72	256	72	28
1982/83	176	53	229	77	23
1983/84	235	60	295	80	20
1984/85	261	40	301	87	13
1985/86	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1986/87	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: Alberta Education. Annual Reports.

Table 20

Per Capita Ratios (Child/Teacher)
of Certified E.C. Teachers employed
in School Board operated Programs

	Staff with ECS Diplomas	Staff with ECS Permits	Diploma Staff/ Children	Permit Staff/ Children	Overall Staff/Child Ratios
1981/82	1,256	135	19	175	17
1982/83	1,595	166	16	158	15
1983/84	1,840	206	15	134	13
1984/85	2,166	184	13	150	12
1985/86	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1986/87	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: Alberta Education. Annual Reports.

Table 21

Per Capita Ratios (Child/Teacher)
of Certified E.C. Teachers employed
in Community/Private Operated Programs

	Staff with ECS Diplomas	Staff with ECS Permits	Diploma Staff/ Children	Permit Staff/ Children	Overall Staff/Child Ratios
1981/82	184	72	58	148	42
1982/83	176	53	52	171	40
1983/84	235	60	37	143	29
1984/85	261	40	32	209	28
1985/86	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1986/87	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: Alberta Education. Annual Reports.

Notes

Dr. Myer Horowitz

July 1969-Chairman Department of Elementary Education.

July 1969-appointed to N-12 Education Task Force for the Commission on Educational Planning (CEP).

1969-appointed as Chairman of OMEP-helped draft brief to CEP - called Education for the Eighties.

June 1970-spoke at ASTA Banff Workshop and Seminar on ECE issues.

July 1970-sat on the Proposal Evaluation Committee for the Inner City Core Pre-School Pilot Project.

Feb. 1971-moderator for OMEP, sponsored public panel discussin on ECE - invited political representatives.

Mar. 1971-helped get Co-operative ECE Project, funded through the Innovative Projects Fund.

July 1971-appointed University of Alberta, Faculty of Education representative on MAC and ECE.

July 1971-through AHRRC - did a feasibility study An Intergrated Approach to ECE - submitted to ASTA in November 1971.

Fall 1971-President of ATA ECEC.

Mar. 1972-conference speaker at study seminar on ECE sponsored by Athabasca Regional Office.

Apr. 1972-CCEE (OMEP) - brief to Prime Minister and Provincial Premiers - establishment of

Child Development at Federal and Provincial levels.

July 1972-Dean of Faculty of Education - member of the panel of Judges assisting AHRCC with evaluation of the Inner City Core Pre-school Pilot Project.

Sept.1972-ATA ECE - brief Alternatives in ECE

Oct. 1972-speaker at AAYC annual conference.

Oct. 1972-part of reaction committee to Downey's Opportunities for Infants.

Glossary of Abbreviations

AAYC	Alberta Association for Young Children
AFHSA	Alberta Federation of Home and School Association
AHRRC	Alberta Human Resources Research Council
ASTA	Alberta School Trustee Association
ATA	Alberta Teachers' Association
(ATA) ECEC	Early Childhood Education Council
CCEC	Canadian Committee on Early Childhood
CEP	Commission on Educational Planning
ECE	Early Childhood Education
ECS	Early Childhood Services
OMEP	World Organization for Early Childhood Education
PCKA	Parent Co-operative Kindergarten Association of Greater Edmonton

Bibliography

Affleck, Dr. Muriel (Retired Professor of Early Childhood Education from University of Alberta), Interview. Edmonton. October 1986 and June 1987.

Affleck, Dr. Muriel and Hersom, Naomi. "Early Childhood Services," Early Childhood Education. Vol. 8, No. 2, Spring, 1974. pp. 1-7.

Affleck, Dr. Muriel and Turner, Dr. Pearl. (Professors of Early Childhood Education at University of Alberta.) Early Childhood Education - Position Paper. Edmonton: Early Childhood Education Council of the Alberta Teachers Association, 1971.

Alberta Education. An Early Childhood Education Pilot Project in Calgary and Edmonton. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1972.

Alberta Education. Annual Reports Edmonton: Alberta Education. 1974-1986

Alberta Education. Early Childhood Services Through Grade Six Education Program Articulation. Draft 10. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1986.

Alberta Education. Policy/Program Monitoring Handbook. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1986.

Alberta Education. School Business Administration Services Reports. 1974-1986.

Alberta Education. School Grants Manuals 1974-1986.

Alberta Teachers' Association. Alberta Teachers' Association Handbook. Edmonton: ATA, 1967.

Bosetti, R. Dr. (Deputy Minister of Alberta Education.) Interview. Edmonton, June, 1987.

Bloom, Benjamin S. All Our Children Learning: A Primer for Parents, Teachers and Other Educators. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1981.

Brubacher, John S. A History of the Problems of Education. 2nd Ed. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Clark, Penny. (Grants Officer for the School Business Administration Services of Alberta Education). Interview. Edmonton: Alberta Education. May 1987.

Clarke, S.C.T. Ed. The Cameron Report: A Condensation of the Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta. Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, 1960.

Colbens, Dorothy. (ed.) Celebration 20 Years of the Early Childhood Education Council Alberta Teachers' Association. Calgary. November 1986.

Corbett, Barbara E. A Garden of Children. Ontario: The Froebel Kindergarten Foundation, 1980.

Curtis, Audrey M. A Curriculum for the Pre-school Child. Windsor: The Nfer-Nelson Publ. Co. Ltd., 1986.

Day, Michael, Fogwell, Lynn and Reid, Isabelle. A Descriptive Overview of Services to Preschool Children In the City of Edmonton. Edmonton: Social Planning Unit Edmonton Social Services, 1973.

Dewey, John. The School and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Downey, L.W. Opportunities for Infants: Towards a Policy on Early Childhood Development. A policy-discussion paper prepared for the Alberta Government. Edmonton: Downey Research Associates Ltd., 1972.

Early Childhood Services. A Progress Report From September 1, 1974 to August 31, 1975. Edmonton: Alberta Education 1975.

Early Childhood Services. Advisory Manual on Early Childhood Services for the Incorporated Non-Profit Society or Private School. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1986.

Early Childhood Services. Bridges To Learning: A Guide to Parent Involvement. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1985.

Early Childhood Services. Early Childhood Services Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1982.

Early Childhood Services. Early Childhood Services Philosophy, Goals and Program Dimensions. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1984.

Early Childhood Services. How to Evaluate Your ECS Program. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1984.

Early Childhood Services. Organizing an ECS In-Home Program. Edmonton: Alberta Education, ECS., 1977.

Edmonton Public School Board. Board Minutes. February 8, 1921.

Everett-Turner, Dr. Loreen. (Professor of Early Childhood Education at University of Alberta). Interview. Edmonton. June, 1987.

Government of Alberta. Operational Plans for Early Childhood Services. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1973.

Harvey Social Research Ltd. Early Childhood Services Coordination Evaluation. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1983.

Horowitz, Dr. Myer. (President of the University of Alberta). Interview. Edmonton, June 1987.

Jeffares, Dr. David. An Update on Primary Articulation. Speech at the Early Childhood Education Council 20th Annual Conference. Calgary, November 1986.

Jeffares, Dr. David. (Acting Director of Early Childhood Services). Interview. Edmonton, October 1986 and June 1987.

Johnson, Terence J. Professions and Power. London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1972.

King, Ethel, Fotheringham, Jack and Shanahan, Pat. A Statistical and Descriptive Study of Services Available For the Education of Three, Four and Five Year Olds in the Province of Alberta. A study prepared for the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education. Edmonton: Government of Alberta, 1972.

Lall, Geeta Rani and Lall, Bernard Mohan. Comparative Early Childhood Education. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas 1983.

Larson, Magali S. The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Leadbeater, Beulah. (Retired Community Kindergarten Supervisor for Calgary). Interview. Calgary, November, 1986.

Lilley, Irene M. Friedrich Froebel. London: Cambridge at the University Press, 1967.

Lockhart, Alexander. "Educational Opportunities and Economic Opportunities - The 'New' Liberal Equality Syndrome," in John Allan Fry (ed.) Economy, Class and Social Reality: Issues in Contemporary Canadian Society. Toronto: Butterworths Ltd., 1979.

McCleary, Iva Dene. Early Childhood Education. New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1976.

Millar, Pat. (President Early Childhood Education Council) Interview. Edmonton, June 1987.

Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education. Recommendations for Government Action. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1973.

Moore, E. and Rosenblum, Gerald. The Professions Roles and Rules. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1970.

Office of Child Development. Head Start: A Child Development Program. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970.

Pain, Dr. Kerrie. Articulation Linkages: Children and Parents in Early/Basic Education. Edmonton: Alberta Education, ECS, 1984.

Pitman, Walter. "Unrealistic Hopes and Missed Opportunities - The '60's in Canadian Education," in J. Donald Wilson (ed.) Canadian Education in the 1980's. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd., 1981.

Policy Advisory Committee for the School Act Review. Partners in Education: Principles for a New School Act. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1985.

Rusk, Robert R. The Doctrines of the Great Educators. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1957.

Schmidt, W.H.O. Human Development: The Early Years. Edmonton: Alberta Education, ECS., 1984.

Seguin, Jean J. Public Policy Planning in Alberta: A Case Study of Policy Formation for the Early Childhood Services Program in Alberta. (Ph.D. Dissertation - Dept. of Ed. Admin.) Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1977.

Slack, Janet. Kindergarten: A Part of the Educational System. (Masters Thesis - Ed. Admin.) Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1986.

Slayton, Philip. "Professional Education and the Consumer Interest: A Framework for Inquiry," in Philip Slayton and Michael Trebilcock (eds.) The Professions and Public Policy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

Small, James. A Study of Selected Factors in the Immigration of British Teachers to Alberta. Edmonton: Department of Ed. Admin. at University of Alberta, 1970.

Stewart, Robin. (Acting Coordinator for Professional Development in Alberta Teachers' Association). Interview. Edmonton, June 1987.

Sutherland, Neil. Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth Century Consensus. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Thomas, Ann. (Accountant for School Business Administration Services of Alberta Education). Interview. November, 1986.

Thomas, Nadine. (President of Alberta Teachers' Association) Opening Address of the Early Childhood Education Council 20th Annual Conference. Calgary, Nov. 1986.

Torgunrud, Dr. E.A. "Articulation: Why? What? When?" Early Childhood Education, Vol. 19, No. 1 Winter 1985-1986.

Trudiver, Dr. Judy. Early Childhood Education/Services. Toronto: Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. 1986.

Vollmer M. and Mills, Donald. Eds. Professionalization. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966.

Weber, Lillian. The English Infant School and Informal Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1971.

Whitbread, Nanette. The Evolution of the Nursery-Infant School: A History of Infant and Nursery Education in Britain, 1800-1970. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

White, Rodney F. "The Professions and Collective Action: Responses to State Control and Public Criticism," in A. Wipper (ed.) The Sociology of Work. Ottawa: University of Carlton Press, 1984.

Wilson, J.Donald. "From the Swinging Sixties to the Sobering Seventies," in E.Brian Titley and Peter J. Miller (eds.) Education In Canada: An Interpretation, Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd., 1982.

Worth, Walter, Dr. A Choice of Futures: Report of the Commission on Educational Planning. Edmonton: L.S. Wall Queen's Printer for the Province of Alberta, 1972.

Worth, Walter, Dr., et al. Before Six: A Report on the Alberta Early Childhood Education Study. Edmonton: The Alberta School Trustees' Association, 1966.

Worth, Walter, Dr. (Professor of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta), Interview. Edmonton, October, 1986.

Youck, B. (Past President of the Parent Co-operative Kindergarten Association of Greater Edmonton). Interview. May 1987.

Zigler, Edward and Valentine, Jeanette (eds.) Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty. New York: The Free Press, 1979.