

REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY  
SPECIAL COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS, NOVEMBER 3, 2009

EARLY LEARNING PROGRAM

The Provincial Executive will be examining a number of matters related to the Early Learning Program (ELP), including the organization of the early childhood educators (ECEs). The following is provided to assist in these endeavors:

- 1) Historical Background of the Early Learning Program (ELP)
- 2) Current information concerning the Early Learning Program.
- 3) Legal issues concerning the organization of the ECEs.
- 4) Resolutions to the AGM
- 5) Questions and Answers
- 6) Benefits and Challenges
- 7) Timeline for Implementation

**Historical Background of the Early Learning Program (ELP)**

The genesis of the ELP or full-day Kindergarten has a long history.

The demand for a comprehensive approach to early learning has had many advocates. Laurier LaPierre in *To Herald a Child: The Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Education of the Young Child* (1983), Fraser Mustard and Margaret McCain in *The Early Years Study: Reversing the Real Brain Drain* (1999) and the OECD Report on *Early Childhood Education and Care Policy in Canada*, (2004) have called for action and co-ordination from those who care about the hopes, health and happiness of our province's youngest citizens. Yet, throughout Ontario, young children's current educational opportunities including childcare can be viewed, at best, as a "patchwork" of services.

For three decades, recognition of the powerful potential and undeniable importance of early years' education has been part of Ontario's political and social agenda. Canadian experts have been aware of the need for changes in funding, policy and practice for many years. There have been repeated calls for universal, coordinated access to such programs, yet little has changed. While Ontario lagged behind, the need for a unified system of education and care that would provide these childhood essentials has increased dramatically.

In the absence of unified government-funded programs, the publicly funded school system has moved ahead with the implementation of full-day Kindergarten programs in some jurisdictions. For over 50 years, Catholic school boards in Ontario have been offering a variety of early learning programs for four- and five-year-olds. Catholic boards, and to a lesser degree French boards, have led the province in Kindergarten programs. Currently, 10 Catholic boards offer full-day every-day programs for either SK or JK and SK classes. Many Catholic boards were the first to implement such programs. They were also the last to cut the programs when funding was eliminated in the 1990s.

Due to the fragmented nature of childcare and the patchwork funding structures, childcare systems in Ontario have not responded in the same way. Childcare advocates tend to be centered in the "pink" ghetto, political agendas are often male-centric, competing interests between for-profit and not-for-profit centres distract resources and energy. These issues have aggravated the fragmented nature of childcare

in Ontario. The Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care (OCBCC) was established over 30 years ago as a response to this problem. They have been lobbying for years for universal childcare. OECTA has been an active partner in the Coalition and in this lobby.

The reality is that as more and more parents seek quality childcare, waiting lists grow longer and frustrated parents often have nowhere to turn.

Amid this chaotic situation, schools have emerged to fill the vacuum with clearly defined and quality programs. The governance of the school system is established, democratic and responsive to local needs, parents know who is accountable and where to find answers to questions regarding their child's needs. Schools have thus become the logical place to focus reform in early learning.

It is against this backdrop that Premier McGuinty announced a plan to implement full-day Kindergarten for four- and five-year-olds in October 2007. However, from the beginning there was confusion as to what he envisioned. Liberal campaign literature spoke about a full-day "pre-school" program. He used the term "full-day kindergarten" during the campaign. When Dr. Charles Pascal was appointed as the Premier's special advisor, he was charged to recommend how to best implement a "full-day of learning" for four- and five-year-olds and how to build on the success of the Best Start program for a comprehensive, continuous integrated system from birth to 12.

In June 2009, Dr. Pascal released his report, *With Our Best Future in Mind*. Described by Dr. Pascal as "transformative", the report seeks to address both full-day Kindergarten and the many problems in the childcare sector. As a result of the broad, far-reaching recommendations, Kindergarten is not undergoing minor changes, but will be transformed into a new program altogether. The report envisions a single program, the Early Learning Program (ELP), which will have a new curriculum, delivered by a team of professionals using a common space and resources. The ELP will be offered to all four- and five-year-olds. Both the core and extended program are optional, but the program will be structured and implemented as a whole.

The Pascal vision includes the possibility of expanding the ELP to include all children up to the age of 12 as a part of the extended aspect of the program.

It is critical to understand the vision in its entirety to fully comprehend the significant changes that will occur for our Kindergarten teachers.

Consider the following:

- Schools will be used as community hubs with planned before and after school activities for children from ages 4 to 12.
- The ELP is composed of an integrated core and extended day component. An Early Learning curriculum will be developed, which will combine the current Kindergarten curriculum and ELECT document (Early Learning for Every Child Today).
- The ideal ELP would see for every class of 26 four- and five-year-olds (on average), an ECE working from 7 a.m. to 1 p.m., a second ECE working from noon to 6 p.m., and a certified teacher working from 9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.
- Certified teachers and registered ECEs will be mandated to work together as a team. The teacher will continue to provide instruction during the school day (the core program), which is generally

defined as 9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Where numbers warrant it, a Certified ECE will work “side by side” to assist the teacher with the delivery of the program.

- Where demand is sufficient, ECEs will be employed by school boards to work in the extended-day component, which is generally defined as 7 to 9 a.m. and 3:30 to 6 p.m. This component of the ELP lead by the ECE will be funded through parent fees on a cost-recovery basis.
- The EL classes would be a mix of four-and five-year-olds and will be funded, staffed and tracked differently from the current JK/SK classes.
- The ELP envisions a collaborative approach involving the teacher and the ECE delivering the curriculum. Some roles will be clearly defined while many other roles and responsibilities will be shared. The ELP envisions each professional bringing a specific set of skills to the classroom.
- The success of the ELP is dependent on how effective the two professionals are at working together.

The Premier, Dr. Pascal, and Ministers Wynne and Broten have acknowledged that the ELP presents a different way of providing instruction and presents a challenge to both teachers and ECEs. Accordingly, they have indicated that professional development will be provided, specifically to assist both professionals adjust to their new roles. Jim Grieve, the newly appoint ADM, agrees that many of the responsibilities overlap. As the program is rolled out, they are open to further discussing the need to clarify the respective roles and responsibilities. However, the responsibility of planning and implementing the program in addition to regular communications with parents will be a shared one.

## **Current Information**

### OCSTA

- 1) Investigating the Catholic school boards current support staff agreements in relation to the ECE issue.
- 2) The OCSTA has informed the Assistant Deputy Minister, Jim Grieve, that the Catholic school boards will be hiring Catholic ECEs.
- 3) The OCSTA see the ECE and the teacher working side-by-side in the delivery of the “instructional program”.
- 4) The OCSTA is very concerned about the competitive advantage that may arise from the larger number of classes being funded with the public school boards. The ADM has indicated that the intent is to have no disruption to the existing student enrollment equilibrium.

### Meeting with Jim Grieve, Assistant Deputy Minister and Jill Vienneau, Director ELP Branch

- 1) Six regional meetings to date with a Ministry education officer from each regional office serving as the ELP coordinator between the Ministry of Education (MOE) – school boards – and municipalities.
- 2) Boards and municipalities must work closely to avoid destabilization of boards’ enrollment patterns and municipal child care (pre age four). If the municipalities and the school boards can agree on an implementation strategy, the Ministry will provide a quick approval for sites.

- 3) Funding will be through EPO (Education Programs: Other) vs. Grants for Student Needs (GSN) giving the Ministry control over the school boards. The Early Learning Program implementation model which will be offered by school boards will be reviewed and approved by the Ministry. Only then will funding be released to the school board for the program. This will allow the Ministry to control the implementation of the program. It is critical to understand that future school board enrollment will be directly linked to the ELP because history shows that once a student enters one of the publicly-funded systems he/she remains for their entire school career.
- 4) Most of the direction will be through Policy but there will be some legislation required for implementation.
- 5) The North is seen as a special circumstance due to the small numbers of students and their geographical isolation
- 6) OECTA will be involved in all aspects of the program rollout. Another meeting is scheduled for January when more details are known, at the request of the ADM.
- 7) Early Learning Program
  - a) Model
    - Based on a “team teaching-approach” and integration of the program throughout the core day;
    - The standard model will consist of two ECEs in six-hour blocks from 7 a.m. to 12 p.m. and 12 p.m. to 6 p.m. with a full-time teacher during the core day. There will be special consideration given for areas, such as the North, on the nature of the model for the extended program. The goal is to have the standard everywhere by full implementation of the program;
    - School boards will need to have their model approved by the Ministry;
    - The model is based on 26:1 average class size with the Ministry monitoring to hold the maximum at 26;
    - The threshold for an ECE has not been determined but it is approximately 15 students;
    - The preference is to have combined classes of four- and five-year olds;
    - The ECEs will be school board employees for the core and extended programs;
    - Boards with full-day program assistance will be required to move to the ECE model;
    - School administration will be solely responsible for the administrative oversight of the extended program.
  - b) Recruitment of ECEs may be an issue and another reason for flexibility.
    - OECTA should encourage boards to adopt a hierarchy in terms of preference in qualifications for ECEs based on the holding of:
      - Ontario Teachers Certificate;
      - Four- vs. three- vs. two-year ECE programs.
  - c) Curriculum
    - The ministry is taking the lead on the curriculum. (This is a brave face because the information is that Pascal is writing the curriculum and will turn it over to the Ministry shortly);
    - Curriculum is under development and will combine the Early Learning for Every Child Today, the Pascal report and the current Ministry kindergarten curriculum. It is expected

that the current curriculum will be enhanced in terms of developmental programming under the ELECT document expected to be completed in the early new year;

- The Catholic curriculum “In God’s Image” will be acceptable;
- The curriculum will be in draft form for 18 months to allow for feedback and fine tuning;
- The pre-/post-school program will be complimentary to the day school program and the ECE will deliver, assess and provide feedback on this portion.

d) Roles and Responsibilities

- The key is that the Ministry sees this as a collaborative partnership with the strengths brought by the teacher and ECE supplementing each other’s efforts. This is not the same as a teacher and educational assistant relationship;
- Roles will be defined and align with the Pascal report (pg 34);
- The functions of each within the relationship will also be noted but it is seen as the teacher dealing with the pedagogy and the ECE dealing with the developmental aspect of the program. Due to the integrated nature of the curriculum this defines the partnership;
- The teacher and ECE will be required to share information, plan and coordinate activities. This will require constant interaction;
- ECEs and teachers will communicate with parents about their children.

e) Education Act vs. Day Nurseries Act

- The ELP will be embedded in the Education Act;
- Relieves the school boards of the requirements of the Day Nurseries Act for staffing, facilities, etc.

f) Professional Development (PD)

- Training will occur in April/May for teachers on the program;
- Training for the teacher-ECEs will occur in late May/June;
- Affiliates (OECTA and ETFO) are being asked to be involved in every aspect of the PD program.

g) Collective Agreements

- Discussion occurred around Regulatory changes, which will be needed to ensure the program is delivered without collective agreement language suited for the previous JK/SK model;
- Limited to JK/SK in terms of the 26:1;
- Staffing and PDT committees under the PDT will maintain their roles in the implementation of the ELP. We will need to give direction to these committees on how to address concerns.

h) ELP Study

- There will be longitudinal studies, but of best practices and strategies, not empirical data, at least for the short term.

It is clear that the government will be moving to ensure implementation of the ELP within the next few months. OECTA will have opportunities throughout the process to help shape the program, save for the fundamentals, one of the most important being the relationship between the teacher and the ECEs. It

cannot be emphasized enough that the government and the Ministry will not allow a subservient relationship to be imposed on the ECEs.

It would be foolhardy on the part of the Association to attempt to address the relationship on the basis of a hierarchical model. To do so would marginalize our voice in the coming months. Instead we need to assist in defining the roles and responsibilities and then provide feedback and support for strong professional development on the implementation in the field with our membership. This will be significantly easier if all components are OECTA members, but regardless of the organizational decision on the ECEs, the Association must be involved in the development of programs and materials to assist our JK/SK members.

### **Legal Issues Related to the Organization of Early Childhood Educators**

Two legal opinions have been obtained to date concerning the organization of the ECEs by the Association (see supporting document # 4):

- 1) November 9, 2009 legal opinion: outlines the process for organization of the ECEs; and
- 2) November 13, 2009 legal opinion: addresses a specific concern raised at the COP related to the duty of fair representation.

It is important to review these two legal opinions concurrently in order to appreciate the options available to the Association regarding the method of organizing the ECEs. There are three possible methods by which the Association could proceed in organizing:

- 1) “Accreted” units in which the ECEs are incorporated into existing teacher bargaining units for elementary or joint units; or [accrete means “to add”]
- 2) Certification application for the ECEs; or
- 3) Voluntary Recognition for a separate bargaining unit for ECEs.

Regardless of the method chosen there are certain principles that are applicable to any of the organizational scenarios which should be used to guide the Association in the organization of the ECEs:

- 1) The OECTA Constitution must be amended to allow for the inclusion of the ECEs under membership.

In the absence of an amendment the Association would need to create a new union to represent the ECEs. It is important to note that forming an entirely new labour organization for the ECEs is not seen as a viable alternative for the Association. The current resources of the organization are insufficient for full-fledged certification drives across the province while meeting current obligations and the bargaining of health care benefits under the PDT. Also, the additional resources required for organizational purposes would require assistance and support provincially and locally from current staff.

In addition, if the Constitution is not amended, the community of interest argument on the part of OECTA is significantly weakened. As well, it will assist the position of “non-teacher” unions in arguing that the ECEs should be added to the existing “non-teacher” collective agreement.

The Provincial Executive has approved that only with sufficient support to change the Constitution to allow for the expansion of the membership of the Association to include Early Childhood Educators (ECEs), will the Association pursue the organization of the ECEs.

This is an extremely important decision for the Association. It will be important for the Council of Presidents to provide guidance to the Annual General Meeting on the issue. Therefore it is recommended that the February Council of Presidents provide a recommendation on the Constitutional amendment

#### Recommendation

That the Winter Council of Presidents' meeting state a recommended disposition on the Annual General Meeting resolution to amend the Constitution, by the addition of a new section: Constitution 1.5.4: early childhood educators.

- 2) All school boards must agree to the inclusion of the ECEs into the elementary/joint teacher bargaining unit.

This is a fundamental construct for only through the agreement of each and every school board will OECTA be able to accrete the ECEs into the existing elementary/joint collective agreements. As also noted under the legal opinion, this could be pursued after agreements are reached under a Voluntary Recognition Agreement (VRA) or certification procedure.

The likelihood of having the school boards agree under the accretion process is highly probable given the fact that the OCSTA has already informed the Ministry that they will be hiring Catholic ECEs. The exercise of their denominational rights indicates that the school boards will not be interested in the public battles which may ensue over the issue, if OECTA is not the union representing the ECEs.

Further, the argument of the non-teacher unions against the fragmentation of the bargaining unit is bolstered if the school boards refuse to accrete the ECEs into the teacher bargaining unit. This would give the non-teacher unions an advantage before the OLRB over OECTA.

Finally, and of the utmost importance, is the implication of separate bargaining units for ECEs and teachers and the Association's responsibilities to its teacher members. The November 13, 2009 legal opinion relates to the ability of the Association to represent the interest of its teacher members in the future should a government attempt to move to decrease the teacher presence in the JK/SK program by increasing the number of ECEs. The ability of the Association to speak out to protect its teachers while not exposing itself to a Duty of Fair Representation (DFR) complaint by the ECEs is completely dependent on the bargaining unit structure. In essence, if the ECEs form separate bargaining units the Association would be open to a DFR complaint from the independent ECEs if OECTA fought against the loss of teacher positions and the increase in the number of ECEs. Under the DFR, OECTA would be obligated to support the increase in the ECEs against the interests of its teacher bargaining unit members.

To ensure the protection of our teacher members the Provincial Executive has determined that only through accretion of ECEs to the elementary/joint teacher bargaining unit will OECTA represent the ECEs in a school board.

- 3) There will be a need for the Association to demonstrate that it has support of the majority of ECEs in the bargaining unit.

It is noted under the accretion process and the VRA that OECTA will need to establish that it has the support of the majority of the ECEs in order to fend off any possible OLRA s.66 challenges by other unions. This is easily addressed through the signing of the majority of the ECEs to membership cards.

The certification process also requires the signing of membership cards and that process is clearly identified in the opinion, therefore there is no need to address it further.

The fundamental difference between the processes is that under the certification process, the cards must be signed before the OLRA will approve OECTA moving forward. In the other two, accretion and VRA, the recognition occurs and then the membership signing could occur to substantiate the claim of representation. The means of pursuing this goal will be addressed after the AGM.

### **Resolutions to the AGM**

The date for resolutions to be submitted to the Legislation Committee for AGM 2010 is December 3, 2009. Normally, the Provincial Executive could delay submission of Handbook amendments by seeking acceptance by the February Council of Presidents for any late resolutions.

However, this is not the case for Constitution amendments, which require strict adherence to the Handbook amendment timelines under Constitution, Section 1.11. Therefore, the Provincial Executive approved the submission of the Handbook amendments related to the organization of the ECEs, given the importance of the matter. The resolution on the constitution has been attached for your review as Appendix A. The rest of the amendments will be available at the next Council of Presidents meeting in February.

### **Questions and Answers**

Questions and Answers are attached as Appendix B.

### **Timeline for Implementation**

Timeline for Implementation is attached as Appendix C.

### **Benefits and Challenges**

Benefits and Challenges are attached as Appendix D.

## **Supporting Documentation**

The following supporting documentation is attached for your information:

- Document 1: Pascal Report: *With Our Best Future in Mind* – Chapter 3
- Document 2: PowerPoint presentation by Zeenat Janmohamed – presented to AECEO
- Document 3: ECEs: The Institutional Framework
- Document 4: Legal Opinions: November 9 and November 13, 2009
- Document 5: a) Ministry Memo re: Implementation of Early Learning for four- and five-year olds (October 27, 2009)  
b) Summary of Ministry Memo
- Document 6: a) Ministry Memo re: Early Learning Program – Planning for 2010-11 and 2011-12 (October 27, 2009)  
c) Summary of Ministry Memo
- Document 7: Summary of Catholic Boards Only

Respectfully submitted,

Marshall Jarvis  
General Secretary

MJ/cr  
November 23, 2009

### Recommendation to the Council of Presidents:

That the Winter Council of Presidents' meeting state a recommended disposition on the Annual General Meeting resolution to amend the Constitution, by the addition of a new section: Constitution 1.5.4: early childhood educators.

Appendix A

**LEGISLATION COMMITTEE AGM RESOLUTION FORM**

**Submit TYPED resolutions with rationale by December 3, 2009**

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Date received at Provincial Office: \_\_\_\_\_

**PART A**

Date Resolution was passed by a majority vote at a unit general meeting: \_\_\_\_\_

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ Unit Secretary: \_\_\_\_\_

or Minority Report YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

PART B

Sponsor: Provincial Executive

Page in Handbook (if applicable): 9

THAT (bold one):

Constitution #1.4.2 By-laws # \_\_\_\_\_ Policy # \_\_\_\_\_ Procedure # \_\_\_\_\_ Action Directive # \_\_\_\_\_

**be amended by: (bold one):**

**deletion of**      **insertion of**      deletion and substitution of      addition of a new number

“early childhood educators”

It would then read:

1.4.2 to develop a greater understanding among parents, teachers, early childhood educators and students;

**RATIONALE:**

In order for the Association to represent early childhood educators who are employees of a Catholic district school board as directed by Ministry of Education Memorandum 2009 B:12 of October 27, 2009, it is necessary to include early childhood educators in the Constitution.

Note: For rationale and/or additional space for a long resolution please continue on another page.

**Please reproduce as necessary.**

**Email to: [a.anezyris@oecta.on.ca](mailto:a.anezyris@oecta.on.ca) or FAX to (416) 925-6940**

Appendix B

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**Organizing**

<u>Question</u>	<u>Answer</u>
What are the other teacher unions in Ontario going to be doing?	ETFFO will organize ECEs in public elementary schools, AEFO will organize in French schools and OSSTF will organize ECEs wherever they work.
What unions would likely compete to organize ECEs in Catholic Boards?	Unions that already organize EAs will try to organize ECEs in Catholic Boards, including CUPE, CAW, OSSTF and OPSEU. They will claim that they are part of the same community of interest. To prove this, they will need to show that ECEs are more like educational workers than teachers.
Shouldn't CUPE or OSSTF that already represent non-teachers organize ECEs instead?	Because ECEs are to be involved in program planning and delivery, ECEs have a closer "community of interest" to teachers than to non-teacher workers in schools.
What is meant by "community of interest"?	This deals with the concept of where does one's interests most closely align. OECTA believes that ECEs are closer to teachers in their roles and responsibilities than to non-teachers. Other unions may challenge this position believing ECEs to be more aligned with non-teachers.
Wouldn't OECTA be raiding another union?	No. ECEs are not organized and do not currently belong to other unions.
If OECTA organizes ECEs, why wouldn't OECTA also organize other workers in Catholic schools?	The only handbook changes being forwarded limits the scope of changes to the constitution and bylaws to ECEs only. OECTA therefore would not have the authority to organize any other school board employee groups unless OECTA chose to change the constitution again.
To organize ECEs, what steps need to be taken	The first step is the OECTA constitution and bylaws would need to be changed during AGM 2010. The second step is to have school boards agree to accretion. The third step is to negotiate the inclusion of the ECEs into agreement. This will be lead by provincial staff. The final phase will be the signing of membership cards. It should be understood that at some point there will be hearings before the OLRB on this matter.
Could OECTA wait until 2011 to make a decision?	No. ECEs will be organized by then and first contracts will be in place.

<p>What duties will unit presidents have? Will there be additional release time?</p>	<p>If OECTA decided to organize ECEs, they would become members of teacher bargaining units. ECEs would be entitled to receive service just like any other member. Additional members would be included in the Unit count, and the handbook would apply accordingly.</p>
--	--

**Qualifications**

<p>OECTA is a union of professionals and has always represented teachers <i>only</i>, so why would we organize ECEs now?</p>	<p>It is important to recognize the professionalism of ECEs. The Ontario College of Early Childhood Educators regulates ECEs. ECEs receive a minimum of two years of specialized post-secondary training. Some hold four-year degrees in Developmental Psychology. Some also hold teaching certificates.</p> <p>The full-day learning program creates a new reality, where teachers and ECEs will work side-by-side, creating a new community of interest. As outlined in the Pascal Report, <i>Our Best Future</i>, teachers and ECEs together will deliver program.</p>
<p>What courses would an ECE need to take to upgrade to be a teacher?</p>	<p>To become a teacher, an ECE would need to complete a faculty of education program.</p>
<p>Will teachers be required to get additional qualifications?</p>	<p>No. There is a possibility in the future as the report <i>Our Best Future</i> recommends that teachers without Early Childhood Development (ECD) qualifications may have to complete an early childhood AQ course within 5 years. Primary specialist teachers may have acquired specific early childhood knowledge and skills through prior postsecondary education, in-service, professional development or early childhood AQ courses. <i>Our Best Future</i> anticipates that a process to recognize equivalency could be established.</p>
<p>Could ECEs apply to be members of the College of Teachers?</p>	<p>ECEs who hold a valid teacher's certificate are entitled to be a member of the Ontario College of Teachers.</p>
<p>Will ECEs be entitled to participate in the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan? It should be noted that ECEs who are not members of the OTTP will be members of OMERS (Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System).</p>	<p>Anyone who holds a valid Ontario Teachers' Certificate and is employed by a school board is automatically a member of the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan.</p>
<p>Will eligible ECEs be allowed to sit on the Board of Governors?</p>	<p>No. The Handbook amendments prevent this.</p>
<p>Aren't primary teacher qualifications enough to qualify as an ECE?</p>	<p>No. ECE qualifications are distinct and different from teacher qualifications.</p>

**Conflict**

<p>How would OECTA manage the conflict between the two groups if ECEs become members of OECTA?</p>	<p>In the same way that OECTA already addresses member-to-member conflict. OECTA could address conflict resolution processes and protocols about role definition as part of the negotiations with the boards for first contracts for ECEs. OECTA could develop PD, communication and education programs to delineate roles and expectations of teachers and ECEs.</p>
<p>Isn't conflict easier to address if teachers and ECEs belong to different unions so we are able to openly represent our different interests?</p>	<p>It depends on local relationships. Where there is a strong competing non-teacher union, conflict resolution can be difficult. The problem with conflict between professionals is that people who perceive themselves as victims often characterize conflict as harassment.</p> <p>Two different unions would seek to expand roles and responsibilities for their own members, often at cost to the other union group.</p> <p>If OECTA organized ECEs, OECTA could include conflict resolution processes and role definition as part of the negotiations with the boards for first contracts for ECEs.</p>
<p>If the government replaces teachers with ECEs, how would OECTA be able to protect teacher jobs if ECEs are in the same union?</p>	<p>OECTA would be in a stronger position to protect teacher jobs if teachers and ECEs were in the same union. See the November 13 Cavalluzzo opinion. (B 10)</p>
<p>Who will oversee ECEs during the core program and during the extended portions of the day?</p>	<p>The school administrator.</p>
<p>Won't having ECEs in the bargaining unit keep teacher salaries down?</p>	<p>Experience in Australia shows the opposite to be true. Salary and benefit enhancements to ECEs in Australia enhanced teacher salaries and benefits. The affect is reciprocal.</p>
<p>Who has the final authority to resolve issues?</p>	<p>As in any conflict between co-workers the employer has the authority and responsibility to resolve issues. At the school level this would be the school administrator.</p>
<p>How are professional and philosophical differences resolved within the team?</p>	<p>There is no easy answer and whether or not OECTA organizes ECEs, this issue must be addressed.</p> <p>OECTA is lobbying the government for funding to provide PD opportunities to address this issue.</p> <p>As in any conflict between co-workers the school administrator and ultimately the employer have authority and responsibility to resolve issues.</p>

**Roles & Working Conditions**

<p><i>Our Best Future</i> partners teachers and ECEs in classrooms. Who does what?</p>	<p><i>Teachers only:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate children’s development progress within context of Early Learning Program curriculum expectations.</li> <li>• Provide summative reports to parents.</li> <li>• Prepare children for the transition to the Grade 1 curriculum.</li> </ul> <p><i>Teachers and ECEs together:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan and implement the <i>Early Learning Program</i> curriculum.</li> <li>• Monitor children’s developmental progress.</li> <li>• Communicate regularly with families.</li> <li>• Maintain healthy physical, emotional and social learning environments.</li> </ul> <p><i>ECEs only:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement extended day activities.</li> <li>• Plan and implement summer programming.</li> <li>• Liaise with community partners.</li> </ul>
<p>What is the role of the EAs in this new program?</p>	<p>The role of the EA does not change. Where appropriate, they remain assigned to help special needs students with individualized programming.</p>
<p>How would OECTA control job descriptions and role definitions?</p>	<p>If both teachers and ECEs belong to the same bargaining unit, OECTA would be able to help define them and establish distinctions.</p> <p>There would be a greater risk of competition and role confusion if teachers and ECEs were <i>not</i> in the same bargaining unit, because a competing union would promote its own interests and might not necessarily understand the role and professionalism of a Catholic teacher.</p>
<p>What are the logistics of reporting to parents?</p>	<p>Teachers alone provide summative reports. However, both teachers and ECEs are responsible for monitoring the child’s development and communicating regularly with families.</p>
<p>What does the curriculum look like?</p>	<p>The new curriculum for four- and five-year olds builds on the current Kindergarten curriculum and the <i>Early Learning for Every Child Today</i> (ELECT) document. It should be available in the spring of 2010.</p>
<p>Will teachers be supervising ECEs?</p>	<p>No.</p>

<p>Would working with an ECE increase teachers' workload?</p>	<p>Although working conditions will change, having an ECE in the classroom should reduce workload. Teachers will have more help in the classroom.</p> <p>The new teacher-ECE-student ratio will reduce the maximum number of student contacts from a maximum of 40 per day to 26 for every teacher. In addition, the average adult to child ratio will be 13 to 1.</p>
<p>Will teachers automatically be working on a team with an ECE?</p>	<p>Only if the class size exceeds the student threshold of approximately 15 students per classroom. However, <i>Our Best Future</i> clearly envisions that normally, a teacher and an ECE will work as a team to deliver full-day learning.</p>
<p>What will be the staffing arrangement in every classroom?</p>	<p>Despite student enrollment, every classroom must have a full-time teacher. However, not every classroom will have a full-time ECE. That will require sufficient enrollment.</p>
<p>How will classroom management be handled?</p>	<p>Jointly. OECTA would address role definition as part of the negotiations for first contracts for ECEs.</p>
<p>How will teachers be informed about the program and working conditions?</p>	<p>This will be a joint effort that involves the Ministry, school boards, OECTA and whatever union finally organizes the ECEs. The Ministry is <i>very</i> clear that it wants a collaborative program delivery model for the teachers <i>and</i> ECEs which aligns with their respective strengths.</p>

### Contracts and Rights

<p>What will the school day look like?</p>	<p>The new program has a single pedagogical and curriculum approach that is planned and delivered by qualified educators using common space and resources.</p> <p>The core program runs from 9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. (or equivalent)</p> <p>The extended before-school program runs from 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and the extended after-school program runs from 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m.</p> <p>The first ECE will deliver the extended program in the morning and then work with the teacher until 1 p.m. A second ECE will join the teacher and the first ECE from noon until 1 p.m., continue working with the teacher until 3:30 p.m. and then, will deliver the extended after-school program until 6 p.m.</p> <p>This is the ideal as envisioned in <i>Our Best Future</i>.</p> <p>If there are not enough students, the organization of the extended program may vary.</p>
--	--

<p>If a teacher is ill, will the teacher be replaced by an OT?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Will ECEs perform as OTs if the regular teacher is absent?</p>	<p>No. OTBUs will need to monitor this to ensure a member of the OTBU replaces the teacher. OECTA will need to educate our members to report such instances.</p>
<p>Will there be Occasional ECEs?</p>	<p>This depends on contract language for ECEs and on who bargains for them. The Ministry is predicting a shortage of qualified ECEs at first. OECTA could advocate that OTs who also hold ECD qualifications be allowed to also work as Occasional ECEs.</p>
<p>Does this open the door for non-teachers to deliver program at secondary level?</p>	<p>Bringing qualified ECEs into OECTA would protect the teaching profession by clearly defining their distinct and non-competing roles and responsibilities within the same community of interest. OECTA would address qualifications and hiring practices as part of the negotiations for first contracts for ECEs.</p> <p>Any hostile government could re-write the legislation as has happened in past.</p>
<p>Who owns classroom equipment and resources? Are teacher/Educator resources shared? Who takes responsibility for these resources?</p>	<p>Unless it's personal equipment and resources, the board owns the equipment, as is the current practice. OECTA can advocate for additional funding for ELP classes to account for the increased use of materials.</p>

**Political**

<p>Will service to ECEs drain OECTA finances?</p>	<p>ECE fees would generate \$2 million when full-day learning is fully implemented.</p>
<p>What fee could ECEs be required to pay?</p>	<p>A possibility is to use the same formula currently used to calculate OECTA's Occasional Teacher membership fees.</p>
<p>What will be the cost to OECTA?</p>	<p>It is estimated that \$500,000 will be the total of all fee returns to units. Organizational and bargaining expenses are estimated at \$30,000. Provincial committee at \$10,000. The other possible cost would be the hiring of an ECE staff officer (cost TBD) if required.</p>

**Denominational Rights**

<p>Will boards exercise their preferential rights to hire Catholic ECEs?</p>	<p>Yes. OCSTA has informed the government that boards intend to hire Catholic ECEs. This is important for OECTA because, depending on who represents ECEs, it could become a point of contention for the Catholic community.</p> <p>OECTA's understanding and familiarity with denominational issues will be important for our Catholic school system. OECTA's thorough understanding and experience would also curtail attempts by boards to expand the scope of denominational rights issues.</p> <p>Currently at least one union representing non-teachers, OSSTF, is on record as supporting a single school system.</p>
--	--

Appendix C

TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

November 30, 2009	Special Council of Presidents on the Early Learning Program (ELP) and Early Childhood Educators (ECEs).
December 3, 2009	Submission of Handbook changes.
December-February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Ongoing dialogue with Ministry on ELP;</li><li>- Assistance and direction to units by provincial office on ELP;</li><li>- Preparation work for the organization of the ECEs;</li></ul>
February 4- 5, 2010	February Council of Presidents to make recommendations on Constitutional changes to the AGM.
March 13-15, 2010	AGM determines ECE issue. All handbook matters related to the change to be dealt with in a special block of time by the AGM. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Yes = Move to immediately commence organizing ECEs;</li><li>o No = End of organizational process.</li></ul>
March 2010	Commencement of accretion agreements with school boards establishing initial collective agreements in selected school boards.
April-August, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Completion of accretion process and the negotiations of collective agreements;</li><li>- Collaboration between OECTA, Ministry and school boards on PD initiatives for teachers and ECEs;</li><li>- Signing of membership cards through units.</li></ul>