

1976  
AUG.

PUBLIC RESPONSE  
TO POLICY GUIDELINES  
REGARDING THE EXPANSION OF DAY CARE SERVICES  
IN EDMONTON

PREPARED BY:

Linda Duncan  
Planner

Edmonton Social Planning Council  
10006 - 107 Street  
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 1J2

August 31, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
EXPLANATION OF THE PROCESS .....	2
PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS .....	5
A. QUALITY OF SERVICE .....	5
B. MODELS FOR PROGRAM EXPANSION .....	8
C. COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF DAY CARE SERVICES .....	12
D. INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS .....	15
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION .....	18
APPENDICES .....	19

## I INTRODUCTION

In 1975 Edmonton Social Services, which is charged with the responsibility of administering the subsidized day care program, was requested to prepare a major planning paper on day care. It was intended that the Report would lead to a clearer delineation of City of Edmonton policy with regard to day care development and operation.

The Report was completed and submitted to the City Commissioners in the Fall of 1975 and included the following:

- 1) an analysis of the need for various types of day care service and the costs associated with these required services;
- 2) an indication of priority areas requiring expanded services;
- 3) proposals regarding the method of developing new services in both existing and developing areas of the City; and
- 4) an identification of major problems in the overall system of day care services and proposed solutions to these problems.

All told the Report contained a total of twenty three recommendations.

The Report was submitted to City Council in the Spring of 1976. Before dealing with it in a substantive way, Council requested that community reaction to the proposals be sought. This task was referred back to Edmonton Social Services.

At this point the involvement of the Edmonton Social Planning Council was requested. It was felt that it would be more valid to have an independent body involved in generating public reactions to the City Report.

Subsequent discussions between the Edmonton Social Planning Council and Edmonton Social Services produced a time frame for a process of public participation. It was anticipated that the process would be developed and advertised through April and May, hearings would be held in June and a summary report submitted to the City in August. There was some concern that this did not allow adequate time to fully explore the issues raised in the Report and that the summer months were not a good time to be seeking public participation. However, it was recognized that there were several factors which made it important to complete the process before the Fall of 1976. By this time the original Report would already be a year old and would become dated if not acted upon. It was also felt that the Report had implications for the annual budget review which would begin in September and should receive some consideration by City Council prior to this.

## II EXPLANATION OF THE PROCESS

A series of six public workshops were held in different areas of the City over a two week period. (See Appendix B for dates and locations of the workshops.) The decision to hold workshops in various locations of the City was based on the belief that not only a greater cross section of people would participate but that these workshops should be brought to the people in their respective communities. Although the discussion topics were general in nature we thought this division could also serve as an indicator of varying opinion in each Edmonton area. Interestingly enough, the workshop results indicate little or no disagreement on issues between regions and in fact a general consensus in favor of all of the recommendations.

The workshops were advertised through use of media including radio, television, Edmonton Journal and community newspapers, and newsletters and community contacts. Community contacts included members of the staff of the Day Care Branch, Edmonton Social Services, Edmonton Social Planning Council, Community Workers, Day Care Centre staff, Social Workers with Edmonton Social Services, the Day Care Council and other interested parties. An announcement of the workshops and an invitation to participate were mailed directly to all of the above parties plus community groups, media, and other interested citizens. The majority of participants stated they attended the workshop because of a personal contact. At almost all of the meetings participants expressed the need for greater media coverage or direct mailing to more Edmontonians for future workshops. Copies of the complete report and the summary of the report were available to anyone on request.

Numbers in attendance at the workshops was as anticipated considering the time constraints on advertising and the summer season:

1) St. Bernadette .....	42
2) Archbishop Macdonald .....	12
3) M. E. LaZerte .....	18
4) Parkallen .....	32
5) Strathearn .....	21
6) Alex Taylor .....	15

Some workshops, it was felt, drew noteworthy attendance considering these factors. The workshops drew participation from a wide variety of

occupations and backgrounds. The age group varied from 4 to 65 years. Several recently immigrating families attended. Parents presently using both subsidized and private day care and parents on waiting lists for both were present. Both mothers and fathers attended, some bringing their children. There were representatives from community based agencies or citizen groups representing large sections of the population. Several members of the provincial legislature attended.

The workshop format utilized in each instance began with a basic explanation of the Recommendations by Mike Day, Director of the Day Care Branch, Edmonton Social Services. Participants were then given the opportunity for questions and clarification of the report. Time was allotted for formal presentations by community groups or individuals. The participants were then allowed questions on the presentations. The entire format was very open and allowance was made for any alterations or additions suggested by the participants. Participants then broke into discussion groups centered around a group of four topics:

- 1) Quality of Service,
- 2) Methods of Program Expansion in Day Care,
- 3) Co-ordination and Integration of Day Care Services, and
- 4) Innovative Programs.

While people were free to choose other topics of discussion they felt to be relevant, they expressed that these topics included all of their concerns. Each of these topics covered a section of Mr. Day's Report.

We were assisted in the facilitation of the workshops by a number of citizens who volunteered as group discussion leaders and recorders. The discussion leaders aided in explaining the significance of the recommendations to participants and keeping discussion channelled to a discussion of the Report. The recorders made possible this correlation of citizen responses as well as providing a brief feedback to all participants from each discussion group. A thorough discussion occurred on each aspect of the Report and participants in many groups were eager to include in their discussion all four areas of concern as delineated by Mr. Day.

At the close of each of the six workshops a discussion was generated by the participants on methods of ensuring that their concerns on expansion and improvement of day care be made clear to government officials. Many

participants stated the need for the municipal and provincial governments to sponsor an educative program on day care for the public. They conceded that many government officials and citizens continue to remain ignorant of the necessity of day care, its long term benefits, the extreme shortage of quality child care facilities in the City and Province and the appalling number of children presently receiving care harmful to their normal development.

Participants expressed an interest in receiving copies of the results of the city-wide workshops. Much of the discussion in the closing session of each workshop centered around the problem of making their concerns known to government. Further individual comments on the Recommendations were submitted by participants on the individual evaluation forms (Appendix "D").

### III PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS

As explained in the process the workshop participants were given the opportunity to express their opinion of the Recommendations by way of open discussion, formal presentation to workshop participants, in small group discussion and by completing the evaluation form (Appendix "D"). These opinions were recorded at all six workshops and are presented in this report under the four general areas of concern delineated by the Report: Quality of Service, Models for Program Expansion, Co-ordination and Integration of Day Care Services and Innovative Programs. The specific recommendations discussed are set out at the beginning of each section.

#### A. QUALITY OF SERVICE

RECOMMENDATION #3: That the following statement of objective be endorsed: The objective of the City of Edmonton in relation to day care services is to promote the development of a comprehensive system of good quality day care service in Edmonton.

- (a) Day Care in this context means the care of children outside their own homes, for some part of the day in circumstances where the care provided at home needs to be supplemented.
- (b) The system to be comprehensive must address itself to the needs of children 0 - 12 years of age, normal and handicapped children, and children who require part time, as well as full time care.

RECOMMENDATION #7: That the City of Edmonton make representation to the Provincial Government suggesting that the Province maintain and strengthen its licensing function through the adoption of a higher set of minimum standards and the addition of legal sanctions to enforce these standards.

RECOMMENDATION #8: That the City of Edmonton through its Social Service Department develop the capacity to provide administrative and program consultation to all day care programs regardless of sponsorship.

RECOMMENDATION #9: That Edmonton Social Services develop a supplemental funding program for private day care centres. Qualification for such supplementation would depend on the centre meeting operating standards set near the level of the present subsidized centres. The supplementation would be extended in the form of flat rate subsidy for each child placed in the program.

The participants at the six workshops endorsed in total Recommendations #3, #7, #8 and #9 dealing with quality of day care service and the role of municipal and provincial governments in ensuring the desired quality standard. Support was given to the recommendation that the City assume responsibility for the development of a comprehensive system of good quality day care service for its citizens and that the service be extended to all families irrespective of their special needs.

It was conceded that the City must assume responsibility for persuading the Provincial Government to maintain and strengthen its licensing function through the adoption of a higher set of minimum standards combined with an effective means of enforcement. Concern was expressed that high standards of quality be required for all child care facilities both privately and publicly operated.

Workshop participants agreed that the City must give its Social Service Department the mandate to

- 1) provide administrative and program consultation to all day care programs regardless of sponsorship, and
- 2) expand its program of supplemental funding to private day care centres.

It was agreed that quality of service will only be improved in all child care situations if funding and consultation assistance is made available to all centres. Participants expressed a concern for the extreme shortage of spaces available in quality subsidized day care centres as well as the growing demand for any type of child care. Many foresaw the possible abuse of subsidy funds by private operators but felt strict controls and enforcement of quality standards by inspectors could provide sufficient safeguards. Generally it was felt that supplementation for child care in private centres should go directly to the centre rather than the parent. Until proper education programs are established to guide parents in choosing quality child care it is preferable to place the funds where they can be closely scrutinized.

It was felt that licensing and enforcement powers should remain separate. The City should only move into a licensing function if the Provincial Government fails to fulfill its duty. An administrative and program consultation service could prove invaluable to the operation of



quality day care and citizens must be encouraged to utilize such a service. The division of licensing and consultation roles is necessary to build a rapport between day care centre staff and city officials.

Participants stressed the belief that stringent day care legislation or regulations must be passed by some level of government. They favored a usurping of the licensing power by the City if the Province continues to ignore the responsibility, irrespective of the resulting conflict of roles between licensing official and consultant.

In this vein participants favored the enactment of a separate piece of legislation governing child care and the operation of child care facilities. It was felt that the subject of proper child care warranted more consideration than a set of regulations. This legislation would include the power of appointment of inspectors specially trained to examine child care premises, equipment, staff qualifications, nutrition, child/staff ratio, and programs. Legislation should also include strict enforcement and penalty provisions.

The major part of each group discussion on quality of service centered around the topic of staff qualification. There was a common consensus that every day care centre, whether private or subsidized be required to employ at the minimum one trained child care worker. A trained child care worker was defined as a person

- 1) who has undergone a minimum of a two-year course or the equivalent in an accredited child development program, and
- 2) who has a minimum of two years related working experience.

The staff employed in day care should be required to take up-dating courses in child development. The provincial government should be encouraged to institute a program which would allow for evening and part time enrollment in this field. Day care centres would be required to facilitate staff attendance in these educative programs.

Concomitant to the requirement of qualifications, participants recommended an increased budget for day care in the province to facilitate the employment of qualified staff and to provide an incentive for updating or improvement of qualifications. Not only would an increased budget allow

for more qualified staff but also more staff which would create a healthier child/staff ratio.

Private centres should be allowed a five year period to upgrade staff qualifications and improve equipment and programs. If the upgrading does not occur the centre should be closed down. Once upgraded, a private centre could then qualify for some degree of subsidization. In order to allow parents to provide proper care for their children, it was recommended that the City prepare a reference sheet for available use of all parents, such material to include the major points to look for when choosing a day care centre - healthy child/staff ratio, nutrition, programs, equipment, staff qualifications and reasonable fees. This information would assist parents in providing quality care for their children.

Participants supported an overall increase in priority for day care at all levels of government. Day care must be recognized as a child development program not a babysitting service. Quality day care should be recognized as a right available to all families irrespective of income level.

B. MODELS FOR PROGRAM EXPANSION

RECOMMENDATION #4: That the first priority of the City be the extension of subsidized services to high priority families.

RECOMMENDATION #5: That the expansion of subsidized group care programs be carried out through the funding of non-profit community Boards who act as program sponsors.

RECOMMENDATION #10: That the rate of expansion of Family Day Care, After School Care, and the supplementation of placements in private centres be based on the growth rate of the subsidized centres serving children 2 to 6 years of age, in a 1:2 ratio.

RECOMMENDATION #11: That the Londonderry, West Jasper Place and Norwood areas be approved as the first priority areas for the expansion of subsidized day care programs in 1976.

RECOMMENDATION #12: That tentative approval be given to development of subsidized centres in the new Y.W.C.A. facility and in the Hermitage area in 1977.

RECOMMENDATION #13: That the following be considered as priority areas for the development of subsidized day care centres in the years 1977 - 1980: King Edward, Hazeldean, Duggan, Delton-Newton, Castledowns, Athlone-Calder and Mill Woods.

RECOMMENDATION #14: That the basic approach to program expansion in the existing areas of the city continue to be the rental of existing community facilities with the additional support of City grants provided through the P.S.S. funding mechanism to cover renovation and start up costs.

RECOMMENDATION #15: That the City of Edmonton accept responsibility for the construction of day care facilities for subsidized programs in developing areas of the City.

RECOMMENDATION #16: That the City borrow the money to cover the cost of constructing day care facilities and in turn rent the facilities to Community Boards at a level which would cover the debenture repayment.

RECOMMENDATION #17: That a parcel of land be set aside in each new community (generally the area coinciding with the catchment area of a Junior High School and being approximately 20,000 in population) as the location for a subsidized day care program and that this site be integrated with the central park and school reserve where possible and appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION #18: That such day care sites be purchased out of the 5% excess dedication as provided in subsection 2 Section A of Standard Terms of Reference for Development Agreements as Approved by City Council July 17th, 1972 and Amended February 11th, 1974.

RECOMMENDATION #23: That in order to facilitate long range planning of day care services an approach be made to the Provincial Government requesting some indication of the amount of funding which will be allocated for day care services over the next five years.

Recommendation #5 proposing that the expansion of subsidized group care programs be carried out through the funding of non-profit community boards who would act as program sponsors was met with unanimous support at all six workshops. Recommendation #10 was met with some degree of confusion, mostly because of the way it was worded. Once the recommendation was explained in detail, the majority of the workshop participants were in agreement while others felt that the development of each program should be related to the expressed needs of each community, rather than a predetermined ratio for future expansion of family day care, after school care, subsidized or private day care centres.

Recommendations #11, #12 and #13 specified particular areas of the City as priority areas for future subsidized day care centres. Depending on the location of the workshop, participants either were in favor or not

of the choice of priority areas. As a general rule, however, the majority of participants felt the older developed areas of the City should be given first priority. Participants also however were in complete consensus with Recommendation #17 proposing that developers must set aside property for day care centres in any proposed plan of development for the City. They felt it to be the responsibility of the City of Edmonton Planning Department to require that this request be satisfied prior to approval given on developments. The cost estimate of the land reserve and possibly the capital costs of the centre structure could be included in the development costs.

The majority of participants favored Recommendations #14 and #16 which recommended utilizing existing community facilities including community halls, school buildings, churches and business premises for community based day care centres. City grants would therefore be necessary only for renovations and start up costs. Where facilities were not available there was agreement that the City and possibly the Province should bear the capital costs and rent the premises to the day care centre board.

One of the recommendations which received the strongest support was #23 which recommends that the Provincial Government be approached by the City to facilitate long-range planning of day care to state a projected budget for day care over a five year period. It was agreed that in order to encourage citizens to establish community boards for future day care centres there must be an indication in advance of whether funds would be available. It was stressed that the City must force the Province to calculate its long term budget on the basis of the statistics of present and projected demand for day care services, a need presently highly under realized.

Generally participants preferred that the decision as to where new day care centres would be established be based on density of population and greatest need, including such factors as little or no available day care in the area, percentage of low income or single parents, and high density population.

Many participants indicated a concern that if existing community facilities were used as day care centres that some guarantee be given that the premises would not be redesignated for another purpose.

A number of suggestions arose on methods whereby day care service could be expanded within the City. Many people supported the idea of day care centres at the place of work and that employers should be required to provide facilities and the City could subsidize the program. Others felt it was better to locate the child care centres in the community where the child resides. Both of these suggestions, however, centered around a common concern felt for difficulties in transporting the children to the centres and therefore the centre should be located either at the place of work, or the local community, to avoid any further travel.

It was commonly felt that efforts for expansion of day care should be divided equally in creating better quality day care and more available day care spaces. In other words, pressure must be exerted to create many more day care facilities and improvement of those already in existence.

Many participants expressed a need for more drop-in or temporary child care facilities. They seemed to feel there was a great shortage of available quality child care for parents in emergency or part-time need situations. It was felt that this was a valid service which must be made available.

A general consensus was expressed that the City should take on the responsibility of an educational program on day care to inform Edmonton citizens about what day care involves. People in the community should be encouraged to set up their own centres and have funding available to do it.

The participants all seemed in favor of the expansion of after school programs for children. Most people felt that while school facilities would be useful, that teachers should not be called upon for supervision. Many persons recommended a program run by at least one qualified paid staff person who would supervise a number of volunteer workers including parents, senior citizens and others. This program, it was felt, was important for children of working parents. The program should also be made available at noon hours. Other suggestions for location of after school care were churches and community halls.

There was a concern expressed about the present method used for determining individual payments for subsidized day care. Many participants expressed the opinion that the payments required of families with two working parents and families of above average incomes could easily be increased. It was felt that the difference between payments received of a single parent and the combined income of two parents was not great enough and that the single parent on a low income bracket in comparison was paying too high a percentage of their income. It was requested that the entire scale of payments be reviewed and revised.

At one workshop the participants eagerly supported the concept of a separate day care office above and beyond the position attached to City Social Services. Participants expressed difficulty in knowing where to obtain information on available day care, regulations, or where complaints are to be made. It was felt that a centralized, well advertised office is a prerequisite for the establishment of quality day care services in the City.

One group suggested a separate mill rate or local improvement tax for the purpose of collecting revenue for the operation of day care centres. Difficulties however were noted with the inevitable necessity of the establishment of a separate department.

There was a general consensus that existing and past community board members would be valuable sources of information to persons wishing to start up new day care centres. There was a suggestion that once established, the central office could distribute names of persons experienced in working with day care.

#### C. COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF DAY CARE SERVICES

RECOMMENDATION #1: That the City of Edmonton make a commitment to take an active leadership role in the further development of an integrated system of day care services within Edmonton.

RECOMMENDATION #2: That Edmonton Social Services be assigned the responsibility for co-ordinating all City activity within the field of day care.

RECOMMENDATION #6: That the City continue to administer the Family Day Care Program and the Glengarry Day Care Centre.

RECOMMENDATION #8: That the City of Edmonton through its Social Service Department develop the capacity to provide administrative and program consultation to all day care programs regardless of sponsorship.

RECOMMENDATION #19: That the Architectural Branch of Real Estate and Housing be assigned the responsibility for managing the construction phase of new day care centres and that the Property Section of the same Department be assigned responsibility for managing the facility and acting as leaseholder to the community group who sponsor the program.

This topic of discussion centered around the present and future role of the City in the operation of day care centres. In general, the recommendation for expansion of the role of the City in co-ordinating and integrating day care was commended. Participants conceded that the City should continue to play a key role in co-ordinating all City activity within the field of day care and supported continued expansion of supervision over private day care centres. There was general agreement that a central, informed organization was necessary to co-ordinate the needs of day care centres, users of the centres, persons in need of day care services and funding bodies.

The majority of participants favored assigning the responsibility for managing the construction phase of new day care centres to the Architectural Branch of the Department of Real Estate and Housing. There was a condition attached to this assignment of responsibility that the Architectural Branch be required to solicit citizen input including that of day care staff, community board members and parents in drafting plans for the centres. Participants also supported the recommendation that the Property Section of the Department of Real Estate and Housing be made responsible for the management of day care facilities and as leaseholder for the community board.

The recommendation which received the most dissension was #9 which recommended the development of a supplemental funding program for private day care centres. Most participants did favor supplementation of private centres in order to improve the quality of service but on the condition that these centres be closely monitored to guarantee that the funds are

properly utilized. Most people felt the private centres should be forced to upgrade their service before any subsidization would be awarded. Discussion centered around the dilemma of improving quality of private centres by granting public funds to profit making enterprises.

There was unanimous support for the recommendation that the City operate a consultation service for day care centres and parents providing information on proper child care. Many participants favored the idea of on-going programs offered by municipal and provincial governments on child development, and parent/child programs for parents and high school students.

At a number of the workshops a concern was expressed about the welfare stigma presently attached to day care programs. It was felt that day care should perhaps be taken out of social services and attached to a different department at both civic and provincial levels of government. This could be accomplished if day care was not attached to the Edmonton Assistance Plan or Preventive Social Services.

It was felt that it should be the City's responsibility to serve as consultants to community boards assisting them in establishing and operating day care centres both properly and efficiently. The City should also have an active educative campaign teaching the public about day care and its potential benefits. The Provincial and Municipal day care staff should be jointly responsible for informing elected representatives and the general public of the demand for day care and the present lack of facilities.

The City should facilitate a communication network between private and subsidized day care centres.

While community boards were felt to be the best method for operating centres it was felt more money should be made available to the boards. It is far too onerous a task to expect volunteer labor to be responsible for managing and administering a centre over a long period of time. There should perhaps be day care people on permanent salary available to all boards and staff for consultation purposes.



D. INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS

RECOMMENDATION #20: That on a demonstration basis a program of extended day care service (evening hours and weekends) be developed to test out the need and the most appropriate pattern for delivering the service.

RECOMMENDATION #21: That on a demonstration basis a program providing group care of infants be developed.

RECOMMENDATION #22: That each centre be encouraged to make available one or two placements daily to provide care on a temporary basis to families needing such service.

Discussion centered around Recommendations #20, #21 and #22, but also included additional innovative ideas for the expansion of day care. Members of this discussion group tended to support the expansion of day care and improvement of quality and were interested in exchanging ideas on making day care available to a larger cross section of families as well as providing better quality care for those already participating.

Most of the participants agreed with Recommendation #20 in that day care service should be extended to cover evenings and weekends. It was suggested that this expansion could occur through utilization of existing day care facilities, family day care and by developing new centres at places of work.

Recommendation #21 was given support but certain conditions attached. Any arrangements for group infant care must be developed on the basis of a low staff/child ratio. Parents, it was suggested, should be encouraged to participate. Utilization of private homes should be considered only where operators have ready access and make use of information and consultation on child care and development. It was generally agreed that in all levels of child care, greater use of homes as centres could relieve the pressure on existing facilities and help to solve the problem of capital costs.

Participants generally supported the idea of increasing the availability of temporary or emergency day care spaces and agreed this type of service while in demand is greatly lacking. Concern however was shown towards a policy of requiring existing centres to provide several places daily to meet these temporary needs. Existing centres are presently over-

taxed simply providing spaces for children on a regular basis. Further, it would be difficult to determine a policy on which children would take priority in filling these temporary spaces. A better solution it was felt would be to establish more centres functioning like Bissell Center which takes on only temporary and emergency cases and has a program for the children suited more to a temporary care situation. Having children dropping in and out of a program could be difficult for both these children and those attending regularly.

It was also recommended that a system of day care should be developed to care for children of parents working shifts. Because of the inherent complications such as overnight care it was felt that the most logical solution within the existing restrictive budget would be home care. These day care situations would have to be strictly regulated to ensure quiet, well equipped spaces for feeding and sleeping infants and young children.

Another suggestion for meeting the present demand for day care spaces without the necessity of large capital costs would be to subsidize spaces in supervised homes. This would provide care for pre-school children during working hours and school age children before and after school.

Many participants expressed enthusiasm for integrated day care staff composing all ages, sexes and ethnic backgrounds. People requested that the elderly be contacted to gauge their interest in becoming involved with the day care programs.

Participants generally supported the extension of the City day care program to provide for educational programs and consultation to all parents. It was expressed that child care programs should definitely be provided for day care staff and board members.

One group supporting the concept of day care at the parents' place of employment argued that this system would allow the parents the choice of being with their children during lunch and coffee breaks. It was felt that those employers employing over 50 persons should be legally required within the day care legislation to provide day care facilities. This same group proposed legislative amendments which would provide for "family leave",

such leave allowing both parents to take time off work to care for sick children and not have their job status jeopardized. In the alternative support services could be developed for the care of sick children.

Support was given to allowing parents and staff to develop innovative programs without undue influence from government regulation. Quality should be regulated and enforced but centres should be allowed to develop their own individual programs to suit the children. Many participants favored the development of parent co-operative centres partially funded by government.

#### IV SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Public response arising out of the workshops indicated an extensive awareness of the crisis situation for day care delineated in the Report prepared by the Day Care Branch of Edmonton Social Services. The results of all six workshops indicated a high level of public concern in four key areas on the subject of day care:

1. Critical lack of quality day care. Participants had either had personal experience or knew of people who had experienced disgraceful child care situations. It was felt the situation warranted improvement now.
2. Extreme concern over government's failure to enact and enforce improved standards for day care. While subsidized centres are required to meet higher municipal quality standards, many private centres continue to offer harmful child care because of lax provincial standards and lack of enforcement.
3. Growing frustration with shortage of day care. Many participants expressed frustration where they were promised day care centres and proceeded to form community boards and expend work planning their centre only to be told they are refused a centre because of budget cuts.
4. Concern with government's failure to follow a long-range plan for expanding day care. It was expressed that the present unsatisfied and growing demand for day care must be recognized and budgeted for on a long term basis to provide day care facilities to all citizens irrespective of their income level.

In conclusion, the results of the workshops indicate a public consensus in favor of the recommendations advanced by Mr. Day in his report "Policy Guidelines Regarding the Expansion of Day Care Services in Edmonton". The workshops further indicate a strong lobbying force in favor of the improvement and expansion of day care services in Edmonton.

APPENDICES

- A. LETTER TO CITIZENS
- B. WORKSHOP LOCATIONS
- C. WORKSHOP AGENDA
- D. EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK FORM

**APPENDIX A**

# EDMONTON SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

April 29, 1976.

## M E M O

TO: Citizens Concerned About Day Care.

FROM: Linda Duncan, Planner,  
Edmonton Social Planning Council.

### Re: Day Care Workshops

People in Edmonton have become aware of two severe problems concerning day care in this City:

- 1) a severe shortage of quality service,
- 2) a failure to provide quantity of service to meet the demands of the growing population in the City.

In response to these problems, the Day Care Branch of Edmonton Social Services has prepared a report entitled "Policy Guidelines Regarding the Expansion of Day Care Services in the City of Edmonton". This report considers the future of subsidized and non-subsidized day care programs, role of the City, the role of commercial day care centers, estimates of future need and possible models for expansion.

To allow for community input on the issue and reaction to the report, five public workshops are scheduled under the joint sponsorship of Edmonton Social Services and the Edmonton Social Planning Council. Interested agencies, community groups and individuals are invited to participate at any of the five meetings (see attached for date and location). Citizens may make their stand known by written submissions and presentations or informal discussion at the workshops in small group discussion. We would encourage you to attend and make your reactions to the Day Care proposal known.

A summary of the Report is attached for your information. If you would like a copy of the full report, please contact the Edmonton Social Planning Council at 424-0331 or the Day Care Branch, Edmonton Social Services at 425-5929.

Please feel free to contact Linda Duncan at the Edmonton Social Planning Council for further information concerning the workshops and for notification of a formal presentation. We look forward to your attendance.

LD/sb  
Enc.

*Affiliated with the*



*Community Fund*

**APPENDIX B**



DAY CARE WORKSHOP LOCATIONS

<u>DATE</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>TIME</u>
Monday, June 7	St. Bernadette Separate School 11917 - 40 Street	7:30 p.m.
Tuesday, June 8	Archbishop MacDonald Separate School 10810 - 142 Street	7:30 p.m.
Monday, June 14	M. E. LaZerte Composite High School Staff Dining Room 6804 - 144 Avenue	7:30 p.m.
Tuesday, June 15	Parkallen Elementary/Junior High School, Gym 6703 - 112 Street	7:30 p.m.
Wednesday, June 16	Strathearn Elementary School Gym 8723 - 93 Avenue	7:30 p.m.
Thursday, June 17	Alex Taylor Elementary School Gym 9321 Jasper Avenue	7:30 p.m.

APPENDIX C

WORKSHOP: EXPANSION OF DAY CARE SERVICES IN EDMONTON

June 7 - 17, 1976

**WELCOME:** Today we will be discussing a topic which is of concern for a great many parents; the expansion, quality and co-ordination of day care services in Edmonton. The Edmonton Social Planning Council has requested your attendance this evening to examine the recommendations regarding expansion of day care services in Edmonton which have been prepared by the Day Care Branch of Edmonton Social Services. Have a good evening examining the recommendations.

A G E N D A

- 7:30 p.m. Welcome and Introduction ..... Linda Duncan (Edmonton Social Planning Council)  
~~Background Presentation on~~  
Recommendations ..... Mike Day (Director, Day Care Branch, Edmonton Social Services)
- 8:00 p.m. Brief Question Period
- ~~WELCOME:~~  
8:10 p.m. Formal Presentations  
a great many parents; the expansion, quality and co-ordination
- 8:45 p.m. Coffee
- 9:00 p.m. Discussion Groups  
to examine the recommendations regarding expansion of day
- 10:00 p.m. Report Back and Summary  
- Where do we go from here?  
to examine the recommendations regarding expansion of day care services in Edmonton which have been prepared by the Day Care Branch of Edmonton Social Services. Have a good evening examining the recommendations.

THANK YOU FOR COMING

E S C

7:30 p.m. Welcome and Introduction ..... Linda Duncan (Edmonton Social Planning Council)

APPENDIX D

EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

WORKSHOP: EXPANSION OF DAY CARE SERVICES IN EDMONTON

June 7 - 17, 1976

This meeting is intended to give the residents of Edmonton an opportunity to express their views concerning day care recommendations proposed by the Day Care Branch of Edmonton Social Services.

Please let us have your feedback on the recommendations and the workshop before you leave the meeting. Your personal view is appreciated.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Please indicate the recommendations which to you are key areas of concern, and why? What alternatives would you visualize?

2) Please indicate key recommendations in the report which you feel are favorable, and should be pursued.

- 3) Have you had personal experience with day care services? Please specify, i.e., Group Care of Preschoolers, Family Day Care, After School Care.
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- 4) Please rate your evaluation of the service.
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- 5) Have you further recommendations regarding day care services in Edmonton? Please specify.
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- 6) What further action do you feel we should consider?

RESPONSE TO THE WORKSHOP

1. Do you feel that small discussion groups allowed for adequate personal expression?  
YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_  
Would you prefer lectures, formal question and answer periods, buzz groups or free time for informal discussion?
  
2. Have you any suggestions on techniques for organizing future community workshops to allow for greater citizen input?