

Review of Junior Kindergarten Technical Report Summary



Prepared for:



Northwest
Territories Education, Culture and Employment

Prepared by:

proactive
INFORMATION SERVICES INC.

“Helping Clients Make a Difference ... since 1984”

September 2015

Acknowledgements

We would like to take this opportunity to thank numerous people for their participation and for assistance they provided as we undertook the Review of Junior Kindergarten.

First, we would like to extend our gratitude to all who participated in the Review process through in-person/telephone interviews, focus groups and community meetings, as well as by responding to the surveys and the open call for submissions.

We would also like to express our appreciation to various government staff including Gabriela Eggenhofer (Former Deputy Minister, ECE) and Rita Mueller (Assistant Deputy Minister, ECE) for their support throughout the Review process. Other ECE staff were also generous with their time and assistance; it was greatly appreciated. While ECE assistance was invaluable, we also appreciated the fact they gave us the freedom to do our work independently.

We would particularly like to thank the Superintendents and school administrators who supported the process by facilitating our community visits. We would also like to say a special thank you to all those people in the communities of Deline, Dettah, Fort Providence, Fort Simpson, Lutselk'e, Norman Wells, Tsiigehtchic, and Tuktoyaktuk who were willing to take the time to share their thoughts with us. This included JK parents and family members, early childhood practitioners, DEC and DEA representatives, other community members, as well as JK teachers, principals/vice-principals, other educators, and educational assistants. We would also like to convey our particular appreciation to the JK teachers who welcomed us into their classrooms. Our visit to each community was special and helped us to learn more about community context and school realities. And, finally, we would like to thank the children in the schools we visited who welcomed us and were comfortable with our presence in their schools.

Larry K. Bremner, Linda E. Lee, Denise Belanger

Proactive Information Services Inc.

September 2015



Glossary of Terms

Aboriginal Head Start (AHS): is a federally funded pre-school program for Dene, Inuit, First Nations and Métis children and their families living in urban centres and northern communities. The eight Aboriginal Head Start centres in the Northwest Territories provide comprehensive experiences that prepare Dene, Inuit, First Nations and Métis pre-schoolers between 3-5 years of age for school by focusing on meeting their spiritual, emotional, intellectual and physical needs.

Community Stakeholders: for purposes of this report were chairs/members of the District Education Authorities (DEAs), members of Divisional Education Councils (DECs) and a representative from the Tłı̨chǫ community.

Early Childhood Consultants: are government staff who assist people operating family day homes, day cares, pre-school programs and after school programs by: assisting with the licence application process and requirements; sharing their knowledge of child development; modeling best practices in early childhood education; providing program development knowledge; providing support to eligible operators who may access funding to assist with operational expenses; and, providing resources.

Early Childhood Educators/Practitioners: are operators and staff in family day homes, day cares, pre-school programs (including Aboriginal Head Start). There are 113 licensed child care programs operating in NWT which include day homes, pre-schools and other out of school programs). The training of staff varies greatly; some staff have completed a one year certificate in early childhood development, others have attained a two year diploma while some early childhood educators/practitioners have no formal training.

Educators: are staff working in the K to 12 system, including principals/vice-principals, teachers, program support teachers, who hold a valid teaching certificate. To be eligible for certification, individuals must hold certification in the original jurisdiction of their teacher education program which would entail holding a Bachelor of Education or a three or four year acceptable degree with a minimum of one year of professional teacher training.

Educational Assistants (EA): support educators in schools. Classroom assistants and special needs assistants fall into this broad category. There are no standard qualifications for EAs; therefore, their background and training varies.

Education Authorities: There are eight education jurisdictions in the NWT, each of which is represented by either a Divisional Education Council (DEC) or a School Board.

Integrated Kindergarten Curriculum: The NWT *Integrated Kindergarten Curriculum: A Holistic Approach to Children's Early Learning (April, 2014)* is mandated for use for both years of Kindergarten (i.e. Junior Kindergarten and Kindergarten). The NWT Integrated Kindergarten Curriculum is child-centred and play-based, allowing children to be actively involved in the learning process and helps them construct a deeper understanding of the world around them. The curriculum is based on 11 Kindergarten Key Competencies, grouped into four major



learning areas that will help children build the necessary skills to be successful in Grade one and beyond.

Junior Kindergarten: is an optional program for children turning four years old on or before December 31st. In the NWT it is currently offered in 19 communities and may be full or half-day.

Kindergarten: While ‘Kindergarten’ can be used to refer to two years of programming prior to Grade 1, for purposes of this report Kindergarten refers to an optional program for children turning five years old on or before December 31st. In the NWT it is currently offered in all communities.

Regional Superintendents: oversee the coordination of government services offered through an ECE service centre.

Superintendents: are the representatives of a DEC or School Board and act as the Chief Executive and Education Officer for the education authority.



-- CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION --

A. Background

Early Childhood Education has been identified as a key vehicle for promoting the development of children in the Northwest Territories (NWT). A series of Aboriginal Student Achievement forums were held in 2010-2011 to discuss educational priorities with Aboriginal, community, educational and youth leaders. The forums were hosted by the Minister of Education, Culture, and Employment. One result from the forums was a recommendation by the Aboriginal Student Achievement Working Group (ASAWG) that one of the four priority areas should be “early childhood development and child care.” The goals under this priority were to, “develop early childhood programs, services and initiatives that optimize the healthy development of Aboriginal children.” This priority was validated during the 2013 roundtable, *Right from the Start Early Childhood Development – Improving our Children’s Future*, which highlighted the need to provide high quality early childhood education, particularly for vulnerable children and their families. As stated in the document:

...investment in programs and services aimed at improving outcomes in early childhood development. The *Framework* is designed to ensure that every child, family, and community in the NWT, including those most at risk, has access to high quality, comprehensive, integrated early childhood development (ECD) programs and services that are community driven, sustainable and culturally relevant.¹

Intended as a ten year vision that will guide Northwest Territories in the area of early childhood development, the *Framework* is built upon three overarching goals and seven strategic commitments, one of which is ensuring that “access to high quality, affordable early learning programs and child care services will be enhanced.”²

“JK will enhance access to high quality, affordable early learning programs and child care services as envisioned in Commitment #6 of Right from the Start.”

1 Government of Northwest Territories. (2013). Framework for Early Childhood Development: Right from the Start in NWT, p. 3. Retrieved from:

http://www.ece.gov.nt.ca/files/publications/ece_framework_-_web_sept_2013.pdf.

2 Ibid, p. 7.



1. School Readiness in NWT

Research consistently shows that high quality education for four year olds positively impacts everything from educational success to health and well-being. The need for early childhood development in the NWT was reinforced by the baseline results from Northwest Territories first three years of data from the Early Development Instrument (EDI). Developed by Offord Centre for Child Studies at McMaster University in 2000, the EDI is widely used in Canada and abroad as a population-based measure of school readiness based on five domains of child development, including physical health and well-being; emotional maturity; communication skills and general knowledge; social competence; and language and cognitive development.

More specifically;

The results from the EDI determine the percentage of children who are ready to learn as they enter grade one and the percentage who are falling behind....Children falling into the bottom 10% are considered 'vulnerable' and children scoring in the lower 10% to 25% are considered 'at risk'.³

Baseline data from three years of administration of the EDI from 2012 to 2014 demonstrates that approximately 38% of NWT children are 'vulnerable' in one or more EDI domains and that this is the case for 53% of children in small communities. Table 1 outlines the percentage of 'vulnerable' children in each EDI domain.

**Table 1:
Percentage of Vulnerable Children in EDI Domains by NWT Location and Overall**

| Domain | Yellowknife | Regional Centres | Small Communities | NWT Overall |
|--|-------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Physical health and well-being | 14.8% | 16.9% | 35.1% | 22.0% |
| Emotional maturity | 8.3% | 10.2% | 22.9% | 13.6% |
| Communication skills and general knowledge | 11.2% | 15.1% | 25.4% | 16.8% |
| Social competence | 12.5% | 11.5% | 27.6% | 17.3% |
| Language and cognitive development | 13.0% | 15.1% | 29.0% | 18.8% |

Note: This table has been copied from *Early Development Measuring Children's Readiness to Learn: Summary of NWT Baseline Results for the 2012, 2013, and 2014 School Years*, p. 4.

³ Government of Northwest Territories. (2014). *Early Development Measuring Children's Readiness to Learn: Summary of NWT Baseline Results for the 2012, 2013, and 2014 School Years*, p. 3. Retrieved from <http://www.ece.gov.nt.ca/files/pages/574/edi-summaryreportsept2014.pdf>.



2. Early Childhood Programs in NWT

A wide variety of early childhood programs are available in Northwest Territories. There are 113 licensed child care programs which include licensed day cares and day homes, differing pre-school programs and Aboriginal Head Start. NWT Aboriginal Head Start is a federally funded early childhood program for Dene, Inuit, First Nation and Métis pre-schoolers between 3 to 5 years of age. AHS is available in four of the NWT regions with a total of eight communities in the NWT offering AHS programming; Fort McPherson, Inuvik, Paulatuk, Fort Providence, Behchoko, N'dilo, Fort Smith, and K'atloodeeche First Nation Reserve. The Department of Education, Culture and Employment also provides funding to these eight AHS programs. Two AHS programs are located in the local school while other communities have separate buildings designated for the AHS program. There are a total of 134 licensed spaces for AHS children in all eight communities.

The availability of early childhood programs varies widely from community to community. In 2014, 10 communities in NWT did not have any early childhood programs. These included Colville Lake, Enterprise, Jean Marie River, Lutselk'e, Kakisa, Nahanni Butte, Norman Wells, Trout Lake, Tsiigehtchic, and Wrigley.⁴

3. Education Funding in NWT

Funding for the delivery of school programs and services is provided to Education Bodies⁵ (EB) through formula funding determined under the School Funding Framework. The Framework takes into consideration a number of factors. One of the primary factors is student enrollment. Calculations for EB School contributions are adjusted annually based on the actual enrollment of the previous school year.

EBs are funded with a guarantee that the student/teacher ratio of 16:1 be maintained. The actual student/teacher-ratio has traditionally fallen well below this benchmark. EBs are also funded on prior year actual teacher salaries whereas every other departmental organization and authority are funded at the mid-point of the salary range for their compensation and benefit expenses. These funding allocations are reflected in cash surpluses (approximately \$9 million annually) that have been generated across the education system the past number of years.

⁴ Government of Northwest Territories. (2014). *Junior Kindergarten: Information Kit*, p. 6. Retrieved from <http://news.exec.gov.nt.ca/wp-content/uploads/Junior-Kindergarten-Info-Package-June-20141.pdf>.

⁵ Education Bodies are defined under the *Education Act* as "District Education Authorities, a Divisional Education Council or a *commission scolaire francophone de division*, or all of them, as the case may be."



B. Junior Kindergarten in NWT

1. Implementation

Acting upon the goals and commitments of *Right from the Start* and supported by information from the EDI, Government of Northwest Territories moved forward with the implementation of a Junior Kindergarten program within territorial schools in order to enhance early learning programming for four year olds (including children who turn four years of age before December 31 of the school year). In addition to providing an optional, high quality, free, and safe learning opportunity for four year olds, JK was seen as an investment in the K-12 education system as it was expected that children attending JK would have a better chance of becoming engaged learners who connect through play, inquiry and exploration. Furthermore, it was believed that the trend toward decreasing enrollment would result in a number of schools having sufficient space to accommodate the addition of a JK program.

The JK implementation plan included a phased approach beginning with small communities, to be followed by regional centres (Inuvik, Hay River, and Fort Smith), and lastly by Yellowknife. Therefore, a demonstration project began in the 2013-14 school year in Fort Providence, Lutselk'e⁶ Norman Wells, and Tsiigehtchic.

At the time of the 2013-2014 demonstration phase there was limited capacity for monitoring and evaluation within the Department of Education, Culture and Employment (ECE). Therefore, monitoring and evaluation was not integrated into the implementation of JK. However, with the establishment of the Planning, Research and Evaluation (PRE) Division in ECE, it was possible to undertake a limited review of the demonstration sites in 2014 in order to answer initial questions regarding the strengths and challenges of implementing JK. This evaluation outlined six recommendations, one of which was to continue the three year phased in approach for JK.⁷

The next phase of implementation was to offer JK as an optional program to communities in 2014-2015, with the intention of full implementation across all schools in the NWT by 2016-2017. In September 2014, schools in 23 communities had agreed to implement JK; however, this number dropped to 19 communities confirming they wished to continue with the implementation of JK. This number may continue to change as JK is offered voluntarily and as some small communities may not have any children in the JK age group in a particular year.

⁶ Please note that while Lutselk'e Dene School chose to offer a JK Demonstration program, they did not continue as a demonstration site due to lack of enrollment.

⁷ Government of Northwest Territories. (2014). *2013-2014 Junior Kindergarten Demonstration Implementation Technical Evaluation - Report*, p. 17.



2. Funding Junior Kindergarten

Based on the system wide surpluses and the GNWT's fiscal situation, ECE decided to fund Junior Kindergarten by adjusting the overall K-12 teacher staffing tables (the ratio of funded teachers to students). The 2014-15 Junior Kindergarten program was expected to cost approximately \$1.8 million and was funded through a reduced student/teacher ratio. The impact of this funding approach is detailed in Table 2.

| Education Authorities | JK Funding 2014-2015* | Revised Student/teacher Ratio 2014-2015* | Projected Net Impact 2014-15 | Actual Net Impact 2014-15 |
|---|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Beaufort-Delta Divisional Education Council | \$294,000 | (\$400,000) | (\$106,000) | (\$132,700) |
| Commission scolaire francophone, TNO | - | (23,000) | (23,000) | (22,000) |
| Dettah District Education Authority | 531,000 | (160,000) | 371,000 | 369,000 |
| Dehcho Divisional Education Council | 15,000 | - | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Ndilo District Education Authority | 99,000 | - | 99,000 | 99,000 |
| Sahtu Divisional Education Council | 626,000 | (64,000) | 562,000 | 564,600 |
| South Slave Divisional Education Council | 268,000 | (317,000) | (49,000) | (58,200) |
| Tłı̄chq Community Services Agency | - | (157,000) | (157,000) | (150,500) |
| Yellowknife Catholic Schools | - | (277,000) | (277,000) | (265,500) |
| Yellowknife District No.1 Education Authority | - | (372,000) | (372,000) | (131,600) ⁺ |
| Total | \$1,833,000 | (\$1,770,000) | \$63,000 | \$288,000 |

* - Source: ECE 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14 Audited Financial Statements and 2014-15 budgets.
 + - This figure includes \$225,000 that was provided to YK1 to maintain the 16:1 pupil teacher ratio. If this figure were not included the cost would be (\$356,600).

ECE committed to provide additional funding to any community District Education Authority that exceeds a 16:1 student/teacher ratio. As a result, YK1 was provided \$225,000 to maintain the 16:1 pupil teacher ratio.

3. Communication

Between February and June 2014, ECE implemented a territorial-wide multi-media communication process which included internet, radio, newspaper, and media releases. There were three digitally available formats; the ECE website portal, A Right from the Start Facebook page, and Right Spot ATMs with screens. In addition, a radio call-in show on *Denendeh Sunrise* aired in March, 2014 and two promotional radio advertisements were aired five times daily from February 20 to March 14, 2014 on CJCD, a Yellowknife radio station. Information was also included in two NWT newspapers, *News North* and *Yellowknifer*, and in *Edge* magazine.



Furthermore, there were media releases which included an open letter to parents, a technical briefing in Yellowknife, and a JK information kit, two written contributions from principals in Norman Wells and Fort Providence, and a contribution from parents in Yellowknife. This information dealt with a range of topics including rationale, funding, projected impact, and a personal interview opportunity with the Deputy Minister.

C. Introduction to the Review

During the October 2014 session of the Legislative Assembly, the Government of the Northwest Territories reached an agreement with the members of the Legislative Assembly that while JK would continue to be offered voluntarily by the schools in small communities currently offering the program, roll-out beyond those communities would not occur until a comprehensive review of the current JK implementation was undertaken.

The purpose of the Review was to examine:

1. whether the Department of ECE's 2014-15 implementation of Junior Kindergarten (JK) in the 23⁸ NWT communities is working as intended;
2. how the implementation of JK in 23 communities compares to the implementation of JK in other jurisdictions;
3. whether the Department of ECE should incorporate JK into the K-12 school system beyond the 23 communities; and
4. based on the results above, what funding model should be implemented for JK, if applicable?

As the company that scored highest in response to the *Standing Offer for Program Monitoring and Evaluation*, Proactive Information Services Inc.⁹ was contacted in order to determine their interest and ability to undertake the Review of Junior Kindergarten. Proactive presented a response outlining interest and qualifications and, subsequently, was awarded the contract.

⁸ The RFP questions cite 23 communities which is the number who started implementing JK in 2014-15. In December 2014 the number dropped to 19 communities confirming they wished to continue offering JK in the 2014-15 school year.

⁹ Based in Western Canada, Proactive Information Services Inc. was established in 1984 specifically to provide research and evaluation services to clients in the public and non-profit sectors. Proactive's clients include government departments, school divisions/districts, schools, health authorities, public sector agencies, community organizations, foundations, and other NGOs in Canada and internationally. Proactive has worked extensively in education, including many evaluation projects focused on early childhood education within Canada, as well as in Europe and South America.



D. Review Questions

The following Review questions are those presented in the Terms of Reference (TOR).

- 1. Is the roll-out of JK in the 23 communities working as intended?**
 - a. What is the level of communication and engagement with parents, educators, other early childhood education programs and communities?
 - b. What have been the complaints and responses related to the program?
 - c. What are the benefits and limitations of the program?
 - d. Are there ways to improve the program?
 - e. To what extent has the implementation of JK financially impacted K-12 programming in the 23 communities, taking enrollments into consideration?
 - f. What have been the impacts that JK has on existing licensed early learning programming in small communities (eg., family day cares, AHS)? (This will include the need to inventory the types of early learning programming offered in each community.)
 - g. What are the impacts that JK has on parents and families?
 - h. Are teachers with a Bachelor of Education qualified to teach JK? Are there other forms of credentials that also qualify someone to teach JK?
 - i. Is the curriculum being implemented as intended? (In what ways have the integrated curriculum been adapted?¹⁰)
 - j. Were schools and classrooms structurally prepared for the program (i.e., in terms of infrastructure and materials)?

- 2. How does the implementation of JK in the 23 communities compare to the implementation of JK in other jurisdictions in terms of:**
 - a. Child-to-staff ratio;
 - b. Levels of staffing required to implement JK;
 - c. Qualifications required of each staffing level; and
 - d. Infrastructure needs?

- 3. Should the GNWT incorporate JK into the K-12 school system beyond the pilot implementation of the 23 communities?**
 - a. What are the anticipated impacts that JK has on existing and comparable early learning programming in the regional centres and Yellowknife? (example: day cares and AHS).
 - b. What impacts of JK can be observed on the students who were enrolled in the demonstration-sites in terms of their level of preparedness for Grade 1?
 - c. If JK were in all NWT schools, what are the anticipated financial impacts on K-12 programming, taking enrollments into consideration?
 - d. What are the anticipated impacts on three year olds and four year olds who have the potential to enter JK?

¹⁰ The second question, in parentheses, has been added to deepen the question regarding curriculum.



4. Dependent on the results above, how should JK be funded, if applicable?

- a. Does the current funding approach work?
- b. Are there alternative ways to fund the program?

E. Approach

Traditional research and evaluation methods have often been criticized for externally imposing judgment without including the voices of participants and stakeholders in a meaningful manner. For this reason, the Terms of Reference for this Review identified many different stakeholders to be consulted. This Review's approach found as many ways as possible to include the voices of these diverse stakeholders, while recognizing the political and individual interests which may exist, as well as possible misconceptions and biases. The Review was structured and implemented to ensure it was as comprehensive as possible within the specified timeframe and addressed the Review's purpose, including answering all Review questions. A variety of methods were used to collect data for the Review.¹¹

In addition, a Jurisdictional Scan was conducted of similar Canadian programs. Jurisdictional websites were the first line of inquiry which led to other data sources. A scan of Canadian jurisdictions using internet searches and reviews of electronic documents gleaned information regarding:

- extent of Junior Kindergarten offerings available for four year-olds;
- intensity of JK programming (full/half-day);
- child/staff ratio;
- curriculum used;
- implementation of JK;
- class size numbers for JK/Class configurations (i.e. JK/SK combined classrooms, other configurations);
- qualifications/credentials for JK teacher/educators.

In addition to information from specific jurisdictions, some general sources were also consulted. A total of 36 sources informed the jurisdictional scan. Finally, in order to obtain more information and clarification on the program in Winnipeg School Division and Yukon, two interviews were undertaken of key stakeholders in those jurisdictions.

While not required by the Terms of Reference, the consultants (as a value added component) examined the *Northwest Territories Integrated Kindergarten Curriculum* (2014) and the *Integrated Kindergarten Curriculum: Draft Implementation Guide* (2014). In addition to a discussion of the NWT curriculum, a comparison between these documents and *Aboriginal Head Start: Making a Difference in the Northwest Territories*

¹¹ A more detailed discussion of the Methodology, including Challenges and Limitations, is contained in Chapter 3 of the full Technical Report.



(2012) and Winnipeg School Division's *Start With the Child: A Guide to Best Practices in Nursery Programs* were included as a way of shedding light on how other curricula/implementation documents address meeting the needs of pre-Kindergarten learners.

1. Community Site Visits

Multi-faceted site visits were undertaken in eight communities, including one community that has discontinued participation and one where there is low participation. The communities were selected to represent different DEC's, diverse community contexts and communities known to have had different implementation stories.

Site visits were conducted between April and June 2015 in:

- Deline
- Dettah
- Fort Providence
- Fort Simpson
- Lutselk'e
- Norman Wells
- Tsiigehtchic
- Tuktoyaktuk

One or two Proactive consultants visited each community to undertake in-person data collection involving:

- parents whose children have attended or are attending JK;
- school principal and vice-principal, where applicable;
- Junior Kindergarten teachers (recognizing children may be in multi-grade classes);
- other teachers in the school;
- educational assistants, if knowledgeable about the JK classroom;
- four year olds in JK through classroom observation;
- DEC and DEA representatives;
- licensed day care centres, licensed day homes and any other early childhood educators (including AHS staff, where applicable); and
- other community stakeholders¹² (as appropriate).

While the questions asked of each stakeholder group were slightly different, a number of areas of inquiry were common to most. These included communication about JK, the impact on families, the limitations, challenges and changes stakeholders would like to see in JK, the benefits of one more year of Kindergarten, qualifications/credentials of JK

¹² Once in the communities, if other community stakeholders were identified, Proactive consultants interviewed them.



educators, impact on existing early learning programs, the funding model for JK and other possible models, as well as whether schools were prepared for the implementation of JK in terms of the school structure and materials needed. In total, 73 people participated in the interviews and focus groups/community meetings.

2. Data Collection Across the NWT

Data were also collected across the Territory using a variety of methods. These included:

- parent questionnaires;
- a web-survey sent to all educators in the NWT;
- a web-survey sent to all early childhood educators/practitioners on the ECE data base;
- focus groups with Regional Early Childhood Consultants and Superintendents; and
- key person interviews, including Aboriginal government/Tłı̨cho Government representative(s) Northwest Territories Teachers' Association, Aboriginal Head Start practitioners, Regional Superintendents, ECE Department staff (as appropriate), and Department of Health and Social Services Staff (as appropriate).

In addition, an open call for Review submissions asked the question; *“Should the GNWT incorporate JK into the K-12 school system beyond the pilot communities? Why or why not?”* The open call for submissions was placed on the GNWT web-site and weekly on the Facebook page. ECE emailed the call for submissions directly to education superintendents, the President of Aurora College, and NWTTA so they could distribute to their constituents. Proactive also sent the call for submission directly to the Chairs of DEAs and DECAs. Submissions were sent directly to Proactive. The call for submissions indicated that submissions would be accepted in electronic, mail or audio format and in the language of the respondent's choice.

3. Participation

In total:

- 114 people participated in interviews, focus groups or community meetings;
- 326 people responded to surveys; and
- 23 submissions were received; 22 in English and one in French.



-- CHAPTER 2: SUMMARY --

A. Findings by Review Question

This summary chapter will answer the questions used to guide the Review which were originally posed in the Terms of Reference. Chapters 4 to 7 of the Technical Report present the detailed results upon which the answers to these questions are based.

1. Roll-out of JK: Is the roll-out of JK in the participating communities working as intended?

In some communities JK was working as intended and in others it was not. The roll-out of JK encountered many challenges. However, the context in different communities created different levels of success or failure with the implementation of JK.

a. What is the level of communication and engagement with parents, educators, other early childhood education programs and communities?

Communication and engagement were reported by all stakeholder groups as being problematic throughout the implementation of JK.

- Most parents heard about JK through the school, some mentioning that they phoned the school for further information.
- Many educators believed there was limited and often confusing communication regarding JK. The information they did receive was not always helpful in understanding why JK was being implemented and of the program itself. In response to the web-survey, about half of educators in JK sites (56%) agreed¹³ that prior to the implementation of JK they were provided with information that helped them have a better understanding of why it was being implemented. A similar split was evident among educators regarding whether their community had been consulted prior to the implementation of JK (45% agreed). When asked whether they believed the consultation process was effective, 14% agreed, while 40% indicated that they did not know. While respondent numbers are small, educational assistants felt less well-informed than educators.
- Early childhood practitioners (those providing other early child programs) and community stakeholders who were interviewed believed communication regarding JK was lacking and that any information they did acquire was often second-hand and not particularly informative. Overall, 38% of respondents to the web-survey agreed that, prior to the implementation of JK, they were

¹³ Agreement is a combination of 'strongly agree' and 'agree.'



provided with information that helped them have a better understanding of why it was being implemented. Interestingly, 48% of those in Yellowknife (where JK has not been implemented) agreed that they had this information, as compared to 23% of those in other communities. Respondents were also asked if prior to JK implementation they were provided with information that helped them have a better understanding of the program itself. Overall, 29% agreed; there was little variation by setting.

- Across all groups, dissatisfaction was expressed regarding the changing messages that were conveyed regarding the implementation of JK (eg. mandatory or not mandatory).
- In some communities those people providing long-standing early childhood programs (such as Aboriginal Head Start and other licensed programs) felt their programs had not been valued or respected.
- Government key informants were aware of and agreed there were difficulties and concerns regarding communication and consultation.

b. What have been the complaints and responses related to the program?

All groups, regardless of community, stressed the importance of supporting child development and early learning. However, not everyone agreed that JK was an appropriate or the most appropriate vehicle, a view that was more prevalent outside communities that offered JK. A more holistic approach to supporting children from zero to five was recommended by numerous review participants across many groups, including those contributing to the submissions.

- Almost all parents whose children had attended or were attending JK were positive about the program, describing both benefits for their children and their families. They believed JK prepared their child for Kindergarten through socialization and familiarity with the school setting and routines. They also saw improvements in language development as well as the development of early literacy and numeracy skills.

"I really like the program but it wasn't thought about enough before it was put in the school. Do more advertising. A lot [of parents] didn't know what their kids would be learning or what it was about. Our biggest fear is the government doesn't want to spend the money. There is some opposition down south. It is an amazing opportunity for these communities and it should stay. It is really good," JK parent.



- A few parents would like to have seen more adults in the JK classroom, as well as more opportunities for preparation and orientation prior to the beginning of JK for them and their children. In communities where JK was a half-day, parents spoke of the challenges of chauffeuring their children between JK and other programs, preferring the full-day option.
- Educators identified many potential benefits of JK. Those in JK sites were positive about the program and presented examples of success stories in their schools and communities. Educators often identified that JK introduces children to the school routine and makes them comfortable at school which, in turn, supports improved behaviour. In addition, JK was viewed as supporting early literacy and numeracy, as well as socialization.
- Challenges for educators in a number of JK sites not only included implementation issues, but also having the resources – particularly adequate and knowledgeable staff – to program for JK students and to address the needs of some four year olds coming into the education system (eg., toileting, lack of language).
- Poor communication, the lack of consultation with communities and the perceived devaluing of existing early childhood programs were major areas of complaint by early childhood practitioners across the territory. While they strongly agreed that support for child development and early learning are important, most felt this was best done outside the school setting.
- The ‘institutionalization’ of four year olds was raised by a number of Aboriginal Head Start representatives who were concerned this might be viewed in some communities as harkening back to residential schools. However, they were not the only ones to identify this as an area of sensitivity. The need to continue to take into account the lingering effects of residential schools was raised by at least a few people in virtually all respondent groups including the Superintendents, Regional Superintendents, the Early Childhood Consultants, community stakeholders, educators, as well as survey respondents (both educators and early childhood practitioners) and in a number of submissions.
- As previously mentioned, many of the community stakeholders believed implementation was rushed and not well planned, leaving GNWT unable to anticipate the questions and issues communities faced. These individuals strongly voiced that there was a lack of consultation and felt this should have been a more grassroots process that built on the strengths of each community.
- Many government key informants stressed the numerous benefits of JK which will, ultimately, foster later school success. For communities that do not have early childhood programming JK was viewed as particularly important.



c. What are the benefits and limitations of the program?

Many benefits of JK were identified, particularly by parents of children attending JK, by educators and by key informants in government. Limitations of the program were also raised, often concerning the implementation of JK in multi-grade classrooms.

- Parents of JK students valued the opportunities for their children's socialization and interaction with their peers. They felt their child had learned a number of things through their participation in JK, ranging from letters and counting to 'getting along,' routines, and cultural learning. Readiness for school and language acquisition were highlighted by parents both in the interviews and in the survey responses. Also, eight of the 11 JK parents responding to the survey felt that JK had "really helped" their child and that the JK experience was "great."
- Limitations were raised by a few parents related to the level of adult supervision and, in some communities, safety concerns regarding the appropriateness of playground equipment and outdoor supervision.
- Educators identified many potential benefits of JK. Virtually all educators in JK schools presented examples of success stories in their schools and communities. Benefits included: early assessment and intervention, the opportunity to support early literacy and language skills development, as well as the development of numeracy and social skills. Other benefits cited were the opportunity to introduce students to school routines and expectations, resulting in an increased comfort level with school, as well as the opportunity to connect with parents and involve them in the school community.
- Overall, 76% of survey respondents to the educator survey, who work in JK schools, agreed that having an extra year of Kindergarten will better prepare students for Grade 1 and that having JK in schools provides an important resource/support for the community.
- In the educator survey, educators were asked to identify potential benefits of JK; those in JK settings were more likely to identify all the benefits listed. However, 90% of all respondents believed that JK supports the development of language skills; 86% believed it supported the development of numeracy skills; 84% believed JK supports social/emotional development and creates comfort with school environment and routines. In addition, 83% saw the opportunity for earlier intervention and 81% the opportunity for earlier assessment, while 80% believed it creates an earlier connection between school and families.



- While limitations regarding student-to-adult ratios and curriculum implementation are addressed elsewhere, a commonly cited concern, particularly in schools where this was the case, was the limitation that having JK in multi-grade classes placed on the teacher's ability to appropriately support and program for both JK and older students. Also, because some JK students enter school with some challenges (eg., not toilet trained, language delays or deficits) they required additional time and attention. These challenges were identified in all JK sites.
- A minority (38%) of early childhood practitioners completing the early childhood educator/practitioner survey believed that having an extra year of Kindergarten will better prepare children for Grade 1 and that having JK in schools provides an important resource to the community. When asked about potential benefits of JK, early childhood practitioners were less positive than educators. However, 62% believed JK creates an earlier connection between schools and families and 59% believed that JK supports language development skills and creates a sense of belonging to the school community. In addition, 56% believed JK provides opportunity for earlier assessment and creates comfort with school environment and routines.
- Community stakeholders who were interviewed outlined benefits of early educational experiences by preparing students for school and supporting development, although not all believed this had to be in a school setting.
- The government instituted JK because "research consistently shows that high quality education programs for four year olds positively impact children's development. High quality early education and care programs positively affect everything from graduation rates to health and well being outcomes. The research shows that high quality pre-school programs benefit all children" (Junior Kindergarten Facts). JK was identified as being especially beneficial to parents and caregivers in the NWT's smallest communities where no licensed childcare exists and for families who cannot afford other pre-school options.

d. Are there ways to improve the program?

Stakeholders made a number of suggestions for improving JK. Almost all those interviewed, both those in JK communities and others, would like to see new/dedicated funding for JK, although not many specifics were given about how this could happen. In addition, most stakeholders would like to see the JK include more adults in the classroom – a dedicated JK teacher and an educational assistant - in order to meet students' needs.

- A few parents in JK sites would like to see more adult supervision outside the classroom, more orientation for themselves and students prior to JK entry, and more attention paid to the appropriateness of playground equipment.



- Most teachers in JK sites (80%) felt that they needed more professional development and support for implementing JK. Some educators identified the need for a deeper understanding of 'play-based,' as well as practical ideas for classroom activities related to curricular outcomes.
- Some of those who participated in the Review process, particularly (but not exclusively) early childhood practitioners and some community stakeholders, argued that JK should be eliminated altogether or in those communities with existing early learning programs. Others thought it should be integrated into existing early learning programs, while others thought it should be implemented in collaboration with existing programs. Regardless of the position, many people, across all respondent groups, argued that implementation needed to fit the community context and did not need to be done the same way in all communities.

e. To what extent has the implementation of JK financially impacted K-12 programming in the participating communities, taking enrollments into consideration?

People from a number of respondent groups were concerned that JK could financially impact K-12 programming, by taking resources from other K-12 programs to provide appropriate supports for the JK program. However, this was generally raised in response to the Territory-wide impact and not in relation to sites where JK was operating¹⁴.

- On the educator survey, 74% of all respondents believed the implementation of JK would have some impact on the K to 12 system were it to be implemented in all NWT schools. Those in schools not offering JK (63%) were more likely than those in JK schools (44%) to believe there would be a 'great impact.'
- In the participating JK communities the issue was discussed in terms of the need for more than one adult (more than a teacher) in classrooms that accommodated JK students. While it was felt that funding by enrollment provided adequately for pupil/teacher ratio, the funding of an educational assistant to help in JK classrooms was dependent on either having a special needs child in the classroom or the school making the decision to devote educational assistant time to this area. Some JK schools were able to access other funding to support an educational assistant but in some cases this meant reallocating staffing, thus affecting K-12 programming.

¹⁴ It should be noted that many of the review questions were to be asked of all groups. However, in a number of instances, individuals either felt they did not have sufficient information to answer or answered based on their perception.



f. What have been the impacts of JK on existing licensed early learning programming in small communities (eg., family day cares, AHS)?

While a number of communities had no existing licensed early learning programming, those communities that did appear to have been affected by the implementation of JK. The number of children was reduced in existing programs, thus raising concerns about continued funding, program viability, and job loss.

- While the impact on existing early learning programs was mentioned by all groups, many early childhood practitioners (including those providing the existing programs in JK communities) emphasized a negative impact both when interviewed and when responding to the survey. Aboriginal Head Start representatives' major concerns were the lack of consultation and the perception that JK was duplicating AHS programs. While the value of early learning opportunities was clearly recognized, there was a belief that the same outcomes could be achieved through working with existing programs and paying attention to community strengths.
- Sixty-four percent of educators in JK settings indicated they had other early childhood programs in their community. Of these respondents, 52% believed there had been some impact on these early childhood programs with the most frequent explanation being that existing programs had been jeopardized due to a reduction in the number of children attending as a result of JK.
- There was concern that if JK is implemented Territory-wide that staff trained in early childhood would suffer job loss.

g. What are the impacts that JK has on parents and families?

Virtually all parents whose children are or were in JK were pleased with the program and believed it had a positive impact on their children and many on their families as well.

- As previously discussed, parents in JK communities felt their child had learned numerous things through their participation in JK, ranging from letters and counting, to improvement in their speech (language skills were highlighted), to social skills and cultural learning. Parents also valued the opportunities for their child to socialize with their peers and to get along with other children and adults. Most felt that JK had helped their children with learning routines and adjusting to the school environment. Some specifically cited JK as having more of an emphasis on learning outcomes than in other early childhood settings.
- A few parents reported that JK had also positively impacted their family, through their JK child's modeling and positive interaction with younger siblings.



- Parents in communities with no other learning opportunities for four year olds spoke of how JK filled a need in the community, not the least of which was providing a substitute for child care that was not available elsewhere.
- As previously discussed, many educators in JK settings reported that having parents bring their children to JK, in addition to the positive impact on children, helped the school connect earlier with parents and involve them in the school community.
- In addition to the benefits for children, government information on JK promoted the fact that JK was free and, therefore, presented a choice for those parents who could not afford some of the other early childhood learning programs.

h. Are teachers with a Bachelor of Education qualified to teach JK? Are there other forms of credentials that also qualify someone to teach JK?

Virtually all groups participating in the Review were split regarding whether or not the JK teacher should have a Bachelor's of Education (B.Ed.) or an Early Childhood Education certificate. However, many who preferred the B.Ed. option believed the teachers should also have some kind of training, specialization and experience in early childhood education.

- Approximately two-thirds (64%) of educators responding to the educator survey felt that a JK teacher should have a B.Ed. but with specialized training in early childhood education. Another quarter (23%) felt that training in early childhood education was sufficient, while 11% felt that a B.Ed. was sufficient as the basic requirement.
- Early childhood practitioners felt that a background/training in early childhood education was a necessity and a B.Ed. was not.
- Other individuals across the various respondent groups believed that an Early Childhood Education certificate was appropriate if it were strictly a JK classroom. However, in multi-grade classrooms (eg., JK to Grade 2) by necessity, there would have to be a certified teacher.

i. Is the curriculum being implemented as intended? (In what ways has the integrated curriculum been adapted?¹⁵)

Educators interviewed in site visits, while generally positive about the focus and intentions of the curriculum, struggled with some aspects of the Integrated Kindergarten Curriculum, particularly regarding its practical application.

¹⁵ The second question, in parentheses, has been added to deepen the question regarding curriculum.



- There was concern expressed by some educators in JK communities about a lack of understanding of play-based education and how this is integrated in all areas of learning, such as social/emotional learning, literacy learning, numeracy learning.
- Based on the classroom observations the learning environments observed were suitable for JK students. JK students were involved in a variety of learning activities, some self-directed and some more teacher-directed.
- Staff in many of the JK classrooms observed had a good understanding of the JK students and of their development. In some JK/K combined classrooms, activities were adapted for JK students, allowing them to fully participate in the learning while understanding that their learning may not be at the same level as the older Kindergarten students. However, this was not the case in all sites. Some educators in JK communities spoke of not being certain how this document applied differently to four year old children (JK), as compared to five year old children (K).
- The curriculum review revealed that the *Integrated Kindergarten Curriculum* and the *Draft Implementation Guide* work well together and supplement one another. The *Draft Implementation Guide* is a valuable complement to the *Integrated Kindergarten Curriculum* and would benefit from a final revision and distribution as a final document. The *Draft Implementation Guide* provides further discussion of learning centres, play-based learning, and presents valuable sections on Aboriginal learning and culturally competent teaching. Furthermore, both of these documents discuss the characteristics and needs of programming for four and five year olds (i.e., Kindergarten age). However, there is no reference to how this would be different for the four year old child who is in Junior Kindergarten. These documents would benefit from supplementary information with different indicators, achievement rubrics, and/or learning continuums. This would help educators better understand different expectations of the four year old child and the five year old child. Furthermore, the documents would benefit from a discussion of the differences in the pacing, flow, and number of learning activities that are best suited to the Junior Kindergarten learner and how these differ from the older Kindergarten learner.



j. Were schools and classrooms structurally prepared for the program (i.e., in terms of infrastructure and materials)?

Site visits revealed different levels of readiness to offer JK at time of implementation, some of which was affected by the school/classroom's existing infrastructure and materials.

- When asked on the educator survey whether their school was structurally prepared for JK, approximately half the respondents (53%) in JK settings agreed. However, when asked if they had all the materials needed to implement JK, less than half (40%) agreed. As well, 40% agreed that the materials arrived in a timely manner.
- Schools rarely have more than one Kindergarten/pre-school classroom with integrated toilet facilities. Therefore, in locations in which a new classroom had to be opened to accommodate the JK program, toilet facilities were not always available in the JK classroom, as school's Kindergarten/pre-school room was already devoted to Kindergarten.¹⁶ However, sinks and integrated cloak room facilities were available in most JK classrooms.
- In terms of the materials available, that too depended on whether a new classroom needed to be opened. In one case, many of the supplies ordered for the new JK classroom did not arrive until October or November, leaving only what could be shared among the school's other classroom to start the school year. In addition, educators spoke of the amount of money from the materials budget that needed to be devoted to shipping as limiting what could be purchased for the JK program.
- The learning environments all had learning centres that fostered different types of learning – there were literacy centres (listening and otherwise), classroom libraries, rest and quiet areas, sand and water play centres, dramatic play centres, sorting and classifying, science centres, etc. Each classroom had appropriate books, games, puzzles and materials suitable to a play based learning environment.

2. Implementation: How does the implementation of JK in the participating communities compare to the implementation of JK in other jurisdictions in terms of:

The Jurisdictional Scan (Chapter 4) informs this section; that is, the comparison of JK implementation to implementation of educational programming for four year olds in other Canadian jurisdictions.

¹⁶ Although the K and JK classrooms could have been switched, it still remains that one of these rooms would not have had an integrated toilet facility.



a. Child-to-staff ratio

Information on child/staff ratio was not available from Quebec or British Columbia. In Ontario, the only Canadian jurisdiction to offer universally accessible pre-Kindergarten programming in a school context, JK classrooms include a certified teacher and certified early childhood educator, although no specifics as to child/staff ratio were available. In other jurisdictions child/staff ratios were:

- 22/1 in Winnipeg School Division, at 23 students an educational assistant is assigned to the classroom;
- 18/1 in Yukon, at 19 students an educational assistant is assigned to the classroom;
- 16/1 in Saskatchewan.
- While participants in the JK Review had divergent ideas as to the child/staff ratio for JK, many were in the range of 10 or 12 children to one adult. Results from the educator survey show a mean of 10:1 for classrooms with JK only; 12:1 for classrooms with JK/K; and 11:1 for classrooms that have JK/K and higher grades.
- Others noted that the Child Day Care Act legislated ratios of 8 or 9 children to one adult, depending on the composition.

b. Levels of staffing required to implement JK

As previously mentioned, Ontario is the only Canadian jurisdiction to offer universally accessible pre-Kindergarten programming in a school context. In Ontario, JK classrooms include both a certified teacher and certified early childhood educator.

- In Winnipeg School Division at 23 students an educational assistant is assigned to the classroom.
- In Yukon at 19 students an educational assistant is assigned to the classroom.

c. Qualifications required of each staffing level

In all other jurisdictions consulted, except British Columbia and Quebec, 'certified teachers,' namely those with Bachelor of Education, are required for JK classrooms.

- British Columbia's StrongStart program requires a certified Early Childhood Educator to lead the program.
- Quebec's Passe-Partout program requires its facilitators to have a Bachelor's in psychology, education, social work, or a related field, as determined by the school district.
- A certified Early Childhood Educator is required for JK in Ontario, in addition to a certified teacher.



d. Infrastructure needs

In the jurisdictions consulted, programming for four year olds generally took place in schools, with the exception of BC StrongStart Outreach programs which could be in schools or in other community locations. Specifics regarding infrastructure needs for JK program in other jurisdictions are not specified, although information about how classrooms and programming should be set up provides some insight into infrastructure needs.

- For example, the curriculum/implementation document from Winnipeg School Division, *Start With the Child: A Guide to Best Practices in Nursery Programs*, devotes a chapter to the organization of space and materials, outlining the spaces and centres appropriate for this type of classroom. Appropriate space is needed for play-based programming including gathering spaces and space for centres as well as free play and exploration. There is also discussion in programming documents from other jurisdictions about the need for space for hand washing, cleaning, and toileting, as appropriate health practices are not only encouraged but are often included in the program of learning outcomes.

3. Incorporation into the School System: Should the GNWT incorporate JK into the K-12 school system beyond the pilot implementation?

a. What are the anticipated impacts that JK has on existing and comparable early learning programming in the regional centres and Yellowknife? (example: day cares and AHS).

In large part, this question has been addressed under Question 1f. Unless consultation and implementation are done differently, other established early learning programs may be in jeopardy of reduced enrollment, thus compromising the viability of some programs and leading to potential job loss and, in the worst case scenario, creating damaging rifts between school and community.

- Regional centres have existing early childhood programs outside the school system, so consultation with these communities and existing programs will be essential. In particular, bridges need to be built with AHS. Also, there is a need to address the confusion over why ECE, which funds and supports early childhood learning programs, now appears to be competing with itself.
- In Yellowknife, the situation is somewhat different as both YK1 and YCS offer fee-based pre-school programming in their schools. Consultation and negotiation with YK1 and YCS will need to take into account this reality. However, the situation in Yellowknife will need to take into account those families who cannot afford fee-based programs.



b. What impacts of JK can be observed on the students who were enrolled in the demonstration sites in terms of their level of preparedness for Grade 1?

Reports from parents and educators indicate that students who participated in the JK demonstration sites had developed skills that served them well in Kindergarten, thus supporting improved preparedness for Grade 1.

c. If JK were in all NWT schools, what are the anticipated financial impacts on K-12 programming, taking enrollments into consideration?

Depending on the funding scenario the financial impacts will be different. If ECE goes forward with the current proposal there will be staffing reductions (at least in the short term) which will have an impact on programming, particularly in larger schools. While ECE sees this as minimal in the longer term, other Review participants have greater concerns about the impact on programming and supports for students, particularly at the high school level. However, the perceived negative impact of JK staffing is exacerbated by the fact that, overall, enrollments are declining across the NWT and, thus, schools are in jeopardy of losing staff positions.

d. What are the anticipated impacts on three year olds and four year olds who have the potential to enter JK?

In communities where there are no other licensed early learning opportunities for four year olds, these children (and their families) will benefit from JK. In communities where other quality options exist, parents will need to determine which option works best for themselves and their children. However, an overriding issue is the need for ECE to work with existing programs, build on community strengths, and find ways to optimize early childhood funding within a more holistic approach to early childhood development and learning.

4. Dependent on the results above, how should JK be funded, if applicable?

a. Does the current funding approach work?

Does the current funding approach work? The general consensus from Review participants is – no, it does not. For example, 52% of educator survey respondents felt it should be funded differently, 39% responded that they did not know, while 9% believed it should be funded as it is currently. Those in non-JK schools (56%) were more likely than those in JK schools (41%) to want a different funding strategy. Most often they wanted new funds from government specific to JK.

However, many key government informants made the point that the current approach provides the necessary funding for smaller communities with minimal impact on larger centres, particularly over the longer term given the cost savings that should result from earlier assessment and intervention.



b. Are there alternative ways to fund the program?

A number of alternative ways to fund JK were identified both through information from the Jurisdictional Scan and through suggestions by those who contributed to the Review. (It should be noted that provinces provide 90% to 100% of education funding with the exception of Manitoba where school boards are still responsible for raising a substantial portion of their funding by imposing their own property taxes.) Provincial and Territorial jurisdictions determine what grades are included in the education system.

- The NWT government could prioritize JK and find dedicated funding. This relates to the need to find dollars, either from other government initiatives within or outside the ECE envelope.
- Yukon is similar to NWT as it is a Northern territory with many small, remote, First Nations communities. Yukon does not fund K4 (JK), but does fund universal full-day Kindergarten for five year olds. Individual schools in rural communities are able allocate funds to offering half-day K4 as they see fit. (These monies come from the Kindergarten allocation).
- In Saskatchewan, pre-Kindergarten is offered in partnership with Aboriginal Head Start sites in seven communities in Northern Lights School Division 113.
- Winnipeg School Division offers the Nursery program within all of its elementary schools, as a school-based program for four year olds which is not offered across Manitoba. The entire cost of the Nursery program is funded by WSD via the Education Special Levy on property taxes. This would only be an option in YK1 and YCS in NWT and, therefore, does not appear to be viable Territorial option.
- NWT could assess its funding to all initiatives that support early learning and development for children age zero to four/five and move towards a more holistic approach that would take into account community contexts (i.e., community strengths and needs).

B. Conclusions and Recommendations

The *Framework and Action for Early Childhood Development in the Northwest Territories* was “an expression of the Government’s continued commitment to support programs and initiatives aimed at ensuring that every child, from birth through the first years of life experiences a positive childhood.” It is within the context of this seminal document that the following discussion is placed. The document articulates a vision, mission and goals.



Vision: Children will have the best start in life, with supports that allow them to develop to their fullest potential, creating a positive future for themselves, their families and their communities.

Mission: To provide equitable access to a continuum of inclusive, culturally relevant early childhood development programs, services and resources for children, parents, families and communities.

Our Goals:

- 1) Increased accessibility and participation in early childhood development programs, services and supports for community and families.
- 2) Enhanced quality of early childhood development programs, services and supports.
- 3) Improved integration and collaboration at all levels of the early childhood development system.

The document goes on to state that “achieving our goals requires an effective, comprehensive and coordinated approach to early childhood development outcomes.” It also identifies the importance of “building on the strengths of early childhood programs and services.”

JK in the NWT was conceived as a research-based intervention that would help support early childhood development and narrow the achievement gap. EDI results from 2012 to 2014 demonstrated that approximately 38% of NWT children are ‘vulnerable’ in one or more EDI domains, and that this is the case for 53% of children in small communities. Therefore, it was logical that small communities be the priority for implementation. However, JK needs to be considered as one deliverable within a larger framework.

There is a need to ensure the bigger picture is considered in a holistic plan to support early childhood development wherein the Mission and Goals of the *Framework and Action for Early Childhood Development* are operationalized, ensuring accessibility, program quality, as well as integration and collaboration.

Recommendations – Moving Forward:

1. Parents and educators in JK settings are collectively positive about the effect that participation in JK has had on children. They identify multiple benefits to children and families. JK should be continued in the existing sites.
2. Expanded implementation of JK must take into account community contexts, strengths, needs, and the existence of quality early childhood learning programs in communities. A holistic strategy for early childhood learning and development (which includes JK, where appropriate) needs to be developed, in consultation with the community, to address diverse community needs and contexts (one size does not fit all).



3. Recognizing that equity must be considered, funding of JK may vary depending on community strengths and needs, with the funding model developed in consultation with the local education authority.
 4. Expanded implementation of JK needs a clear communication strategy and a comprehensive, locally sensitive implementation plan.
 5. Decisions regarding appropriate pupil-teacher ratios within school settings need to be made, taking into consideration the Child Day Care Act, the Education Act, the needs of four year olds, and the type of classroom setting (eg. multi-grade).
 6. More teacher professional development related to early childhood education and the Kindergarten curriculum in relation to four year olds is needed.
 7. The *Integrated Kindergarten Curriculum* and the *Draft Implementation Guide* work well together; however, these documents would benefit from supplementary information, such as identification of the learning activities that are best suited to the Junior Kindergarten learner.
 8. GNWT needs to engage multiple stakeholders in a process whereby the findings of this Review form a basis for ongoing consultation and collaboration.
-