

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE GOVERNANCE MODELS

The highlights below summarize key lessons from an in-depth review of 5 governance models: New Zealand, Denmark, Quebec, the Community Living British Columbia and the BC School Board.

Each of these models was assessed against the attached Template. For each element of the governance template, we have drawn one or two examples from the models we examined. Where possible, we have highlighted examples where the governance model achieves or promotes the element in question. In some cases, several elements from the models have been identified as a point for consultation. As a reminder, the following is not an evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the systems we examined. For this project, we have intentionally focused on the governance aspects of these systems, wherever possible.

Some big picture questions to get us thinking about ‘Governance’

1. Imagine your own vision of an ‘ideal’ child care governance model for BC: Do any of the elements listed in the Template for Good Governance of Child Care appear in your vision? Are there some elements in the Template that don’t appear in your vision but make a lot of sense?
2. Which of the elements in the Template are critical for a BC model and which ones are not as important? Which ones do you think we could/should start working on now and which ones could/should come later?

Now – let’s consider some specific questions related to each element of the Template:

The BC Child Care Governance Model

<p>1. Clear Mandate</p>	<p><i>There is a clear and formal mandate for the assessment of need, planning, development and delivery of child care or other service (mandate enshrined in legislation with a budget to back it and full accountability).</i></p>
<p>Observations</p>	<p>All of the models have relatively clear mandates; yet, the best examples of where it works are usually where the mandate has evolved over time and is entrenched in the public realm (i.e. citizens expect their government to provide these universally accessible services).</p>
<p>Examples of lessons learned</p>	<p>BC School Board Model: Accountability to the province is strong, although there is controversy around some of the accountability mechanisms used.</p> <p>Denmark Model: The mandate is very clear – the authority is written into the Danish constitution and direction is given through legislation.</p> <p>CLBC Model: There is a clear mandate for assessment of need, planning and delivery: CLBC is a Crown Corporation with authority to exercise the power and perform the functions and duties under BC’s Community Living Authority Act, 2004 (CLAA). As outlined in CLAA section 3(1), the authority is for all purposes an agent of the government.</p>

Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there any organization/group/body in BC that currently has a clear and formal mandate to assess need, plan, develop and deliver child care? 2. If not, (in relation to #1), who should or could have this mandate? Could it fall to an evolved form of one of the existing tables? Could it be devolved to an existing elected body? In other words, what elements would a body need to have a strong mandate for child care governance?
------------------	---

2. The degree to which the governance model promotes CCCABC values:	
Accountable	<i>The model promotes accountability to the community through government for ensuring standards/regulations are met and financial reporting is transparent and that the service is responsive to individual needs.</i>
Observations	Each of the models had core accountability mechanisms in place.
Examples of lessons learned	<p>BC School Board Model: Education is available universally to “school-age children” in BC (although independent schools have the right to refuse enrolment for some students).</p> <p>Denmark Model: As mentioned above, local authorities (which are elected governments in and of themselves) determine the objectives and framework for work carried out in day-care facilities; although central government can provide powerful influence over local decision-making (i.e. the guarantees?)</p> <p>Quebec Model: Centres de la Petite Enfance (CPE), are accountable to government for ensuring standards/regulations are met (via ministry oversight, inspectors, licensing, etc.) and, presumably through ministry oversight, financial reporting is transparent. It is not clear in the literature how individual concerns are handled.</p>
Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are effective accountability measures for a BC child care governance model? 2. How can the governance model be financially transparent?

Coordinated	<i>The model promotes coordination and integration of service (avoid overlap, duplication and ensure efficiency of available resources).</i>
Observations	This is a difficult element to assess because 'coordination' is used in a variety of ways, including coordination within child care and between child care and family support services.
Examples of where it works	<p>New Zealand Model: The Ministry of Education plays a significant oversight role regarding equitable service and therefore it is reasonable to suggest that this role will include coordination and integration of service, i.e. the funding Application Assessment matrix should assist in the planning of coordinated services. The government's strategic plan will also promote internal and cross-sectoral collaboration.</p> <p>Quebec Model: The model avoids overlap and duplication, and ensures efficiency of available resources through a provincial-wide planning process involving regional development councils, and through local planning and networking through the CPEs themselves. However, recent developments have separated coordination of group and family child care coordination.</p>
Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do we need a coordinated and integrated system of child care? 2. If yes (see #1), what is the breadth of services that needs to be coordinated? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Childcare alone? b. Childcare and other early learning/early childhood development services? c. Childcare and Kindergarten? 3. If yes (see #1) at what governance level should coordination occur? 4. What elements of a governance model would promote coordination?

Equitable	<i>The model promotes equitable access across regions.</i>
Observations	It is important to note the distinction in the models where equitable access is measured by per capita access (equity of input), and where it is measured by equity of outcome.
Examples of lessons learned	<p>New Zealand Model: A significant role of the Ministry of Education is 'facilitating' access to quality ECE services and supporting ECE services to be more responsive to the needs of children, families and whānau (children, nuclear families and extended families).</p> <p>Quebec Model: Regional development councils have the responsibility to develop equitable five-year plans across regions based on 'places' distributed to the regions based on need by the Ministère de la Famille.</p> <p>Denmark Model: This model allows for a respectable amount of equity across regions. The decentralized nature of the model means that 87% of local authorities guarantee child care availability.</p>
Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does a "per capita" funding formula promote equity? 2. If not (1), what else might work? 3. How would a governance model promote equity?

Inclusive and responsive to diversity	<i>The model provides those who require additional supports, and those who come from different backgrounds, the services they need to support their full development.</i>
Observations	Given the differences in diversity within the jurisdictions where these models operate, comparisons are difficult.
Examples of lessons learned	<p>New Zealand Model: One clear aspect of all of New Zealand's initiatives in child care is a strong commitment to action in honouring Maori and Pacific peoples and cultures. The curriculum also outlines specific approaches to take with children with special needs in ECE.</p> <p>Community Living BC: This governance model was specifically designed to provide governance of services by the users of those services.</p>
Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What elements of a governance model would be most inclusive and responsive to diversity?

<p>Community Control</p>	<p><i>The model promotes democratic community control, meaning it will be participatory, reflect community ownership, be delivered through non-profit or public organizations, allow for political autonomy, allow for a direct relationship between users and caregivers, provide infrastructure to support community involvement, allow service delivery to be decentralized, and build on strengths that currently existed in the community.</i></p>
<p>Observations</p>	<p>The models provided distinct and diverse ways of achieving community control. (Also, during our analysis we closely examined community control for a number of factors listed above – please see full documents for details).</p>
<p>Examples of lessons learned</p>	<p>New Zealand Model: The literature was unclear on specific participation by community; however, a vast amount of decision-making power on the planning and delivery of ECE services seems to rest with the providers.</p> <p>CLBC Model: The governing board must be comprised of a majority who are adults with developmental disabilities and families, or people with a significant connection to children and/or adults with developmental disabilities, including family members, and two directors must be individuals with a developmental disability. Also, the community councils may include community members at large.</p> <p>Quebec Model: The board is highly inclusive of parents but the literature is silent on whether the boards also include children, caregivers and community members at large.</p> <p>Denmark Model: Through the parent boards, this governance model is highly inclusive of parents and caregivers (other stakeholders may sit on the board). The literature is silent on whether children themselves are involved in governance; however, the Danish service delivery approach to child care is explicitly child rights-based and very participatory.</p>
<p>Questions</p>	<p>1. What type of a governance model would best support community control that is truly participatory and effective? For example, what elements are most important in the examples listed above (think about a democratically-elected board: does this work)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Parent-user involvement? b. Universal Democratic elections?

The Public Policy Context

Public Policy	<i>The broader public policy context in which the governance model operates, including a universal entitlement approach, an approach that promotes quality services, affordability of services, services that are predominantly publicly funded, and services that are accessible</i>
Observations	All of the models demonstrate the interdependence between the public policy context and the governance structure.
Examples of lessons learned	<p>BC School Board Model: Education is available universally to “school-age children” in BC (although independent schools have the right to refuse enrolment for some students).</p> <p>Denmark Model: The local government takes a universal entitlement approach to child care and now has a responsibility to provide spaces to all children in their community.</p>
Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there value in developing public policy to support governance of child care? 2. Must we wait for public policy to be in place before developing child care governance structures or is it possible for momentum to come from the ground up (i.e. looking to New Zealand for examples in this regard)?