knowing numbers

A community approach to understanding the early childhood education workforce

County of Lanark

County of Renfrew





Counties of Lanark and Renfrew

The regional data presented here are part of the larger provincial early childhood education workforce study **Knowing Our Numbers** (KON). The Counties of Lanark and Renfrew are two of 43 regional children's service districts that participated in the study. In total, this represents over 91% of all regions in Ontario. Details on the project, methodology, and province-wide results can be found <u>here</u>. The data from the counties were merged in consultation with regional officials. In the <u>Executive Report</u>, the counties are part of the 'East' data region. Census data provided on the following pages allow readers to put the results into the context of regional demographics.

This report should be cited as:

Akbari, E., McCuaig, K., Schurter, M. Varmuza, P., Akbari, S., Mudie, S. (2024). Knowing Our Numbers: A Provincial Study with a Local Lens on the Early Childhood Education Workforce in Ontario. The Counties of Lanark and Renfrew.

All communication and inquiries should be made to Dr. Emis Akbari—<u>emis.akbari@ece-rpa.ca</u> and Kerry McCuaig—<u>kerry.mccuaig@ece-rpa.ca</u>

County of Lanark

Population and Family

Population and Family					
Population 2021	75,760	Average number of childr	en per fa	amily	1.7
2021 2016 Change since 2016:	68,698 +10.3%	One-pa	arent fan	nilies	13.7%
Change Since 2016.	+10.3%	Lone-pa	arent fan	nilies	
Population density per sq km	25.4		Wo	omen	10.1%
				Men	3.6%
Median age	48.8 years		/arital st		
Racialized population	3.3%	Married or living			52.4%
		Not married or living			37.6%
Multi-generational households	2.1%	Married or common-law			35.9%
Immigrant population	6.6%	Language most often spo	oken at h	ome	
L	4.40				97.3%
Indigenous identity	4.4%		Fr	ench	1.0%
Education			(Other	0.9%
No certificate, diploma, or degree	14.5%	*Estimates associated with Indigenous languages			
High school diploma or equivalent	30.0%	incomplete enumeration of certain reserves and se	ettlements in	the Census o	of Population.
		Hon	ne owne	rshin	
Post secondary certificate, diploma or degree	55.5%			•	78.4%
*15+ years old					21.6%
Education obtained outside Canada	3.1%			enter .	21.070
*25-64 years old		Spending more than 30% on	shelter o	costs	17.3%
Employment and Income					
Labour force participation rate		Commuting duration (mins)	Total %	% Men	% Women
Women	55.3%	Less than 15	32.4	27.4	38.6
Men	63.1%	15 to 29	26.8	25.1	28.9
		30 to 44	21.4	23.6	18.7
Unemployment rate		45 to 59	10.8	12.9	8.1
Women	0 1 0/	60 minutes and over	~ ~		5.7
Men	9.1% 7.9%		8.6	11.1	5.7
Men		Income distribution	8.6 Total %	% Men	
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM)	7.9%	Income distribution In bottom half of the distribution			
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17	7.9% 8.7%		Total %	% Men	% Women
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17 0-5	7.9% 8.7% 9.0%	In bottom half of the distribution	Total % 45.2	% Men 43.9	% Women 46.5
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17 0-5 18-64	7.9% 8.7% 9.0% 10.2%	In bottom half of the distribution In bottom decile	Total % 45.2 7.5	% Men 43.9 7.5	% Women 46.5 7.6
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17 0-5 18-64 *LIM: Low Income Measure reflects those whose incomes are below half	7.9% 8.7% 9.0% 10.2%	In bottom half of the distribution In bottom decile In second decile	Total % 45.2 7.5 8.5	% Men 43.9 7.5 7.9	% Women 46.5 7.6 9.1
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17 0-5 18-64 *LIM: Low Income Measure reflects those whose incomes are below half adjusted income distribution	7.9% 8.7% 9.0% 10.2%	In bottom half of the distribution In bottom decile In second decile In third decile	Total % 45.2 7.5 8.5 9.2	% Men 43.9 7.5 7.9 9.0	% Women 46.5 7.6 9.1 9.4
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17 0-5 18-64 *LIM: Low Income Measure reflects those whose incomes are below half	7.9% 8.7% 9.0% 10.2%	In bottom half of the distribution In bottom decile In second decile In third decile In fourth decile In fifth decile	Total % 45.2 7.5 8.5 9.2 9.6 10.4	% Men 43.9 7.5 7.9 9.0 9.3 10.3	% Women 46.5 7.6 9.1 9.4 9.8 10.6
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17 0-5 18-64 *LIM: Low Income Measure reflects those whose incomes are below half adjusted income distribution Median employment income	7.9% 8.7% 9.0% 10.2% of the median of the \$38,800	In bottom half of the distribution In bottom decile In second decile In third decile In fourth decile In fifth decile In top half of the distribution	Total % 45.2 7.5 8.5 9.2 9.6 10.4 54.8	% Men 43.9 7.5 7.9 9.0 9.3 10.3 56.1	% Women 46.5 7.6 9.1 9.4 9.8 10.6 53.5
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17 0-5 18-64 *LIM: Low Income Measure reflects those whose incomes are below half adjusted income distribution Median employment income Median employment income in 2020 for	7.9% 8.7% 9.0% 10.2%	In bottom half of the distribution In bottom decile In second decile In third decile In fourth decile In fifth decile In top half of the distribution In sixth decile	Total % 45.2 7.5 8.5 9.2 9.6 10.4 54.8 11.1	% Men 43.9 7.5 7.9 9.0 9.3 10.3 56.1 11.2	% Women 46.5 7.6 9.1 9.4 9.8 10.6 53.5 10.9
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17 0-5 18-64 *LIM: Low Income Measure reflects those whose incomes are below half adjusted income distribution Median employment income Median employment income in 2020 for full-year full-time workers	7.9% 8.7% 9.0% 10.2% of the median of the \$38,800 \$64,500	In bottom half of the distribution In bottom decile In second decile In third decile In fourth decile In forth decile In top half of the distribution In sixth decile In seventh decile	Total % 45.2 7.5 8.5 9.2 9.6 10.4 54.8 11.1 11.1	% Men 43.9 7.5 7.9 9.0 9.3 10.3 56.1 11.2 11.2	% Womer 46.5 7.6 9.1 9.4 9.8 10.6 53.5 10.9 10.9
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17 0-5 18-64 *LIM: Low Income Measure reflects those whose incomes are below half adjusted income distribution Median employment income Median employment income in 2020 for	7.9% 8.7% 9.0% 10.2% of the median of the \$38,800	In bottom half of the distribution In bottom decile In second decile In third decile In fourth decile In fifth decile In top half of the distribution In sixth decile In seventh decile In eighth decile	Total % 45.2 7.5 8.5 9.2 9.6 10.4 54.8 11.1 11.1 11.3	% Men 43.9 7.5 7.9 9.0 9.3 10.3 56.1 11.2 11.2 11.6	% Women 46.5 7.6 9.1 9.4 9.8 10.6 53.5 10.9 10.9 10.9 11.0
Men Prevalence of low income (LIM) 0-17 0-5 18-64 *LIM: Low Income Measure reflects those whose incomes are below half adjusted income distribution Median employment income Median employment income in 2020 for full-year full-time workers	7.9% 8.7% 9.0% 10.2% of the median of the \$38,800 \$64,500	In bottom half of the distribution In bottom decile In second decile In third decile In fourth decile In forth decile In top half of the distribution In sixth decile In seventh decile	Total % 45.2 7.5 8.5 9.2 9.6 10.4 54.8 11.1 11.1	% Men 43.9 7.5 7.9 9.0 9.3 10.3 56.1 11.2 11.2	% Women 46.5 7.6 9.1 9.4 9.8 10.6 53.5 10.9 10.9

Reference: https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&SearchText=Lanark&DGUIDlist=2021A00033509& GENDERlist=1,2,3&STATISTIClist=1&HEADERlist=0

County of Renfrew

Population and Family

106,365	Average number of children per fam	nily	1.8
102,394 +3.90%	One-parent famili	ies	14.5%
10.90%	Lone-parent famili	ies	
14.5			10.6%
45.2 years	M	len	3.9%
	Marital stat	us	
3.3%	Married or living common-la	aw 6	50.2%
1 00/	-		39.8%
1.9%	Married or common-law with childre	ren 3	36.4%
5.5%	Language most often spoken at hor	me	
0 7%	Engli	ish 🤉	95.8%
0.7 %			1.9%
			1.3%
16.4%	*Estimates associated with Indigenous languages are more affecte incomplete enumeration of certain reserves and settlements in the	ed than m Census c	ost by the of Population.
33.1%			
50.5%	Home ownersh	•	
	Owr		74.8%
0.0%	Ren	iter 2	25.1%
2.9%	Spending more than 30% on shelter cos	sts	14.3%
	Commuting duration (mins) Total % %	6 Men	% Women
53.3%	Less than 15 41.3	37.9	45.5
61.9%	15 to 29 29.7	29.2	30.3
	30 to 44 15.1	15.5	14.5
	45 to 59 6.8	7.7	5.6
	60 minutes and over 7.1	9.6	4.1
	Income distribution Total % %	6 Men	% Womer
10.00	In bottom half of the distribution 50.5	48.9	52.2
	In bottom decile 8.9	8.3	9.4
	In second decile 9.9	9.0	10.7
	In third decile 10.2	9.8	10.5
ui uie mediah of the	In fourth decile 10.8	10.6	11.0
620.200	In fifth decile 10.8	11.1	10.6
\$39,20U	In top half of the distribution 49.5	51.1	47.8
\$64,000		11.5	10.9
-	In seventh decile 11.4	11.9	10.9
400.000	In eighth decile 10.5	10.7	10.2
\$80,000	In ninth decile 9.5	9.9	9.1
	45.2 years 3.3% 1.9% 5.5% 8.7% 16.4% 33.1% 50.5% 2.9% 2.9% 53.3% 61.9% 10.5% 7.9% 10.5% 7.9% 10.3% 10.9% 9.2% of the median of the \$39,200	14.5 Worr 45.2 years Marital stat 3.3% Married or living common-law 1.9% Not married or living common-law 1.9% Married or common-law with childred 5.5% Language most often spoken at how 8.7% Engl 16.4% Free 33.1% Ott 50.5% Home owners: 2.9% Spending more than 30% on shelter co 53.3% Less than 15 41.3 61.9% Less than 15 41.3 10.5% Less than 15 41.3 10.5% In bottom half of the distribution 50.5 10.5% In bottom decile 9.9 10.3% In bottom decile 9.9 10.3% In bottom decile 9.9 In bottom decile 10.2 In third decile 10.8 S39,200 In sixth decile 11.2 In seventh decile 11.4 In eighth decile 10.5 In seventh decile 11.4	14.5 Women Men 45.2 years Marital status Marital status 3.3% Married or living common-law Marital status 1.9% Married or common-law with children Married or common-law 5.5% Language most often spoken at home English Men 8.7% English Married or common-law with children Men 16.4% Spending most often spoken at home English Men 16.4% Spending more than 30% on shelter costs Owner Men 2.9% Spending more than 30% on shelter costs Men 53.3% Sto 29 29.7 29.2 30 to 44 15.1 15.5 10.5% 7.7 60 minutes and over 7.1 10.3% In bottom half of the distribution 50.5 48.9 10.3% In bottom half of the distribution 50.5 48.9 10.3% In bottom half of the distribution 50.5 48.9 10.3% In bottom half of the distribution 50.5 48.9 10.3% In bottom half of the distribution 50.5 48.9

Reference: https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&SearchText=Renfrew&DGUIDlist=2021A00033547&GENDERlist=1,2,3&STATISTIClist=1&HEADERlist=0

Sample Characteristics

A total of 97 individuals working in early years services in the Counties of Lanark and Renfrew responded to the survey (referred to as the *'workforce survey'*). Of these, 70.1% are RECEs and 29.9% are non-RECEs (referred as the *'workforce'*). About three-quarters (74.7%) of the respondents are from non-profit programs. Additionally, 18 directors responded to the survey. As the number of respondents who are licensed home child care providers in the counties is low (n=8), data are not presented here; these data are included in the **Executive Report**.



74.7% Non-profit



AGE

Approximately 55% of *workforce* respondents are under the age of 45. Most director/supervisor respondents in the two counties are over the age of 45 years. The low number of director/supervisor participants prevents further age breakdown.

Respondents working in for-profit organizations are more likely to be younger. Three-quarters of *workforce* participants from for-profit programs are under the age of 45 years. By comparison, 54.4% in non-profit and 50% in public programs are under 45 years of age.



YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Participants who work in for-profit programs have the fewest median years of experience. In contrast, public programs tend to have more experienced educators.

Years of Experience by Auspice

	Workforce					
Auspice	Mean	Minimum	25th percentile	Median	75th percentile	Maximum
For-profit	11.6	11.6	3.0	8.5	19.0	31.0
Non-profit	13.7	10.6	5.0	10.0	22.0	38.0
Public	17.4	10.1	8.0	22.5	24.5	35.0

Of the 18 directors/supervisors who responded to the survey, five are not RECEs and are either waiting for their RECE status or are otherwise approved. The majority of those who are RECEs have been registered with the College of Early Childhood Educators for less than five years.

FAMILY STATUS

Approximately 27% of the workforce survey respondents are single.



RACIALIZATION

Only 3.7% of the *workforce* sample identify as racialized. Provincial-level results indicate that non-RECEs are more likely than RECEs to identify as racialized. These findings are discussed in the **Executive Report**.





Compensation

WAGES

Wages of RECEs are higher than for non-RECEs. Those working in for-profit and non-profit programs have the lowest hourly wages. Approximately 21% of respondents report having additional employment to supplement their primary wages.

Hourly Wages by Auspice and RECE Status Workforce				
	RECE status			
Auspice	Non-RECE	RECE	Average across RECE status	
For-profit	\$20.00	\$25.40	\$23.38	
Non-profit	\$21.50	\$24.17	\$23.37	
Public*	\$32.00	\$27.31	\$27.64	
Average across auspice	\$22.77	\$24.95	\$25.07	

*Interpret with caution due to low number of participants. Note: All averages are weighted.

The reported director/supervisor median wage of \$30 per hour in the counties is on par with provincial level findings. The median director/supervisor hourly wage in the overall provincial findings is \$30 per hour, with a minimum of \$18 and a maximum of \$80 per hour. Wages for directors/supervisors in the two counties should be interpreted with caution due to a low sample size.

BENEFITS

Just over 88% of *workforce* respondents report having access to paid sick days, while 61.1% have pensions or RRSP contributions through their employer. Over half have access to paid professional learning opportunities (56.8%) and extended health benefits (55.8%). Pay increases for obtaining a new credential or degree in early education are not common (11.6%) and tuition assistance is rare (3.2%).



Workforce Stability, Stress, and Job Satisfaction

DISCRIMINATION

Around 40% of *workforce* respondents report having experienced workplace discrimination. The types of discrimination experienced vary, with bullying (66.7%) being the most common, followed by education/seniority (41%). Note that bullying may involve, or be rooted in, other forms of discrimination (e.g., racism or ageism).

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Experiences of Workplace Discrimination Workforce



Experiencing discrimination: 40.2% Not experiencing discrimination: 59.8%

Types of Discrimination Workforce				
Bullying	66.7%			
Education/seniority	41.0%			
Ageism	15.4%			
Other*	12.8%			
Mental health	10.3%			
Ableism	10.3%			
Sexism	7.7%			

*Merged due to data suppression. Includes racism, body prejudice, and homophobia.



JOB SATISFACTION

Across all auspices, only 37.4% of respondents report plans to stay in the sector over the next five years. Those who work in for-profit programs are least likely to report plans to leave or say they are unsure (37.5%). Those working in non-profit programs are most likely to report plans to leave the sector or uncertainty (69%). These findings have important implications for retention strategies.







Those between the ages of 45 and 64 years are most likely to report plans to leave the sector or report uncertainty in their plans (72.5%). This is concerning as this age group is also likely to have the most experience in early years. Many respondents across all age groups remain undecided about their plans, which has implications for policy development and retention investments and strategies. Note that those 65+ are not included in these findings as plans for retirement would confound results.



KNOWING OUR NUMBERS: COUNTIES OF LANARK AND RENFREW

Overall, only 38.2% of RECE respondents report plans to stay in the sector, with 61.8% either planning to leave or reporting they are unsure. Non-RECE respondents are less likely to report plans to stay in the sector (27.6%).

Plans to Leave the Sector by RECE Status Workforce





Plans to leave the sector are not associated with experiences of workplace discrimination in the two counties. However, provincial-level findings indicate that those who experience discrimination are more likely to report plans to leave the sector in the next five years. This has implications for professional learning and human resource management. More detailed discussion can be found in the **Executive Report**.

Only 33.3% of director/supervisor respondents report wanting to stay in the sector. This is on par with provincial findings. Findings for directors/supervisors in the two counties should be interpreted with caution due to a low sample size.

Percentage of Directors/Supervisors with Plans to Stay in the Sector Counties of Lanark and Renfrew Versus All Participating Regions



*Interpret with caution due to low number of participants.



WORKPLACE STRESS

Those working within public auspices report the highest levels of stress on a scale of 1 (low stress) to 5 (high stress). In addition, RECEs report higher stress levels than non-RECEs.

Average Level of Stress by Auspice Workforce (1=low stress; 5=high stress) **RECE status** Non-RECE RECE Auspice Average across RECE status For-profit 3.2 2.8 2.9 Non-profit 3.0 3.3 3.2 Public 4.0 4.1 4.1 3.1 3.4 3.3 Average across auspice Note: All averages are weighted.

Participants in the two counties generally report a low level of job satisfaction. On a scale of 1 (low job satisfaction) to 5 (high job satisfaction), participants' level of satisfaction is 2.6 out of 5. Job satisfaction is lower among non-RECEs (2.4) compared to RECEs (2.7). There are no significant differences in stress levels among auspices.

Average Level of Job Satisfaction by Auspice and RECE Status Workforce				
(1=low job satisfaction; 5=high job satisfaction)				
RECE status				
Auspice	Non-RECE	RECE	Average across RECE status	
For-profit	2.2	3.0	2.7	
Non-profit	2.4	2.6	2.6	
Public	2.2	2.9	2.8	

2.7

2.6

2.4

Note: All averages are weighted.

Average across auspice

WORKPLACE STABILITY

Directors often stand in for absent staff by necessity, taking them away from their leadership and administrative duties. Half of management staff report having to fill in six or more times per month to maintain ratios.



Number of Times per Month Directors/Supervisors Fill in Ratio

Note: Interpret with caution due to low number of participants.

Staff shortages also have deleterious effects on the inclusion of children with disabilities or varying needs. Almost half (46.7%) of director/supervisor respondents report they sent a child(ren) with a disability home due to staffing shortages (data not shown). This is higher than the provincial sample average of 26.6%.

About 33% of director/supervisor respondents in the counties report they de-enlisted at least one child with a disability from their program in the previous 12 months due to staffing shortages. This is higher than the provincial sample average of 16.5%. Furthermore, 33.3% (compared to 27.3% in provincial findings) report they have refused admission to a child with a disability in the previous 12 months due to workforce shortages (data not shown). These findings for directors/supervisors in the two counties should be interpreted with caution due to a low sample size.

Less than half (48.5%) of *workforce* respondents in the counties report they would recommend a career in the early years to others who are interested. Another third (32%) state they are uncertain if they would recommend child care as a career option.

Percentage of Workforce Respondents Who Recommend a Career in the Early Years



Around 80% of *workforce* respondents state they would recommend their program to a family member or friend looking for child care.





Note: Totals do not add up to 100 due to missing data.



Professional Development

FORMS OF PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

Respondents from the Counties of Lanark and Renfrew report that the most common form of professional learning in the previous 12 months was through online delivery (77.3%), followed by self-study (54.6%) and in-person workshops (51.6%). Only 6.2% of respondents report having taken a course in the previous 12 months, while 13.4% report having access to structured mentoring.

Although online delivery is the most common form of professional learning received in the previous 12 months, respondents report it is the least desired format (14.4%). Respondents prefer taking courses (33%), structured mentoring (32%), small group coaching (30.9%), and opportunities for team discussions and reflective practice (30.9%), all of which are forms of collective learning.



CONTENT OF PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

About 38% of respondents report receiving training in supporting children with disabilities in the previous 12 months. About 30% report training in anti-bias/anti-racism (29.9%) and Indigenous ways of knowing/being and decolonization (28.9%). Participants report the least amount of professional learning in the areas of incorporating Afrocentric ways of being (4.1%) and land-based learning (9.3%), as well as supporting newcomer families (3.1%). Census data for the region help contextualize results.

The most wanted professional learning reported is centred around supporting vulnerable (49.5%) and newcomer (49.5%) families, as well as critical trauma-informed practice (47.4%). Over 40% also report wanting more professional learning in the areas of land-based learning (42.3%) and supporting children with disabilities (42.3%).

