

BKTC G&F Newsletter



The Brisbane Kindergarten Teachers College Graduates&Friends is a QUT Alumni Chapter that brings into contact people who continue to value teaching approaches that were actively promoted by Brisbane Kindergarten Teachers Colleg from 1911 to 1981.

The BKTC G&F Newsletter aims to highlight the working lives of BKTC graduates that brought early childhood philosophies and valued practices into the lives of so many Queensland families raising young children.

Gail Halliwell Editor

Look inside for more about

- BKTC G&F Executive 2009 p.02
- Projects 2002-2008 p.02
- A SIGN about a time p.03
- Honouring BKTC Graduates p.04
- Planning towards 2011 centenary p.05
- Jean Ferguson OAM Memorial Lecture 2009 p.06
- Jean Ferguson OAM lecture delivered in 2008 p.06
- List of currently financial members p.15
- Three year membership form 2009-2011 is enclosed

Write to us at:

PO Box 3026 South Brisbane Business Centre, Brisbane 4104

Email to:

bkccassoc@hotmail.com

Download a colour version of this Newsletter. Go to:

<http://www.alumni.qut.edu.au/networking/chapters/bkcc.jsp>

Our thanks to
QUT Alumni staff
who print and mail
this Newsletter
for our Chapter.









BKTC G&F EXECUTIVE 2009

The AGM held in October 2008 elected the following members for 2009:

President [& Membership sub-committee chair]	Robyn Davey, BKTC graduate 1976
Vic-President [& Newsletter Editor]	Gail Halliwell, BKTC graduate 1974
Secretary	Cath O'Connor, BKTC graduate 1976
Treasurer	Margaret Moss, BKTC graduate 1975
Member [& Jean Ferguson OAM Lecture sub-committee chair]	Jennette Lavis OAM, BKTC graduate 1952
Member [& October function sub-committee chair]	Chris Denning, BKTC graduate 1976
Member	Denise Sherwood, BKTC graduate 1979
Member	Edna Irwin, BKTC graduate 1935
Member [& Past President]	Bill Deans, BKTC graduate 1977

PROJECTS 2002-2008 include:

-  Seven annual lectures honouring the work of 1933 graduate Jean Ferguson OAM. Download the lectures from our QUT web address.
-  Newsletters have featured 9 work histories told by women who graduated between 1932 and 1950. Download the newsletters from our QUT web address.
-  October afternoon functions that honour the work of Peggy Banff 1949 graduate.
-  Archive for use at our functions & by researchers: graduates' list updated - photo collections - stories & profiles from graduates
-  Planning for a centenary celebration in 2011
-  A memorial SIGN erected in March 2009. This is the culmination of a three year project involving more than ten members who contributed to email discussions and meetings. Thanks are due to those ten BKTC graduates, to the QUT Vice-Chancellor and to Stephen Pincus who, as Director of the Kelvin Grove Urban Village Project Team, smoothed the passage from our ideas to finished project. On the next page is a photo showing the sign in place and the words finally agreed for the sign.

A SIGN ABOUT A TIME

Established in 1911 by the Creche & Kindergarten Association of Queensland, the Brisbane Kindergarten Training College moved to this site in 1919, occupying the gracious colonial home *Wauna*.

photo 1: *Wauna*

BKTC was Queensland's first and major training centre for kindergarten teachers. Students undertook three years of study to prepare them for educating children birth to eight years of age, and, working with families responsible for raising young Queenslanders.

In 1942, all kindergartens within a two mile radius of the city centre were closed, and the college facility was seconded and occupied as headquarters for the armed forces. Creches and kindergartens remained closed until 1944, even though mothers engaged in wartime work were desperately in need of such services.

photo 2: BKTC students photographed during 1930's.

By the 1950's many early graduates were local ambassadors and advisers as the community kindergarten movement gained momentum.

In 1962, rapid post-war growth and community demand for early education led to the demolition of *Wauna* and its replacement by a larger four story building that opened in 1965. The Brisbane Kindergarten Teachers College was evolving into a large tertiary institution that prepared teachers for employment in schools, community kindergartens and child care centres.

In 1982 many of the Brisbane teachers colleges were amalgamated into the Brisbane College of Advanced Education. The name *Brisbane Kindergarten Teachers College* lapsed and students now studied on the same site in what was now named the School of Early Childhood at BCAE.

In 1990, federal government legislation led to the closure of Colleges of Advanced Education and the School of Early Childhood became part of the newly established Queensland University of Technology. The School remains a vital part of this Kelvin Grove campus.



HONOURING BKTC GRADUATES



Our stories from graduates of the 1930's and 40's are beginning to show that while government interest in bringing kindergarten philosophies and practices into school systems might have waxed and waned, BKTC graduates were becoming ambassadors for good practices with young children in the many rural centres where they resided and raised their own children.

Our 2008 issue two Newsletter featured our first oral history from a graduate of the next decade, the 1950's, a decade when the community kindergarten movement became the major area of growth for early education in Queensland.

In our 2009 and 2010 issues, we hope to feature many oral history anecdotes and work histories from those who graduated in the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's.

We are also interested in the views of those who graduated in 1980-1981, two quite turbulent years as politics and funding decisions made it impossible for BKTC to continue as an independent institution.

And, those who started as BKTC students but graduated after 1981 - what were your thoughts, feelings and experiences at the time? What have been your work experiences since then?

-  Do YOU know a 1950's graduate who would be willing to share experiences related to early education? Gail will arrange the interview and prepare for publishing.
-  Are you able to email information about a group of graduates from any year - how many worked in an early childhood program in Queensland or elsewhere - has the group met over the years - what anecdotes have they shared about work?

The BKTC G&F Chapter is assembling quite an archive of information about BKTC graduates at work. Now we are seeking grant funding to publish a book based on these data sources.

So please help us build up a rich store of information that can be used to tell about the important contributions that BKTC graduates have made to caring for and educating young people in Queensland.

A 2011 CELEBRATION OF A CENTENARY

BKTC was open to students in 1911.

In 2011 that will be 100 years ago.

BKTC is one of four predecessor institutions of QUT so it is fitting that a celebration of the centenary of this institution should take place within QUT.

This centenary celebration offers:

- Graduates a time to meet together and re-affirm commitments to beliefs and values that were shared through time together within BKTC.
- QUT an opportunity to demonstrate continuing support for philosophies and practices that remain foundational to early care and education.
- Queenslanders a time to reflect on the contributions made by graduates of this foundational institution of QUT.

The BKTC G&F is a smallish group and even though we enjoy considerable support from the Alumni Division of QUT our projects must be manageable.

We are planning a series of events during 2011 that will bring attention to and provide opportunities for graduates and friends to celebrate.

Ideas underway are:

- We are offering 3 year membership 2009-2011 at an attractive fee of \$35. We aim is to build a membership that is supportive of the plans we are making for 2011.
- Extend archive of memorabilia about BKTC to use at functions during 2011.
- Negotiate with QUT La Boite theatre to produce a play for early 2011 that relates to BKTC values, children, parents and teachers.
- Tenth Jean Ferguson OAM Memorial Lecture - July.
- High Tea at Old Govt House - September.
- Submit grant applications - aim is publication of book about BKTC graduates and their work.
- Produce a booklet for visitors to campus using photos and anecdotes to tell about life at BKTC.
- Secure volunteer members who will take visitors to the BKTC site, hand out our booklet and talk about BKTC's contribution to education in Queensland - visitor program limited to dates such as Orientation Week.
- Secure involvement of C&K in at least one of the above projects - acknowledging that this institution promoted and administered the work of BKTC for seventy years.

Eighth Jean Ferguson OAM Memorial Lecture

This event will take place on Tuesday 28 July 2009.

Venue will be Owen J Wordsworth Room, S Block, Level 12, Gardens Point campus QUT starting at 6.30 pm with food and drinks, followed by the presentation from 7.15 pm.

Cost will be \$30 for members, \$40 non-members and \$25 for a limited number of early childhood education students.

The title for 2009 will be *ICT and Child Development: Three Perspectives*

The presentation will involve three speakers and a moderator.

Speakers will offer different perspectives on this issue of technology and young children.

Free parking will be available under the building. BKTC Executive members are offering to arrange transport for members who contact them. More information in June.

JEAN FERGUSON OAM MEMORIAL LECTURE 2008

On 29 July 2008, Dr Susan Irvine, a graduate of BKTC and currently CEO The Gowrie (QLD) Inc. presented the SEVENTH annual Jean Ferguson OAM Memorial lecture. Her presentation focussed on teachers' work with parents - one of the enduring themes related to good practice in early education.

Plan it...but they might not come.

Rethinking parent participation in the early years

Dr S Irvine

Parent participation has been a fundamental tenet of quality early childhood services. From our earliest services, to the current day focus of the Council of Australian Governments, there has been an unwavering emphasis on early childhood professionals working with parents to sustain the best outcomes for children.

Yet, while the overarching focus on parent participation has remained consistent, history reveals a range of different perspectives when it comes to rationale, benefits and practical implementation.

Tonight I plan to reflect on some of these different perspectives.

In the interest of upfront disclosure, I confess some personal baggage in relation to this topic. My own perspectives on parent participation have been shaped by my experience as an early childhood teacher, a policy officer, and a parent using early childhood services. Building on personal interest, this was the focus of my PhD which looked at how parents viewed and experienced their role in using early childhood services. The overarching finding of this study was that parents view and experience

this role in different ways. Not rocket science – but a good reason to step away from singular or narrow approaches to parent participation in the early years.

Tonight, my intent is to highlight some of these different perspectives, and how they can influence parent participation. To do this, I am going to look through three different lenses at the issue of parent participation in early childhood services. The lenses that I am applying are:

- early childhood – theory and practice,
- government policy, and
- parent views and experiences.

Through each of these lenses, I am going to look at how the role of parents is viewed and how this impacts on parent participation in early childhood. My aim is not to endorse the right view or best approach to parent participation, but to challenge those working with children and families to recognise, accept and work with different perspectives. My use of the term ‘participation’ draws on the work of Epstein et al., (1997), which suggests that participation spans any and all interactions and activities to facilitate information sharing, involvement of parents in service activities, through to participation in service decision-making.

The Early Childhood lens

As noted earlier, working in partnership with parents has been a long-standing tenet of quality early childhood services. It is true to say that there are different and changing views on what constitutes parent participation. It is also true to say that the role of parents in early childhood has most often been constructed around the perceived role of the teacher – defined by practitioners and not parents.

Within this context, I have identified two broad perspectives on parent participation in early childhood and I have distinguished these as traditional and contemporary perspectives.

Traditional perspective

The traditional perspective of parent participation is based on the view of ‘teacher as expert’ providing or delivering a service which includes parent education. With the very best of intent, this perspective is evident in many of our earliest services.

Targeting families in need, these services employed qualified professionals to improve outcomes for children. With a focus on holistic child and family needs, and sustainable outcomes, service provision extended to the delivery of parent education.

From its earliest days, Lady Gowrie in Brisbane employed a multi-disciplinary team of professionals (teachers, a registered nurse and a social worker), and offered instruction to mothers on matters of care, education, health and nutrition via mothers groups and home visits. Lillian de Lissa adopted a similar approach in the South Australian Free Kindergartens. Mothers clubs were convened once a month, the primary purpose being to educate the mothers on such topics as child development, diet and hygiene.

Within this traditional model of parent participation, the teacher or qualified professional is generally seen to hold all of the knowledge. The teacher's role is to share this knowledge with parents and the parent's role is to learn and improve their parenting knowledge and skills.

The model promotes one-way communication, and is most often based on a deficit view of parenting (ie. seeking to improve parent knowledge and skills and addressing parenting problems).

Within this context, parent participation is strongly defined and controlled by the service.

The teacher as expert model continued for some time.

I can illustrate this with a personal example. In the mid 80s, I was a relatively new teacher working in a state preschool. As the end of the year and transition to school approached, I was concerned about one of the children in my group, a small and quite frail child called Richard. Richard had been born premature, lived with his young single mum, and demonstrated wide ranging developmental delays. With the best of intent, I met with his mother – who I hadn't seen a great deal and really didn't have a strong relationship with – to recommend that Richard repeat preschool.

She was devastated, then angry, and ultimately rejected my 'expert advice'. However, the story doesn't end there. Having shared information and records with the adjoining school, the principal actually wrote to the mother to advise that he had decided not to accept Richard at school. He instructed her to re-enrol Richard at the preschool.

Now I have no doubt that my professional view regarding Richard's readiness for school was correct. However, in hindsight, I can also now appreciate the multiple factors influencing his immediate well-being at this time. I understand that it was in his best interest to go to school, enabling his mother to seek better employment and support her family. In addition, I hadn't developed much of a relationship with this mother. I had offered the usual opportunities – special events, parent letters, meetings – which she had not taken up. And, when it came to the end of the year, I was a little anxious, and concentrated on how to deliver my message as opposed to how she might view and experience this.

You will be interested to know that this young mum actually won her case, and the school was required to accept Richard.

Perhaps the greatest limitation of the traditional model of parent participation is the absence of two-way information sharing to support the best decisions.

Contemporary perspectives

More contemporary early childhood practice rests on a strengths-based model, promoting parent partnership and participation. Within this model, there is recognition that both parties hold important information and that sharing this is of broad benefit to all concerned – the child, family and professionals working with the child and family.

The focus becomes relationship building and two-way meaningful dialogue. The overriding principle is that positive child outcomes can only be achieved and sustained when parents and early childhood professionals value and respect each other's roles, and work together.

Again, practice and research suggest a continuum of parent participation, spanning involvement as prescribed by the service through to participation in all aspects of service delivery, including service decision-making.

I believe that parents need, want and should have a voice in what happens for their child at a service, and feel competent and in control of their child's nurturing and well being.

It is our job to support them in this endeavour.

Government perspectives

The second lens that I wish to apply is Government policy.

A review of Australian early childhood public policy over the past twenty-five years reveals changing views on the role of parents and parent participation in ECEC.

Within this context, there are two dominant perspectives:

the view of parent as consumer.

the view of parent as participant.

Parent as consumer

Take a moment to look at how these policy perspectives position parents and define parent participation.

With the rise of the early childhood mixed market in the 1990s, government policy positioned parents as individual consumers of services. Their primary role being to select the 'right' service for their child. Government policy at this time encouraged parents to shop around and early childhood services to be more customer focused. According to Rizvi (1995), this constitutes a market view of participation where emphasis is placed on the sovereignty of the individual. Services are directly accountable to individual parents (consumers) and the key avenue for parent participation is at the point of selecting or choosing to exit a service.

From a straight market perspective, this is seen to offer a strong mechanism to parents, where good services will flourish and bad services will cease to operate as parents exercise their choices.

There are some positive aspects to this view of parent participation. In particular, the emphasis on promoting informed consumers who have particular rights. In practice, however, there are also significant limitations to this approach. It relies on parents having access to good information, and having real choices in terms of services (not simply between centre 1 or 2 of the local corporate chain). Despite the best economic arguments, many researchers look at this as a weak model of participation where parents are at liberty to choose from what's on offer, but are unable to really influence what is provided.

Parent as participant

While concepts of market theory and parent-as-consumer remain evident, more recent policy places greater emphasis on democratic participation.

Related social policy promotes themes of consultation, involvement, partnership, and collaboration spanning the design, implementation and evaluation of services. This leads to a renewed emphasis on the role of parents as participants in ECEC. It takes us back to our grass roots. Early childhood services emerged from the community sector and parent participation has been a strong principle underpinning ECEC in Australia.

The push for increased participation is based on research promoting the benefits of this. The general view is that enhanced parent participation yields positive outcomes for all concerned – children, families, staff and service providers, governments and communities.

Identified benefits include:

- knowledge sharing and skill development
- improved relationships and connections
- more relevant and responsive services
- improved job satisfaction for staff in services.

However, to achieve these benefits, it is argued that parent participation needs to extend a voice to parents, promoting two-way meaningful dialogue and participation in service decision-making.

Now, I need to point out that the line between these two policy perspectives is not always as clean cut as I am suggesting here. In fact, frequently, both views sit side by side in contemporary ECEC policy. I originally had some difficulty with this, perceiving some contradiction between the idea of parent as consumer and parent as participant.

While there is clearly tension, I am now thinking that pragmatically both are relevant to our current context. Parents are paying for a service and have particular expectations and rights when it comes to service provision – some of which are enshrined in legislation and related quality standards. Nevertheless, new knowledge and understanding, supports participation beyond the traditional consumer context and policy is looking at ways to promote and facilitate this.

It is therefore not surprising to find both perspectives co-existing in current national ECEC policy. For example:

- The proposed new Accreditation system – with its focus on a 5 star rating system can be linked to the notion of parent as consumer and supporting informed consumer choices.
- The establishment of integrated parent and child centres arguably starts with a consumer focus, but extends to one of parent and community participation and connectedness.

So far we have explored four different perspectives on the role of parents and parent participation in early childhood.

These span traditional and contemporary early childhood views and government policy views positioning parents as consumers and/or participants in early childhood. Significantly, these views are not confined to Australia and are also evident in the

international context. Each of these views promotes a particular way of fulfilling the role of parent in ECEC. These are the roles on offer to parents. And each of these views sets a particular framework for parent participation.

Yet, these roles have been constructed for parents by others, with little reference to the views and experiences of parents using ECEC.

Parent views and experiences

Identifying this gap in our knowledge base, I took opportunity through my PhD to examine parent participation through the eyes of parents.

The aim of this research was to enhance understanding of parent views and experiences in early childhood, in particular, how parents viewed and experienced their role in using early childhood services. Recognising diversity in Australian family life, it seems reasonable to expect that different parents may have different views and expectations of their role. These are likely to be influenced by factors including work status, family responsibilities, social class, cultural background and gender. With this in mind, I was particularly interested in identifying and understanding variation in parent views and experiences.

My focus here wasn't to determine the best or one right way to approach parent participation in ECEC. It was merely to better know and appreciate different approaches by different parents. Given that as a teacher, and a parent, I have my own particular views on this topic, it wasn't easy to suspend my own biases and look objectively at different views and experiences. However, this is what I did, and this is what I am asking you to do tonight.

I would like you to try to set aside your own views, to see different ways of viewing and experiencing parent participation. I want you to simply appreciate these different views and experiences, without casting any judgement on their merit.

The study

The aim of the study was to identify different ways of viewing and experiencing the role of parents. To do this, I used a methodology called phenomenography. Without going into this in great detail, the aim of this approach is to look at similarities and differences in the way that something is experienced by different individuals. Different ways of experiencing are grouped together and then analysed to determine what makes them different. The underpinning rationale is that by understanding different ways of experiencing something, we can develop a richer appreciation of the whole and better ways of working within this context.

The study involved 26 parents (mothers & fathers) with recent experience using ECEC. In line with my selected methodology, I employed a process of purposive sampling, seeking to maximise variation amongst the parents in my study.

Data were collected by individual semi-structured interviews. All interviews were audio-taped, then transcribed verbatim. The transcripts were subjected to a rigorous process of phenomenographic analysis.

The study identified five categories or qualitatively different ways that parents viewed and experienced their role in using EC services. Each category of description differs through the meaning parents assigned to their role and the way they experienced that role. I need to stress that these categories are based on collective parental views and experiences, grouping together similar views and experiences. Let's take a moment to look more closely at the different ways these parents experienced this role.

Category 1

Parents defined their role as selecting the best service for their child, based on a range of criteria, and then using that service. The distinguishing feature of this category was the focus on service use. This was revealed in responses such as these:

Make sure I find the best one... one that will be the most for my son.

I just pick him up and drop him off...say hello and that's the end of it.

These parents questioned the notion of any ongoing formal role, beyond making a choice of service. Having selected and enrolled, they expressed reliance on the service for information, in particular if something happens or there is a problem.

In the case of a problem arising, these parents said they would be more likely to change service than raise the problem.

Category 2

Parents defined their role as knowing what is happening for their child in the service. The distinguishing feature of this category was the focus on information and communication (albeit one-way). As in the previous category, these parents sought the best service but identified an ongoing monitoring role. This focus is evident in responses such as these:

I like to know what's going on. I like to be part of it.

First thing I do is ask my children if they've had a happy day... I talk to the carer...normally she will say what they've done. That's how I keep track of it.

These parents perceived that it was the service provider's role to provide information, but also identified strategies they used to find out what was happening (talk with child, staff, notice boards, newsletters and visiting the service). They acknowledged they also had information to share but perceived it was the service's responsibility to seek this information.

Category 3

Parents saw themselves as consumers, paying for a service and thereby enacting certain consumer rights. The distinguishing feature of this category is the focus on parent as consumer. As in the previous categories, these parents wanted to find the best service and perceived an ongoing monitoring role.

This view is reflected in statements such as:

Well, I'm paying for it, so I suppose I am a consumer.

I feel if I'm paying for it...and I have a problem, I have the right to stand up and say...fix it, it's not good enough.

These parents saw themselves as consumers or customers, paying for a service (either directly or indirectly as tax payers). Within this context, they perceived certain consumer rights, in particular, the right to raise issues or concerns relating to their child in the service.

The role of parents was conceived as a reaction to an identified problem with service provision. Parent participation is motivated by and restricted to identifying and raising problems.

Category 4

Parents described their role in terms of a partnership. These parents saw their role as supporting their selected service & having some say in what happens for their child. As in previous categories, these parents sought to find the best service, wanted to know what's happening, and engaged in ongoing monitoring - including raising concerns. The distinguishing feature of this category was a sense of shared responsibility for quality service provision, as revealed in responses such as:

Helping out...show them support, because your children are with them.

I feel more of a partnership rather than a consumer. In a partnership it's equal. With a consumer, you're using...

These parents perceived they had something to offer (skills, time) and that their contribution made it better for their child and others.

They also perceived their involvement, in various ways, provided enhanced access to information and staff.

Category 5

Parents defined their role as working as a member of the service community, for the benefit of all concerned. Once again, these parents identified similar role aspects to those in previous categories. However, the distinguishing feature of this conception is these parents saw themselves as members of a service community and discussed their role within this context. These parents talked about working together and the benefits of a sense of community, as evidenced in the following responses:

Being informed and being included in the decision making loop.

A really good P&C makes a really good school. It involves all the parents and it provides a sense of community for people. And I think that community helps the kids....

These parents looked for opportunities to be involved, were proactive in seeking information and sharing their views, and expected to be included in service decision making.

While not suggesting that all parents fit into one of these 5 categories, I would suggest that many here would identify parents who perhaps share similar views. In fact, the study puts forward something of a continuum of parent participation, spanning none to limited to high levels of participation.

The main finding of the study was that these parents viewed and experienced their role in a limited number of qualitatively different ways. In addition, the study revealed varying views as to what constitutes parent participation from a parent's perspective. Running along a continuum of sorts, parent participation was seen to span anything

from ‘knowing what’s happening’, to raising concerns, to supporting your service, to working together and taking part in decision making.

Conclusion

So, as promised, I have shared a number of different perspectives on parent participation in early childhood.

We have looked at early childhood perspectives and traditional and contemporary views of parent participation.

We have looked at government policy perspectives and notions of parent as consumer and parent as participant in early childhood.

And, we have looked at the different ways that parents may view and experience parent participation in ECEC, spanning no to little participation to high levels of participation.

Clearly, there are many different perspectives as to what constitutes parent participation in early childhood. On the basis of this, defining parent participation too narrowly or constructing a particular role for parents is likely to have minimal impact. Rather than promoting one right way for parents to act, or providing narrow opportunities for participation, there is a need for a broad and multi-layered approach to parent participation in ECEC.

Such an approach would recognise and respond to the different ways that parents view and experience their role and would seek to optimise parent participation in a range of ways. It would be based on the evidence that the vast majority of parents want the best for their children, are interested in knowing what is happening for them, and perceive they have information to share about their children.

Recognising different parent views and experiences in ECEC, the focus becomes respecting and working with difference. The goal being to find ways to optimise participation, while accepting that this will be different for different parents. And, accepting that this is okay – and by no means an indication of parent interest or commitment to their child or service.

References

Epstein, J. L., Coates, L., Salinas, K. C., Sanders, M. G., & Simon, B. S. (1997). School, family, and community partnerships : Your handbook for action. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Irvine, S.,(2005). Parent conceptions of their role in early childhood education and care: A phenomenographic study from Queensland, Australia. PhD thesis. QUT: Brisbane.

Australian Dictionary of Biography On-line edition. Lilian de Lissa. At <http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A080294b.htm> Accessed on 30 June 2008.

Rizvi, F. (1995). Discourses of participation. In B. Limerick & H. Nielsen (Eds.), School and community relations: Participation, policy and practice. Marrickville, NSW, Australia: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Members financial 2009-2011

1	Mrs	Janice	Akes	
2	Mrs	Rhonda	Biggs	
3	Mrs	Frances	Clark	
4	Ms	Marian	Clegg	
5	Mrs	Anne	Dallas	
6	Ms	Annabel	Daunt Watney	
7	Mrs	Rosemarie	Dawes	
8	Mr	Bill	Deans	
9	Mrs	Chris	Denning	
10	Mrs	Mary	Elliott	
11	Mrs	Fran	Fitch	
12	Dr	Deborah	Gahan	
13	Mrs	Jocelyn	Grant-Taylor	
14	Dr	Gail	Halliwell	
15	Mrs	Valerie	Hall-Matthews	
16	Mrs	Carmel	Harrison	
17	Mrs	Sue	Hayne	
18	Mrs	Edna	Irwin	
19	Mrs	Juliette	Job	
20	Ms	Christine	Larkin	
21	Mrs	Jennette	Lavis	OAM
22	Mrs	Janet	Lehmann	
23	Ms	Ruth	Lightbody	
24	Mrs	Barbara	MacDiarmid	
25	Mrs	Joan	Macnaught	
26	Adjunct Professor	Mary	Mahoney	AO
27	Mrs	Jeanette	Martin	
28	Mrs	Betty	McCutchan	
29	Mrs	Pam	McGahey	
30	Mrs	Libby	McMicking	
31	Mrs	Margaret	Moss	
32	Ms	Josephine	Musumeci	
33	Ms	Cathy	O'Connor	
34	Mrs	Mary	O'Sullivan	
35	Mrs	Jennifer	Parsons	
36	Mrs	Althea	Pearson	
37	Dr	Rosemary	Perry	
38	Mrs	Pam	Quinn	
39	Ms	Rosalie	Raciti	
40	Mrs	Alison	Robson	
41	Mrs	Merelyn	Rostron	
42	Mrs	Anne	Russell	
43	Mrs	Margaret	Sear	

44	Ms	Christine	Shackleton-Skuja	
45	Ms	Sheree	Shannon	
46	Mrs	Denise	Sherwood	
47	Mrs	Margaret	Slaughter	
48	Mrs	Anne	Taylor	
49	Mrs	Marie	Tiley	
50	Ms	Marjorie	Voss	
51	Ms	Susan	Whitaker	
52	Mrs	Julie	Whiting	
53	Mrs	Vicki	Whittle	
54	Ms	Therese	Wolters	