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Successful theatre hinges on relationships. In our research, we devised an immersive theatre piece about urban wildlife through key early childhood education concepts outlined in the Canadian document *Flight: Alberta’s Early Learning and Care Framework*. The project’s guiding question was: How could we better understand audience engagement in the early years demographic by using the reflective process, rights-based perspectives, and holistic play-based goals of the *Flight* framework to interpret children’s experiences? Our creative team aimed to develop democratic and playful relationships with children during theatrical exploration, and using the *Flight* framework to analyse what children were communicating grounded our theatre creation and dramaturgy in respectful and agentic relationships between actors, theatrical objects, and young children.

The *Flight: Alberta’s Early Learning and Care Framework* was integral to how we thought about creation, dramaturgy, and audience reception. Canadian-devised theatre has been profoundly influenced by the Halprins’ RSVP cycles (and their later interpretation as Cycles REPÈRE, as developed by Canada’s Jacques Lessard and famously used by Robert LePage). RSVP stands for resources (what you have to work with, including physical and human resources, and their motivations), score (the process leading to the performance), valuaction (evaluation, decision, and action), and performance (the sum of the score and the style). Meanwhile, the Cycles REPÈRE acronym refers to RESources, Participation, Evaluation, and REPresentation. In both devising systems, actors and designers collaboratively explore materials (characters, text, design, and props) before a score or script is fixed; this collaboration is done through a cyclical process of participation, evaluation, and re-evaluation. Much of the cyclical part of the work happens in the valuaction or evaluation stage. As RSVP resources include the creative team and what they bring to the process, devising often focuses on the creative ideas and interests in the room. To devise in a child-centred, relationship-focused way, we applied the *Flight* Cycle of Co-Inquiry (Figure 27.1) to the valuaction stage of the devising process.

In collaboration with others, educators use the Cycle of Co-Inquiry, based on Dewey’s co-inquiry process (Abramson, 2012), to focus on refining, clarifying, and deepening understandings about teaching and learning experiences in support of co-constructing curriculum. With permission to video-record and photograph our audience, we discussed
during the Cycle reflection processes of Talking the Documentation and Curriculum Cross-checking (Makovichuk et al., 2014b, p. 4). The Cycle of Co-Inquiry kept the focus on children’s meaning-making as we aimed to make meaningful work. To date, our creative research process has included three distinct offerings, which were shared with three audiences of children (ages two to four) from Early Learning at MacEwan (ELM) (Edmonton, AB), the children’s education centre at our university. Considering urban wildlife that our local child audiences would be familiar with, our team first spent a week with the children exploring ideas about four creatures: chickadees, magpies, hares (jackrabbits), and squirrels. Using resources we had available and materials we constructed, we interpreted the animals in a variety of ways, including puppetry, movement, sound, and music. For brevity, this chapter will focus on the representations of chickadees and squirrels and on examples of how the Cycle of Co-Inquiry influenced relationships between actors, theatrical design, and audiences. Each immersive theatre experience began with a preamble; next came a creative offering of rehearsed and semi-improvised scenes by actors, with select scenic elements, props, and costume pieces; we closed with open playtime, in which the actors and the young audience members played together with the materials we had incorporated into the creative offering. After sharing the vignettes and playing with the children, we reflected, revised, and planned additional material to explore.

Figure 27.1 A diagram of the cycle of the Flight model of Co-Inquiry for co-constructing curriculum
Introduction to Flight

The foundation for the structure of *Flight: Alberta’s Early Learning and Care Framework* (Makovichuk et al., 2014a) is built upon shared values for early learning processes; guiding principles that emphasize the significance of early experiences; and meaningful relationships with children, families, and communities. These values, principles, and relationships shift the emphasis from ‘best practices’ to practice which is embedded in a reciprocal, relational, and rights-based context which supports the child-centred devising cycle we wanted to develop. Rather than a curriculum with specific subject outcomes, *Flight* focuses on broad, holistic, play-based goals (well-being, play and playfulness, communication and literacies, respect for diversity, and social responsibility) and dispositions to learn (playing and playfulness, seeking, participating, persisting, caring) to describe and interpret children’s experiences and meaning-making. Using the language of the holistic play-based goals and dispositions to learn offers a common vocabulary for making visible the potential meaning and learning opportunities an experience might have. With the image in mind of children as mighty learners and citizens, educators use the specific co-inquiry tools and processes of Talking the Documentation and Curriculum Cross-checking to interpret children’s responses. Talking the Documentation is a process of looking for meaning in what children are doing/communicating through their play and participation. Sharing multiple perspectives through revisiting and reflecting on documented observations, educators ask questions and look for patterns, continued interests, and repeated use of objects. Curriculum Cross-checking refers to using the *Flight* curriculum framework goals to describe and interpret the meaning of what children are doing (Makovichuk et al., 2014a, p. 142; 2014b, pp. 2–4), guiding educators as they nurture and expand experiences for children. Seeing children as citizens who are strong, resourceful, and capable learners “affirms each child’s right to be listened to, to be treated with respect, and to participate in daily decisions that affect him or her” and “shifts the intention of our interactions from ‘doing to’ a child toward ‘participating with’ each child” (Makovichuk et al., 2014a, p. 39). In this way, the curriculum is democratically co-constructed with young children. The role of the educator is to work and play alongside children as co-learners, co-researchers, and co-imaginers of possibilities.

Although *Flight* is not a document written to support dramaturgy, Talking the Documentation enabled us to ask more relevant questions, and Curriculum Cross-checking guided us to interpret children’s responses to our creative offerings in more nuanced ways. By adopting *Flight’s* values, rights-based approaches, and the Cycle of Co-Inquiry, we kept children’s meaning-making central to our devising process. *Flight* changed how we invited meaningful, respectful, and playful relationships between actors, objects, and children because it reminded us to pay attention to what children might be expressing through their responses and to observe and learn from the ways they make meaning for themselves. The way *Flight* encourages early childhood educators to use responsive practices as they co-learn, co-research, and co-imagine possibilities with children inspired our approach to theatrical design; our incorporation of playful, abstract ways of communicating ideas and our interpretation of audience engagement, in turn, influenced our theatrical creation. Ultimately, we wanted to create a democratic, shared, and immersive theatre experience. *Flight’s* core concepts – recognizing the child as a mighty learner and citizen; working in a practice of relationships; considering time, space, materials, and participation as part of responsive environments – led us to do that more collaboratively with our young audience.
Responsive environment and theatrical design

Establishing an immersive theatre environment in which to share our creative offerings and engage with the young audience meant defining the performance space and encouraging our young audiences to have a relationship with the theatrical design (in RSVP, these are resources, while in *Flight*, the similar focus on materials is understood as a “responsive environment”: time, space, materials, and participation). *Flight* draws attention to the ways that children grow to understand their roles “as responsible citizens as they participate daily in communities where their voices are heard and their contributions are valued, and where they learn to value the contributions of others” (Makovichuk et al., 2014, p. 112). The success of our co-constructed theatrical experience relies on the children understanding that their contributions influence the production as a whole: as Manscher and Jancovic put it, “Every child must feel – both during and after the show – that: ‘...if I hadn’t been there, the show would have been different’” (quoted in Reason, 2010, p. 41). Actors engaging with the audience in respectful and responsive ways at the outset create a supportive environment in which children can explore immersive theatrical experience possibilities. We want them to feel that they can question the conventions of theatre and that their contributions are valued, but, as responsible citizen-audience members, it is important for them to consider that they are part of a meaningful shared experience for all participants. This approach gives children an opportunity to develop awareness of the perspective of others in the space—the educators, the other children, and the actors—creating a climate of reciprocity.

Since our offerings took place in an early learning centre and in a rehearsal hall, rather than inside a defined theatre, we discussed ways the spaces could encourage our young audience to participate in “intellectually, socially, and culturally engaging environment(s)” (Makovichuk et al., 2014a, p. 33). In rehearsal, when the actors explored magpies building nests out of large pieces of fabric, the idea of providing children with their own nests, using blankets and pillows—familiar objects that offer comfort and security—emerged, while still creating an atmosphere that welcomed participation.

This space and actor/audience relationship functioned differently in the two spaces in which we shared our work. Providing the audience with a place of their own was only partially successful in the early learning centre. Children started on the blanket-nests, but soon some of them crawled into the acting area and grabbed props or blocked the view for other children. We believe that there were two primary reasons for this behaviour. There was little difference between the blankets and the carpeted floors of the ELM, and the space was too crowded (10’ × 20’) to allow the audience to move while remaining on the blankets. Second, the children were in a caring and safe environment to which they belonged, where they were used to accessing all of the areas within the centre and where the culture was already defined. Since our research examined how children would want to engage with an immersive theatrical performance, we purposely did not inform them that we expected them to remain on the blankets. As a result, the children may have expected the actors to conform to ELM conventions about their space, rather than adopt new conventions associated with a theatrical experience.

Although we wanted children to respond kinaesthetically in the performance space, *Flight* helped us to recognize the need to define the space differently in order to facilitate a respectful relationship. During the actor debriefing of the first offering, our young actors discussed why the confining space at ELM did not always support the theatrical interactions we planned. The actors had not anticipated the variety of connections they experienced, which included a lot of child-initiated physical contact, as audience children grabbed the actors’ feet and poked the actors to get their attention. Using *Flight* means asking questions about
these reactions and avoiding making facile assumptions about what the children’s behaviours mean, so that our dramaturgy responds effectively. Maybe they were curious, enthusiastic, or uncertain of the expectations. The early childhood educators recommended introducing our audience to some theatre conventions and using some familiar Flight language, such as “respecting the materials, equipment, and spaces shared with others” and “treating others with respect” (Makovichuk et al., 2014a, p. 112).

We presented our second offering in a theatre rehearsal space, which provided opportunities to address concerns about democratic relationships raised in the actor debriefing. Led by the actors using chickadee puppets, the children were invited into the unfamiliar room and settled onto blankets. The audience accepted these ‘nests’ as their safe places and took control of them by sitting, lying, and rolling on them. A few of them moved from nest to nest, settling into spots where they felt most comfortable. Children flew from their nests and stood to interact with the actors, but returned to their nests when appropriate. When two girls wanted to be closer to the action than their nest allowed, they edged closer, bringing their nest along with them, negotiating the implicit rules of space (Makovichuk et al., 2014a, p. 100). We believe some children in the audience were beginning to develop a sense of belonging, and that they were identifying and using the nests as personal landmarks (p. 94), spaces that they could identify with as they were becoming familiar with the new sights, sounds, and rhythms of these theatre experiences.

At one point, the actors told a story using small bunnies and squirrels, and a blanket to make a green hill (Figure 27.2). As the actors put the animals to bed, the children echoed the behaviour, asking their educators to cover them up as they lay down, “generating a shared repertoire of narratives and memories” (p. 94) and demonstrating their developing awareness of the imagined and ordinary worlds that they move between as they play (p. 99). Some child expressions of multimodal learning, such as large motor movement, were easier to engage with in the large studio rehearsal hall than in the children’s smaller classroom. In open playtime, while exploring the space and the props, children created shared narratives, using the blankets to fly, imitating the magpie wings used in the performance (p. 99). Flight’s Cycle of Co-Inquiry meant that as we revisited these particular moments and

Figure 27.2 Snuggling down. Urban Wildlife workshop, Collective Creation, dir. – H. Fitzsimmons Frey, photo – R. Ayles, MacEwan University, June 13, 2019, Actors: Ayla Gandall, Aidan Spila, Emma Abbott
the responses of the children, we asked ourselves the following questions: How are children making meaning? What are possible meanings? How should our dramaturgy respond in the future? Guided by *Flight*, our valuation decision-making was child- and relationship-led rather than being exclusively led by a creative team in a rehearsal hall.

**Play, multimodal literacies, and children’s responses: chickadees**

As part of our research process, our design team and actors went to the North Saskatchewan river valley to encounter chickadees, so that we could bring experiences of chickadee sound and movement as materials (resources) that we drew upon for our performance sharing. Our team developed three ways to portray the little bird: through sound; through a tiny, crocheted puppet; and through embodied exploration. While our audiences may not have experienced a chickadee encounter in a river valley themselves, these birds are so common in Edmonton that children would likely have prior knowledge of chickadees that they could use to interpret and extend our creative offerings. Multimodal literacies “[involve] how children make use of various sign systems as they construct meaning through multiple modes of image, print, gaze, gesture, movement, and speech, often using these modes simultaneously” (Makovichuk, 2014a, p. 145). Our chickadee explorations playfully engaged with multimodal literacies, and exploring facets of chickadees offered children a different way to think about and express ideas about birds.

One creative response to the river valley chickadee experience was a multimodal improvised song. Actors sat on the floor and looked up into imaginary trees, initially listening to pre-recorded birdcalls, then vocalizing and building a song. The song was reminiscent of chickadee birdcalls but became a complex abstraction of sound beyond the realistic notion of the bird. Building our song as the children listened meant they could hear how sound could inspire something new, while linking the sonic interpretation to the feelings we associated with an afternoon in the woods with the birds.

Applying *Flight*’s Cycle of Co-Inquiry to the dramaturgy of the moment demonstrated that our song functioned in several ways: it allowed children to use prior knowledge, introduced them to some theatrical conventions, and provided a transition into the theatrical space. Recognizing that children co-construct knowledge and co-imagine possibilities with one another and with us as theatre artists, the recordings of real chickadee calls evoked the children’s own knowledge of the birds. Through singing the increasingly abstract song, the actors introduced the audience to some key theatrical conventions: we can perform “as if” and we can be inspired to do something new. “In play, children use words and symbols to transform the world around them, creating worlds where they can act ‘as if’ rather than ‘as is’” (p. 98). *Flight* helps us understand that, in play, children develop dispositions for flexible and fluid thinking as they negotiate the meaning of symbols with others. In the slow introduction to the performance, when children could see and hear the actors use the symbolic language of drama, they also could see how using symbolic language could transform in a theatrical space. Modelling the use of multimodal literacies, the actors used their voices to playfully explore the properties of the chickadee calls (p. 100), resulting in a sound language that meant chickadee. Functioning as a transition, the song extended the children’s prior knowledge of chickadees while introducing them to some of the conventions of drama that they could use to help them navigate the offering. Some children softly called out, “Chickadees!” demonstrating that they had made the connection. A few children made chickadee songs or calls, expressing their interest in co-creating with the actors, but most listened intently as the increasingly unfamiliar and
slightly eerie song evolved. The song aimed to calm the space and help the children feel secure, yet also foster a sense of anticipation – what would happen next? In our process of Talking the Documentation, we agreed that the children’s affective response to the music, as well as their uncertainty about what to expect in the performance, probably explains why most children chose to participate by observing as opposed to contributing their voices to the song.

We brought the river valley experience of chickadee movement into our creative offering in two ways: with puppets and with embodied exploration. The chickadee-sized puppets looped over an actor’s finger as if perched there (Figure 27.3).

By creating swooping and fluttering patterns with their arms, the actors could fly the puppets around and land them on a child’s shoulder, a knee, or a hand when invited. The chickadee puppets welcomed the children, ushered them in, guided them to the nests, and invited them to participate in actor-audience engagement and play. Flight’s conception of democratic practices includes children learning to be responsible and responsive members of the community, practising democratic decision-making, and making choices in matters that affect them (p. 112). Establishing some shared understanding of the democratic practices (p. 112) of respecting materials and spaces, this early welcoming engagement also introduced children to puppets, another convention of dramatic storytelling. Some children pointed out that the chickadees weren’t real, asserting their own prior knowledge about urban wildlife, but willingly played along, reaching out their hands and allowing the birds to hop into them, and sometimes calling: “Here, birdie!” Through the puppets, the actors indicated that they would welcome the opportunity to negotiate symbolic language with the children, and that they could co-create shared narratives through play together (p. 99). Our actors modelled playful and respectful engagement with the space, the puppets, and with each other, while the children were testing the limits of their own creative engagement with the space and the puppets.

Finally, the actors shared the idea of chickadee movement with full-body exploration. The actors hopped, cocked their heads in jerky ways, and ‘flew’ by flapping their arms and shuffling their feet in order to launch or hover. They startled easily and responded to loud
sounds. The actors’ movement vocabulary was immediately clear to the child audience, several of whom got to their feet again and started to fly and hop in the space, once again demonstrating an interest in co-creating narrative. When we performed in their own classroom space, that kind of behaviour was not taken up until the open playtime; but in the much larger open studio space, some children were inspired to move like birds and occupy as much of the space as possible. A few children experimented with hopping and making head gestures, and one child even got to his feet and tilted his head in a way that invited an actor to hop over and nearly touch ‘beaks’ before breaking away.

This wordless invitation to play and to embody a familiar bird was also an appeal to develop relationships with the actors, and playing at being chickadees was a co-constructed moment that demonstrated Flight principles of child-led democratic practice in action.

Interpreting children’s actions to inform theatrical creation: squirrels

Red squirrels are commonly seen and heard in parks and yards across the city of Edmonton. Squirrels are extraordinarily agile and light; they whisk, they frisk, and they chatter. They are tiny whirlwinds of energy that bound along branches and vault from tree to tree, scolding humans and other squirrels alike. They alternate between jerky staccato movement and sound to graceful leaps and sporadic scampers. They battle over food and territory but will call alarms to other squirrels if an intruder is present. Our actors observed urban squirrels in a local park and then improvised actions and sounds that invoked ‘squirrel-ness’. They explored props and noisemakers, movement, and sound effects in ways that abstracted squirrels. We wanted to inspire children to develop their own multi-sensory creative responses to squirrels.

The process of Curriculum Cross-checking encouraged us to name how children were making meaning from our representations. Using play-based vocabulary and Talking the Documentation encouraged us to ask questions about the kinds of meaning the children were making during the performance and after play and about the opportunities they might be craving in response to the performance. This child-centred approach to devising was particularly revealing when we addressed two ideas we had about representing squirrels in abstract ways.

Imitating the light, leaping shape of squirrel movement, actors manipulated short brown gymnastics-inspired ribbons that shifted the focus to how a squirrel moves through space – something bulky humans had trouble representing, while the wave-like ribbon could scamper, race, freeze, and leap with ease. We hoped the children’s prior knowledge of squirrels would support their recognition of the animal represented by the ribbons, yet while the children identified the squirrel sounds accompanying the movement sequence, they seemed to be uncertain about what the ribbons meant. At the first offering, the space was very small, and the ribbons were very close to the audience – too close, as it turns out. Children responded as though it was a game that invited them to play with the materials. Before long, a child reached out to grab a ribbon, and the movement froze. After gently taking the ribbon from the child, the actors put the ribbons away and began their next scene. However, the ribbons were so tempting that one child crept over to the prop box and pulled one out, creating a bit of chaos. Drawing on Flight, we know children learn about the world through playfully exploring and investigating the properties of objects and experimenting with action and reaction, cause and effect (Makовичук et al., 2014a, p. 100). While the ribbons were fascinating, we had not introduced them in a way that worked for the creative offering
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as a whole, or in a way that fostered democratic and respectful relationships between actors, audience, and objects.

To distinguish the creative potential of the ribbons from the performance and the children's responses and meaning-making, we identified several key issues. One was the limited space at ELM, and another was that our young actors did not know how to respond to the children's playful offerings. Afterwards, using Flight's language of democratic practices, nurturing social responsibility and inclusion to discuss the possible ways to interpret the children's responses, we reminded our actors of key principles of improv theatre: offering and accepting the offer. In this case, the children made an offer, and it was not accepted by the actors. In addition, the actors did not make an offer (of the ribbon stick), and the children wanted an offer. The Cycle of Co-Inquiry helped us to revisit that moment so that we could consider how we could create a theatrical structure that supported a democratic experience for the children and the actors in a way that allowed both actors and children to say, “Yes! And...”

In the final workshop, which occurred in the children's space in ELM, the actors brought the props and materials they had used in the previous two performances, intending to explore creative possibilities through play with the children. We selected materials and vignettes that we felt had been less successful at previous offerings, in order to explore these concepts in a less presentational way. One actor showed the children how to move the ribbons so that they could scamper and leap like squirrels. When some children moved onto other activities, one boy – we believe it was the boy who had crept over to the prop box during our very first squirrel offering – asked one of our research partners to help him to master the squirrel ribbon manipulation. After working with her, the boy took the ribbon to a private corner and kept practising on his own. Flight reminds us that children's responses are not always immediate and may develop over time.

Another highly abstract squirrel interpretation that Flight helped us develop was a movement piece we called Squirrel-in-the-Body. The original provocation was: “What would it be like if there was a squirrel in a particular body part?” Actors experimented with animating specific parts of their own bodies as if a squirrel occupied it, and then passed the invisible squirrel between them. The invisible squirrel could race through the actor’s shoulder, through their torso, and into a hip, before the actor passed it on to another performer’s foot. To help link the actors’ movements to an invisible squirrel, we played an audio track of real squirrels chattering. Some children called out, “What are they doing?”, “They look like a worm!” Another child called, “Come here, squirrel”. When the actors offered to exchange the invisible squirrel with children in the audience, some moved closer and reached out, but none took the invitation to accept the squirrel into their own body. The process of Talking the Documentation asked us to rethink the meanings children were making during the Squirrel-in-the-Body vignette, which, unlike the original ribbon-squirrels offering, included an invitation to play. If they misunderstood the implicit rules of the game, or the intention to pass the movement because of their limited experience with symbols of drama, what kinds of meanings were they making from the gestures, and what could we do to help make our intentions more clear, generous, and inclusive? The smaller workshop iteration gave our actors opportunities to work with individual children and develop meaningful play-based relationships. Although actors did not use verbal language in our earlier offerings, during this exploratory workshop, they used words. Using language and a more personal connection, one actor adapted Squirrel-in-the-Body movements to Hare-in-the-Hand movements and the children readily took up the idea and played along, passing the hare between them (Figure 27.4). Relationship and communication altered how the children responded and made meaning out of the vignette.
Children’s responses influenced our dramaturgy. We concluded that our initial creative squirrel interpretations may have been recognizable if we had led with more concrete examples and followed these with abstract ones, as we had done with the chickadees. We also believe the children’s inconsistent responses to our performance suggest that some may need more time to engage with the materials, symbols, and practices of drama in their own ways, before they are willing to share in that narrative with the actors and that our actors need to be more comfortable with nurturing reciprocal relationships with children during performance. In addition, as theatre practitioners, we often expect immediate audience responses affirming that our communication is working, but we have to consider that results may not be immediate. In fact, returning to some of the same children, we were reminded that as young children accumulate experience, they may reveal later what they have interpreted. When we intentionally made children our creative partners by co-imagining possibilities with them, our relationship to our young audience shifted how we worked through the valuaction/evaluation stage of the devising cycle: our dramaturgical decision-making revisited each moment and idea through our relationships with children.

**Following paths of Flight**

Playtime is an essential part of the theatrical experience for children because it offers dedicated space and time to make meaning; it is also essential for this child-centred devising cycle because the creative team can focus on interpreting children’s meaning-making. During post-sharing open playtime, children synthesised aspects of the performance, and performers saw what elements of the offering suggested links for the audience. In addition, revisiting our young audience many weeks later allowed us to re-evaluate particular elements and reflect on and refine them. Playtime encourages the *audience* to have ownership of the event and encourages *actors* to respond to ways that children make meaning through their own creative
practices. Engaging in democratic practices and shared relationships means that audience uptake will happen in its own time, and possibly in a different form than what we, as theatre makers, anticipate.

Our immersive theatre experience for the very young aimed to create opportunities for children and actors to engage in respectful, playful, and meaning-rich relationships with one another and with the theatrical materials and space. The play-based values and interpretative processes associated with Flight, such as Talking the Documentation and Curriculum Cross-checking, have proven to be valuable resources to help us interpret how children are responding to the creative offering and how actors and children can co-create playful, exploratory learning experiences through multimodal literacies. Using Flight values as we workshopped this material also helped us put children in the centre of every aspect of our devising process. Besides demonstrating the powerful relationship-based, rights-based, and play-based learning that dramatic play offers in early childhood settings, these insights, gleaned through the lens of Flight, provide building blocks to creating engaging, responsive, and respectful theatrical productions for very young audiences. Flight establishes a framework for the valuation step of the RSVP devising method, helping practitioners make child-centred, thoughtful, meaning-rich decisions about devised dramaturgy for the very young.
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Notes

1 For more analysis on RSVP and REPÈRE see Houle (2022), Hunt (1989), or Scholte (2019).
2 The first of the three offerings took place in ELM, with 16 children and four early childhood educators. The second offering was given in a university acting studio with another group of 15 ELM children (some different and some the same). For the third offering, we returned to ELM with an artist residency (nine children) that explored several ideas about sound, physical movement, story, and materials, in response to questions raised in the previous offerings. In this third offering, our actors had a scaffold structure of questions to explore with children, and they approached those in a non-linear, non-performative, and collaborative way.
3 The Flight framework is informed by diverse curriculum frameworks and post-foundational perspectives of learning in Canada and across the world. A few examples are: The New Brunswick Curriculum Framework for Early Learning and Child Care, Canada; Te Whariki, New Zealand; The Practice of Relationships, New South Wales, Australia; and the philosophy and pedagogies of the infant and toddler centres and preschools of Reggio Emilia, Italy.
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