



Review of the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED 97)

Proposal on the revision of ISCED 0 and Early Childhood and Education Programmes

UIS Regional Expert Meetings 2009/2010

Draft Version September 2009

ISCED Technical Advisory Panel
[Doc:RM_ISCED 0 and ECCE]

Contents

Introduction	1
1. Why is ECCE important?	2
2. Defining and classifying ECCE programmes	3
3. Examples of ECCE programmes not currently part of ISCED	7
Brazil, programa primeira infancia melhor (PIM)	7
Denmark	8
India	8
Jordan	8
Mexico	9
Mozambique, Save the Children-ELMA early literacy project	9
Philippines	10
Senegal	10
Singapore	10
Madrasa early childhood programme: Kenya, Uganda, and the United Republic of Tanzania	11
Kenya	11
Step by Step Programme: Belarus and Tajikistan	12
Belarus	12
Tajikistan	12
Summary of the characteristics of select ECCE programmes around the world	13
4. Review of ISCED 0: proposal for discussion – rationale	14
5. Recommendations for discussion in the regional ISCED meetings	16
References	18
Annex I. Preliminary analysis of the ISCED 0 & other ECCE programmes in the UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009.	20
Table 1. ISCED 0 programmes by region	20
Table 2. ISCED 0 programmes organized by broad categories	21
Table 3. ISCED 0 programmes for the Arab States region	22
Table 4. ISCED 0 programmes for the regions: Central Asia, East Asia & the Pacific and South & West Asia	23
Table 5 ISCED 0 programmes for the Central and Eastern Europe regions	24
Table 6. ISCED 0 programmes for Latin America & the Caribbean	25
Table 7. ISCED 0 programmes for North America and Western Europe	26
Table 8. ISCED 0 programmes for Sub-Saharan Africa	27
Other ECCE programmes	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table 9. Other ECCE programmes by region in Section III – ISCED Questionnaire	28
Table 10: Other ECCE programmes by region (Section III)	29
Annex II. Development of ECCE indicators in Latin America	31
Table 11. Latin American experience: classification of ECCE programmes	31
Table 12. Latin American selected countries: Classification of ECCE programmes according to UNESCO/Santiago proposal	32

Introduction

The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) was designed by UNESCO to serve as an instrument suitable for assembling, compiling and presenting statistics of education both within individual countries and internationally. In terms of Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE), ISCED focuses specifically on “pre-primary education programmes or the initial stage of organized instruction designed primarily to introduce very young children to a school-type environment” (UNESCO, 2006a). This type of educational programme is classified as ISCED 0.

At the national level, countries present a wide range of ECCE programmes upon completion of which children proceed to primary schooling. These programmes vary a lot in terms of length or presence of educational component, staff qualifications, and location in which the programme is delivered. More recently variation in terms of their compulsory nature, as well as target population has grown.

In order to help countries to classify their ECCE programmes, ISCED establishes proxy measures to determine whether or not a programme fits the ISCED 0 level. The classification criteria establishes that: (a) the programme should be centre or school-based (main criteria); (b) the programme should be designed mainly for children 3 years of age and above (main criteria); (c) the staff should have the adequate pedagogical training or qualifications, if this provision exists in the country (subsidiary criteria); (d) a formal curriculum with educational contents should be implemented (main criteria).

Although ECCE *educational properties* are the key elements in defining if a programme qualifies for ISCED 0, some of the main criteria, especially age and location where the programme is delivered, have limited many programmes – mainly from developing countries – to be classified as ISCED 0.

In 2009, the UIS established an ISCED Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) to make recommendations for the review of the ISCED to be presented for adoption at the UNESCO General Conference in 2011. The first TAP meeting on January 2009 identified the need to review the coverage of ECCE programmes in ISCED 0 as one of the main areas of work for the ISCED review.

On April 2009, this paper was commissioned by the UIS and prepared by Paula Louzano¹, a TAP member. In July 2009, the draft paper was presented at a TAP meeting and members modified the proposal. The recommendations presented in this paper for ISCED 0 modifications are put forth for discussion during the ISCED regional expert meetings during the fall of 2009 and in 2010.

This proposal is divided into five parts. The first discusses the importance of ECCE, while the second presents a definition of ECCE and its classification according to the ISCED 0 criteria. This section includes a preliminary analysis of the world-wide coverage of ISCED 0 programmes. The third part presents some examples of ECCE programmes in different regions of the world that are not currently being classified as ISCED 0. Parts four builds on the arguments in previous sections and thus presents the rationale for the review of ISCED 0 to better represent the current picture of ECCE programmes. A set of recommendations for the review of ISCED 0 is proposed in section 5.

¹ in collaboration with Carol da Silva.

1. Why is ECCE important?

In 2000, the World Declaration on Education for All called for “expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children” (UNESCO, 2001). This call to focus on fostering access and quality in early childhood care and education is supported by an extensive body of international research illustrating the positive impacts of ECCE on children’s literacy learning and school achievement, and its potential benefits to society (UNESCO, 2001; 2006; UNICEF, 2002; Yoshikawa, McCartney, et al., 2007; Yoshikawa, 1995).

Literature on ECCE suggests that everyday literacy activities that can and do occur in early childhood education programmes positively influence children’s literacy development (Lonigan & Whitehurst, 1998). Activities such as regular storybook reading can influence children’s vocabulary development (Lonigan & Whitehurst, 1998; Sénéchal & LeFevre, 2002), phonological awareness (Sénéchal & LeFevre, 2002) and reading comprehension (Lesemen & DeJong, 1998). Participation in pre-Kindergarten programmes also has been found to positively influence print awareness (National Forum on Early Childhood Programme Evaluation, 2008). Children’s abilities in vocabulary, phonologic awareness, print awareness and comprehension are some of the key components necessary for reading development (National Reading Panel, 2000).

Research on the impact of ECCE on a variety of school achievement outcomes is positive. In a review of 38 programmes in the United States, Barnett (1998) found that children in early childhood interventions groups had lower rates of grade retention and placement in special education than their counterparts. Similar findings on grade retention have been found in studies of other ECCE programmes (Adams et al., 2004; Temple & Reynolds, 2007).

Empirical studies of the long-term benefits of participation in early childhood education are few, but those that exist indicate a positive link between ECCE and social outcomes. Analysis of such early childhood education programmes as Child-Parent Centres, the Perry Preschool Programme and the Abcedarian Project find that participation in ECCE programmes can reduce costs spent on crime and special education services and increase earnings (Barnett & Belfield, 2006; Center on the Developing Child, 2009; Temple & Reynolds, 2007).

Of course, not all ECCE programmes result in higher pupil language learning, achievement and social outcomes. Research on the impact of ECCE programmes on learning, achievement and social development provides insight into some of the structural characteristics and educational properties of effective ECCE programmes. Elements that are frequently cited as characteristics of effective ECCE programmes include: qualified personnel, small adult-to-child ratios, a language-rich environment, a developmentally appropriate curriculum, a safe setting, and positive adult-child interactions (Center on the Developing Child, 2009).

The research findings match ISCED 0 classification criteria. However, while these factors are likely to be important, they are drawn primarily from research in high-income contexts. Incipient research on ECCE programmes in low and middle-income countries suggests that effective interventions may vary in

the domains in which they occur (centre-based vs. school-based), the ages of pupils they serve, and the level of education and training of the caregivers and teachers/educators working in the programmes.

For example, programmes such as the Integrated Child Development Programmes in India and Bolivia have been shown to have positive effects on children's psychosocial skills, language and cognition (Gragnotati, Shekar, Das Gupta, Bredenkamp & Lee, 2005). Although these longstanding programmes offer pre-school education to children ages 3 to 6, they may not occur in schools or centres, as they target rural and poor communities. Centre-based early childhood programmes such as *PROAPE (Programa de Alimentação de Pre-escolar)* in Brazil, the Early Childhood Education Project in India and a summer preschool programme in the Philippines showed decreased rates of school dropout among participants compared to non-participants (Myers, 1995; The Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development, 1997; UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2004; Yoshikawa et al., 2007). Also, in contexts where the average child is poor and his or her parents have little or no education, ECCE programmes, even those that occur in non-traditional settings or are led by individuals without formal teaching credentials, are likely to have a significant impact on child development (Brooks-Gunn, 2000).

2. Defining and classifying ECCE programmes

The adage “what gets measured gets done” illustrates the importance of establishing a clear and informative international definition of early childhood care and education. According to UNESCO (2006b), ECCE is defined as:

Programmes that, in addition to providing children with care, offer a structured and purposeful set of learning activities either in a formal institution (pre-primary) or as part of a non-formal child development programme.

However, for the purpose of international comparable statistics, ISCED 0 (pre-primary education) puts emphasis on the more formal component of early childhood care and education. Thus, the difference between general ECCE and ISCED 0 is that the latter focuses only on what is known on many countries as “pre-primary education” which generally takes place in a formal institution. Nevertheless, both, ISCED 0 and ECCE, as a whole, have in common that the programmes offer “a structured and purposeful set of learning activities”. It is in this discussion that the differentiation between formal and non-formal ECCE education becomes important.

The current ISCED 0 definition clearly focuses on the formal component of ECCE in order to define the boundary between care and education and to facilitate data collection and international comparability. In ISCED 0, educational programmes must have the following characteristics to be classified in this level:

1. the curriculum must have “educational properties”;
2. the programme must be school or centre-based;

3. the minimum age of the children for whom this is designed is 3 years old and the upper-limit is the entry into ISCED 1;
4. where applicable, staff, are required to have some pedagogical credentials.

The existing definition is useful in that it gives objective measures to define ISCED 0 programmes, facilitating data collection and cross-national comparisons. At the same time the definition presents the following pitfalls:

- It prioritizes structural characteristics over educational characteristics thus excluding educational programmes in low- and middle-income countries with weak infrastructure or teacher/educator training systems.
- The minimum entrance age of 3 years old does not take into account results from child development research on children ages 0 to 3 which makes it inconsistent with evolving early childhood education policies around the world.
- While considered as subsidiary criteria, in developing countries pedagogical credentials may only be the result of short training due to the requirements of an expanding pre-primary education, mostly in rural areas, even if proper teacher training institutions exist in the country (which would mostly cater for pre-schools in urban areas).
- By prioritizing the formal provision, it does not recognize what the broader ECCE definition argues for, that is, the possibility of its availability as part of a non-formal education programme.

The current ISCED 0 defines early childhood programmes by the programme location (requiring a physical infrastructure) and in some cases, teacher/educator pedagogical training. In fact, a structural factor, such as location of the programme, is considered as important as the educational properties of the programme in determining whether or not a programme is defined as ISCED 0. While structural characteristics are simple to measure and regulate, structural quality does not guarantee, and is insufficient without, high process quality (Smith, 2003; Yoshikawa, et al., 2007). In other words, structural quality does not necessarily indicate the educational properties of a programme, which should be the main determinant for inclusion in the ISCED definition.

In the past, the narrow focus on structural characteristics likely captured a majority of educational programmes aimed at children ages 3 and older as pre-primary education was restricted primarily to high-income, largely urban nations, such as those in North America and Western Europe. These nations possess adequate physical infrastructure, teacher training and certification systems, as well as local and national policies to guide and inform the curriculum and activities offered in early childhood education centres.

Further, more and more mid- and low-income nations have begun to launch ECCE initiatives aimed at improving educational access and opportunity, especially to vulnerable children. These nations may or

may not possess, for example, sufficient numbers of school buildings or formally-trained early childhood teachers/educators, factors which may prohibit them from being counted in the current ISCED 0 definition.

Moreover, culture, rather than finances, sometimes determines the structure or location of early childhood education programmes, with families in many Middle Eastern and Asian countries preferring home-based rather than centre-based services (UNESCO, 2008). These factors should be considered when defining ISCED 0.

Regarding the minimum starting age of ISCED 0 at 3 years old, international research on early child development promotes that learning begins not at three years of age, but at birth, a position affirmed by the 1990 Jomtien Declaration (UNESCO, 1990). Researchers are concluding that ECCE must include children ages 0 to 3 (Gallagher, Clifford, & Maxwell, 2004). While primary education is essential, by the time children arrive at school at the age of 6, 7 or 8 years, many of their key cognitive abilities have been established. During the period between ages 0 to 6, children's brains develop most rapidly, with approximately 2/3 of brain development occurring between the ages of 0 to 4 (Göçer, 2006). Scientists posit that brain development is influenced by the interactions that take place between parent or caregiver and child (Center on the Developing Child, 2009), highlighting the importance of early educational experiences. Also, a review of the impact of early childhood programmes on later school achievement finds that the most successful programmes were those that started earlier (Barnett, 1998).

Furthermore, there are some ECCE policy statements that refer to the educational aspects of programmes for the early ages. For example, in Italy, the "asilo nido" (crèche) for the age group 0-3 years conceived "as a social service in the public interest with its own educational characteristics" (Law 1044). Slovenia provides from age 8 months preschool education that "includes the activities concerning both care and education, which are interwoven and complement each other"; and whose curriculum emphasizes processes rather than content. Finally, in the UK, there is "no sensible distinction between education and care" (UK Department for Education and Skills, 1998).

Expanding the definition of ISCED 0 will allow researchers and teachers/educators to explore the impact of educational activities to promote learning among children in the most critical developmental years.

Finally, the current ISCED 0 definition does not accurately reflect the development of early childhood programmes and policy around the world. Many developed countries have increasingly begun to focus on education for children ages 0 to 3 (Lee & Hayden, 2009). For example, in Denmark, the 1998 Act of Social Service that governs ECCE stipulates that daycare centres serving children between the ages of 1 and 6 must possess specific educational properties including:

Facilitate experiences and activities likely to stimulate the imagination, creativity, and linguistic skills of the child and provide each child with space and opportunities for playing and learning, for physical exercise, for socializing, and for investigating the surroundings.

National ECCE policy in Denmark promotes educational properties for all children enrolled in ECCE, ranging from age 1 to 6. As this example shows, ECCE policy does not consistently distinguish between age groups when promoting educational curriculum. When education is central to early childhood programmes enrolling children from ages 0 to 3, it is important to measure those programmes to provide an accurate count of enrolment in early childhood education.

In summary, the current limits of the ISCED 0 definition relate to the absence or difficulty to establish 'measurable' factors other than structural characteristics (mainly physical buildings, but also teacher/educators' credentials) and children's age. Thus, these two main criteria have been used as proxy of "educational properties of a programme".

How could current research and the new developments in ECCE around the world help to broaden the definition of ISCED 0? Before answering this question, it is worth taking a look at the current worldwide coverage of ISCED 0 programmes available in the ISCED database collected through the international data collection mechanisms² (see annex I). This database is an important effort towards better transparency on the educational programmes included in the international education statistics. A preliminary analysis made of ISCED 0 programmes in the UIS-UOE ISCED database provides evidence for the following points considered of relevance to the review of ISCED 0:

- a) ISCED 0 programmes are available for over half of the countries in the world (Table 1, Annex I).
- b) There are countries that report more than one ISCED 0 programme (e.g. Indonesia, Bolivia) (Tables 3 to 8, Annex I).
- c) Some countries do not report any ISCED 0 programme and the reasons for this may vary from region to region (e.g. programme is not compulsory so no data is collected nationally, the programme falls outside of the Ministry of Education's authority).
- d) The majority of the programmes reported correspond to children 3 years and older (as stipulated by ISCED 0).
- e) There are a few programmes where the theoretical entrance age is for children younger than 3 years-old (e.g. Lebanon, Ukraine, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines – Tables 3, 5 & 6, Annex I).
- f) In principle, these programmes do not qualify for ISCED 0 as they do not meet the 3 years-old minimum entrance criteria³; however, this shows the existence of ECCE programmes that target younger children which are considered as having educational properties by the reporting countries.
- g) The recent collection of ISCED characteristics for *Other ECCE programmes* through the ISCED Questionnaire is a first step towards having a more holistic view of ECCE supply beyond the

² Data to the UIS is reported through the Questionnaire on National Programmes (ISCED Questionnaire) and the ISCED table in the UOE questionnaire (UNESCO-OECD and Eurostat). The international database resulting from this is called the UIS-UOE ISCED database.

³ Only children 3 years and older are counted in international statistics.

formal education sector. However, this questionnaire is sent to Ministries of Education and in order to have a more complete and universal picture the data collection approach needs to be modified to also address other providers (e.g. NGO's, private and community providers, Ministries of population, health, etc) (Tables 9-10, Annex I).

- h) Last but not least, the name of many programmes such as Early Childhood or Initial education may discourage their proper classification in ISCED 0 (if the criteria is met) because the label of ISCED 0 is pre-primary (Table 2, Annex I).

3. Examples of ECCE programmes not currently part of ISCED

This section presents ECCE programmes considered by current research and international organizations as offering “structured and purposeful set of learning activities” but which according to the current ISCED 0 proxy criteria⁴, are excluded from this level. However, the brief descriptions for each national example suggest that these programmes include a set of *organized learning activities* which, as discussed later on, should be considered as the most important criteria. Likewise, the summary in table 1 suggests the need for reviewing the current notion of centre-based used in ISCED 0 to make it more inclusive going beyond the traditional concept of being ‘school-based’.

Brazil, programa primeira infancia melhor (PIM)

The programa primeira infancia melhor was launched in 2003 in the state of Rio Grande do Sul in Brazil. The programme’s main objective is to improve young children’s development through the delivery of health and education interventions for pregnant mothers and children ages 0 to 6. Through these interventions, PIM strives to attain the first goal of the World Declaration on Education for All which aims to expand ECCE for vulnerable children. PIM is based on Cuba’s successful Educa a Tu Hijo programme, a non-formal, community-based ECCE initiative.

PIM is a state government initiative and is managed through the Department of Health in collaboration with the Departments of Education, Culture, Justice and Social Development. In 2006, a state law was passed to turn PIM into official state policy to promote and development early childhood. By 2009, PIM had been implemented in 65 per cent of the towns in Rio Grande do Sul and provided services to 49,825 families and 74,738 children.

PIM has two main ECCE interventions: 1) individual care for children ages 0 to 3; and 2) group care for children ages 3-6 (in addition to education and support for pregnant women). The individual care programme occurs in children’s homes. A PIM trainer visits the home once a week for one hour, training the mother and child in educational activities that support child development. For example, mothers are shown how to create a game to foster oral language development. The game consists of creating a large die with drawings of animals (e.g. chicken, dog) on each side. The child-mother pair rolls the die and then

⁴ (a) location where the programme is delivered; (b) children’s minimum age; (c) staff qualifications (where applicable).

identifies and discusses the animal. In group care, children and their mothers meet weekly in community centres to engage in educational activities supervised by PIM trainers (Schneider, Ramires, Paiva & Almeida, 2009).

Denmark

Denmark provides free or low-cost early childhood care and education to all children ages 0 to 6. ECCE policy is set by the Ministry of Social Affairs but day-to-day management and oversight of ECCE programmes has been decentralized to local government authorities. The overarching objective of ECCE services is to support the development of young children. Also, ECCE services are intended to provide structured learning activities.

For children ages 0 to 6 years, the Denmark system provides access to multiple forms of ECCE including, family day-care, centre-based day care, and independent day care. Other than family day-care, all facilities must possess administrators that are trained in pedagogy at the tertiary level. Training for family day care providers is not mandatory but providers have access to three weeks of initial training and regular, ongoing in-service training. In 1999, 64 per cent of children ages 6 months to 2 years and 91 per cent of children ages 3 to 5 years were enrolled in some form of ECCE (OECD, 2001).

India

The Balwadi pre-school programme is run by Pratham, a large educational NGO in India founded in 1994 that works mainly in the area of elementary education⁵. The goal of the Balwadi Programme is to provide access to pre-school education to low-income children ages 3 to 6 and in rural areas. Although the programme targets children of appropriate age, according to the current ISCED definition, it does not meet the physical structure or the teacher/educator pedagogical training criteria. The programme may be located at a municipal school, but it may also be located in a community space, place of worship or an teacher/educator's home thus making it ineligible for inclusion within the ISCED 0 definition. Also, each class is run by an instructor from the local community who generally might not possess formal teacher/educator qualifications. In 2000, the Balwadi programme served 53,000 children in Mumbai alone (Pratham, 2009).

Jordan

In Jordan, two ministries are responsible for the administration of ECCE programmes: the Ministry of Social Development and the Ministry of Education. The Ministry of Social Development manages parenting education programmes and centre-based child care programmes, whereas the Ministry of Education supervises pre-schools and kindergartens. Centre-based programmes serve children ages 0 to 4. Preschool is targeted at children ages 4 to 6.

⁵ It should be noted that private and NGO programmes are not the main ECCE programmes in the country, and that the Indian Government currently has some major initiatives aimed at extending pre-school education to the masses.

By the end of 2002, Jordan had 730 child care centres or nurseries, serving children ages 1 to 4. The majority of these nurseries were governmental (57 per cent), with 38 per cent private and 4.6 per cent affiliated with NGOs. In 2006 the numbers of childcare centers increased to 785.

Teachers/Educators working in nurseries possess varied levels of training and education. Nearly half possess university or college degrees, with 32 per cent possessing high school certificates and 23 per cent with lower qualifications (Four, Hajjar, Chehab & Zaaza, 2006; UNESCO International Bureau of Education, 2006a).

Mexico

Mexico has multiple modalities of early childhood care and education. One of these, the Consejo Nacional de Fomento Educativo (CONAFE), primarily serves disadvantaged rural and indigenous children. Under CONAFE, local preschools are established and run by parents or community members who are also expected to provide direct support and services to needy families in the communities. These individuals receive educational scholarships and also receive ongoing training through the programme. A teacher/educator trainer visits the community once a month to provide on-site guidance to teachers/educators.

Preschools in the CONAFE programme also receive curricular support. In schools that serve indigenous children, didactic materials and textbooks are provided in both Spanish and the local indigenous language to support bilingual education.

Unfortunately, there is little precise data available on the enrolment and impact of participation in the CONAFE programme. In 2004, the programme served approximately 3 million pupils in both ECCE and primary education, including 1 million indigenous children. A 2004 study on the impact of CONAFE's compensatory programmes at the primary school level found that it positively influenced both Spanish and math scores; however, no such study has been conducted at the pre-primary level (Patrinos, Shapiro & Trevino, 2004; Yoshikawa et al., 2007).

Mozambique, Save the Children-ELMA early literacy project

In 2008, Save the Children and ELMA philanthropies initiated the SC-ELMA early literacy project in Mozambique. Working in 40 communities in the Gaza Province, the project provides teacher/educator training and community mobilization around early literacy and reading promotion activities to foster systemic and high-quality early literacy instruction in Portuguese. The target population for the project is approximately 6,000 preschool-aged children (ranging from 3 to 5 years), including those affected by HIV/AIDS and other vulnerable children. The early literacy project recruits and trains community members who are responsible for teaching pre-school aged children. Classes usually take place at the village primary school (Save the Children, 2007; Melissa Kelly, personal communication, June 12, 2009).

Philippines⁶

The Philippines has a national system for early childhood care and development for children ages 0 to 6 that was established through policy in 2000, known as the ECCD Act. The educational objectives of the system include enhancing cognitive and language development among young children and facilitating the transition from home, community or school-based early education to primary school.

Early childhood care in the Philippines is offered through a wide variety of modalities, including centre-based programmes, community or church based programmes, and home-based programmes, among others. ECCE service providers include professionals such as teacher/educators, paraprofessionals and voluntary caregivers (The Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development, 1997).

Senegal

Senegal offers non-compulsory early childhood care and education programmes for children ages 3 to 6 years. The Ministry of Education preschool division is responsible for the preschool programme.

In 2003/2004, just 5.6 per cent of children were enrolled in preschool, approximately half girls. Despite targeting children ages 3 and up, enrolment statistics also find two-year-olds are participating in the preschool programme. Ongoing professional development is also provided through Regional Training Centres (*Pôles régionaux de formation – PRF*).

In 2004/2005, Senegal had 2,259 teachers/educators working in these preschools, all of whom possessed training. Preschool teachers/educators are trained by the Primary Teacher Training Colleges, also responsible for the training of primary school teachers.

The main goals of preschool education in Senegal are to develop language skills and cultural values, and to foster psychomotor, intellectual and social development.

International NGOs and aid organizations also manage numerous ECCE projects in early childhood-centres. These programmes are usually community-based, may be run by volunteers, and focus on disadvantaged children, often in rural areas (UNESCO International Bureau of Education, 2006b).

Singapore

Singapore has two main tracks of early childhood care and education: childcare centres, which service children ages 2 to 6 and kindergartens, which target those ages 4 to 6. Childcare centres are licensed by the Ministry of Community Development, Youth and Sports, whereas kindergartens are administered by the Ministry of Education. In 2004/2005, 10,499 children below the age of 3 were enrolled in state-licensed childcare centres in Singapore, out of a total of nearly 50,000 children overall.

⁶ Document provided by Ms. Lina Castro, Technical Advisory Panel. The LawPhil Project – Arellano Law Foundation, RA No. 8980 - “An Act Promulgating a Comprehensive Policy and a National System for Early Childhood Care and Development (ECCD), Providing Funds Therefore and for other Purposes”. December 5, 2000.

The large majority of teacher/educators working in childcare centres in Singapore possess state-accredited diplomas, certificates or degrees in preschool education. Of the 5,213 teachers/educators working in childcare centres, 80 per cent were trained.

The curriculum in childcare centres in Singapore aim to “facilitate children’s development and learning.” Childcare centres may provide educational activities such as reading programmes and bilingual education. Centres also conduct play activities centred around specific curricular goals, such as sorting objects by their attributes, to help children acquire concepts of mathematics, science and language, among others (Singapore Ministry of Community Development, Youth and Sports, 2009; UNESCO International Bureau of Education, 2006c).

Madrasa early childhood programme: Kenya, Uganda, and the United Republic of Tanzania

The Madrasa early childhood programme has been established and run by the Aga Khan Foundation for 25 years (Aga Khan Development Network, 2008). The programme operates in Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania, and has established over 200 community schools serving over 67,000 children. The programme targets children ages 3 to 6.

Local woman are selected to serve as teachers/educators and receive training through the programme. Staff members undergo a pre-service training programme and also receive ongoing professional development and support.

The curriculum focuses on several subject areas including religious instruction in Islam, math, language and literacy, health education and others. The Programme offers numerous materials to support programme development and instruction. These materials include a teacher/educator training manual, parent support manual, community resource manual, school management manual and resource book for teachers/educators. Instruction is usually bi- or multi-lingual.

A study of the impact of attending Madrasa preschools found that, while preschool experience in general had a significant and positive cognitive impact on children, participating in a Madrasa preschool had a greater impact than other comparable preschool programmes among the sample studied.

Kenya

The Madrasa programme was piloted first in Kenya in the 1980’s. A Madrasa Resource Centre was established in 1986 and the programme worked in 10 to 12 communities by 1990. The success of this first programme influenced the establishment of additional programmes in Tanzania and Uganda.

By the end of 2002, the Madrasa programme benefited 66 communities in Kenya. More than 400 Madrasa preschool teachers/educators had been trained and 2,432 children were enrolled in the schools. More than half of those pupils were girls (Aga Khan Development Network, 2008).

Step by Step Programme: Belarus and Tajikistan

The Step by Step programme was initiated by the Open Society Institute (OSI) to teach child-centred teaching methods in preschools (International Step by Step Association, 2009). It operates in 30 countries, primarily in Central Asia and Eastern Europe. Some of those countries include Albania, Georgia, Romania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and the Republic of Moldova. The programme partners with non-governmental organizations and also strives to obtain official recognition by national governments.

The crèche-preschool programme targets children ages 0 to 6; and additional initiatives also aim to assist Roma children and other disadvantaged minorities. In the case that formal preschool programmes are unavailable, the Step by Step programme also works with parents or community-based preschool initiatives. The Step-by-Step curriculum focuses on child development through play, cooperative work and thematic projects, including activities such as story dramatization.

Between 1994 and 2006, 26 countries in the Step-by-Step programme had crèche-preschool programmes. In 2006, more than 700,000 children at the crèche-preschool level had been exposed to the Step-by-Step methodologies. Instruction generally occurs in nursery schools or other community-learning centres.

Step by Step preschool programmes are managed by both full-time and part-time staff. The Step by Step network has teacher/educator trainers who are responsible for training teachers/educators in child-centred methodologies. Training may be provided at training centres or in cooperation with higher education institutions. In 2006, of 30 reporting countries, the average number of teachers/educators trained for crèche-preschool programmes per country was 378. In total, about 68,000 teachers/educators have been trained through the programme, primarily at the crèche-preschool level. The following are examples of these programmes in two participating countries: Belarus and Tajikistan.

Belarus

The Step-by-Step programme in Belarus is administered through the Belarussian Parents' and Teachers' League, an NGO formed in 1998. The programme focuses on creating democratic schools, encouraging parent and community involvement, and promoting child-centred practices.

The educational programmes serve children ages 0 to 12. Thus far, 17,900 teachers/educators have been trained in Step-by-Step methodologies in Belarus. The programme also works with marginalized Roma children. Parents and community members also participate in workshops and trainings, and educational manuals have been published for parents, teachers/educators and administrators.

Tajikistan

The Step by Step in Tajikistan began in 2001. It works through the Open Society Institute Assistance Foundation and also received support through USAID. It has formal support from the Ministry of

Education of the Republic of Tajikistan. Its goal is to democratize education and involve parents in their children's education.

The programme implements child centred preschool education in 5 regions of the country that are not already served by existing state preschool programmes. Teachers/Educators and administrators receive training in child-centred methodologies through pre- and in-service education. The programme is currently implemented in 19 school-settings (International Step by Step Association, 2009; Stasz, Krop, Rastegar & Vuollo, 2008).

Summary of the characteristics of select ECCE programmes around the world

Country	Programme	Target Age	Range of Educator/Caregiver Qualifications	Location
Brazil	Better Early Childhood Programme	0 to 6		Home- and community-based
Denmark	Early Childhood Care and Education National System	0 to 6	Access to optional pre-service and in-service training to formal certification	Home-, community- and centre-based
India	Balwadi Preschool Programme	3 to 5	Mandatory pre-service and in-service training	Community-based (e.g. municipal schools, church, teacher/educator's home)
Jordan	Early Childhood Care and Education National System	0 to 6	Access to pre-service training	School- and centre-based
Mexico	CONAFE programme	Preschool and primary ages	Access to in-service training	School- and community-based
Mozambique	Save the Children-ELMA Philanthropies Early Literacy Project	3 to 5	Mandatory pre-service and in-service training	Community-based (e.g. village's primary school)
Philippines	Early Childhood Care and Development National System	0 to 6	None to formal teacher /educator certification	Home-, community-, and centre-based
Senegal	Early Childhood Care and Education National System	3 to 6	Access to pre-service and in-service training	School-or centre-based
Singapore	Early Childhood Care and Education National System	2 to 6	Access to pre-service and ongoing training	School- and centre-based
Kenya Uganda U.R. Tanzania	Madrasa Early Childhood Programme	3 to 6	Access to pre-service and in-service training	Community-based
Belarus & Tajikistan	Step-by-Step preschool programmes	0 to 6	Access to ongoing in-service training, with some teachers/educators possessing pre-service training	School- and community-based

4. Review of ISCED 0: proposal for discussion – rationale

The most important criteria guiding the classification of a programme as ISCED 0 should be its *educational properties*. Because of the above arguments, among the criteria established in ISCED to classify a programme as ISCED 0, the two most often used (i.e. older than 3 years of age, school or centre-based) are not considered adequate for defining the *educational properties* of the programmes.

The subsidiary criteria (i.e. teacher/educator credentials) can be considered a proxy for quality in the delivery of education. However, as in the case of the programmes being centre-based, this cannot determine if a programme is educational in nature. As mentioned before, structural quality does not necessarily indicate the educational properties of a programme, which should be the main determinant for inclusion in the ISCED definition.

Therefore, an operational definition of *educational properties* of the programme should guide the ISCED 0 classification. ISCED97 (UNESCO, 2006a) already pointed to this direction when proposing (paragraphs 23 and 26) that:

23. Some educational activities cannot be easily described in terms of an educational programme in the above sense even though they clearly involve *organized and sustained communication* designed to bring about *learning* so that they fall, in principle, under the scope of ISCED. Family-centred early childhood education can serve as an example. *[Italics in original.]*

26. All such educational activities should be classified based on their equivalence with the educational content of regular programmes... In other words, they should be classified together with those regular educational programmes to which they are most similar with respect to the criteria provided. For example, where family-centred early childhood education satisfies the content-based criteria of ISCED level 0, it should be classified as an ISCED level 0 pre-primary programme. *[Underline added here.]*

Because the definition of content based criteria was not clearly operationalized in ISCED, this equivalence was rarely put in place in the case of ECCE programmes. An exception is the classification of the Cuban ECCE programme *Educa a tu Hijo* as ISCED 0. Similar in nature to several other programmes in the region (PIM in Brazil, *Abuelitos* in Peru and *Aprendiendo Juntos* in Chile, to cite a few mentioned in this paper), *Educa a tu Hijo* had to make a case, based on the paragraphs cited above, to be included as ISCED 0⁷. Similar programmes that fail to do so are not classified as ISCED 0 since the most used criteria (centre-based) tend to prevent those programmes from being classified as ISCED 0.

Efforts to operationalize the educational properties of a programme point in the direction of the existing definition of “in average 2 hours per day and 100 days a year” included in the glossary of the EFA GMR since the publication of the first volume in 2002 (“EFA: Is the World on Track?”, UNESCO, 2002) as

⁷ Only children 3-6 years old are reported in international statistics.

well as in the UIS education statistics Instruction Manual since 2000. Earlier discussions on this suggest that the original purpose of the above average was to better define “other ECCE programmes” that might be included under ISCED 0 (in addition to the typical pre-school programmes). According to the 2007 GMR (“Strong Foundations: ECCE”):

‘Other ECCE programmes’ refers to non-formal development programmes designed for children from age 3 that include organized learning activities spanning, on average, the equivalent of at least 2 hours per day and 100 days per year. This category emerged from decisions following the Dakar forum and underscored the need to develop additional measures for monitoring ECCE provision. Data on ‘other ECCE programmes’, which began to be compiled in 2000, are still missing for many countries.” (UNESCO, 2006b, Note 10, p, 124)

Some countries have also operationalized their own definition of ECCE in order to establish their educational policies. For example, Denmark defines educational programmes for young children as those facilitating:

experiences and activities likely to stimulate the imagination, creativity, and linguistic skills of the child and provide each child with space and opportunities for playing and learning, for physical exercise, for socializing, and for investigating the surroundings (Brostrom, 2006, p. 392).

It is worth noting that Denmark’s definition of educational properties of a programme is neither related to the location where the programme is delivered nor to the children’s minimum age (as discussed earlier in section III). Following current research on child development, programmes in Denmark target children from 0 to 6 years of age. The teacher/educator qualification is optional as well. All of this suggests that it is possible to operationalize the educational content of a programme by staying away from the proxy criteria currently used in ISCED 0.

The inclusion of younger children is another concern in revising the ISCED 0 criteria. ECCE programmes target children of different age groups. As shown in the case of the Latin American ECCE experience (Annex II), these differences might not only have an impact on the types of educational programmes provided to different age groups, but also educational policy and goals, which may differ for each of these groups. For example, even though it might make sense to make educational programmes compulsory and/or universal for children ages 3 to 6, this is not necessarily true for children ages 0 to 3 (even though educational programmes for children this age might exist and be educational in nature). Thus, ISCED 0 should be able to expand beyond pre-primary education programmes – which usually aim at children over 3 years of age – at the same time keeping the data collection divided into two different

groups: initial education programmes (0-3 years old) and pre-primary programmes (3-6). Broadening data collection and keeping programmes separate are both important steps in revising ISCED 0. Thus a proposal eliminating the minimum age limit for ISCED 0 has to consider the possibility of splitting this level into two different groups.

Finally, the notion of a programme being centre-based needs to be better defined. Pre-school programmes may be offered at schools with adequate building and space for children and also at centres located in some school building or a temple/ church or a community place. In some cases, a home will serve as a centre where children gather to attend whatever an organized pre-school programme is offered under the care of an educator or trained worker. However, apart from other problems, it will be very difficult to count children attending home-based programmes.

5. Recommendations for discussion in the regional ISCED meetings

The discussion of this proposal during the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) meeting in July 2009 revolved around the two main criteria used to classify ISCED 0 programmes: targeting age and location of the programmes. Strong emphasis was put on the need to clearly define how to measure the educational properties of the programmes.

Most of the members disagree with the notion that programmes targeting children under the age of 3 should be classified as ISCED 0 arguing that these programmes are not educational in nature. However they do agree that children under the age of 3 that are enrolled in educational programmes targeting mainly older children should be considered.

Most TAP members do agree that on its own, the criteria of being home-based should not be used to exclude a programme from being classified as ISCED 0. In these cases, however, the home should serve as a centre where children gather to attend any organized pre-school programme that is offered under the care of an educator or trained worker. This notion is present in the French version of the ISCED97 but is missing in its corresponding versions in English and Spanish. The ISCED 0 review should thus ensure the consistency of the new ISCED across all languages.

All TAP members agree that educational properties should be the guiding force behind the classification and that the proposal used by EFA should be used as a starting point for regional discussions. Other criteria such as the five dimensions of child development put forward by UNICEF should also be considered in the regional debate.

At the end of the meeting the Panel approved the following proposal for the ISCED 0 review.

The ISCED TAP members invite the regional ISCED meeting participants to discuss the following recommendations:

1. The educational properties of the programmes should be the main classification criteria in ISCED. The following definition can be used as a starting point for defining this criterion: ISCED 0 programmes have as ‘one of its purposes to offer a structured and purposeful set of learning activities (accounting for at least the equivalent of 2 hours per day and 100 days a year” (UIS, 2009). It should be noted that this is also used in the definition of ECCE programmes in the EFA Global Monitoring Reports.
2. Formal education can happen in different contexts. The criteria of being school or centre-based should be clarified to also include community-based and family-based centres, as long as these programmes’ educational content is equivalent to that of institutionalized programmes. This is already in the ISCED97 classification (paragraph 26) and clearly marked in the French version.
3. Teacher/Educator qualification should remain a subsidiary classification criterion; however, it cannot serve as a proxy for curriculum or educational properties of a pre-school programme.
4. ISCED Level 0 includes programmes that typically target children from age 3 to the beginning of ISCED 1. However, enrolment of younger children in these programmes should also be included in international statistics.
5. It is important to discuss the operationalization of educational properties with experts from different agencies such as UNESCO, UNICEF, etc., and in other international fora (e.g. the World Conference on ECE organized by UNESCO). These discussions should keep in mind the ultimate goal of collecting internationally comparable statistics on education.
6. The ISCED glossary should include a definition for *Other ECCE Programmes* even if these are not part of ISCED 0 because of being designed for children younger than 3 years old. These data are currently collected and used in the annual EFA Global Monitoring Report.
7. The new ISCED should recognize that many countries are making ISCED 0 part of compulsory schooling. This will inevitably lead to revising the current description of ISCED 1 that states it as being the “beginning of compulsory schooling” (ISCED 1997, paragraph 48). Likewise, ISCED should emphasize the importance of collecting data at the national level for ECCE programmes, even if they are not compulsory.
8. International data collection mechanisms should emphasize the importance of collecting and reporting data for ECCE programmes even if these are not considered as compulsory and regardless of whether they are provided in the formal or the non-formal sectors. More attention in international statistics to ECCE programmes would raise the awareness of policy-makers to improve data availability at the national level. The availability of the daily duration of publicly subsidized pre-primary programmes should help in the efforts to operationalize the educational properties of the programmes.

References

- Adams, S., Alexander, E., Drummond, M. J. & Moyles, J. (2004). *Inside the Foundation State: Recreating the Reception Year*. London: Association of Teachers and Lecturers.
- Aga Khan Development Network. (2008). *The Madrasa Early Childhood Programme: 25 Years of Experience*. Retrieved June 23, 2009 from the Aga Khan Development Network website: http://www.akdn.org/publications/2008_madrasa.pdf
- Barnett, William Steven & Belfield, Clive R. (2006): Early childhood development and social mobility. Published in: *The Future of Children* 2 16 (2006): pp. 73-98.
- Barnett, William Steven. (1998). Long-term cognitive and academic effects of early childhood education on children in poverty. *Preventive Medicine*, 27(2), 204-207.
- Brostrom, S. (2006). Care and Education: Towards a new Paradigm in Early Childhood Education. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 35, pp. 391-409.
- Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000). *Do you Believe in Magic? What We Can Expect From Early Childhood Intervention Programs*. Paper presented at Early Childhood Intervention Programs: Are the Costs Justified? Congressional Briefing. Washington, D.C.
- Center on the Developing Child (2009). *The science of early childhood development*. Harvard University, www.developingchild.harvard.edu
- The Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development. (1997). *Site visit: Preparing children for school in the Philippines*. <http://www.ecdgroup.com/download/vc1pcsp.pdf>, accessed May 26, 2006.
- Four, B., Hajjar, Y. Chehab, M., & Zaaza, R. (2006). *Comparative, regional analysis of ECCE in four Arab countries* (Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, and Sudan.) Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2007, Strong foundations: Early Childhood Care and Education. Arab Resource Collective and UNESCO International Bureau of Education. Retrieved from UNESCO website, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001474/147440e.pdf>
- Gallagher, J. J., Clifford, R. M., & Maxwell, K. (2004). Getting from here to there: To an ideal early preschool system. *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, 6. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v6n1/clifford.html>
- Göçer, Ayla Göksel (2006). *7 is too late!: Early Childhood Education for Social and Economic Development*. Retrieved from: <http://www.acev.org>
- Gragnotati, M., Shekar, M., Das Gupta, M., Bredenkamp, C., & Lee, Y. (2005). India's undernourished children: A call for reform and action. *Worldbank Health, Nutrition, and Population Discussion Paper*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- International Step by Step Association (2009). Amsterdam and Budapest: ISSA. Retrieved from ISSA website: www.issa.nl
- Keough, L. (2004). Chapter 15: Expanding Early Childhood Education in Africa. Madrasas in East Africa, pp. 183-195 in *Mind, Heart and Soul in the Fight Against Poverty*, Katherine Marshall and Lucie Keough, Eds. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Lee, Y & Hayden, M. (2009). Early Childhood Care and Education: Worldwide Challenges and Progresses. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, Vol. 11, http://www.tc.columbia.edu/cice/Current/11/11_edintro.html, Retrieved June 15, 2009.
- Leseman, P.P.M. & deJong, P.F. (1998). Home literacy: Opportunity, instruction, cooperation and social-emotional quality predicting. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 33, 294-316.
- Lonigan, C.J., & Whitehurst, G.J. (1998). Relative efficacy of parent and teacher involvement in a shared-reading intervention for preschool children from low-income backgrounds. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 17, 265-292.
- Myers, R. G. 1995. *The Twelve Who Survive*. Ypsilanti, Michigan: High/Scope Press, (2nd Edition).
- National Forum on Early Childhood Program Evaluation (2008). *Science Briefs: Do State Pre-K Programs Improve Children's Pre-Literacy and Math Learning?* <http://www.developingchild.harvard.edu>
- National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction*, http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/nrp/upload/smallbook_pdf.pdf
- OECD. (2001). *Starting Strong: Early Childhood Education and Care: Denmark*. Retrieved June 14, <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/43/35/1942303.pdf>
- Patrinos, H., Shapiro, J., & Trevino, J.M. (2004). *Education for All: Educating for Disadvantage in Mexico*. World Bank, Education Notes Series, Retrieved from World Bank web site: http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/IB/2004/07/22/000090341_20040722132237/Rendered/PDF/296960PAPER0Ed0for0all010mexico.pdf
- Pratham. (2009). *Pratham Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE)*. Mumbai and Delhi. Retrieved from Pratham website <http://www.pratham.org/M-25-3-ECCE.aspx>
- Save the Children. (2007). *Save the Children's Commitment to Early Literacy and Transitions to School for Orphans and Vulnerable Children in Mozambique*. A Proposal to ELMA Philanthropies. Westport: Save the Children.

- Schneider, A., Ramires, V.R., Paiva, M.G.G.P., & Almeida, L. (2009). The Better Early Childhood Development Program: An Innovative Brazilian Public Policy, *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, Vol. 11, Teachers College, <http://www.tc.edu/cice>
- Senechal, M., & LeFevre, J. (2002) Parental Involvement in the Development of Children's Reading Skill: A Five-Year Longitudinal Study, *Child Development*, March/April 2002, Vol. 73, Nu. 2, pp. 445-460.
- Singapore Ministry of Community Development, Youth and Sports. (2009). *Child Care Centres*. Retrieved from MCYS website: http://app.mcys.gov.sg/WEB/faml_nurture_childcarectr.asp
- Smith, A.B. (2003). School Completion/Academic Achievement-Outcomes of Early Childhood Education. *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development*, Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development. .Published online April 28, 2003.
- Stasz, C. Krop, C., Rastegar, A., & Vuollo, M. (2008) *The Step by Step Early Childhood Education Program. Assessment of Reach and Sustainability*. Study conducted by Rand Education and prepared for the Open Society Institute. http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/2008/RAND_TR593.pdf
- Temple, Judy A, & Arthur J. Reynolds. 2007. The benefits and costs of investments in preschool. *Economics of Education Review*, vol. 26, 126-144.
- UK Department for Education and Skills. (1998). Consultation Paper on the Regulation and Inspection of Early Education and Day Care', London: DFES. http://www.dfes.gov.uk/consultations/downloadableDocs/37_1.doc
- UNESCO. (1990). *Meeting Basic Learning Needs: A Vision for the 1990s*. Background Document from the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien, Thailand. New York: UNICEF
- UNESCO. (2001). *Dakar Framework for Action. Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments*. Adopted by the World Education Forum Dakar, Senegal, 26-28 April 2000. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2002). *Education for All: Is the World on Track?* 2002 EFA Global Monitoring Report. Paris: UNESCO. <http://www.unesco.org/en/efareport/reports/2007-early-childhood/>
- UNESCO (2006a). ISCED 1997. International Standard Classification of Education. May 2006 re-edition.
- UNESCO (2006b). *Strong Foundations. Early Childhood Care and Education*. 2007 EFA Global Monitoring Report. Paris: UNESCO. <http://www.unesco.org/en/efareport/reports/2007-early-childhood/>
- UNESCO, (2008). *Education for All by 2015: Will we make it?* EFA Global Monitoring Report, <http://www.unesco.org/en/efareport/reports/2008-mid-term-review/>
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2004). *UIS Annual Report 2003-2004*. Retrieved from UNESCO website. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001501/150162e.pdf>
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2009). *Survey 2009, Instruction manual for completing the questionnaires on statistics of education*. Data collection on Education Statistics.
- UNESCO International Bureau of Education. (2006a). *Jordan, Early Childhood Care and Education programmes*. Country Profile prepared for the 2007 Education for All Global Monitoring Report, Strong Foundations: Early Childhood Care and Education. Geneva: UNESCO-IBE. Retrieved from the UNESCO website: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001472/147215e.pdf>
- UNESCO International Bureau of Education. (2006b). *Senegal. Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) programmes*. Country profile prepared for the 2007 Education for All Global Monitoring Report, Strong Foundations: Early Childhood Care and Education. Geneva: UNESCO-IBE. Retrieved from the UNESCO website: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001480/148045e.pdf>
- UNESCO International Bureau of Education. (2006c). *Singapore Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) programmes*. Country profile prepared for the 2007 Education for All Global Monitoring Report, Strong Foundations: Early Childhood Care and Education. Geneva: UNESCO-IBE. Retrieved from the UNESCO website: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001472/147238e.pdf>
- UNESCO/Santiago. (2008). *Indicadores de la educación de la primera infancia en América Latina: propuesta y experiencias piloto*. Santiago : UNESCO/Santiago. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001629/162970S.pdf>
- UNICEF. (2002). *UNICEF Annual Report 2002*. New York: UNICEF.
- Yoshikawa, H. (1995). Long-term effects of early childhood programs on social outcomes and delinquency. *The Future of Children*, 5(3), 51-75 (Special Issue: Long-Term Effects of Early Childhood Programs).
- Yoshikawa, H., McCartney, K., Myers, R., Bub, K.L., Lugo-Gil, J. Ramos, M.A., & Knaul, F. (2007). *Early Childhood Education in Mexico. Expansion, Quality Improvement and Curricular Reform*. Unicef Innocenti Working Paper, IWP-2007-03.

Annex I. Preliminary analysis of the ISCED 0 & other ECCE programmes in the UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009⁸.

ISCED 0

The following analyses the programmes classified as ISCED 0 by countries in each region of the world⁹. There are currently 189 ISCED 0 programmes from 116 countries in the UIS database. This represents a little over half of the countries in the world. Table 1 shows the number of countries by region that reports any ISCED 0 programme to UIS. Central and Eastern Europe (81%) as well as North America and Western Europe (76%) are the regions with proportionally more countries reporting those types of programmes. On the other hand, East Asia and the Pacific (38%), as well as Central Asia (44%) are the regions with proportionally less countries reporting existing ISCED 0 programmes.

Table 1. ISCED 0 programmes by region

Region	Number countries	No. countries with ISCED 0	% ¹
Arab States	20	10	50%
Central Asia	9	4	44%
Central and Eastern Europe	21	17	81%
East Asia and the Pacific	34	13	38%
Latin America and the Caribbean	41	21	51%
North America and Western Europe	29	22	76%
Sub-Saharan Africa	45	23	51%
South and West Asia	9	6	67%
All	208	116	56%

Source: UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009.

¹ Percentage of countries in the region reporting at least one ISCED 0 programme

The reasons for not reporting a programme may vary from region to region. It may range from not offering ECCE programmes at all – since this level of education usually falls outside of compulsory education for most countries – to having programmes which do not meet the ISCED 0 classification criteria. In fact, a 2004 UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE) review of 155 countries found that pre-school education is compulsory in only 14% of cases (21 countries), and in most of the cases (81%), pre-school

⁸ The UIS-UOE data base results from the data collection through the UIS ISCED questionnaires (launched in 2007 and 2008 only) and the ISCED table in the UOE questionnaires (used for OECD and European countries). The UIS ISCED questionnaire aims to obtain a most comprehensive taxonomy of formal (or regular) and non-formal education programmes in countries worldwide. This information collected for the regular system is used to produce the ISCED mappings available on the UIS website here: www.uis.unesco.org/publications/iscedmmaps

⁹ The current information in the ISCED database is not standardized (e.g. does not use pre-defined categories) thus while some countries report age in years, others express it in months, and some might report starting age with milestones such as “when the child starts to speak”. This great variability limits the analysis made in this section. Standardizing the programme information, while challenging, would facilitate further analysis of ISCED related information.

education has been made compulsory between 1990 and 2004¹⁰. Although by now it is likely that more countries have made pre-school education compulsory, it is important to note that this movement towards making it compulsory is recent and parallels research showing the importance of ECCE to cognitive development and equality of educational opportunities.

The fact that in most countries ISCED 0 falls outside of compulsory education might influence not only the existence of educational programmes for young children, but also national and international data collecting and reporting. In many developing nations, international and even national pressure to universalize compulsory education (mainly primary), might have driven data collection resources to this level of education. Thus, ISCED 0 programmes around the world – those that would fall within the current criteria – might have been underestimated by international statistics.

A closer look at some characteristics of ISCED 0 reveals that most of the programmes reported by countries are theoretically focusing on children 3 years of age and older, since only 27 programmes in 20 countries target also children under 3. However, it is hard to access the full universe of the programmes targeting children under the age of 3 by looking solely at this database. Ministries of Education (MoE) are responsible to answer UIS or UOE questionnaires. In the case of ISCED 0 programmes, some of them might fall outside of MoE constituency, and for the reasons stated above (i.e. not being compulsory, not being the focus of national educational policies) efforts might not be made to gather data outside the MoE, impacting international statistics.

The current review also shows that ISCED 0 programmes are labelled in a variety of ways, “pre-school/pre-primary education” being the name used for more than half of the programmes worldwide (Table 2). Examples of the various names for ISCED 0 programmes in different countries and regions are also presented in Tables 3-9. This finding matches the review by the IBE finding that more than 60% of the programmes fall within this denomination. According to the IBE, programmes run or supported by international organizations tend to be labelled Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE), Early Childhood Education (ECE) or Early Childhood Development (ECD) programmes. This programmes do not necessarily match ISCED 0 criteria.

Table 2. ISCED 0 programmes organized by broad categories

Category	Number	%
Pre-school/pre-primary	103	54%
Initial education	20	11%
Kindergarten	32	17%
Nursery/crèche	15	8%
ECCE/ECE/ECD	19	10%
Total	189	100%

Source: UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009.

Also, name similarity might reflect the fact that most programmes reported to the UIS belong to the formal education system. However, this type of education is known for having programmes outside the regular system.

¹⁰ Unpublished report made by the International Bureau of Education (IBE) provided by Massimo Amadio, member of the ISCED Technical Advisory Panel.

Table 3. ISCED 0 programmes for the Arab States region

Country	Programme Name	Theoretical Starting Age	Programme Duration
Arab States			
Algeria	Enseignement préparatoire	4	2
Djibouti	Enseignement pré-scolaire	4	2
Egypt	Pre-primary	4	2
Kuwait	Kindergarten	4	2
Lebanon	Préprimaire	3	3
Lebanon	Kindergarten 1	2	1
Lebanon	Kindergarten 2	3	3
Lebanon	Kindergarten	4	2
Lebanon	Préprimaire	3	3
Mauritania	Pré-primaire	3	3
Morocco	Pre-school education	3	2
Morocco	Preparatory year for primary education	5	1
Morocco	Enseignement préscolaire	4	2
Qatar	Kindergarten	3	2
Qatar	Pre-primary education	5	1
Sudan	Pre-school education	4	2
Syrian Arab Republic	Crèche	4	2
Yemen	Preparatory	3	3

Source: UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009.

Theoretical entrance age – This is the age at which pupils or students would enter in a given programme assuming they had started at the official entrance age for the lowest level of education, had studied full-time throughout and had progressed through the system without repeating a grade or skipping a grade. The theoretical entrance to a given programme or level is often but not always the typical or most common one.

Programme Duration – The number of years the programme or activity is planned to last. Please note that the theoretical duration of a programme is often but not always the typical or most common one.

Table 4. ISCED 0 programmes for the regions: Central Asia, East Asia & the Pacific and South & West Asia

Country	Programme Name	Theoretical Starting Age	Programme Duration
Central Asia			
Azerbaijan	Pre-primary education	3	3
Georgia	Pre-primary	3	3
Mongolia	Preschool education	2	5
Uzbekistan	Pre-primary education	3	4
East Asia and the Pacific			
Australia	Pre-primary, Kindergarten, Preschool	3	2
Cambodia	Pre-school	3	3
Fiji	Early childhood	5	1
Hong Kong (China), SAR	Kindergarten	3	3
Indonesia	Preprimary (playgroup)	3	2
Indonesia	Kindergarten	4.5	2
Japan	Day nursery	3	3
Japan	Kindergarten	3	3
Japan	Special education school, kindergarten department	3	3
Lao	Pre-primary	3	3
Macao, China	Ensino Pre-escolar	3	3
Myanmar	Monastic education -Primary	5	5
Nauru	ECCE	3	3
New Zealand	Early childhood education	3	2
Singapore	Pre-primary	3	3
Viet Nam	ECEC	0.3	5
South and West Asia			
Bangladesh	Enseignement pre-primaire	4	3
Bhutan	Nursery	3	
India	Pre-primary education	3	3
Iran, Islamic Republic of	Pishdabestan(pri-primary)	5	1
Maldives	Pre-primary	2-3	3
Maldives	Pre-primary	2-3	3
Nepal	Pre-primary / ECD	3.4	2

Source: UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009.

Table 5 ISCED 0 programmes for the Central and Eastern Europe regions

Country	Programme Name	Theoretical Starting Age	Programme Duration
Central and Eastern Europe			
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Pre-primary education	2	5
Bulgaria	Pre-primary education	3	4
Bulgaria	Pre-primary education	3	3
Czech Republic	Kindergarten	3	3
Czech Republic	Preparatory classes for socially disadvantaged children	6	1
Czech Republic	Preparatory stage of special basic school	6	3
Estonia	Pre-primary education (general study programme of pre-primary education)	3	4
Estonia	Preparatory courses for pre-school children	6	1
Hungary	Kindergarten (of which one year pre-school education)	3	3
Latvia	Pre-primary education for children not in pre-primary education institution	5	2
Latvia	Pre-primary education	3	4
Lithuania	Pre-primary education	3	4
Lithuania	Pre-primary education for children of special needs	3	4
Lithuania	Pre-school education (preparatory classes for schooling)	6	1
Lithuania	Pre-school education for children of special needs (prep. classes for schooling)	6	1
Poland	Pre-school education, (kindergarten)	3	4
Poland	Pre-school education, (special kindergarten)	3	4
Rep. of Macedonia	Pre-primary education in pre-primary institution	3	4
Rep. of Macedonia	Pre-primary education in primary institution	5	1
Rep. Of Moldova	Pre-school education	3	4
Rep. of Moldova	Compulsory preparation for school	6	1
Rep. of Moldova	Pre-prime education	3	4
Rep. of Moldova	Éducation Pré-primaire	3	3
Romania	Pre-primary	3	4
Russian Federation	Pre-primary education	1.5	5
Slovakia	Kindergarten	3	3
Slovakia	Special kindergarten	3	3
Slovakia	Preparatory classes in basic school	6	1
Slovakia	Preparatory classes in special school	6	1
Slovakia	Kindergarten	3	3
Slovakia	Special kindergarten	3	3
Slovakia	Preparatory classes in basic school	6	1
Slovakia	Preparatory classes in special school	6	1
Slovenia	Pre-school education programme	3	3
Slovenia	Pre-school education- international programme	4	2
Turkey	Kindergarten	3	3
Turkey	Practising nursery	3	3
Turkey	Nursery class	5	1
Turkey	Early childhood care and education: day nursery	0	6
Turkey	Special education kindergarten and nursery classes	3	3
Ukraine	Pre-primary education	1	5

Source: UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009.

Table 6. ISCED 0 programmes for Latin America & the Caribbean

Country	Programme Name	Theoretical Starting Age	Programme Duration
Latin America and the Caribbean			
Anguilla	Pre-primary	3	2
Argentina	Kindergarten	3.5	2
Argentina	Pre-school education	3	3
Bolivia	Programa de atención al niño (PAN)	0	5
Bolivia	Ciclo de preparación escolar	4	2
Bolivia	Ciclo de primeros aprendizajes	3	1
Bolivia	Ciclo de preparación escolar	4	2
Brazil	Early Childhood Education (Pre-school)	4	3
Brazil	Literacy Classes for Children	6	1
Brazil	Kindergarten	3	2
Brazil	Pre-school	5	1
Brazil	Nursery and Reception	3	2
British Virgin Islands	Pre-school	3	2
Chile	Pre-primary	3	3
Colombia	Maternelle	3	3
Colombia	Éducation pré-scolaire	3	3
Colombia	Enseignement préscolaire	3	3
Colombia	Pré-scolaire	3	3
Cuba	"Educa a tu hijo" vías no formales	0	2
Cuba	Educ. Preescolar	1	5
Dominica	Pre-primary	3	2
Dominican Republic	Pre-kindergarten	3	1
Dominican Republic	Kindergarten	4	1
Dominican Republic	Preescolar	5	1
Guatemala	Centros de Aprendizaje Comunitario en Educación Preescolar, CENACEP	6	1
Guatemala	Proyecto de Atención Integral al Niño y la niña de 0 a 6 años (PAIN)	0 - 6	7
Haiti	Préscolaire	3	3
Honduras	Educación Prebásic/ Jardines de Niños/ CCEPREB	3	3
Mexico	Pre-primary education	4	3
Montserrat	Nursery	3	2
Netherlands Antilles	Educación maternal/infantil/Preprimaria/ Preescolar	3	3
Panama	Pre-primary education	3	2
Panama	Pre-Jardín	3	2
Panama	Jardín	5	2
Paraguay	Kindergarten	3.8	2
Saint Lucia	Early Childhood Education / Pre-Primary (Preschool)	3	2
S. Vincent & Grenadines	Early Childhood Education	2	3
Turks & Caicos Islands	Enseignement préprimaire	3	3
Venezuela	Preescolar formal	3	3

Source: UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009.

Table 7. ISCED 0 programmes for North America and Western Europe

Country	Programme Name	Theoretical Starting Age	Programme Duration
North America and Western Europe			
Austria	Pre- school	3	2
Belgium	Regular pre-primary education	2.5	3
Belgium	Special pre-primary education	2.5	3
Belgium	Regular nursery education	2.5	3
Belgium	Special nursery education	2.5	3
Belgium	European and international schools	2.5	3
Belgium	Enseignement Maternel	4	2
Canada	Enseignement Préscolaire	3	3
Cyprus	Pre-primary/Kindergarten	3	3
Cyprus	Pre-school	4	1
Cyprus	Reception Programme	4	1
Denmark	Kindergarten	2	4
Denmark	Pre-school class in primary school	5	1
Finland	Kindergartens (3 to 5-year-old children), including special ed. programmes	3	3
Finland	Pre-primary education for 6-year-old children in kindergartens and comprehensive schools, including special education programmes	6	1
France	Pre-school education	2	4
Germany	Kindergarten	3	3
Germany	School kindergarten	6	1
Germany	Pre-school classes	5	1
Gibraltar	Programme d'éveil de la petite enfance	4	3
Greece	Kindergarten (Pre-primary)	4	2
Iceland	Pre-primary schools	2	4
Iceland	0 grade for 5 year olds	5	1
Ireland	Early start and private pre-primary	3	1
Israel	Pre-primary	3	3
Italy	Pre-primary school	3	3
Luxembourg	early maturity education	3	1
Luxembourg	Early maturity education (independent private institutions)	<4	2
Luxembourg	Pre-primary education	4	2
Luxembourg	Pre-primary education (independent private institutions)	4	2
Monaco	Préprimaire	3	3
Netherlands	Primary ed. and primary special needs ed.; pupils 3-5 years of age	4	
Norway	Pre-school	3	3
Spain	Pre-primary education	0	6
Sweden	Pre-school, for children/pupils 3 years of age or older	3	3
Sweden	Pre-school classes	6	1
Sweden	Education pré-scolaire	3	3
Switzerland	Kindergarten	4	2
Switzerland	Pre-primary	3	3
United States of America	Preschool or pre-kindergarten	2	2
United States of America	Kindergarten	4	1

Source: UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009.

Table 8. ISCED 0 programmes for Sub-Saharan Africa

Country	Programme Name	Theoretical Starting Age	Programme Duration
Sub-Saharan Africa			
Botswana	Pre-primary	2.5	3
Burkina Faso	Enseignement préscolaire formelle	3	4
Cameroon	Education préprimaire	4	2
Côte d'Ivoire	Pré-scolaire (Public et privé)	3	3
Ethiopia	Pre-primary (Kindergarten)	4	3
Gabon	Pre-primaire	3	3
Gambia	Nursery	3	4
Guinea	Enseignement préprimaire	3	3
Guinea	Educación 1ce infancia	3	4
Guinea	Educación 2ce infancia	3	3
Kenya	Early childhood development programme (ECD)	3	3
Kenya	Nursery	3	2
Kenya	Pre-unit	5	1
Lesotho	Early childhood	3	3
Mali	Education préscolaire	4	3
Mauritius	Pre-primary education	3	2
Namibia	Pre-primary program	5	2
Niger	Préscolaire	4	3
Nigeria	Pre-primary education	3	3
Rwanda	Préscolaire	3	3
Sao Tome and Principe	ECE	3	3
Sierra Leone	Pre-primary	3	3
Sierra Leone	Educación Parvularia	4	3
Sierra Leone	Programas de educación infantil (CDI)	4	3
Sierra Leone	Educación prescolar y basica en la Red Solidaria	6	1
Sierra Leone	Juega Leyendo	6	1
Somalia	Early childhood programme	5	1
Uganda	Pre-school / Nursery school	2	2
Uganda	Play-group / Day nursery	2	2
Uganda	Reception classes	4	1
United Republic of Tanzania	Pre-primary	5	2
Zambia	Pre-school education	3	4
Zimbabwe	Pre-school	3	3

Source: UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009.

Other ECCE Programmes

These programmes are reported in *Section III* in the UIS questionnaire (all other non-formal education)¹¹. Table 9 shows that most of the countries who have answered the ISCED questionnaire do not report *Other ECCE programmes*. One of the reasons for that might be the fact that they do not have ECCE programmes that would fall outside ISCED 0. However, research and international review of ECCE programmes systematically show that this is not the case, especially in developing countries. Thus, the fact that this data is not used to develop educational indicators or even reported as such, might undermine the incentives countries would have to fill out this table. It might also expose difficulties most countries do have in collecting data for programmes that fall outside of MoE constituency. As the review of these programmes reported shows, they tend to be non-formal in nature, delivered outside an educational centre and in some cases not requiring the same educator certification as ISCED 0 programmes.

Table 9. Other ECCE programmes by region in Section III – ISCED Questionnaire

Region	Total Countries	Section III Countries	%
Arab States	20	4	20%
Central Asia	9	1	11%
Central and Eastern Europe	21	0	0%
East Asia and the Pacific	34	3	9%
Latin America and the Caribbean	41	11	27%
North America and Western Europe ¹²	29	1	3%
Sub-Saharan Africa	45	8	18%
South and West Asia	9	1	11%
All	208	29	14%

Source: UIS ISCED database, June 2009. *Section III* of the ISCED Questionnaire.

However, in most of the cases, programmes reported in *Section III* tend to focus on younger children (0-3). This could be because these programmes are only offered to children within this age group or because younger children enrolled in ISCED 0 programmes cannot be reported on ISCED 0 table, thus the programmes are presented again in *Section III* along with enrolment data for the younger age group. This is the case of Brazil, where early childhood education programmes target children ages 0 to 6. Thus data is split by age and reported in two different tables on the UIS questionnaire.

Table 10 provides an overview of the programmes reported in *Section III* in 2007 and 2008. For the reasons presented above, as well as the fact that developed countries do not have a “Section III” table in their international data collection instrument, it is important to interpret this table with caution and to consider that the size and diversity of ECCE programmes around the world is greater. Also, information submitted by countries in this Section is limited and many are missing or not available.

¹¹ The ISCED questionnaire has 3 sections: I – Regular or formal education programmes; II - Adult education (formal and non-formal); III – all other non-formal education

¹² These countries do not receive UIS questionnaires with the exception of Andorra, which is the country cited in this table.

Table 10: Other ECCE programmes by region

Country	Programme	Starting Age Range	Duration	Stats Collected	Stats Reported	Teacher Qualifications	Education Institution
Arab States							
Djibouti	Écoles coraniques de "plein air" ou école de la rue	3 - 7					
Egypt	Nurseries	2 - 3	2				Y
Mauritania	Jardins d'enfants	3	3				
Mauritania	Crèches		5				
Morocco	Préscolaire						
Central Asia							
Azerbaijan	Others ECCE	1	2				
East Asia and the Pacific							
Brunei Darussalam	Nursery	2	1	Y	Y	3	
Brunei Darussalam	Nursery	3	1	Y	Y	3	
Cambodia	Pre-school community		5				
Cambodia	Home based Early childhood care (starting age <5)		5				
Indonesia	Play groups and crèches						
Latin America and the Caribbean							
Brazil	Early Childhood Education (nursery/day care)	0	3				
British Virgin Islands	Day care	0	3	Y	Y	3	
British Virgin Islands	Summer school programme	4		Y	N		
British Virgin Islands	Day care	0	2				
Cayman Islands	Day care	0	5				
Cayman Islands	Early Intervention	0	4.75	Y	Y	5	
Costa Rica	Maternal II	2.5	1				
Costa Rica	Interactivo I	3.5	1				
Cuba	Educa a tu Hijo	0	5	Y	Y	3	N
Dominican Republic	Casas infantiles comunitarias	2	3				
Honduras	Educación Prebásica -CCEPREB	5	1	Y	Y	Voluntary	N
Honduras	INHFA	0	3	N	N	No Qual	N
Mexico	Initial education programmes						
Saint Lucia	Day care services	1	2				
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Early Childhood/Care	1	3				
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Day care services	1	2				
Venezuela	Atención no Convencional Preescolar (SENIFA)	0		Y	N	3	N

Table 10 continued.

Country	Programme	Starting Age Range	Duration	Stats Collected	Stats Reported	Teacher Qualifications	Education Institution
North America and Western Europe							
Andorra	Guarderia	0	3				
Sub-Saharan Africa							
Burundi	Education maternelle communautaire	4 - 6	1	N	N	1	Y
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Jardin d'enfants	1	3				
Kenya	Quranic institutions (Madarassa and Duksis)- Early childhood						
Liberia	Nursery		2				
Namibia	Early childhood programme	1	4	N	N		Y
Nigeria	Nursery 1-3		3				
Seychelles	Non formal early childhood	0	4				
South Africa	Early childhood development	0 - 3					
South and West Asia							
Pakistan	Day care centres (play group)	1	2				

Source: UIS-UOE ISCED database, June 2009.

Starting Age Range – The starting age for these programmes/activities may vary considerably. Countries are asked to mention as many options as applicable.

Duration – The number of years the programme or activity is planned to last. The duration for these programmes/activities may vary dramatically. Countries are asked to provide any age range possible.

Stats Collected – *Are statistics collected for this programme?*

Stats Reported – *Are these statistics reported in the data provided to UNESCO through the UIS questionnaires on education statistics?* The response to this column ideally should be “NO” since the UIS questionnaire requests that adult education and non-formal education are excluded from the statistics reported. However, for international comparability purposes, it is important to identify in which cases this separation is not possible.

Teacher Qualification – *Which minimum qualifications, in ISCED levels, are required to teach this programme?*

Education Institution – *Does this programme take place in an educational institution?* This criterion is important to identify programmes that may be part of a certain type of non-formal education or other educational activities taking place outside an institution.

Annex II. Development of ECCE indicators in Latin America

In 2000, the UNESCO Regional Bureau of Education for Latin America and the Caribbean started a project aiming at developing indicators to better measure the EFA goal related to ECCE. This project involved both ECCE and data specialists and tried to build upon the already existing international data collection system, and consequently ISCED97, as well the data available at national level. The first stage of the project involved a review of the Latin American EFA country reports in terms of definitions and indicators used to measure the achievement of the goal related to ECCE, as well as four case studies to identify data availability and indicators used at national level. A second phase of the project involved a proposal of a set of ECCE indicators to better capture the diversity of educational programmes for children ages 0 to 6 observed in the regions through EFA country reports. The proposal was discussed at a regional meeting with ECCE and data specialists. The third phase involved running a pilot in three countries of the region to prove the feasibility of collecting data and calculating the indicators.

In terms of data collection, the document proposes the following criteria for the classification of ECCE programmes: direct and indirect delivery (see Table 11). The direct delivery programmes target two different age groups (0-3 and 3-6 years old), and indirect delivery programmes would be divided between (a) parents and (b) means of communication. This division draws from the regions' experience with several indirect delivery types of programmes (i.e. *Educa tu Hijo* in Cuba and *PIM* in Brazil). It also divides direct delivery programmes into two types, taking into consideration differences between the two age ranges (0-3) and (3-6).

Table 11. Latin American experience: classification of ECCE programmes

Direct Delivery		Indirect Delivery (through)	
Children 0 to 3 years old	Children 3 to 6 years old	Parents (or other adult in charge)	Means of Communication (TV, radio, etc)
Disaggregate by programme management (private, private subsidized, public)	Disaggregate by programme management (private, private subsidized, public)	Disaggregate by programme management (private, private subsidized, public)	Disaggregate by programme management (private, private subsidized, public)

Source: UNESCO/Santiago, 2008

According to UNESCO/Santiago (2008) although data for children 0 to 6 years of age should be collected, there are important differences between these two age groups that justify considering them separately. From the ages of 0 to 3, there is a more direct presence of the family in the education of the children and less child autonomy, reflecting upon the types of educational programmes offered. In the first stage (ages 0 to 3), there are fewer formal educational programmes; most of the official and formal programmes are in the second stage (ages 3 to 6). In Latin America, most countries do divide early childhood into two stages. Also, in general, public policy tends to focus on the second stage of early childhood education; and to this age group, ECCE is in the process of being universalized in the region.

Table 12. Latin American selected countries: Classification of ECCE programmes according to UNESCO/Santiago proposal

Age group	Country	Types of Programme	
		Direct Delivery	Indirect Delivery
0 - 3	Brazil	Crèches	
	Chile	PMI, Jardín Infantil Clásico, Familiar, Étnico, Laboral Estacional, Jardín Infantil, Sala Cuna, Centros estacionales, Sala Cuna en Cárceles, Centros Bilingües Mapuches, Veranadas Pehuenche, Jardín sobre ruedas, Arca de Sofía, Jardín Isla	CASH, Jardín Infantil a Distancia, Aprendiendo Juntos, Jardín Infantil a Domicilio, Sala Cuna en el Hogar, Sala Cuna en el Consultorio
	Peru	Cuna, PIET, Wasa Wasi	PIETBAF, PAIGRUMA, Hermanos o niño/a, Abuelitos, Jardín Infantil a través de la radio
3-6	Brazil	Pré-Escolas	
	Chile	1er y 2o Nivel de Transición, PMI, Jardín Infantil Clásico, Familiar, Étnico, Laboral, Estacional, Jardín Infantil, Centros Estacionales, Centros Bilingües Mapuches, Veranadas Mapuches, Jardín sobre ruedas, Arca de Sofía, Jardín Isla	CASH, Jardín Infantil a Distancia, Aprendiendo Juntos, Jardín Infantil a Domicilio, Patio Abierto
	Peru	Jardines, PRONOEI, Programas de articulación, PAIN	Jardín Infantil a través de la radio

Source: UNESCO/Santiago, 2008

The classification of programmes in 3 different countries showed a variety of programmes (Table 12) under both direct and indirect programmes. It also showed that although there are common programmes for children ages 0 to 6, some programmes are tailored according to the age group.