

4.2 Developmentally on track (ECD)

- What tools should be used?
 - One tool is not feasible or desirable for all countries
 - Explore a common set of items across MICS ECDI, new OECD study, regional studies such as IDELA, EAP, MELQO
 - Set criteria for usable data – nationally representative sample of all children, direct child assessment vs. parent or teacher surveys
- How to define developmentally on track (threshold)?
 - Decide on whether to consider the boundaries of normal child development (mild and moderate disabilities would be captured by the scales)
 - Explore whether we are interested in relative (within each country) and absolute (across all countries) “on track”
 - Look at longitudinal data where exists
 - Examine what countries are already measuring. Line up all national standards (common constructs across ELDS countries)
 - Include children birth to age six, even if one age group is the main focus at the start

- How to establish global comparability
 - Explore approaches: anchor items, scaling, growth curves
 - Determine whether there are gold standard tools (there are promising methodologies so far, but no clear gold standard)
 - What domains could be measured (follow a clear developmental/learning trajectory)? Explore whether some domains are possible to measure on an internationally comparable scale, while others might need to be nationally defined
- Periodicity
 - 3-5 years probably feasible and enough time to see changes

Next steps

- Set up task force and develop timeline—develop technical strategy
- In-country consultations on what is developmentally on-track
- Guidance for how to integrate into regional and national efforts, also how to coordinate across indicators (esp. 4.1)
- Developing steps at a country level and trying out in a few countries explicitly interested in measuring 4.2

Where are we on 4.2

- Moved from tier 2 to 3, more susceptible to being removed
- Antidote: Workplan on how to measure
- Member states unwilling to adopt just one measure (e.g. MICS ECDI)
- Issues around coverage – ECDI adapted for low-income countries
- Psychometric properties questioned
- More interest in direct child assessment
- Can ECD be measured in an internationally comparable way across settings
- Is it inappropriate to assess very young children
- Last version of list of tools went to IEAG-SDGs inc. IDELA, EAP-ECS

- Questions: Who is reporting and how can the existing tools communicate with each other?
 - Low correlations between existing tools
 - Parent report easier
 - Anchor item tests, D-score
 - MELQO, IDELA, others have taken the field down the road to finding common items
 - Appear to be core items

Anchor item model

- Each tool commits to using a common set of items

Scaling

- Putting existing tools on developmental trajectory beginning at the 0-3 range
- Developmentally on-track can be absolute or relative –
- Increasingly complex skills – can work for cognitive and social-emotional domains

Growth curve model

- Test high-income children in all countries to determine ideal development/learning for each domain

Common set of items

- D-scores, anchor items
- Using IRT to identify a small set of the most sensitive items
- Requires a gold standard/anchor test (WPSI, but would need s/e)