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)