A Framework and Tool Box for Monitoring and Improving Quality
I. INTRODUCTION

In a bid to expand provision, countries in the CEECIS region have adopted a number of different approaches to reach young children with early education opportunities. Several countries have introduced, expanded or universalized one year of pre-primary education. Sometimes referred to as Grade 0, this arrangement is intended to address 5-6 year olds or 6-7 year olds depending on the age of entry to compulsory schooling which for example is age 6 in Serbia and age 7 in the Kyrgyz Republic. Children in the age group 3-6/7 years, particularly those who come from privileged, urban families, attend full-day kindergartens many of which survived the transition from Soviet times. Given the very limited number of places in these kindergartens, countries have begun to devise and expand alternative arrangements for early education, primarily community-based early learning centers and half-day preschools that are supported by Ministries of Education, local authorities, NGOs or private parties. Given the burgeoning early childhood education sector and the relatively independently evolving educational arrangements, it is critical that there is a common understanding and application of quality concepts in order to ensure a) that resources invested will lead to appropriate outcomes, and b) young children are protected from potentially harmful practices. A generic quality framework developed at regional level is intended to guide the development of country-context specific frameworks, in order to guide, control, and monitor the performance of the respective early education arrangements. It is hoped that country specific frameworks will provide the necessary impulse to gather and analyze relevant data and feed it back in order to improve the quality of services. Quality monitoring and assurance of ECE services is directly related to larger issues that countries face in the region such as ECE programme improvement, scalability, certification, and impact assessment. It also has important implications for equity as it has the potential to identify variations in provision for different socio-economic population groups.

All children have the right to education resources and services that support their development in early childhood. In addition to young children’s right to early childhood education, quality early childhood development interventions are proven to alleviate the effects of poverty on children, families, women, communities, and societies. In the CEECIS region, access to early childhood education (ECE) services, although generally still limited and inequitable, has begun to show signs of improvement in the last decade, with increased preschool enrolments, improved policies on early education and more widespread awareness of the importance of ECE.

The drive to improve access to ECE has not been accompanied by a parallel interest in issues of quality, leaving the region with very little information about how well children and families are being served. As innovative alternative models of ECE services continue to develop alongside traditional models, there is a need for measurement tools to gather and analyze data in order to assess and monitor the quality and outcomes of early education services, with a view to increasing both effectiveness and efficiency. Such data are needed to provide evidence to support policy, regulatory, planning and advocacy processes. Quality monitoring and quality assurance are directly related to issues of programme improvement,
scalability, certification, and impact assessment. Monitoring also has important implications for equity, as it has the potential to identify disparities in the provision of services and the kind of services available to different population groups.

Research in the United States, the European Union and developing countries shows that the positive impacts of early education services for all children, including those most in need, are evident only when services meet a minimum threshold of quality. Internationally, the quest for quality in ECE services, together with fairness in the provision of services, is beginning to appear more frequently on the agenda of international policy platforms, programs and initiatives, in both developed and developing countries and is of growing concern for international organizations worldwide (OECD, UNESCO, UNICEF, and the World Bank, among others).

The new challenge for the international community is to support countries in developing strategies for assessing, monitoring, and improving the quality of early education services. While indicators and tools for monitoring access to early education have become more widespread, resources and capacity at country level for tracking levels of and improvements in quality remain scarce. In order to increase countries’ interest and commitment to improving the quality of ECE services, there is a need to create a common understanding around:

(i) the definition of quality for early education services;
(ii) the components of quality that should be tracked and monitored;
(iii) a selection of validated tools for measuring and monitoring services; and,
(iv) the gathering, management and use of information and data on quality.

In early education, as in other levels of education, there are many different factors that contribute to quality, e.g. learning environment, teacher quality, and the home-school relationship. To measure quality accurately, all of these factors must be taken into account. While there are many tools for monitoring individual aspects of quality, e.g. learning outcomes, there is currently no comprehensive framework in CEECIS countries that incorporates all components of quality in a systematic way.

Contents: This ECE quality resource comprises two documents:

**Volume I**: Entitled *Quality in Early Education: Conceptual Choices and Context*, develops the rationale and justification for the conceptual framework. It defines quality and presents selected components and indicators of quality for ECE services. It presents the CEECIS context, a brief overview of the status of children (with a focus on ages three to six), and of ECE services in the region. It answers questions like: What are the progress and current tendencies for ECE services addressing children’s needs between ages three and six and before Grade One? What are the challenges that must be met in order to achieve quality ECE services that also reach children who are most vulnerable and most at risk?

**Volume II**: Entitled *A Framework and Tool Box to Monitor and Measure Quality* describes the objectives, scope and methodology of the quality framework; it lists and explains seven components of quality ECE services used in the framework. It builds on Volume I by
providing guidance and tools for the development of frameworks for country-level monitoring and evaluation. Relevant existing tools for measuring and evaluating the quality of ECE programs for each category of quality factors are identified and recommended for use at country level. Two main sources were used to identify suitable tools:


It is anticipated, that a thorough understanding of the concept of quality and familiarity with the necessary instruments of data collection will enable ECE actors at country level:

(i) to prioritize at policy level aspects of quality across different ECE arrangements that should be measured and monitored;

(ii) to address disparities in the quality of ECE services across population groups; and,

(iii) to maintain and promote improvements in access to quality ECE services for all children, especially the most disadvantaged children.

The proposed quality framework is expected to respond to:

(a) The policy challenges that governments in the CEECIS region are currently facing in order to improve the quality of existing Early Childhood Education services;

(b) The recognized need to drastically improve the quality of ECE services especially for children from disadvantaged environments in the region, given the fact that there is now vigorous evidence suggesting that only quality ECE services benefit all children and especially children from disadvantaged families;

(c) The international interest in boosting the quality of Early Childhood Education services, in order to meet EFA Goal 1 aiming to ensure that all children are prepared for school and successful learning.

**Rationale**

Why is a conceptual framework for measuring the quality of ECE services needed? The following provide a rationale for the development of this framework:

- ECE is emerging as a growing policy priority in the CEECIS region and worldwide. Economic, social science and programme evaluations have all shown that investing in education for young children has powerful short- and long-term impacts on children’s learning outcomes, well-being and potential. ECE services are also proven to play an important role in alleviating poverty for children, families, communities and societies.
• Early education is directly linked to the effectiveness and efficiency of basic education; children who attend preschool are more likely to be ready for primary school and are more likely to persist and succeed in education. Quality preschool education can also play an important compensatory role in reducing the developmental gap between children from resource backgrounds and their more privileged peers.

• The Education for All goals commit the international community to ‘expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children’ (Goal No. 1). The CEECIS region has made significant progress in increasing and monitoring access to ECE services. However, there has been no systematic evaluation of the quality of existing ECE services. There is an important need for data on the quality of ECE. The proposed quality monitoring framework will provide a comprehensive approach to enable UNICEF Country Offices (COs), government agencies and partners to gather information on and monitor indicators of quality.

• Quality education is notoriously difficult to define; this is one reason it is so rarely monitored. In early education, as in other levels of education, there are many different components contributing to quality, e.g. learning environment, teacher quality, the home-school relationship, etc. To accurately measure quality, all of these components must be accounted for. Yet, while there are many tools for monitoring individual aspects of quality, e.g. learning outcomes, there is currently no comprehensive tool that incorporates all the relevant components of quality. The proposed quality monitoring framework will identify and bring together existing instruments into one comprehensive quality measuring package. This will improve and increase efforts to evaluate the quality of early learning services, increase the accessibility of existing tools and increase attention to neglected components of quality.

• Research shows that in order for ECE to have a positive impact on children’s development, communities and societies, the services must meet a minimum standard of quality. This means that if the quality of existing services in the region is below the minimum threshold that ECE will not bring positive impacts for children and their families. Sub-par levels of quality may even lead to a reversal in the progress made toward increasing access to ECE, given the strong linkages between quality and access. For example, governments may choose to stop or reverse investments in ECE, if the benefits are not clear and if quality levels are insufficient. The proposed quality monitoring framework will raise awareness of the importance of paying attention to all components of quality. For UNICEF COs and partners, the outputs of the quality monitoring framework will provide more evidence to support programmatic improvement and advocacy.
Given the low levels of quality in primary and secondary schools in the CEECIS region, there is good reason to be concerned about the levels of quality in ECE. In addition to providing an overall picture of quality, the quality monitoring framework will encourage the identification of individual programmes and policies, which will allow service providers and other stakeholders to focus attention on improving quality.

**Goal and objectives**

This framework is meant to be a tool to help governments, public and non-public providers to develop policies, revise existing monitoring and assessment systems and operationalize a strategy in order to improve the overall quality of ECE services. The goal of the framework is to improve the access of young children, especially those from the most disadvantaged groups, to quality ECE services in the CEECIS region.

The objective of this paper is to provide a comprehensive framework of tools for monitoring and evaluating the quality of ECE services as a means to improving access to and availability of such services in the CEECIS region, with the following aims:

- To construct a definition of quality ECE services for the CEECIS region
- To identify and recommend selected existing tools for measuring ECE quality and to assess the gaps in available tools, and
- To recommend how monitoring information should flow and be managed at local and national level
- To enable the development of country level quality monitoring frameworks through providing conceptual guidance

**Scope**

For the purposes of this report ECE services are defined as educational arrangements that target children aged three to seven (before Grade One). This corresponds to ISCED Level 0 - equal to pre-primary education as defined by OECD in 1997. Early education services may be provided by public, private, non-profit, and community-based services, including faith-based services, through a centre-based approach. While recognizing the importance of home-based and parent-mediated early childhood education, the focus here is on centre-based early education. Early childhood programmes for children in the age group birth to three are also not included as they fall within the realm of child development rather than education and involve different sets of actors and agents. It is appreciated that a framework that addresses the quality of health, protection and welfare services for children under age three and their families is needed. We also acknowledge that while developmentally the birth to three years period and the three to six years period can be distinguished from one another, children’s needs for care, affection and language and intellectual development are continuous; early education necessarily includes strong elements of care and support for the young children’s social and emotional development. Indeed other groups, have attempted to address quality issues with respect to the entire
early childhood period. We however, for the sake of conceptual clarity are limiting ourselves to services provided through ECE centers. Any early childhood education system is composed of several building blocks and a number of questions relating to the quality of each of these building blocks need to be articulated. We describe very briefly the building blocks as well as relevant questions relating to quality in Table 1. Again, a comprehensive framework that addresses the quality of the early childhood education system in a country would necessarily include all these and more questions. The Quality Framework proposed in Volume II restricts itself to blocks 1, 2 and 4. The overall discussion on quality however cannot be divided up into neat and mutually exclusive categories and we refrain from attempting to do this in the later sections of Volume I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Blocks</th>
<th>Examples of Quality-related Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1 Service Delivery** | - Are services equitable and inclusive?  
| **Effective and quality ECE interventions** | - Are services responsive to and respectful of the rights and needs of young children and their families? |
| **2 ECE Workforce** | - Are early educators adequately trained and skilled?  
| | - Do they receive adequate mentoring and remuneration |
| **3 Information Systems** | - Are data on ECE collected using valid methods and routinely?  
| **Production, analysis, dissemination and use of reliable information** | - Are data analyses made available for evidence-based decision-making? |
| **4 Curricula, Pedagogy, Teaching-Learning Resources** | - Are these based on child rights principles and the science of how children develop and learn?  
| | - Are learning resources developmentally appropriate? |
| **5 Financing** | - Are available funds adequate to implement policy commitments?  
| | - Are funds used efficiently and effectively? |
| **6 Policy, Legislation, Regulations, Governance** | - Is ECE policy and legislation in line with the UNCRC and national policy frameworks? Are regulations enforced?  
| | - Is the governance infrastructure adequate and effective? |


Geographically, the focus is on UNICEF’s CEECIS region. Twenty-eight countries and territories are part of the CEECIS region (UNICEF works in 22). Since 1989, these countries have shared a common past. They have all transitioned from centrally planned communist economies to democratic market economies; experienced economic growth (2000-2008); and, since 2008, they have been undergoing the effects of the economic crisis. The implications of this crisis are still under analysis, especially in terms of their effects on human development, health and education services, as well as poverty indicators. A group of Central and South-Eastern European countries is part of the European Union; other countries are in the process of becoming members; and a third group has privileged agreements with the European Union. Thus, both economically and politically, the European Union constitutes the present and the future of a large number of CEECIS countries (see Box 1).
Box 1: Which Countries form part of the CEE and CIS?

Central and Eastern Europe (CEE): Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia
Baltic Countries: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania
South-Eastern Europe (EU): Bulgaria, Romania
South-Eastern Europe (Non-EU): Albania, B&H, Croatia, Montenegro, Serbia, FYR The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Western CIS: Belarus, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Ukraine
Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia
Central Asia: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan

Of the above, eight Central European countries joined the EU in 2004: the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia. Bulgaria and Romania joined the EU in 2007. Croatia began EU accession negotiations in October 2005.

For analytical purposes, UNICEF divides the heterogeneous CEECIS region into four sub-regions: (a) Central Asia (b) the Caucasus (c) Western CIS and (d) South Eastern Europe.


Guiding Principles

All of UNICEF’s work to promote access to quality early childhood services takes a rights-based approach. A rights-based approach to education is informed by seven basic principles of human rights, which are the following:

A rights-based approach to education is informed by seven basic principles of human rights:

1. Universality and inalienability: Human rights are universal and inalienable, the entitlement of all people everywhere in the world. An individual cannot voluntarily give them up, nor can others take them away.
2. **Indivisibility**: Human rights are indivisible. Whether civil, cultural, economic, political or social, human rights are all inherent to the dignity of every person.

3. **Interdependence and interrelatedness**: The realization of one right often depends, wholly or in part, on the realization of others.

4. **Equality and non-discrimination**: All individuals are equal as human beings, and by virtue of the inherent dignity of each person, are entitled to their rights without discrimination of any kind.

5. **Participation and inclusion**: Every person and all peoples are entitled to active, free and meaningful participation in, contribution to and enjoyment of civil, economic, social, cultural and political development.

6. **Empowerment**: Empowerment is the process by which the capabilities of people to demand and use their human rights grow. The goal is to give people the power and capabilities to claim their rights in order to change their own lives and improve their communities.

7. **Accountability and respect for the rule of law**: A rights-based approach seeks to raise levels of accountability in the development process by identifying ‘rights holders’ and corresponding ‘duty bearers’, and to enhance the capacities of those duty bearers to meet their obligations.

**Intended outcomes**

The hope is that this ECE quality framework will help to inform discussion around key questions raised by government, service providers, civil society organizations, communities, and parents:

- How is quality defined in ECE?
- What are the components that make up quality ECE?
- What guidance on monitoring the quality of ECE is available in international literature?
- What tools and resources already exist for measuring the quality of ECE?
- How can these tools be applied in CEECIS countries?
- What opportunities and gaps exist among existing tools for measuring quality?
II. HOW TO USE THIS FRAMEWORK

This framework provides a menu of tools to support stakeholders to evaluate the quality of ECE services in their contexts; it is not intended to act as a comprehensive assessment to be applied in its entirety to ECE services. When applying this framework, stakeholders are encouraged to pick and choose the components of quality, the tools and the strategies that are most applicable to their contexts. Countries are also encouraged to build on the structure of this framework to develop national ECE quality frameworks and locally relevant tools. More guidance is provided in Chapter 6 on how to develop national quality frameworks for ECE.

The following steps provide loose guidance on how this framework may be applied at country or regional levels.

1. **Establish ECE Quality task force to coordinate the quality assessment.** The task force should include relevant ministry officials, local partners working on ECE and international partners. If possible, it should be chaired by a Ministry of Education official that can champion that findings and advocate in government for improved quality in early education. (Ideally this would be an official with a strong personal commitment to ECE)

2. **Review this framework’s components, definitions and indicators through collaborative process.** Discuss the components and categories of this framework amongst task force members in the context of existing knowledge of ECE quality in your country. Review existing assessments or analysis of ECE quality in your context.

3. **Identify the component(s) of quality that will be assessed in priority.** After discussing the information that exists and comparing the quality framework, decide together on which of the components should be assessed first according to the needs and opportunities in your context.

4. **Review the tools listed for chosen component(s) and identify which tools may be useful in your country context.** Once you have identified which components will be evaluated, identify which tools listed in the following chapters may be used or adapted and then used. It may be that none of the tools listed here are sufficient in their current form for your context; many of the tools are very complex. If this is the case, the tools can act as a foundation for a local research team to develop locally relevant tools that draw from internationally accepted tools.

5. **Adapt the tool(s) to your context.** All tools listed in this framework will need to be adapted, even those that have already been piloted in the region. Quality is a very context-specific concept and so any tools should be as closely aligned as possible to the local environment.

6. **Select research team to design and conduct assessment(s), which should include a pilot of the adapted tools.** The research team may be international or local (or a mix). The team should consist of experts in M&E but also experts in ECE. If student
interviews are required, the research team MUST have team members who are experienced in working with young children.

7. **When initial assessment is complete, debrief on the results and develop advocacy and follow up strategies based on the findings.** The results of the assessment are only the first step in improving ECE quality and in ensuring longer term quality monitoring systems. Once the reports are available the task team should come together to discuss the results, identify advocacy messages and develop follow up strategies for disseminating the results. This would also be an opportunity to discuss the possibility of developing a national framework for monitoring the quality of ECE.
III. FRAMEWORK FOR MEASURING QUALITY OF ECE

There is no static definition of quality. Quality is a dynamic concept that changes with time and across contexts. For the purpose of this framework, quality is defined according to categories and components deemed essential for ECE services in this region. This definition draws from a desk review of quality definitions and builds on UNICEF’s existing frameworks of education quality, such as the Child Friendly School Framework.

The definition of quality comprises seven fundamental components, which are organized into five categories. UNESCO provides a visual representation of the structure of the quality ECE services according to the five categories: learner characteristics, enabling inputs, teaching and learning processes, outcomes and context. See Figure 2.

All of the categories and components identified in Figure 2 are important in measuring and improving quality. However, the scope of this framework addresses only three of the categories: teaching and learning processes, enabling inputs and outcomes. Within these three categories seven components have been identified as being of particular importance for the CEECIS region. The tools, definitions and indicators provided in this framework will center around these seven priority components (shown in bold in Figure 2):

1. Physical learning environment
2. Teaching and learning processes
3. Teacher quality
4. Curriculum
5. School readiness outcomes
6. Leadership
7. Parent and community involvement

These components were selected based on a desk review that was conducted for the background paper that supports this framework (See Part 1: Quality in Early Education: Conceptual Choices and Context). These components were identified because they plan a key role in improving the quality of ECE services in the CEECIS region in an equitable way.

The authors of the framework include additional components (not bolded) that will not be discussed in this paper. This is to demonstrate that these seven components are not exhaustive; the definition of quality can be adapted and the core components can be changed according to local priorities and contexts. Countries, according to their needs, may prioritize specific components, and add or delete components. For example, recent EU reports identify three factors being crucial for providing high quality ECE services and serving especially children from disadvantaged environments in EU countries: (1) A favorable child/adult ratio; (2) High-level training for educational staff (tertiary education); and (3) Parental involvement.
A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING QUALITY OF CENTER-BASED ECE SERVICES

Enabling inputs

Teaching and learning processes
- Learning time
- Teaching methods
- Assessment, feedback, incentives
- Class size
- Teaching and learning materials
- Curriculum
- Physical learning environment
- Teacher quality
- Leadership: principals, inspectors, supervisors, administrators
- Parent and community involvement

Outcomes
- School readiness
- Early literacy and numeracy skills
- Social and emotional skills

Learner characteristics
- Prior knowledge
- Barriers to learning
- Parental support

Context
- Economic and labour market conditions in the community
- Socio-cultural and religious factors
- (Aid strategies)
- Educational strategies and support infrastructure
- Public resources available for education
- Competitiveness of the teaching profession on the labour market
- National governance and management strategies
- Philosophical stand point of teacher and learner
- Peer effects
- Parental support
- Time available for schooling and homework
- National standards (ELDS)
- Public expectations


FIGURE 2. A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING QUALITY OF CENTER-BASED ECE SERVICES
IV. DEFINITIONS, INDICATORS AND TOOLS FOR MEASURING AND MONITORING THE QUALITY OF ECE CENTERS

This chapter presents each of the seven priority components in greater detail: Physical learning environment; Teaching and learning processes; Teacher quality; Curriculum; School readiness outcomes; Leadership; and Parent and community involvement. For each of the seven components, the following information will be provided:

- **Introduction to the component.** The first few paragraphs of each section describe the importance of the component and the rationale for monitoring its quality. These short paragraphs can be used in the development of advocacy materials.

- **Definition of the component.** Each of the seven components fundamental to the definition of quality are themselves complex to define. Each organization, stakeholder and parent may have a different perception of the definition of quality. This section provides some examples of definitions for each quality component, however it should be understood that these are only a few of the possible definitions and stakeholders using this framework should take the time to explore national definitions of quality.

- **Table of tools that can be used to measure the component.** Each Table of Tools provides a list of existing quality assessment instruments that are available to measure the component of quality covered in the section. All of the tools are described in greater detail in Annex 1. The Tool number assigned in the table corresponds to the number of the tool in the Annex. It should be noted that some of the tools can measure more than one component of quality.

1. **THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

The quality of the physical environment is strongly linked to the quality of the learning that can take place in an ECE facility. In the CEECIS region, ECE facilities are often not appropriate for young children, with poor isolation and maintenance, and without the right sanitation and heating system to face the harsh winters. Buildings may also be vulnerable in natural catastrophes where young children are among the first victims (flood, earthquakes, and other hazards). Rehabilitation of buildings is under way in several countries, however there

---

is a lack of public budget for construction, rehabilitation and maintenance, and costs are often passed on to parents and the communities. This means that in poorer communities, facilities and general learning environment are often of poorer quality because of the lack of resources in the community. Thus, assessments of physical environment should be a priority for equity, safety, efficiency, and pedagogical reasons.

**Defining the physical environment**

The physical environment comprises the environment inside and outside an ECE facility. Key characteristics of physical environment of an education setting are **location, accessibility, safety, flexibility, scale, and visibility** (OECD, 2010a). ‘The role of the physical environment is to support the activities and needs of the users. The characteristics of the physical environment include the location, accessibility, safety, flexibility, scale and visibility. Buildings should enable the teachers and care[givers] to carry out their work with as little stress placed on them by the environment as possible. Implications on policy level are related to spacing standards, maintenance and the use of facilities outside school hours (OECD, 2010b).’

Thus a quality early physical learning environment is: ‘a physical space that supports multiple and diverse teaching and learning programmes and pedagogies, including current technologies; one that demonstrates optimal, cost-effective building performance and operation over time; one that respects and is in harmony with the environment; and one that encourages social participation, providing a healthy, comfortable, safe, secure and stimulating setting for its occupants (CELE, Undated).’

**Recommended Tools for monitoring the physical environment**

When assessing the state of the physical environment, a country should start with a status report to obtain the baseline and the right data on the situation of physical environment of ECE centers (public, nonpublic and community based centers), in regional and international safety standards, often developed in the country emergency plans. The following tools may guide countries in monitoring ECE physical environments or in developing local tools for monitoring the physical environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool No.</th>
<th>Name of tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1</td>
<td>International Pilot Study on the Evaluation of Quality in Education Spaces (EQES), OECE Centre for Effective Learning Environments (CELE) web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 2</td>
<td>Assessment Profile for Early Childhood Programmes (APECP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3</td>
<td>The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 7</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education (ECE) Programme Evaluation Package (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 8</td>
<td>Early Language &amp; Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 9</td>
<td>Early Literacy Observation Tool (E-LOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 11</td>
<td>Preschool Programme Quality Assessment, 2nd Edition (PQA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 16</td>
<td>Child Development Programme Evaluation Scale (CDPED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 19</td>
<td>ACEI Self-Assessment Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 22</td>
<td>High/Scope Project, USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESSES

Defining the teaching-learning process

The teaching learning process is at the heart of ECE services. It includes everything that goes on in the classroom but refers mainly to the interactions between teachers, students and their environment. Classroom interactions can be classified into three domains: emotional support, the classroom organization and the instructional support (See Figure 2).

‘Setting indicators for the quality of teaching and learning process is far more challenging than measuring learning outcomes as ultimately much depends on values and beliefs regarding educational purpose and the upbringing of children. It is, however, exactly the task that school inspectorates and other supervision services, perform for national governments. How teaching and learning processes are evaluated and monitored in schools and support for inspection services, including the development of quality indicators must be a central concern of any effort to ensure that all children are receiving meaningful basic education. (Alexander 2008).’

Currently, researchers and practitioners have wide-varying perspectives on the most appropriate pedagogical processes for child development. Some experts promote the developmentally appropriate practices (DAP) (with a ‘social-emotional orientation and based in the constructivist and social–constructivist theories) and others promote didactic or academic approaches with direct instruction and a strong focus on basic language and cognitive skills, relating to initial reading, writing and math, but not necessarily direct instruction (Leseman, 2009)².

This framework recommends a proposed synthesis of the two options considers that while DAP is the best option for the youngest children, older preschoolers should gradually be prepared for learning tasks, to facilitate transition to first grade. Thus in the year before grade 1: “An academic orientation on basic skills such as phonological awareness and letter knowledge, can be set in a curriculum of playful, authentic activities, including shared

² Paul P.M. Leseman, Utrecht University, the Netherlands EU/EACEA 2009)
dialogical reading and talking with the teacher, that foster deep vocabulary, discourse comprehension and world knowledge\(^3\).

Other approaches of ECE pedagogies active in the CEECIS region look at whether programmes are focusing on educating democratic values and inclusion in order to introduce young children to democratic values and reflexes and teaching them to participate and live together (adults and children) in a respectful, constructive manner (ISSA, 2009). Pedagogy is also approached from the point of view of interactions and pedagogical practices that promote creativity, communication and collaboration (Iram Siraj-Blachford, 2007) and the “child well-being” (UNICEF, 2009 and OECD, 2009).

Finally the last decades, in many programmes, there is growing respect for – and confidence in – children's adaptability and natural learning strategies, for e.g., play, active learning, expression through language and other media (such as the arts), learning from relationships with significant others, and informal but intense research on matters of interest or concern to the child. Listening to children is also a sign of respect for the child's capacity to guide his or her own learning, when supported by well-trained educators within a rich learning environment. Project themes or specific topics, influenced by the surrounding environment are determined by dialogue between children and educators. The main aim of this approach is that children should develop a desire and curiosity for learning, and confidence in their own learning, rather than achieving a pre-specified level of knowledge and proficiency (Martin-Korpi 2005).

ECE researchers underline that essential to pedagogical approaches should include:
- A positive socio-emotional climate: emotionally safe and stable relationships, with sensitive-responsive, teachers.
- Practice aimed at emerging learning (school) skills through authentic activities in which teachers participate.

**Recommended tools for monitoring the pedagogy and teaching-learning process**

There is a big industry of production of measures and instruments for monitoring pedagogy and the teaching-learning process (see Annex). Most of these instruments/measures were developed for research purposes having as objective to describe the settings and characteristics of Early Childhood Education services.

The proposed measures and tools to monitor the quality of early childhood classroom contexts and pedagogical processes were selected according to the following criteria:

a) The measure is used in early childhood education and care settings to assess the quality of settings for children 3 to 6 years old and focus on pedagogy and the teaching learning process.

b) Most of the measures are looking especially at the language development and communication, as this is an important parameter in child development especially for young children coming from disadvantaged communities.

\(^3\) Leseman P., in EACEA – Eurydice 2009
c) The measure can be obtained for use at low costs or free of charge.

d) The purpose of the measure is program improvement, monitoring, accreditation, and evidence-based policy development. Measures that are only for research and evaluation are not included (except if the measure is relevant for specific questions in the CEECIS).

e) The measure may be applied by the educators themselves with minimum training or by external observers who receive a “light” training.

f) Target users are mainly educators of the ECE programmes, local monitoring personnel, or policy makers.

g) The data collection methods are class/group observations, interviews, questionnaire and document review.

h) The data analysis requires only basic statistics treatment and not analysis by “expensive” international research centers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool No.</th>
<th>Name of tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool 2</td>
<td>Assessment Profile for Early Childhood Programmes (APECP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3</td>
<td>The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 5</td>
<td>The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 6</td>
<td>Early Childhood Classroom Observation Measure (ECCOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 7</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education (ECE) Programme Evaluation Package (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 8</td>
<td>Early Language &amp; Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 9</td>
<td>Early Literacy Observation Tool (E-LOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 10</td>
<td>Observation Measures of Language and Literacy (OMLIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 11</td>
<td>Preschool Programme Quality Assessment, 2nd Edition (PQA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 12</td>
<td>Preschool Rating Instrument for Science and Math (PRISM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. TEACHER QUALITY

Educators are those leading the teaching learning process and constitute the most important factor affecting the quality of ECE services, as continually is demonstrated in national and international analysis (OECD, 2010; Hanushek 2008; EU 2007).

Research evidence shows strong correlation between teachers and staff qualifications and child development outcomes (Montie, Xiang, Schweinhart 2006). Teacher knowledge of curricula and of child development principles correlate with strong child outcomes (Siraj-Blatchford et al. 2003). Finally there is evidence of low correlation between centers using paraprofessionals staffer centers and promising child development outcomes (Madrasa Preschools in East Africa - Mwaura and Mohamed, 2008).

Defining Educator Quality

Teacher quality may be the single most important school level factor influencing learning processes, families’ experiences with the school and student performances. The term ‘educators’ includes lead teachers and supporting staff that play a direct role in children’s learning in ECE centres.
‘Quality teachers are those that ‘use child-centred teaching approaches in well-managed classrooms and schools and skilful assessment to facilitate learning and reduce disparities’ (UNICEF, 2000). Defining the precise characteristics of a successful early childhood education teacher is very difficult, however the International Step by Step Association (ISSA) identifies a list of successful educator practices or ‘principles’ that act as indicators for quality teachers. The ISSA principles and indicators are broken into seven categories, as shown in Box XX.

Box XX. ISSA PRINCIPLES FOR QUALITY INSTRUCTION

‘1. Interactions
1.1 The Educator interacts with children in a friendly and respectful manner that supports the development of each child’s construction self/identity and learning
1.2 The educators interactions promote the development of a learning community where each child feels s/he belongs and is supported to reach his/her potential
1.3 The educator engages in purposeful, reciprocal interactions with other adults to support children’s development and learning

‘2. Family and community
2.1 The educator promotes partnerships with families and provides a variety of opportunities for families and community members to be involved in children’s learning and development.
2.2 The educator uses formal and informal opportunities for communication and information sharing with families.
2.3 The educator uses community resources and family culture to enrich children’s development and learning experiences.

‘3. Inclusion, diversity and values of democracy
3.1 The educator provides equal opportunities for every child and family to learn and participate regardless of gender, race, ethnic origin, culture, native language, religion, family structure, social status, economic status, age, or special need.
3.2 The educator helps children understand, accept, and appreciate diversity.
3.3 The educator develops children’s understanding of the values of civil society and the skills required for participation.

‘4. Assessment and planning
4.1 The educator regularly and systematically monitors each child’s progress, learning processes, and achievements.
4.2 The educator plans for teaching and learning based on information about children and national requirements.
4.3 The educator includes children, families, and relevant professionals in the assessment and planning process.

‘5. Teaching strategies
5.1 The educator implements a variety of teaching strategies that actively engage children to develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions as defined by national requirements, and which build the foundation for lifelong learning.
5.2 The educator uses teaching strategies that support children’s emotional and social
5.3 The educator designs activities taking into account children’s experiences and competences to support and expand further development and learning.
5.4 The educator uses strategies that promote democratic processes and procedures.

‘Learning environment
6.1 The educator provides a learning environment that promotes each child’s well-being.
6.2 The educator provides an inviting, safe, healthy, stimulating, and inclusive physical environment that promotes children’s exploration, learning, and independence.
6.3 The educator provides an environment that promotes children’s sense of community and participation in creating the classroom’s culture.

‘Professional development
7.1 The educator continually improves his/her competences to reach and maintain high quality in the teaching profession according to the changing demands of today’s world (ISSA, 2010).’

These indicators help evaluate educator quality at the classroom level. However, there are also systemic issues outside the classroom that have a major impact on educator quality. These issues must be considered in reflecting on the quality of the early education systems. See Chapter XX for more information on systems level monitoring.

**Recommended tools for monitoring**

Quantitative and qualitative data on initial training, professional development, payment, career development, and working conditions do exist in all countries gathered at the ECE settings, regional education offices, the MoE, the Ministry of Finance, and the National Statistics Offices. However, through a participatory process with participation of all stakeholders, countries should develop or endorse benchmarks and targets taking into account the EU, OECD and UNICEF suggested teacher policies, standards, and benchmarks.

Specifically for teacher professional skills assessment and monitoring many tools exist, in particular observation tools. These tools often overlap with tools intended to monitor teaching and learning processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool 2</td>
<td>Assessment Profile for Early Childhood Programmes (APECP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3</td>
<td>The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 5</td>
<td>The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 6</td>
<td>Early Childhood Classroom Observation Measure (ECCOM9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 7</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education Programme Evaluation Package (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 8</td>
<td>Early Language &amp; Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 11</td>
<td>Preschool Programme Quality Assessment, 2nd Edition (PQA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 13</td>
<td>Teacher Knowledge Assessment (TKA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 14</td>
<td>Emlem Scales: A Packet of Scales for Measuring the Quality of Child Care from a Parent’s point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 15</td>
<td>Ready School Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 17</td>
<td>A process oriented self-evaluation instrument for measuring the interactions in care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**4. CURRICULUM**

ECE curriculum is the foundation on which pedagogy is developed, and accomplishes multiple functions. It (i) clarifies the development/education objectives; (b) provides organized and commonly agreed answers to children needs; (iii) supports the work of educators; and (iv) secures a minimum level of quality for various ECE services. ECE Curriculum is also a key determinant of quality of ECE services.

Curricula is often measured as part of the teaching and learning process, however, should be considered as a distinct element that has an important impact of the quality and structure of teaching content.

**Defining Quality Curriculum**

The curriculum in ECE services should outline clear goals across a range of developmental areas to which educators and children can aspire. For instance the five goals proposed by the US National Educational Goal Panel (NEGP) in 1997 that were meant to be treated and pursued equally are:

(a) health and physical development;
(b) emotional well-being and social competence;
(c) positive approaches to learning;
(d) communication skills; and
(e) cognition and general knowledge.

**Recommended tools for monitoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool no.</th>
<th>Tool name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool 2.</td>
<td>Assessment Profile for Early Childhood Programmes (APECP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3.</td>
<td>The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 4.</td>
<td>The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale - Extension (ECERS-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 15.</td>
<td>Ready School Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 16.</td>
<td>Hild Development Programme Evaluation Scale (CDPES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 19.</td>
<td>ACEI Self-Assessment Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 22.</td>
<td>High/Scope USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. SCHOOL READINESS OUTCOMES

Measuring child outcomes helps accelerate action in terms of efficient policies for ECE services and apply new understanding about Early Child Development. It also helps identify the need for and benefits of ECE programmes. It is now well documented that young children growing up in poverty are disproportionately exposed to a wide range of risk factors such as: poor nutrition; less stimulating learning environments; poor sanitation; stressful life events; exposure to environmental risks. Good quality ECE services may reduce the above risk factors.

A recent World Bank commissioned study of (Fernald, Kariger, Engle, Rakes, 2009) aims to provide a resource for researchers from various disciplines interested in planning and evaluating programmes or interventions especially at the level of assessment of children in the first five years of Life.

The assessment chosen should be (Fernald et al., 2009):

- Psychometrically adequate, valid and reliable;
- Balanced in terms of number of items at the lower end to avoid children with low scores;
- Enjoyable for children;
- Relatively easy to adapt;
- Not requiring much material;
- Not too difficult to obtain or too expensive;
- Able to be used for a wide age range. (Fernald et al., 2009, p.67).

Defining School Readiness Outcomes

The overarching goal of early childhood education programmes is to make young children ready for school. School readiness is a level of development at which an individual is ready to learn the specific materials taught in school settings (Mustard, Young, 2007). It means a child possesses the cognitive and socio-emotional abilities necessary to learn and succeed in school. “School readiness” implies fixed standards of physical well-being and motor development, social and emotional development, approach to learning, language development, cognitive development and gener knowledge that enables children to fulfill requirements and to assimilate a school’s curriculum” (Mustard, Young 2007).

Related educational outcomes include improved performance on standardized tests, reduced school dropout or failure, and increased grade retention (Lynch 2005). The following table provides a list of dimensions and indicators that can used to define and measure a child’s school readiness.

Quality ECE are proven to positively affect school readiness and academic achievement. Thus the school readiness outcome indicators below are some examples of indicators that can be used to demonstrate the quality of the outcomes of an ECE centre or programme.
According to the EFA Global Monitoring Report (2007) “the consensus from research is that school readiness encompasses development in five distinct but interconnected domains – physical well being and motor development; social and emotional development; approach to learning; language development; cognitive development and general knowledge”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical health and motor development</th>
<th>Social and emotional development</th>
<th>Approaches to learning</th>
<th>Language development</th>
<th>Cognitive development and general knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate of growth; physical fitness; chronic conditions such as diabetes, disability, malnutrition; fine motor skills; gross motor skills; and self-care abilities.</td>
<td>Ability to form positive relationships with teachers and peers; aspects of self-concept and self-efficacy, ability to express feelings appropriately, and sensitivity to others’ feelings.</td>
<td>Openness and curiosity to tasks and challenges, task persistence, imagination, attentiveness, and cognitive learning style (e.g., better at processing information by listening than observing/reading).</td>
<td>Verbal language: listening, speaking, social uses of language (e.g., using social conventions and manners), and spoken vocabulary. Emergent literacy: Interest in books and stories, emergent writing (scribbling to imitate writing), print awareness (understanding that text represents spoken words), and sequencing (stories follow a standard sequence).</td>
<td>Knowledge of the properties of objects (e.g., color, weight, and movement); understanding the relationships between objects, events, or people (e.g., determining how two objects are different); learning social conventions or school-learned knowledge (e.g., knowing one’s name and address or being able to count).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Naudau et al., 2011.

**Recommended tools for monitoring child development outcomes:**
There are a considerable number of tools to monitor the quality of children outcomes and they are constantly being updated and reformulated in order to meet requirements. Several
of the measures proposed above to measure pedagogy and the teaching-learning process may also be used to measure some aspects of child development outcomes.

The study presents an overview of available measurements of child development with particular focus to measurements developed and applied in developing countries. The authors underline that it is important for policy makers and researchers to know “why, what and how” to select measurements for child development. It is key to consider:

1) The purpose of the testing. In most cases, policy makers and researchers introduce the testing because they want to have an evidence of the impact of a specific ECE program.

2) The difference between screening and assessment of abilities and achievement;

3) The different modes of available testing;

4) The use of population level vs. individual level testing;

5) The practical and logistical issues that will affect the selection of tests. Intervention teams may find it necessary to consider which tests suit the project best and are feasible given constraints such as: budget, copyright issues, ethical issues, time allocated for testing, training, test setting, capacity of the respondent, language and cultural differences and materials.

Selection and adaptation of measurements in local contexts: An important number of measurements for child development are developed worldwide. A classification of measurements for young children under 6 years old describes screening tests versus assessment of abilities and population versus individual based testing (Fernald et al., 2009, p. 33). Finally, it is worth mentioning the survey based measure that includes survey-based assessments of children’s development using a rating system like the EDI (see below), based on parent ratings rather teacher ratings. UNICEF developed a 18 item simple version of the EDI that asks parents to rate their child’s behavior in five domains of child development that is planned to be included in the next round of the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS4) (Fernald et al, p.35). Most of the assessments should be modified substantially before use in other countries.

Below are presented selected measures for preschool children (3-5 years) that apply to various domains of child development and have been implemented in developing countries as well as population-based assessments based on the work of Fernald, et al. (2009) are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool No.</th>
<th>Name of tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool 2.</td>
<td>Assessment Profile for Early Childhood Programmes (APECP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 7</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education (ECE) Programme Evaluation Package (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 8</td>
<td>Early Language &amp; Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 10</td>
<td>Observation Measures of Language and Literacy (OMLIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 22</td>
<td>High/Scope USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. LEADERSHIP

Quality leadership is vital to providing teachers and students with support, motivation and guidance towards quality pedagogy. Little attention has been given in the research literature to assessing and promoting the leadership skills of center directors, principals and administrators.

Defining good quality governance
Some accounts from research about the characteristics of quality leaders in ECE are as follows:

- ‘Leadership in early care and education has many facets, including and not limited to management and administration...At its core is a deep knowledge of the field, a willingness to take risks, and a breadth of vision and thinking that transcends individual programmes, services or organisations. Leadership in early care and education is innovative, but sensitive to history, diversity and context, and it is collaborative yet bold (Scrivens, 1999).’

- ‘In addition to being kind, patient, warm, nurturant and so on, effective leaders were perceived ... to be goal oriented, having a planning orientation, assertive, proactive, professionally confident, visionary, influential and a mentor or guide. (Rodd 1996: 122).’

- ‘To develop good working relationships with all concerned within the centre, to acknowledge staff strengths and provide constructive feedback, to assist less qualified staff, assist in resolving staff disagreements and to participate in but not dominate decision making (Scrivens, 1999).’

More dimensions of quality leadership were identified:

- being a guide to children and staff
- acting like a professional
- being a good communicator
- being able to meet people's needs
- being a multifaceted and flexible person
- taking responsibility, and
- being visionary (Rodd 1996: 122) (Rodd 1996: 122).’

Leadership in Early Childhood Education: Six Standards and Strategies for Principals from the USA

Standard 1: Embrace early childhood learning. Effective principals embrace high-quality early childhood programs, principles and practices as the foundation for education throughout the school community.
- Consider birth through age eight as a continuum of early learning;
- Engage the school community in understanding children’s early development and use that combined knowledge to strengthen learning throughout the school;
- Balance leadership and management roles to incorporate early childhood programs into the
school’s culture and organizational structure;
● Articulate the value of early intervention to prevent later difficulties.

Standard 2: Engage families and communities. Effective principals work with families and community organizations to support children at home, in the community and in pre-K and kindergarten programs.
● Acknowledge and support families as children’s first and most influential teachers;
● Provide early education experiences that are informed by young children’s cultural and community experiences;
● Act as a bridge between schools and community-based supports for young children and their families;
● Build coalitions with community organizations to strengthen learning for children from age 0-8.

Standard 3: Promote appropriate learning environments for young children. Effective principals recognize the role of rich learning environments for young children and help create them.
● Promote environments that are developmentally and age appropriate and address individual ways of learning;
● Foster relationships that provide the foundation for children’s learning;
● Cultivate children’s social competencies;
● Ensure that facilities and learning opportunities promote children’s health and safety.

Standard 4: Ensure quality teaching. Effective principals ensure high-quality curriculum and instructional practices that foster young children’s learning and development.
● Foster young children’s eagerness to learn;
● Develop early literacy and numeracy skills to provide a foundation for later learning;
● Provide ongoing professional development for the school community to build teachers’ eagerness to learn.

Standard 5: Use multiple assessments to strengthen learning. Effective principals use multiple assessments to create experiences that strengthen student learning.
● Support teachers in using observation, records and portfolios of student work to demonstrate students’ growth;
● Use assessments to identify learning barriers and design strategies to overcome them, plan new learning experiences and initiate discussions across grade levels;
● Develop systems for sharing information about program effectiveness between school systems and other providers;
● Educate parents and report to them on their children’s development and individual progress.

● Use the trusted voice of the principal to advocate for the needs of young children in their communities;
● Become familiar with early childhood funding streams and policy issues;
● Keep the public and policymakers focused on the need for kindergarten programs that match the workday of mothers and fathers and the importance of quality pre-K in a continuum of learning that helps children and schools succeed.

**Tools for monitoring the quality of ECE leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool 7</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education (ECE) Programme Evaluation Package (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 11</td>
<td>Preschool Programme Quality Assessment, 2nd Edition (PQA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 15</td>
<td>Ready School Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. PARENT AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

‘Parent involvement is linked to children’s school readiness. Research shows that greater parent involvement in children’s learning positively affects the child’s school performance, including higher academic achievement (McNeal, 1999; Scribner, Young, & Pedroza, 1999; Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996; Trusty, 1998; Yan & Lin, 2002) and greater social and emotional development (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997; Fantuzzo & McWayne, 2002). Simple interactions, such as reading to young children, may lead to greater reading knowledge and skills (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998) (Lin, 2003).’

Parent and community participation in the early learning process is key to maximizing the learning outcomes of children. It is also often very important for the maintenance of the ECE center. Reinforcing accountability is considered as a key parameter in improving public services in general and ECE services in particular. As more and more ECE public services are decentralized with or without sufficient financing, the involvement of local communities and families in supporting and providing part of the ECE services is becoming indispensable. For instance, the involvement of communities and parents in the community-based centers is crucial for the very existence of this kind of ECE services. Moreover, such involvement expands the mission of ECE services that often becomes wider than supporting child development and may provide services such as parent education, support to women’s and parents groups, as well as coordination with local social health, employment and youth programmes.  

Parental involvement in early learning has also been shown to increase parental involvement in primary and post-primary school. Thus, The main reasons for involving parents and the community in ECE services are: (a) Establishing better understanding of children by educators; (b) promoting among parents and the community appropriate education practices attitudes and behaviors towards children; (c) providing parent/staff with information and referrals to other services; (d) supporting for better parenting

---

Defining quality participation

There is no universal agreement on what parental involvement is, as the concept of participation varies widely by context. However there are two broad strands.

- Parents’ involvement in the life of the school.
- Their involvement in support of the individual child at home and at school (UK Dept. of education and skills, 2003).

The exact characteristics of quality parental involvement in early learning processes must be defined in country contexts. However, some examples from international literature are provided below.

Quality involvement in the home involves stimulating and supporting children’s learning. Some examples of quality involvement may be reading with children, prompting children for sounds, numerical concepts and other academic concepts in the home, making available learning materials in the home and taking an interest in children’s time at school.

Some examples of quality involvement in the life of the ECE center means that parents are invited to take part in school events, to provide and receive regular feedback to teachers on their child’s performance in school, to interact with center leaders and to provide resources to strengthen learning in the center.

Tools for monitoring parent and community participation

There are few resources on how to measure parents’ involvement in center-based early learning processes. The most common method reported in international research is surveys and questionnaires to teachers and parents about their involvement in the school. Figure XX provides an example of a survey that was given to educators about parents’ involvement in their classrooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool no</th>
<th>Tool name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3</td>
<td>The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS–R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 7</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education (ECE) Programme Evaluation Package (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 15</td>
<td>Ready School Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 19</td>
<td>ACEI Self-Assessment Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 22</td>
<td>High/Scope USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. MONITORING ECE QUALITY AT THE SYSTEMS LEVEL

This chapter zooms out from the ECE center and considers the components of measuring and monitoring the quality of national early childhood education systems. At the system level, there are six categories of building blocks that make up a quality system, as shown in Table 1. Strategies for measuring and monitoring the quality of ECE systems require broader tools than those for measuring the quality of individual ECE centers.

A note on ECE accessibility in the CEECIS region

Accessibility of ECE services means to have access from geographical, cost and cultural point of view: having available ECE service in proximity to households, but also to daily duration of ECE and the affordability of services and are meeting parents needs and can receive the most vulnerable children, including the undocumented children (NESSE, 2009). It includes equity measures for monitoring the access to ECE services for children of the higher wealth quintile, versus children from the poorer wealth quintile, for children of minorities such as Roma children, for children from rural populations versus urban, for children with disabilities and learning difficulties and for emigrant and undocumented children.

Monitoring the access to ECE of children from disadvantaged environments and often “invisible” children, a country level analysis, using administrative and survey data as well as qualitative resources may be necessary.

The priority in the European Union is the universal coverage for the children of four (4) years old and up, rather than targeting specific populations. The target for the EU countries (Barcelona EU Council 2002) made a commitment to provide childcare facilities for 90 % of children between 3 years old and the entrance to school. In the CEECIS, in line with the above EU orientations, the challenges that most countries are facing are to increase access to affordable quality ECE services for all children and especially for children from disadvantaged environments (the poorest, the rural populations, the ethnic minorities and the most vulnerable, the emigrant children and undocumented children).

Measuring the accessibility to ECE services with focus to equity and inclusion, helps country based policy makers and stakeholders to (a) record the access to services not only based on the age group (percentage of the 3 years old, of the 4 years old and of 5 years old enrolled in ECE services), but also the rural versus urban and the percentage of ethnic minorities and children with special needs (b) be able to understand progress and (c) to draw the right policies in order to improve equity and inclusion in the access to ECE services.

In the CEECIS countries are observed considerable variations regarding the access to ECE services especially in country with low coverage. This component will support the integration of equity and inclusion in the agenda of ECE services for universal coverage.
There is a trend towards a gradual extension of compulsory education at the pre-primary level worldwide. This is reflected in the EU adoption of the universal access approach and the benchmark for 2020 that 90 per cent of four years old should participate in pre-primary education. Thus the universalization target serves also the accessibility component especially for the four years old children. This tendency is also reflected in the policies adopted recently in several CEECIS to reinstating a new level called the Grade 0 or preparatory classes, given the fact that children in some schools may start grade 1 at the age of 7 years old.

In the poorest countries of Central Asia the “access” challenges are pronounced, because on one hand they have to raise the very low access to ECE services and on the other hand to increase of quality of services. In the middle income countries of the region the challenge is to increase the overall quality of services while trying to increase access and inclusion for the “invisible” children, the more vulnerable, the excluded and children at risk of marginalization.

**Recommended tools for monitoring ECE Quality at systems level**

**National statistics and MICS.** In particular, this category may be monitored using data derived from national surveys as well as surveys carried out with support of international organizations such as the Multiple indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) in 13 countries (2005-06) supported by UNICEF. The later is a UNICEF initiative to assist countries in gathering additional data for monitoring the situation of children and women. The existing data at the level of National Statistics are the best source to start monitoring access to ECE services.

**Household Budget survey** and other surveys that are usually carried out on a regular basis and are necessary for child-center analysis are: the Household Budget Surveys (HBS), the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS) supported by the World Bank, the Labor Force Surveys (LFS) and the EU-SILK survey, supported by the European Union, providing indicators on poverty and social exclusion.

Data on the access rates of children with disabilities and learning difficulties are scarce. The reasons are that ECE field is not a priority in the National Statistics and that affects data on children with disabilities. Also this kind of data relies on census based on parents self-identification and inclusion policies are only started to be developed in the

**Policy analyses.** it is suggested, as proxy measure, countries may record whether governments have a national plan for the organization and financing of ECE services (UNICEF/IRC no 8, 2008). Then each country should define the priorities in terms of monitoring the access to ECE services of specific group of children as defined previously (Rural versus urban, Roma children, children with special needs etc. Thus, each country may prioritize and select to monitor those categories that are relevant for the country’s challenges and policy priorities. The monitoring of the category should be performed each 2 years, at local administration level and at central government level.
Teacher qualifications. The key factors affecting teacher quality are the training, the pay, and the working conditions. The EU\textsuperscript{6} provided Member States with a number of broad pillars for developing policies and practices in order to improve teacher quality. These include:

- ensuring that all teachers have access to the knowledge, attitudes and pedagogic skills that they require to be effective;
- ensuring that provision for teachers' education and professional development is coordinated, coherent, and adequately resourced;
- promoting a culture of reflective practice and research among teachers;
- promoting the status and recognition of the teaching profession;
- supporting the professionalization of teaching.

Additionally, a UNICEF and IRC report outlines some system level benchmarks for ensuring educator quality in ECE:

- ‘At least 80 per cent of contact staff in state regulated early childhood services (including family day care) has initial training in the care and education of young children.
- ‘At least 50 per cent of staff in state regulated early education centers is composed of professionals – educators, pedagogues and/or teachers – with a minimum of three years of post-senior secondary training and certification in early childhood education and care, or an equivalent field.
- ‘The minimum proposed is that the ratio of preschool children (four-to-five year-olds) to trained staff (educators and assistants) should not be greater than 15 to 1, and that group size should not exceed 24.
- ‘The suggested minimum is that the level of public spending on early childhood education and care (for children aged 0 to 6 years) should not be less than 1 per cent of GDP.’
- In order to address the heterogeneity of staffing in the ECE centers, policies for unified staffing systems are proposed (UNICEF/IRC 2008) in which qualifications, work conditions, and salaries are aligned with the education or social sector staff salaries.

\textsuperscript{6} EU Communication, IP/07/1210 Brussels, 6 August 2007
VI. GUIDANCE ON DEVELOPING NATIONAL FRAMEWORKS FOR MONITORING ECE QUALITY

The development of an ECE Quality Framework adapted to the country context takes time and requires comparative research of existing country programmes. An example of such process is the ongoing multiyear OECD program on Early Childhood Education and Care Quality, as well as the EU multi-year planned initiative on Early Childhood Quality Framework development. In order to test and operationalize the framework UNICEF and/or other international partners active in the CEECT region (such as the EU, OECD, and the World Bank), should continue to produce regional studies, while supporting countries to develop national studies and analyses, that help design and implement policies for ECE services design/expansion and establish basic mechanisms of quality assurance, including country-based quality indicators and targets.

Indicative studies to be produced:

(a) Assess the outcomes, the cost effectiveness and sustainability of the various types of ECE services that have emerged since transition, including those in the private sector;
(b) Assess the decentralization effect on ECE financing and on availability of ECE services, for the most disadvantaged children, especially in rural areas;
(c) Data analysis on how alternative ECE address access issues for the most vulnerable and at risk children (outcomes, sustainability, scalability);
(d) Assess the effectiveness of existing monitoring mechanisms and regulations.

While some of the above-proposed studies exist at regional level, it is imperative to intensify the analytical work at country level.

Consultation process with CEECT region for quality framework validation As it was underlined previously, an ECE quality framework in CEECT needs to be based on analytical and comparative research of country practices in providing ECE services. As there has not yet been yet performed such analytical/comparative research it would be too early to draw up a definitive quality framework. Only the fulfillment of an analytical work at country level can lead to the compilation of these country experiences that can then in turn lead to the finalization and the adoption of a quality framework on ECE for the region. In order to support the implementation of evidence-based and coherent policies for the improvement of access and quality of ECE services in the CEECT countries, UNICEF may propose the quality framework of ECE services for discussion at country level. A regional quality framework should be discussed through a consultation process with participation of all key ECE actors in each country.
Contextualization of quality components and defining indicators and targets at country level

A country-led approach for operationalization of quality framework for ECE services is key in all countries. For instance, in some countries, the inputs to the ECE services need further support and investment, while in other countries, priority may be given to the education process, child outcomes or accountability process. The framework can be a helpful reference for countries to develop their own national targets according to which they can monitor, assess, and evaluate their respective ECE systems. This will help create awareness on quality factors of ECE services and start a dialogue at country level on quality for ECE services, and define targets and indicators for each factor at the country level.

The quality framework is targeted at interested countries in the region. Since quality is approached here as a dynamic, continuous process, involving all concerned stakeholders, it is clear that the proposed quality framework should be contextualized in the interested countries. Contextualization can be achieved through a participatory consultation process with key stakeholders in each country. ECE stakeholders should be mobilized through the right incentives and motivations in order to define and achieve targets and indicators of quality.

Contextualization requires two main steps:

Step 1: An external process of establishing the necessary regulations and/or accreditation, and making sure that the physical environment is safe for young children and that there is accepted minimum quality in the provision of ECE services.

Step 2: An internal process that implies the system of incentives and motivations for educators and other stakeholders in order to start up a quality improvement process in a given ECE center itself. Motivations and incentives are necessary to encourage stakeholders to go beyond the implementation of minimum regulatory standards and work together in order to improve the educator/children interactions, increase the learning opportunities, and thus improve the quality of pedagogical process.

Awareness and focus on equity

Capturing the equity dimension in the process of contextualization and implementation of a quality framework for ECE services at the country level is a key part of the proposed process. Implementation of a quality framework at country level should capture inequalities in the provision of quality ECE services by using related data on disparities in the provision of ECE services, especially between rural and urban settings, communities at differing socio-economic levels and within communities having minorities and emigrant populations.

Revise regulations and licensing

As argued in Part 1, if the aim is to significantly improve the quality of ECE services, only a system of regulations and licensing is not sufficient. Regulations and licenses may certainly ensure safety and minimum functioning conditions of ECE centers in order not to harm children, but it cannot help achieve the claimed high quality ECE. In that respect, countries should first select the key factors affecting the quality of ECE services that are relevant for the specific country and set up targets.
**Elect priority factors and define targets for quality ECE services.** In the light of the particular political, cultural and sociological context of individual countries, the quality factors affecting the quality of ECE services should be selected and prioritized on the basis of needs for child development, access and equity needs as well necessity to renew and revitalize the ECE services provision, in a given country. The next step will be defining targets to be achieved within a specific timeframe as well as indicators for measuring progress towards the assigned targets. Following the anthropological/cultural approach argument, the quality indicators and targets should be defined through a participatory process of motivated actors with incentives to reach the assigned targets.

**Potential Issues Or Challenges For Developing The Framework In The Countries**

(a) Opting for a top-down process without ownership at country level.
(b) Proposing quality measurements that are too costly while there is low capacity at country level to gather requested data.
(c) The proposed measures to monitor the quality of ECE services may be complex and serve research purposes rather than improvement of services in the short term.
(d) The equity dimension is lost under the pressure of the “better off families” to improve the existing ECE services rather than to expand to the “unreached.”

**Methodological Issues: Data Collection for ECE Services**

All programmes and studies trying to provide information on the status of quality ECE services and children outcomes underline several challenges and weaknesses in data collection in the early childhood field affecting all aspects of indicators and target setting. Main challenges and weaknesses are:

- Poor data for the age group 0-3 (according to the UNICEF/Innocenti working papers)
- Multiple definitions of Early Education services can affect data collection. Countries are interpreting the category ISCED Level 0 (pre-primary education) in different ways and are using different definitions to report expenditure and other data (UNICEF/Innocenti, 2008)
- Double counting. Because of different definitions and licensing arrangements across countries, many children actually attending services may not be counted, and in other circumstances may be counted twice. The former occurs most often in systems where private, unlicensed services predominate (UNICEF/Innocenti, 2008).
## ANNEX 1 - UNDER CONSTRUCTION

### Tool 1: International Pilot Study on the Evaluation of Quality in Education Spaces (EQES) OECD Centre for Effective Learning Environments (CELE) Web site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The principal objective of this manual is to provide a practical, user-friendly guide for those involved in the International Pilot Study on the Evaluation of Quality in Educational Spaces (EQES): national co-ordinators and research teams, teaching staff, students, school principals and others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This tool was developed as a user manual for an international pilot evaluation, link to the OECD’s Centre for Effective Learning Environments (CELE, formerly OECD Programme on Educational Building), which promotes the exchange and analysis of policy, research and experience in all matters related to educational building. However, it is a useful framework that can be adapted to local contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The manual describes four research tools, which countries are required to implement: *Priority-rating exercise for OECD quality performance objectives; Educational facility analysis; Student and teaching staff questionnaires; and Focus groups.*

- This tool can be found, along with several other useful resources on educational facilities, at: [http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3746,en_2649_35961311_35470674_1_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3746,en_2649_35961311_35470674_1_1_1_1_1,00.html)

- The CELE web site offers many useful resources on evaluating quality components linked to the learning environments: [http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en_2649_35961311_1_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en_2649_35961311_1_1_1_1_1,00.html)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CELE web site, <a href="http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en_2649_35961311_1_1_1_1_1,00.html">http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en_2649_35961311_1_1_1_1_1,00.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tool 2: Assessment Profile for Early Childhood Programmes (APECsP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose

Intended for children aged 3-7m, the APECsP is an observational checklist with dichotomous items that provides a global assessment of overall preschool classroom environment; it includes subscales that address specific aspects of the dimensions thought to define global quality. ([http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=12446&page=157](http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=12446&page=157))

### Description of tool

Data collection requires observation, review of records, and interview with teachers, administrator(s), and/or family child care provider(s).

### Key constructs

The scales include (1) learning environment (provisions for and accessibility of materials, space conducive to child independence), (2) scheduling (written plans assessed for balance and variety of activities), (3) curriculum (degree to which alternative techniques are used to facilitate learning, based on assessment of children in class; degree to which children are encouraged to be active in guiding their own learning; the role of the teacher in facilitating learning), (4) interacting (teachers’ positive interactions, responsiveness, and management of children), and (5) individualizing (support for individualized learning experiences through assessment, parent communication, and referrals; plans for children with special needs).


### Notes on implementation

- Training required: Training is required to establish inter-rater reliability. Training involves a review of the criteria and data collection methods and on-site practice observation, record review, and interviews. Training generally involves 2-3 days.

- The measure has also demonstrated to be reliable and valid in assessing the child care environment. This assessment does not measure teacher-children interactions, and must be used in combination with other assessments that examine interaction variables.

### For more information

Halle & Vicke, 2007; Martha Abbott-Shim, 294 Woodview Drive, Decatur, GA 30030, martha.abbottshim@gmail.com
### Tool 3: The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS-R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment areas</th>
<th>Learning environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose
The ECERS is designed to assess group programs for preschool-kindergarten aged children. It is intended for children aged 2 to 5 years.

#### Description of tool
The ECERS-R measures and describes what high quality programs should look like in seven key areas: Space and Furnishings; Personal Care Routines; Language and Reasoning; Activities; Interaction; Program Structure; and Parents and Staff (Total scale consists of 43 items.).

The scales are designed to assess process quality in an early childhood or school age care group. Process quality consists of the various interactions that go on in a classroom between staff and children, staff, parents, and other adults, among the children themselves, and the interactions children have with the many materials and activities in the environment, as well as those features, such as space, schedule and materials that support these interactions. Process quality is assessed primarily through observation and has been found to be more predictive of child outcomes than structural indicators such as staff to child ratio, group size, cost of care, and even type of care, for example child care center or family child care home.

For more information contact:
Lesia Oesterreich, State Extension Specialist, Early Childhood/Child Care
Iowa State University, 1086 LeBaron Hall, Ames IA 50011,
loesterr@iastate.edu, (515) 294-0363

#### Key constructs
Our scales define environment in a broad sense and guide the observer to assess the arrangement of space both indoors and outdoors, the materials and activities offered to the children, the supervision and interactions (including language) that occur in the classroom, and the schedule of the day, including routines and activities. The support offered to parents and staff is also included.

For more information
Iowa State University, 2003; (Whitebook, Howes & Phillips, 1995)
### Tool 4. Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale- Extension (ECERS-E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose**
The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – Extension (ECERS-E) was developed to supplement the ECERS-R in the area of curriculum.

**Description of tool**
The ECERS-E (extension) was designed by Professor Kathy Sylva, Professor Iram Siraj-Blatchford and Brenda Taggart as a companion scale to the ECERS-R. It provides greater depth and additional items in four educational aspects of provision:

- **Literacy** (e.g. opportunities for emergent writing, letters and sounds)
- **Mathematics** (e.g. number, reasoning)
- **Science and Environment** (e.g. supporting children’s creative and critical thinking and understanding of the natural and physical world)
- **Diversity** (e.g. planning for children’s individual learning needs, valuing and respecting other cultures, gender diversity).

**Key constructs**
Items are rated on a 7-point scale from (1) Inadequate to (7) Excellent. Examples are provided at scoring points 1, 3, 5, and 7 for each item. Average subscale scores can also be calculated. ECERS-E added the following sub-scales: **Literacy** (6 items); **Mathematics** (4 items); **Science** (5 items); **Diversity** (3 items)

**Notes on implementation**
The additional sub-scales of ECERS-E are very valuable for monitoring and improving ECE pedagogy in the region. At least half a day in the classroom, including 15 minutes to speak with teachers and children at the end of the observation to ask any additional question. It has to be used as a continuity of ECERS-R. Training includes the training on ECERS-R and advice on making judgments of video extracts.

**Source**
# Tool 5. The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Purpose
The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) is an observational instrument developed to assess classroom quality in preschool through third grade classrooms. The CLASS dimensions are based on observed interactions among teachers and students in classrooms. The instrument may be used as a research tool, a professional development tool, and/or as a program development and evaluation tool (Pianta et al., 2008). Intended for Pre-K to third grade.

## Description of tool
The assessment is conducted by Administrators, supervisors, principals, program directors, researchers. It consists of Two manuals (Pre–K and K–3) provide system overview, procedures, and scoring for classroom observation; Scoring Summary Sheet for quick scoring information; package of laminated dimensions overview; quick-guides to introduce teachers to the 10 dimensions of CLASS (includes practical classroom tips and strategies); and observation and scoring forms.

For more information, see: [http://www.brookespublishing.com/store/books/pianta-class/index.htm](http://www.brookespublishing.com/store/books/pianta-class/index.htm)

## Key constructs
The assessment measures ten dimensions across three domains of teacher-student and peer interactions in pre-K through 3rd grade classrooms. The key constructs include Emotional Support (positive and negative climate, regard for student perspectives, teacher sensitivity), Instructional Support (concept development, language modeling, quality of feedback), and Classroom Organization (behavior management, instructional learning formats, productivity). Each of the domains predicts child behavioral and academic outcomes in the early years (Mashburn et al., 2008). CLASS assesses aspects of teacher warmth and responsiveness, organization and preparedness, communication and flexibility, and scaffolding of social-emotional and academic interactions across the classroom (Cappella, 2010).

## Notes on implementation
The CLASS primarily measures pedagogical processes. 20-minute classroom observations for each one of the ten dimensions. Training is provided by the University of Virginia ([http://classobservation.com](http://classobservation.com)). The administrative component only requires 20-minute observation X 10 dimensions.

For more information [http://www.brookespublishing.com/store/books/pianta-class/index.htm](http://www.brookespublishing.com/store/books/pianta-class/index.htm)
### Tool 6. Early Childhood Classroom Observation Measure (ECCOM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
<th>Teacher Quality</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose
The Early Childhood Classroom Observation Measure (ECCOM) was developed to tap the nature and quality of academic instruction as well as the social climate, resources, and other aspects of effective classrooms” (Stipek & Byler, undated coding manual, p. 1). The version of the ECCOM reported on in Stipek and Byler (2004) assesses independently the degree to which constructivist (child-centered) and didactic (teacher-centered) instructional approaches are observed. This measure is appropriate for classrooms serving children ages 4 to 7, roughly corresponding to the last year of preschool, kindergarten, and first grade.

#### Description of tool
The measure focuses on the approach used for instruction rather than subject matter content. The instrument was developed primarily as a research tool. However, at least one research team (Head Start Quality Research Project) is using the ECCOM as an intervention tool as well as for research. “The ECCOM might also be used effectively to help teachers assess and adjust their own practices, or as a tool for principals and directors for assessing teachers” (Stipek & Byler, 2004, p. 392). Thus, the ECCOM may be used for research, as a professional development tool, and/or as a program development and evaluation tool. The value of the ECCOM for professional development purposes has not yet been systematically assessed.

#### Key constructs
The ECCOM reported on in Stipek and Byler (2004) consists of 32 items (17 constructivist, 15 didactic) rated on a scale of 1 (practices are rarely seen) to 5 (practices predominate). There were parallel items for both constructivist and didactic practices, but there were two additional items in the constructivist scale (relevance of instruction activities, and teacher warmth). The rating of each item occurs after an observation of the classroom.

#### Source
Stipek & Byler, 2004; For more information: see [http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0885200604000596](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0885200604000596); and/or contact: Dr. Deborah Stipek at [stipek@stanford.edu](mailto:stipek@stanford.edu).
### Tool 7. Early Childhood Education (ECE) Program Evaluation Package

#### (India)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment:</th>
<th>Learning environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose

‘This package has been designed in response to this need for assessment of the quality of the system, specifically for the Integrated Child Development Services program in India which delivers ECE through a preschool center referred to as Anganwadi. However, it can be adapted for other programs as well. It is essentially a package for evaluation of inputs, processes and outcomes at a systemic level through a randomized survey mode; it is not meant to evaluate individual children for their overall developmental progress. At the same time, an attempt has been made to assess ECE more holistically through the different research instruments listed below. The table below gives the contents of the package.’ It is a package for evaluation of inputs, processes and outcomes of ECE program, school readiness. It does not evaluate individual children’s development progress.

#### Description of tool

- The School Readiness Instrument (SRI) is selective, in terms of domains, since it focuses on cognitive and language domains only.
- Assessment of ECE Center, which has five sections: Identification and Background Data; Classroom Observation (2 consecutive days); Physical Facilities; Interaction/Interview with Anganwadi Workers/Teachers; and Feedback from AWW/Teacher and Helper on Monitoring & Supervision Systems of AWCs
- Questionnaire for Parents: This instrument provides feedback from the parents regarding their experiences, expectations and assessment of the AW or preschool program which their child is attending. It also captures the reasons for some children not attending any preschool.
- Facility Mapping Sheet: This instrument is essentially to seek information from the community for mapping the provision for ECE in a given geographical location across public, private and voluntary sectors.

#### Key constructs

Physical Health and Development; Social and Emotional Development; Language Development; Cognitive Development and General Knowledge

#### Source


---

7 For further information: Venita Kaul, Deepa Sankar, Tanusree Talukdar, The World Bank Office, New Delhi, India.
Tool 8. Early Language & Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose

“The Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO) Toolkit (...) provides researchers and practitioners with a comprehensive set of observation tools for describing the extent to which classrooms provide children optimal support for their language and literacy development” (Smith, M.W., wt al., 2008).

Description of tool

The ELLCO Toolkit is composed of four interdependent research tools: the Literacy Environment Checklist; the Classroom Observation, Teacher Interview, and the Literacy Activities Rating Scale.

Key constructs

- The Literacy Environment Checklist (24 items) is divided into five conceptual areas: Book Area (3 items); Book Selection (4 items); Book Use (5 items); Writing Materials (6 items; Writing Around the Room (6 items);
- The Classroom Observation (14 items) is scored from 1 (deficient) to 5 (exemplary) and is divided into: General Classroom Environment; Language, Literacy, and Curriculum.
- The Teacher Interview consists of questions that help clarify and complete the observation
- The Literacy Activities Rating Scale consists of nine questions divided into two categories: Book Reading and Writing.

A revised version of ELLCO is available in 2008. It is a well-known instrument in the USA, based on the developmentally appropriate practices in: Learning to Read and Write: Developmentally Appropriate Practices for Young Children (International Reading Association [IRA] & National Association for the Education of Young Children [NAEYC], 1998). Approximately 1 – 1 ½ hours. Cost: User’s Guide and Toolkit: $50.00. Depending on the purpose, the ELLCO toolkit can be used by researchers, supervisors, program directors, principals, administrators, and/or teachers. It is recommended that potential users have strong background knowledge of children’s language and literacy development, as well as teaching experience in the intended age range. Training Required: A minimum of 9 hours

For more information

For more information: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment:</th>
<th>Learning environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose**

The Early Literacy Observation Tool (E-LOT) is an observation instrument designed to measure research-based instructional practices, student activities, and environmental settings in early childhood classrooms where teachers are engaged in teaching the foundations of reading and other literacy processes.

**Description/ Key Constructs**

"The E-LOT was designed to assist schools in evaluating the effectiveness of teacher implementation of research-based teaching strategies. The E-LOT has been aligned to the National Reading Panel and National Research Council findings and captures all essential components of the Early Reading First program" (Grehan et al., 2006, p. 27).

During literacy-related instruction, observers complete the “E-LOT Notes” every 10 minutes of observed instruction. The observations are organized around the following six categories: Instructional Orientation; Instructional Components (Concepts of Print Alphabetic and Phonological Awareness Fluency; Vocabulary and Oral Language Development, Development of Cognition and Text Comprehension; Emergent Writing); Assessment; Learning Environment; Visible Print Environment; Materials Used.

"The subcategories of Instructional Components include the essential components of early reading identified by the National Research Council and the National Reading Panel as important in achieving effective early literacy instruction" (Grehan et al., 2006, p. 28).

**Notes on implementation**

Implementation time at least 80 min. Trained observers administer the E-LOT. Training Required: there is a three step training: read manual, formal training, practice sessions.

**For more information**

Grehan et al., 2006
## Tool 10. Observation Measures of Language and Literacy (OMLIT)\(^9\)

### Areas of Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning environment</td>
<td>Teaching and learning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose

The Observation Measures of Language and Literacy Instruction in Early Childhood Education Classrooms (OMLIT) was developed as a battery of measures “to address the need for research-based, reliable and valid measures of the instructional practices and environmental supports for language and literacy in early childhood classrooms”, (Goodson, B. D., et al, 2004). The OMLIT includes six instruments: (1) Classroom Description, (2) Snapshot of Classroom Activities (SNAPSHOT); (3) Read-Aloud Profile (RAP), (4) Classroom Literacy Instruction Profile (CLIP), (5) Quality Rating of Language and Literacy Instruction (QUILL), (6) Classroom Literacy Opportunities Checklist (CLOC).

### Description and Key constructs

The authors of OMLIT explain that individual OMLIT measures may be used alone, together the measures provide an in-depth assessment of the quality (and in some cases quantity) of the language and literacy activities in the classroom.

*The OMLIT is made up of six separate measures and the Arnett Caregiver Rating Scale (Arnett, 1989).*

- The Classroom Description (OMLIT-Description): Setting Profile; Staff; Child Population; Classroom Theme; Language(s) of Instruction;
- The Snapshot of Classroom Activities (OMLIT-Snapshot) has two sections: (1) Environment and (2) Activities.
- The Read Aloud Profile (OMLIT-RAP) has seven sections. Pre-reading; Reading; Post-reading; Adult reading book; Adult language with children; Number of children reading Book characteristics.
- The Classroom Literacy Opportunities Checklist (OMLIT-CLOC) is an inventory of classroom literacy resources. It identifies 11 aspects of the literacy environment, each of which is rated on a 1 (minimal) to 3 (high) scale.
- The Classroom Literacy Instruction Profile (OMLIT-CLIP) involves a two-stage-coding protocol. First, the observer determines if any classroom staff member is involved in a literacy activity. If so, the observer codes seven characteristics of the literacy activity: Type of activity Literacy knowledge being afforded to the children
  - Teacher’s instructional style Text support/Context for literacy instruction, Number of children involved in activity with teacher Languages spoken by staff and children, and focus of the language (i.e., talk with peers, talk with group, talk with individual children, etc.)

### For more information

http://www.abtassociates.com;
http://ies.ed.gov/director/conferences/06ies_conference/posters/sacd_layzer.asp

---

http://www.abtassociates.com
### Tool 11. Preschool Program Quality Assessment, 2nd Edition (PQA)

#### Areas of Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Environment</strong></td>
<td>Teaching and learning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching and learning processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Quality</strong></td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School readiness outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents/guardian participation</strong></td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program-specific items based on interviews</strong></td>
<td>Parent Involvement and Family Services (10 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Qualifications and Staff Development</strong></td>
<td>Staff Qualifications and Staff Development (7 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure, Pedagogical Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose

“The Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA), Second Edition, is a rating instrument designed to evaluate the quality of early childhood programmes and identify the training needs of staff. The PQA intentionally reflects “best practices” in early childhood education as a whole. The measure identifies the structural characteristics and dynamic relationships that effectively promote the development of young children, encourage the involvement of families and communities, and create supportive working environments for staff”. The PQA can be used for a variety of purposes including both pre-service and in-service training initiatives, self-assessment and monitoring, feedback to staff, research tool and to explain research-based practices to a variety of individuals and agencies including administrators, policymakers, and support staff in the preschool.

#### Notes on implementation

The measure may be administered by independent raters including researchers, program evaluators, outside consultants or agency administrators as well as by site staff, including directors, early childhood specialists, curriculum coordinators, teachers, or parents may also complete it as part of a self-assessment. Training required 2 days.

#### For more information


---

### Tool 12. Preschool Rating Instrument for Science and Math (PRISM)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose

The PRISM assesses differences in classroom supports for mathematics and science. It measures the presence of classroom materials and teaching strategies that support early mathematical and science concept development. Both the math and science domains can be measured with similar tools because they are conceptually similar (e.g., reasoning that supports classification, seriation, identifying patterns, measurement, and data collection and representation).

**Materials, Instruction For Math And Science**

#### Description and key constructs

The PRISM contains 16 items. Six items assess the types of materials in the classroom (e.g., materials for counting, comparing, estimating and recognizing number symbols), and 10 items assess staff interactions (e.g., recording science information). The PRISM contains 11 items that focus on math materials and teacher-child interactions around mathematics concepts, including the following concepts: *Supports for counting, comparing, estimating, and recognizing number symbols; Measurement; Classifying and seriating; Geometric thinking and spatial relations.* It also contains 5 science items that focus on materials and teacher-child interactions that support: *Explorations of biological and non-biological science, encouraging reading, writing, and drawing about science, Encourage investigations and discussions of scientific concepts, Support observing, predicting, comparing, and contrasting.* A complementary instrument was designed to be used for systematic professional development that involves self-assessment and mentor coaching.

**Notes on implementation**

The PRISM is designed to be used by researchers. *Training required:* at least 5 days.

The observation period should be an entire half-day program and approximately 4 hours in a full-day classroom beginning before the children arrive. *Cost:* Not currently publicly available.

**For more information**


---

### Tool 13. Teacher Knowledge Assessment (TKA)\(^\text{12}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose
The Teacher Knowledge Assessment was constructed to examine teachers’ knowledge of early language and literacy development and practice.

### Description and Key constructs
The instrument consists of 45 multiple-choice questions, designed to tap high-quality early language and literacy knowledge and practice, and 25 true-false questions for a total of 70 items. Eight items were constructed in eight subscales in alignment with the core competencies in Language and Literacy: Oral Language Comprehension; Phonological Awareness; Letter Knowledge/Alphabetic Principle; Print Conventions; Strategies for Second Language Learners; Literacy Assessment; Parental Involvement; and Literacy Links across the Curriculum. In addition to the eight subscales, assessing language and literacy knowledge, an additional subscale comprised of 22 of the items was included to assess practitioners’ foundational knowledge in early childhood development and education (Neuman, S. B. & Cunningham, L., 2009).

### Notes on implementation
The instrument is completed by the educator him/herself, online or through traditional paper and pencil. No training is required.

The average completion time is 45 minutes. Two forms of the Assessment were created for pre- and post-test purposes. The test is scored by calculating the total number of correct answers or by calculating a percentage of correct answers. Cost: Free with request of authors.

### For more information
This measure is currently unpublished. Contact Dr. Susan B. Neuman: sbneuman@umich.edu at University of Michigan, USA.

---

\(^{12}\) This measure is currently unpublished. Contact Dr. Susan B. Neuman: sbneuman@umich.edu
### Tool 14. Emlen Scales: A Packet of Scales for Measuring the Quality of Child Care From a Parent’s Point of View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose

The scales measure parent perceptions of the quality of their childcare arrangements. The scales are not measures of satisfaction, but provide an implicit evaluation of specific, descriptive characteristics of the care a child receives. The scales are designed to measure a parent’s view of various aspects of that care, such as the warmth and interest in the child or the skill of the caregiver. The vehicle for collecting the quality data is a survey questionnaire designed to understand the work, family, and child-care context of parents’ childcare decisions.

### Description and Key constructs

There are eight scales representing conceptually and empirically distinct facets of quality of care:

- *Warmth and interest in my child* (10 items)
- *Rich activities and environment* (5 items)
- *Skilled caregiver* (8 items)
- *Talk and share information* (3 items)
- *Caregiver accepting and supportive* (4 items)
- *Child feels safe and secure* (8 items)
- *Child getting along well socially* (2 items)
- *High risk care* (11 items)

It also includes a composite scale: *Parent scale measuring quality of child care* (15 items). The data and method of scale construction: The parent scales consist of evaluative statements that are simple, specific, and descriptive of the childcare experience of the parent’s youngest child. Parents responded by rating how often each statement described their experience—never, rarely, sometimes, often, or always. Based on a factor analysis of parent responses to 55 such statements, those item responses that were most highly correlated, and had a similar underlying meaning in common, were grouped together as distinguishable aspects of childcare quality from a parent’s point of view. Those scales are named above.

### Notes on implementation

Parents self-administer the questionnaire. No training required. Rated reading level: 7th grade. Depends on total number of items in questionnaire. For quality items alone, allow 10 minutes. To estimate cost, users should consider the following: sample size, printing, postage for mailing questionnaire and returns (unless distributed by a company or organization), double data entry and verification, preparation of data and frequencies, data analysis, and reporting.

### For more information

### Tool 15. Ready School Assessment (RSA)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose

"The focus of the Ready School Assessment (RSA) is on the general policies and practices of a school, with particular emphasis on those that are relevant to the K-2 classrooms, teachers, children, and parents. The RSA is a planning tool designed to provide school improvement teams with a developmental profile of the strength of readiness features in their school,” (High Scope Educational Research Foundation, 2006, p. 1).

#### Description and key constructs

The RSA identifies eight major dimensions of what it means to be a ready school. Items are assessed on a scale from "Never" to "Always", “Yes” and “No” questions, and numerical frequency questions: **Leaders and Leadership** (14 items); **Transitions** (18 items); **Teacher Supports** (11 items); **Engaging Environments** (21 items) **Effective Curricula** (13 items); **Family, School, and Community Partnerships** (19 items); **Respecting Diversity** (20 items); **Assessing Progress** (13 items).

#### Notes on implementation

The kit includes 5 copies of instrument, 1 Administration Manual, 5 Team Handbooks, 5 Questionnaires, license for online profiler. The test should be administered by a team of:
- K-2 teachers – the classroom environments and transitional practices
- Parents – family involvement practices
- Preschool teachers/Childcare providers – ready school’s communication efforts
- School Principals – school and district policies, curriculum, and assessment practices

*Training needed 2 days workshop and customized training and technical assistance available.*

#### For more information

http://www.readyschoolassessment.net/about/index.shtml;  

---

13 www.highscope.org; www.readyschoolassessment.net
### Tool 16. Child Development Program Evaluation Scale (CDPES)\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose

“The purpose in constructing the CDPE Scale was the perceived need in the child development program area to have a comprehensive scale that could be used by states or local agencies to determine compliance of child development programmes with basic minimal requirements that ensure a child is in a safe and healthy environment” (Fiene, 1984). The scale also measures the quality of the child development program.

#### Description and Key constructs

The CDPES measures seven domains: administration (6 items), environmental safety (4 items), child development curriculum (15 items), health services (4 items), nutritional services (2 items), social services (5 items), and transportation (1 item).

While the CDPES may be used to assess the seven domains above, it actually comprises two distinct scales: a center licensing scale and a program quality scale. Ratings of quality related to social-emotional development, physical development, cognitive development, language development, art, music, and dramatic play should be performed based on classroom observations.

The CDPES can be used by state licensing and monitoring staff, researchers, and directors of early care and education programmes. **Training:** 1-2 days of classroom training followed by on-site inter-rater reliability (usually 2-3 days). Individuals who are interested in using the scale should plan on 1 week of training and on-site implementation before using the scale for actual data collection.

Generally the CDPES can be completed in a day’s time by one individual for programmes that have fewer than 60 children.

#### For more information

- [http://ecti.hbg.psu.edu/docs/publication/ChildDev_ProgEvalScale_Fiene.pdf](http://ecti.hbg.psu.edu/docs/publication/ChildDev_ProgEvalScale_Fiene.pdf)

---

### Tool 17. A process oriented self-evaluation instrument for measuring the interactions in care settings: measuring the child well-being and involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose

The component financing for Early Childhood Education in each country affects the quality and equity of services, especially in times of financial constraints. Since several CEECIS are still in the phase of recovery and scale for ECE services it is crucial what is the current financial cost and the cost sharing between providers (public and private) and parents. Thus the key questions for countries are:

- What is the share of public and private sources for ECE?
- How much parents pay for ECE? What are the net costs of ECE per child for parents?
- What are the costs of different ECE services (unit costs or per child costs) (OECD, ECEC Network, 2010).

#### Description and Key constructs

This is an instrument that has been developed by a team based at the Research Centre for Experiential Education (Leuven University – Belgium) under the supervision of Dr. Ferre Laevers that was required to meet three requirements: (1) to serve as a tool for self-assessment by care settings; (2) to regard the child and its experience of the care environment as the main focus for examining quality; and (3) to be appropriate for the wide range of care provision, including care for the under three’s in day care centers and family care, as well as the out of school care for children up to the age of twelve.

A comparison of family costs for ECE with the family income, adds in understanding the accessibility especially for children from disadvantaged environments. The financial component helps to understand policies between universal measures and targeted measures. (Myers on financial mechanisms)

The issues in financing ECE programmes in CEECIS, including the public and the private. Share of public and private sources for ECE: Net costs of ECE per child for parents and Costs of different ECE services (unit costs or per child costs/full time vs part-time (OECD, ECEC Network, 2010).

Constraints in data collection are: Low policy priority, Fragmentation of ECE services, Difference in definition of terms used for data collection; different fee structures; different spending etc.; Poor information and knowledge on private sources of private ECE institutions; different accounting standards for private institutions and public institutions.

The MoE and the National Statistics Center should monitor the category “Financing” every year. The results should be used for policy development and plan to financing scale of ECE services.

#### For more information

### Tool 18. International Step by Step Principles of Quality Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose
Planning and Improvement Tool. Accreditation to Step-by-Step Program

#### Description of tool /Key constructs
The ISSA standards are used in more than 27 countries, mostly in Eastern Europe

- Teacher-Child Interactions 4
- Family Participation 9
- Planning a Child-Centered Program 5
- Strategies for Meaningful Learning 4
- Learning Environment 3
- Health and Safety 4

Teacher standards:
- Individualization 4
- Learning Environment 3
- Family Participation 6
- Teaching Strategies for Meaningful Learning 5
- Planning and Assessment 7
- Professional Development

#### For more information

#### Source
## Tool 19. ACEI Self-Assessment Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Description of tool /Key constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>The ACEI assessment was developed with the input of educators from more than 27 nations. The assessment consists of five program content areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Environment and Physical Space 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Curriculum Content and Pedagogy 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>Educators and Caregivers 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young Children with Special Needs 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership with Families and Communities 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 2011 edition of the GGA includes 76 indicators of program quality that have global relevance; however, please keep in mind that specific markers of how a standard is met may vary from nation to nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Although the GGA includes a general rating scale (excellent to inadequate), educators will need to determine their own methods of measuring the attainment of indicators in relation to their own nation’s policies and community practices and settings. ACEI encourages educators to use these resources either to design new early childhood programs or improve existing programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose

To facilitate Self-assessment by ECE centers

### Description of tool /Key constructs

- Environment and Physical Space 17
- Curriculum Content and Pedagogy 39
- Educators and Caregivers 13
- Young Children with Special Needs 24
- Partnership with Families and Communities 5

The 2011 edition of the GGA includes 76 indicators of program quality that have global relevance; however, please keep in mind that specific markers of how a standard is met may vary from nation to nation. Although the GGA includes a general rating scale (excellent to inadequate), educators will need to determine their own methods of measuring the attainment of indicators in relation to their own nation’s policies and community practices and settings. ACEI encourages educators to use these resources either to design new early childhood programs or improve existing programs.

### For more information


### Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose**

The IEA Preprimary Project (PPP) was a longitudinal study designed to explore the quality of life of preschool children in the various care and educational environments provided for them (such as preschools, child care centers, or family day care centers), and to assess how these environments affected their development. The study was conducted on over 5,000 four-year-old children (with a follow-up at age seven) in nearly 2,000 educational settings.

**Description of tool /Key constructs**

The observation system focuses on process using three dimensions:
- Management of Time (e.g., time in 3 categories of proposed activities, group structure, pacing of activities)
- Child Activities (e.g., children’s verbalization, Child-child interaction, adult-child interaction, children’s non-active engagement, time on task)
- Adult Behavior (e.g., behavior in major categories, directive teaching, degree of involvement, listening behavior, child management)

**For more information**

### Tool 22. High/Scope, USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose
HighScope offers validated assessment tools and materials for infant-toddler, preschool, elementary, and youth programs. These include instruments for both child assessment and program assessment.

#### Description and key constructs
- Physical Environment 10
- Daily Routine 6
- Adult-Child Interaction 8
- Adult-Adult interaction

#### For more information
Tool 23. Examining early childhood development in low income countries: A toolkit for the assessment of children in the first five years of life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Teaching and learning processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School readiness outcomes</td>
<td>Leadershi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardian participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>System-level indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose**

The primary purpose of this toolkit is to provide a resource for researchers from various disciplines interested in planning and evaluating programs or interventions aimed at improving the health and development of infants and young children. The toolkit aims to: provide an overview of issues affecting early development and its measurement; discuss the types of tests typically used with children under five years; provide guidelines for selecting and adapting tests for use in developing countries, and make recommendations for planning successful assessment strategies. The toolkit focuses on children who have not yet entered school, and are thus under six years old.

**Description and key constructs**

For more information
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