ALL CHILDREN READING – ASIA

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION: CONSIDERATIONS FOR PROGRAMMING

Early Learning Assessment

Assessment of learning and the quality of early learning environments is an important component of early childhood education. This brief outlines the existing early learning assessments of children and environments used in the Asia region, excluding diagnostic and screening assessments.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR ASSESSMENT SELECTION

In their 2017 toolkit for measuring early childhood development in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), Fernald, Prado, Kariger, and Raikes cite several key characteristics that should be considered in identification and selection of assessments:

- Purpose of the assessment
- Psychometric properties
- Cultural relevance
- Ease of administration

ADAPTING ASSESSMENTS FOR LMICS

Although there are no universally recognized minimum standards for adaptation, there are general guidelines for the adaptation of existing measures for use in other contexts (Fernald et al., 2017), including but not limited to the following:

- Translation and back-translation
- Pilot testing
- Selection of culturally sensitive content
- Tracking and documentation of all revisions
- Reduction of culturally based differences in assessment procedures
TYPES OF ASSESSMENTS

Typically, measures of child learning and development are collected through child-direct assessments or ratings from caregivers or teachers. Both methods have benefits and drawbacks. Child-direct measures elicit more accurate data, whereas caregiver or teacher ratings rely on recall and can be biased. However, teacher and caregiver methods are generally more cost-conscious than child-direct measures.

CHILD-DIRECT MEASURES OF LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Assessments that measure child learning and development directly through interaction with the child have been shown to be the least biased and to reveal the highest quality of data when gathered from a highly trained enumerator—but they typically require more resources. Training enumerators to consistently collect standardized data takes time and financial commitment. In addition, sometimes administration of these assessments can take up to 30 minutes. The tables below list a sample of child-direct measures used in the Asia region and contain our analysis and recommendations.

Information on a Selected List of Child-Direct Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Age Group</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Domains Measured</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Psycho-metrics in LMICs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| East Asia Pacific – Early Child Development Scales (EAP-ECDS): 3–5 years (Rao et al, 2018) | • Cambodia  
• China  
• Fiji  
• Mongolia  
• Myanmar  
• Papua New Guinea  
• Timor-Leste  
• Vanuatu | • Approaches to Learning  
• Cognitive Development  
• Cultural Knowledge and Participation  
• Health, Hygiene, and Safety  
• Language and Emergent Literacy  
• Motor Development  
• Socio-emotional Development | Population monitoring | Yes |
| Save the Children International Development Early Learning Assessment (IDELA): 3–6 years (Pisani, Borisova, & Dowd, 2015) | • Bangladesh  
• Bhutan  
• Cambodia  
• Indonesia  
• Philippines | • Emergent Language/Literacy  
• Emergent Numeracy/Problem Solving | Motor Development  
Social-Emotional Inhibitory Control (add-on)  
Memory (add-on)  
Learning Approaches (add-on) | Impact Evaluation | Yes |
| Measuring Early Learning Quality and Outcomes Measure of Development of Early Learning (MELQO MODEL): 4–6 years (UNESCO, 2017) | • Bangladesh  
• Lao PDR  
• Mongolia  
• Cambodia | • Pre-literacy  
• Pre-numeracy  
• Fine Motor Skills  
• Executive Function  
• Socio-emotional Skills | Population monitoring | Yes |

Analysis and Recommendations

Analysis

Only two child-level assessments (including the EAP-ECDS) focused on regions in Asia. Only early versions of the MELQO MODEL assessment have undergone piloting in Asian countries.

Only two specific assessments designed for impact evaluations were found in the literature with sufficient documentation of their development.

Recommendations

Development of the EAP-ECDS and the MELQO MODEL used appropriate instrument design and development methods. Both should be tested further for use in more countries in Asia, using similar methods.

More studies, research, and programs should describe the tasks and/or assessments used in their evaluations and their development. As ECE programming leans toward considering the child in a holistic manner, evaluation measures should also assess the whole child, not just specific learning domains. More studies are needed to understand the relationship among program inputs and their effect on the whole child, not just pre-literacy or pre-numeracy.
CAREGIVER AND TEACHER REPORTS/RATINGS

Child development and learning may also be measured through a caregiver and/or teacher report. These assessments rely on caregiver and/or teacher reports of behaviors that are easy for caregivers and teachers to understand, observe, and describe. The tables below provide examples of caregiver and teacher report assessments and provide our analysis and recommendations.

### Selected Caregiver and Teacher Report Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Age Group</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Domains Measured</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Reliability and Validity in LMICs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys Early Child Development Index (MICS ECDI)</strong></td>
<td>• Bhutan</td>
<td>• Nepal</td>
<td>Population monitoring</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bangladesh</td>
<td>• Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kazakhstan</td>
<td>• Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>• Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lao PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Development Instrument (EDI)</strong></td>
<td>• Indonesia</td>
<td>• Communication and General Knowledge</td>
<td>Population monitoring</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• India</td>
<td>• Emotional Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Philippines</td>
<td>• Language and Cognitive Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vietnam</td>
<td>• Physical Health and Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5–6.5 years (Janus &amp; Offord, 2007)</td>
<td>• Social Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis and Recommendations

**Analysis**

There is a lack of measures utilizing caregiver and teacher ratings and reports of child development.

**Recommendations**

As this type of measure tends to be more cost-conscious, more studies should focus on the development of valid and reliable caregiver and teacher reports of child learning.

### ASSESSMENTS OF THE EARLY LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

A young child’s early learning environment plays a key role in determining learning and development. Assessments of the early learning environments typically include the measurement of the “structural” and “process” indicators. Assessments of structural indicators include ratings of the physical aspects of the environment, such as presence of teaching and learning materials, safety of the physical environment (e.g., presence of broken glass), and class size. Assessments of process indicators include ratings of interactions with children, such as instructional styles, emotional tone of the teacher, and communication between teacher and child. The tables below show details of an environmental assessment and analysis and recommendations.
Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Domains Measured</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Reliability and Validity in LMICs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, Activities and Program Subscales – Revised (ECERS-R) (Harms, Clifford, &amp; Cryer, 1998)</td>
<td>Indonesia, India—Tamil Nadu Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (TECERS): Preschool (Chopra, 2012)</td>
<td>• Creative Activities&lt;br&gt;• Fine and Gross Motor Activity&lt;br&gt;• Infrastructure&lt;br&gt;• Language and Reasoning Experiences&lt;br&gt;• Personal Care and Routine&lt;br&gt;• Physical Learning Aids&lt;br&gt;• Social Development&lt;br&gt;• Literacy Activities&lt;br&gt;• Numeracy Activities</td>
<td>Guide country/ regional progress and needs; has been used in connection with child outcomes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECERS-Extension Literacy and Math Subscales (ECERS-E) (Sylva, Siraj-Blatchford, &amp; Taggart, 2003)</td>
<td>Cambodia Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (CECERS): Preschool (Rao &amp; Pearson, 2007)</td>
<td>• Creative Activities&lt;br&gt;• Fine and Gross Motor Activity&lt;br&gt;• Infrastructure&lt;br&gt;• Language and Reasoning Experiences&lt;br&gt;• Personal Care and Routine&lt;br&gt;• Physical Learning Aids&lt;br&gt;• Social Development&lt;br&gt;• Literacy Activities&lt;br&gt;• Numeracy Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; India &amp; Sri Lanka—Early Childhood Education Quality Assessment Scale (ECEQAS) – Plus (Kaul et al., 2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only three were found, the TECERS, CECERS, and ECEQAS, that had been developed for use specifically in Asian contexts, and all of these were adapted from an existing measure of quality in Western contexts.</td>
<td>As global indicators move from access to the quality of education provided, it will be important to increase our understanding of early learning settings. There is no firm agreement on the components that make a quality early learning environment across countries. More research is needed to appropriately test adapted measures and to develop new instruments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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