

**DIRECTORATE FOR EDUCATION
EDUCATION POLICY COMMITTEE**

Network on Early Childhood Education and Care

REVISED PROJECT PROPOSAL OF NEW POLICY OUTPUT ON EARLY LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT

17-18 December 2012
Conference Centre Room CC10
OECD, Paris, France

Michael Davidson, Acting Head of Division; Tel: +33 (0) 1 45 24 92 25; Email: michael.davidson@oecd.org
Miho Taguma, Project Leader; Tel: +33 (0) 1 45 24 92 65; Email: miho.taguma@oecd.org

JT03331645

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

REVISED PROJECT PROPOSAL OF NEW POLICY OUTPUT ON EARLY LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT

1. Purpose

1. At the 11th Meeting of the OECD Network on Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC), a subsidiary body of the Education Policy Committee, the Secretariat presented a draft proposal for the new project “policy review of monitoring quality in early learning and development” in the Programme of Work and Budget 2013/14 (PoWB 2013/14). The network members discussed the country needs for expected outputs of the new proposed activity, followed by providing comments through written procedure.
2. Based on the results of the consultation exercise, this paper presents a revised proposal. The network members are invited to:
 - BE REMINDED of the discussions at the last meeting and BE INFORMED of the results of the consultation process;
 - DISCUSS and PROVIDE feedback on: the scoping, process, methodology and timeline of the activity; and
 - INDICATE interest in receiving additional outputs by providing voluntary contributions.
3. The structure of this paper is as follows:
 - Background
 - Overall scope
 - Focus, scope and expected tasks for Strands 1, 2 and 3
 - Resources and expected outputs
 - Key links with other work

2. Background

4. There is increasing recognition that early childhood education and care (ECEC) provides a crucial foundation for future learning and helps to develop the cognitive and non-cognitive skills shown to be important for future success. There is also growing recognition that the magnitude of the benefits is conditional on “quality”, but there has been no consensus on what constitutes quality. The OECD’s *Starting Strong III* has attempted to answer the question and identified five areas of quality that can be leveraged by policies for better child development.
 1. Quality goals and minimum standards
 2. Curriculum and learning standards
 3. Workforce quality
 4. Family and community engagement
 5. Data, research and monitoring

5. Of the five areas, country information and practices on “data, research and monitoring” in ECEC are still under-researched. At the launch event of the report, high-level government officials, academics and key stakeholders showed interest in furthering the findings of *Starting Strong III* by collecting more data on ECEC for international comparison and consolidating information on how countries are measuring quality and how they assess their progress in improving it. The concluding remarks of the launch event registered countries’ interests and needs.¹
6. To respond to such needs, a new policy output on ECEC, namely *OECD Review of Policies and Practices for Monitoring and Evaluating Quality in Early Learning and Development*, has been proposed in the PoWB 2013/14 of the Education Policy Committee: see Annex A2.7 in [EDU(2012)1]. Among various policy outputs, this proposal was rated high by the Education Policy Committee in the priority rating exercise: see Annex 1 in [EDU/EDPC(2012)1].
7. A discussion paper for the new project was discussed at the last network meeting. After the meeting, seventeen jurisdictions submitted written comments as of 10 October.² The Council of Ministers of Education Canada (CMEC)³ also responded with a note that it is not a jurisdiction but as a body representing provincial and territorial governments. Country comments are summarised in [EDU/EDPC/ECEC(2012)3/REV1/ANN1]. The following paper sets out the revised project plan, based on the needs and expectations expressed by network members.

3. Overall scope

3.1. Age coverage

8. The PoWB 2013/14 indicates that the new project enlarges the scope of the OECD’s work on ECEC by including the early years of primary education. The rationale behind the decision was to recognise that the value of ECEC depends on successful transitions to formal schooling that builds on, and consolidates, the early learning experience. It is important to clarify that this is not to exclude an “early child care” dimension but to be inclusive of birth through the early years of primary schooling.
9. Although a few countries suggested limiting the scope to cover ages 0-6/7, other countries agreed to enlarge the scope to cover ages 0-8/10, as suggested in the PoWB 2013/14. Ensuring a smoother transition from an ECEC setting to formal schooling is becoming a common policy challenge faced by many countries today. In particular, redefining “school readiness” is becoming an issue in many countries, that is, it is not just that children should be ready to learn at school but also that schools need to be ready for them. Therefore, the new project attempts to cover a wider scope of “early learning and development”. Network members are encouraged to communicate and collaborate with their colleagues responsible for the early years of primary schooling within their ministry; this collaboration might help facilitate internal discussion on transition issues in some countries.

¹ See www.oecd.org/dataoecd/56/13/49647717.pdf.

² AUS, BEL (Flanders and Wallonia-Brussels Federation), CAN (Government of Canada, Alberta and Prince Edward Island), DEU, EST, FIN, JAP, KOR, MEX, NLD, NOR, POR, SWE and UKM.

³ Hereafter referred to as “Canadian education ministries” or CMEC.

3.2. *Types of provision*⁴

10. While recognising the diversity of ECEC provision, the new project will include:

- Preschool, early education programmes and kindergartens;
- Centre-based child care; and
- Integrated early childhood education and care.

11. It will *not* include:

- Family day care, children in family, friend and neighbour care (*i.e.*, informal arrangement) and children.

4. Focus, scope and expected tasks for Strands 1, 2 and 3

12. The project has three separate but inter-connected strands (Figure 1). Countries can take part in one or more strands, depending on their needs.

⁴ Definitions for different ECEC provisions from *Starting Strong III* and the OECD Family Database are:

- **Preschool, early education programmes and kindergartens:** centre- or school-based programmes designed to meet the needs of children preparing to enter primary education. In most countries, these programmes include at least 50% educational content and are supervised by qualified staff. Usually, children of an older age bracket (three or four years old) are enrolled until compulsory primary schooling starts.
- **Integrated early childhood education and care:** an integrated system that provides integrated pedagogical settings covering ages zero or one to compulsory schooling age, *e.g.* Norway, New Zealand and Sweden.
- **Centre-based day-care:** all child care that is provided in licensed centres outside the home. The services provided can be full- or part-time and are most commonly referred to as nurseries, day care centres, crèches, playschools and parent-run groups. Children are usually enrolled in centre-based services from the age of zero.
- **Family day care:** services provided in a home setting. This can be at the childminder's home or at the child's own home where a qualified or registered childminder looks after the child. Usually, children start attending day care at age one, with the exceptions of Mexico and Norway, where child care is available from birth.

Figure 1. Overview of the three strands of the new activity

Year Time	2013				2014			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Strand 1: Monitoring quality	Phase I: Analytical phase			Phase II: Data/information collection phase		Phase III: Country comparative phase		
	Literature review of monitoring and evaluation;	Development of guidelines for survey	Finalising survey and sending out	Responding to survey	Verification and analysis of collected information	Policy lessons		Final report
					Policy options			
Strand 2: Data development	Phase I: Analytical phase		Phase II: Data/information collection phase			Phase III: Country comparative phase		
	Developing a conceptual framework, defining scope, preparing guidelines and survey		Piloting	Finalising survey and send out	Responding to survey	Cleaning up data (validation, verification) and data analysis		Set of internationally comparative indicators
							Road map	
Strand 3: Country reviews on ECEC systems	Phase I: Analytical phase		Phase II: Country review phase			Phase III: Country comparative phase		
	Literature review (research updating) and Development of guidelines/framework for background report	Country background report	Fact finding mission and policy review framework for	Country 1 Country 2 Country 3 Country 4	Policy review mission and country notes for	Country 1 Country 2 Country 3 Country 4	Analysis of collected information	Final report
Network meetings		13th ECEC network meeting with thematic working group presentations		14th ECEC network meeting with thematic working group presentations		15th ECEC network meeting with thematic working group presentations		16th ECEC network meeting with thematic working group presentations

Note: The final reports of Strands 1 and 3 will be merged into one synthesis report based on the broad international comparative analysis and the in-depth country review analysis, provided that both strands will be supported by the required voluntary contributions.

4.1. Strand 1: Policies for effectively monitoring quality across early learning settings

4.1.1. Proposed key overarching questions

13. All sixteen jurisdictions and the Canadian education ministries commented that the proposed questions are relevant to their country's priorities. Based on country suggestions, the overarching policy questions will remain as proposed but with a refined focus:

- What can research tell us about the effectiveness of monitoring practices?
- What kinds of approaches are most widely used by OECD countries to monitor the quality of the early learning and development sector at child, staff, centre/institution and system levels?

4.1.2. Scoping

14. Seven aspects were presented below as a menu of options to choose from as the country priority(ies), the results of which will define the scope for collecting information on monitoring policy and practices. The list was suggested based on the findings of *Starting Strong III*.

Individual level

- Child development or outcomes
- Parent satisfaction

Staff level

- Staff performance

Centre level

- Level of service quality

System level

- Regulation compliance
- Curriculum implementation
- Workforce supply and working conditions

15. Six jurisdictions and the Canadian education ministries indicated that monitoring child outcomes/development is their priority; six countries selected staff performance; and three selected curriculum implementation and the level of service quality. Two respondents mentioned workforce supply and working conditions; regulation compliance; and parental satisfaction. For the exercise to be completed within the given timeframe and with the available resources, the scope will focus on:

Individual level

- Child development or outcomes

Staff level

- Staff performance

Centre level

- Level of service quality

System level

- Curriculum implementation

16. The respondents suggested that staff quality include “process quality,⁵ *i.e.*, staff-child interaction” and “leadership/management”.

4.1.3. Expected tasks

17. This strand aims to:
- Bring together existing research and evidence on approaches to monitoring the quality of early learning among OECD countries within the agreed scope of Strand 1.
 - Develop an analytical framework for assessing quality.
 - Collect and analyse countries’ policies and practices.
 - Examine case studies of different practices to identify key lessons and policy options.

⁵ “Process quality” consists of what children actually experience in their programme – that which happens within a setting, such as interactions between educators and children. It also consists of the relationships with parents, available materials and professional development.

4.2. Strand 2: Strengthening monitoring of early learning quality through internationally-comparable indicators

4.2.1. Proposed key overarching questions

18. All seventeen respondents commented that the proposed questions are relevant to their country's priorities. Thus, the overarching policy questions will remain as proposed:
- Of the existing international data, which data still need quality improvement?
 - Which data are expected to fill the current gaps and will be most useful to underpin policy reforms in ECEC?

4.2.2. Scoping

19. Four areas of data development were presented as a menu of options to choose from as the country priority(ies). The list is an adaption from the conceptual framework used for *Education at a Glance* (see Annex A), and builds on the data collected for *Starting Strong III*.
- Governance and system/programme management
 - Financing
 - Access and participation
 - Learning and well-being environments for children

Wide or focused coverage

20. Countries were asked whether the network should collect fewer indicators covering all four areas, or collect a more comprehensive set of indicators in one specific area. The majority of respondents (12) indicated that they prefer the latter, while one indicated the former. Therefore, Strand 2 will focus on one area to ensure feasibility, improve data quality and close data gaps.

Scope

21. Of the four areas, 10 jurisdictions and the Canadian education ministries have prioritised “learning and well-being environments for children” as the focus of the scope. Five jurisdictions indicated that their preferred area of focus is “access and participation”; three, “governance and system management”; and two, “financing”. Thus, Strand 2 will primarily focus on “learning and well-being environments for children”. However, this needs to be understood that other areas may be included in the scope of “learning and well-being environments” in a broader sense, such as “financing”, as a policy input to shape the quality of the environments.
22. To further the scoping, this paper proposes a programme of work for the network on data development. The proposal is prepared based on the following exercises undertaken in parallel: *a*) a stock-taking exercise to identify currently available international data; *b*) a mapping exercise to identify new data to be collected or data to be updated by other bodies; *c*) a consultation with network members to identify needs for policy-driven data; and *d*) a concrete proposal from the network's thematic working group on data.

4.2.3 What data are currently available for international comparison?

23. The available data are largely related to structural quality indicators⁶ and workforce indicators. There has been a strong interest among policy makers in researching how structural quality may influence ECEC environments for children, such as funding, staff-child ratio, programme duration and space per child. When reliable data are available, correlational studies are often conducted; the results of such studies have shown that funding, staff-child ratio and programme duration are positively related with better child development. (OECD, 2011; Pianta *et al.*, 2009; UNESCO, 2004; Love *et al.*, 2003; Melhuish *et al.*, 2004; Smith, 2003; Belsky *et al.*, 2007; Glass, 2004).
24. Of the structural indicators, data on group size, intensity of programme (half-day/ full-day), and physical environment (*e.g.*, indoor space per child, outdoor space per child) are still under-developed for international comparison and can be further investigated to better understand the relationship between such structural policy inputs and outputs or outcomes.
25. Workforce indicators, such as staff qualification levels, initial education, professional development, remuneration and staff turn-over rates, are also found to play a critical role in influencing the quality of interactions with children and therefore the quality of child outcomes (OECD, 2001; Pianta *et al.*, 2009; CCL, 2006; Elliott, 2006; NIEER, 2006; Shonkoff and Philips, 2000). Striking the right balance between the qualification level and quantity of a qualified workforce is a policy question that requires careful planning concerning both quality and costs. While qualification levels need to be high enough to ensure quality learning environments, higher qualifications may lead to higher salary expectations. If ECEC providers may not be able to afford to meet the requirements, this might negatively impact quality (Bender *et al.*, 2007). Therefore, some countries have started to target raising the qualification level of the workforce only for a certain proportion of qualified staff, such as in New Zealand, for which “a mixture of qualified workforce within setting” could be a useful indicator for international comparison [[EDU/EDPC/ECEC\(2012\)4](#)].
26. ECEC policy outcome data have a broad range of indicators, depending on the country’s policy goals. They may include child outcomes, labour market outcomes and demographic outcomes, corresponding to the goals set out by the countries, as is found in the *Starting Strong III*. Strand 2, however, will focus on child outcomes, rather than other types of outcome indicators.
27. Child outcome data are still lacking in early childhood education and care. Outcome data have mostly been collected on older children, such as student performance in primary and secondary school, social outcomes and societal outcomes. International comparative data on learning outcomes or socio-emotional development do not exist for younger children.⁷ While monitoring child development/ outcomes in early learning and development is becoming high on the policy agenda in many countries, collecting data on child outcomes could be regarded as an issue unless *scoping* is carefully designed, with relevance responses to both ethical and technical challenges. Curricula which include explicit child outcomes for younger children often have a broad scope which focuses not only on the cognitive development, such as the development of literacy and numeracy skills, but also on socio-emotional development.⁸ Practical instruments, such as the Early Development

⁶ “Structural quality” refers to the overarching structures needed to ensure quality in early childhood programmes and are often aspects of ECEC that can be regulated, though they may contain variables which may differ from real situations at the centre level (*e.g.*, staff-child ratio, space, group size and qualifications of ECEC staff).

⁷ For developing countries, international comparison is available on aspects more relevant to developing countries, such as nutrition, child health treatments, water and sanitation, and some literacy and educational outcomes, measured by UNICEF’s Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS).

⁸ Recently, UNESCO and the Center for Universal Education (CUE) at the Brookings Institution have joined efforts to convene a Learning Metrics Task Force. They are tasked to make recommendations for learning competencies

Instrument (EDI), are used internationally, but results are not internationally comparable. This assessment is carried out by kindergarten staff on how children develop in five core areas: i) physical health and well-being, ii) social competence, iii) emotional maturity, iv) language and cognitive development, and v) communication skills and general knowledge.

28. A brief overview of the existing data on ECEC for international comparison is presented in Annex B. A more in-depth report can be found in [[EDU/EDPC/ECEC\(2012\)3/REV1/ANN2](#)].

4.2.4. *What new indicators are going to be collected?*

29. Major international organisations are planning to, or are in the process of, developing additional indicators and updating or improving existing indicators. The OECD INES Working Group on ECEC plans to improve the interpretability of the existing indicators reported in *Education at a Glance*, by improving the definition of early childhood education and care and, thus, to improve the comparability of data without any overlap between child care and education data. The INES Network for the Collection and Adjudication of System-Level Descriptive Information on Educational Structures, Policies and Practices (NESLI) plans to mainstream certain indicators on pre-primary education into the data collection on other levels of education. Also, the OECD Family Database attempts to update several ECEC indicators, such as public spending by age of children, public spending on child care and early education, and enrolment of under-three-year-olds in child care.
30. Eurydice plans to collect new data on a wide range of new indicators relevant to learning and well-being environments. Their plan for data collection is concerned with *process quality* at the practice level as well as *structural quality* at the system level. While structural indicators will be mainly updated or improved, indicators on pedagogy, learning and caring practices and *de facto* (not regulated) environments will need to be newly developed. Examples include: teaching approaches as recommended in the curriculum; and the actual share of staff with a tertiary education level (rather than qualification requirement level). For data concerning staff, the scope of countries' interest has grown and, therefore, it will include not only practitioners but also centre managers/owners, such as "official requirements to be a head in an ECEC setting". This is in line with recent research findings recognising the importance of "leadership/management" in centres or programme/ service delivery (Sylva *et al.*, 2010; Ackerman, 2006; OECD, 2006).
31. As mentioned earlier, international comparative data on child outcomes and early child development are non-existent to date, although some countries collect and monitor child outcome data within their country. There is a growing interest in international comparative research on "learning gains" with a baseline assessment which allows to measure value added between how children fair at the school entry and their later learning outcomes. The iPIPS (international Performance Indicators in Primary Schools) is a new comparative study of children starting school, aiming at capturing children's progress against a range of early literacy, numeracy and broader development indicators. Children will be assessed as they enter school, and again after one year in school. A pilot study is being prepared [[EDU/EDPC/ECEC/RD\(2012\)5](#)]. An overview of the new data or data to be updated/ improved can be found in Annex C.

and measures at the early childhood, primary and post-primary levels as part of the post-2015 agenda. The competencies will be described in terms of five domains for early childhood: *i)* language and literacy, *ii)* cognition and general knowledge, *iii)* physical well-being and motor development, *iv)* social and emotional development, and *v)* approaches to learning. Specific outcome indicators are still to be developed.

4.2.5. *Which comparative indicators are needed by the OECD ECEC Network members?*

32. Several countries specified what kinds of indicators on “learning and well-being environments” are relevant to their country policy priorities. Country feedback has shown their interest in both structural and process indicators.
33. Eight jurisdictions mentioned the relevance of having data on system-level data on organisation and management (such as regulated staff-child ratio and space per child as well as monitoring); and five respondents expressed an interest in process quality, *i.e.*, learning and caring practices. One jurisdiction suggested data collection on curriculum content and materials in ECEC centres for different age groups, which could facilitate better interactions between staff and children.
34. Workforce data are also mentioned, but by only a few countries. Two jurisdictions highlighted the importance of data on initial education and professional development. One jurisdiction highlighted the importance of data on working conditions such as the number of team meetings and organisation of staff time.
35. To better understand what characterises a high-quality ECEC environment, three jurisdictions emphasised that it is of importance to have data on child development outcomes, such as health, learning and social outcomes. Additionally, it was suggested by one jurisdiction to collect data on the impact of a programme on children’s development. Data collection on outcomes contributes to understanding which learning and well-being environments have better outcomes.
36. The importance of collecting cultural and contextual information was highlighted by four jurisdictions. ECEC systems can vary widely between jurisdictions and countries. It is necessary to understand a country or jurisdiction’s ECEC system and put its data in the proper context, as contextual differences are of great importance to take into account when collecting information in the data collection process. A brief overview can be found in Annex D.

4.2.6. *Which indicators are proposed by the OECD ECEC Network’s Thematic Working Group on Data?*

37. The ECEC Network’s thematic working group on data has reported that [[EDU/EDPC/ECEC\(2012\)4](#)]:

ECEC is a developing field, still lacking in many commonly accepted policy positions supported by robust evidence...any new information must address at least some of these policy challenges...summarised as research questions as follows:

- ***What works? What aspects of learning and wellbeing environments genuinely improve the learning and wellbeing of young children?***
- ***What works best? Are the greatest improvements in learning and wellbeing environments to be had from improving qualifications, number of staff, ongoing professional development, or any other factors?***
- ***How do governments make it work? What is the mixture of expenditure, regulation, and information across various domains of activity that achieve meaningful gains? And at what cost?***
- ***How are the gains distributed? In the field of ECEC, one of the key accepted facts is that gains should accrue particularly to children from disadvantaged backgrounds. How effective are different systems at achieving the kinds of distribution of resources, learning and wellbeing opportunities that should achieve these gains?***

38. The group further suggested two principles for data development: i) **representative validity** (*i.e.*, to what extent does a set of data present the concepts which interest policy makers), and ii) **representative utility** (*i.e.*, whether a set of data imply a normative goal and whether the goal is genuinely optimal). Based on these two principles, the group suggests indicators to develop or to improve for three types: i) inputs (*e.g.*, staff, qualifications, staff child ratios, group size, space per child, curriculum, expenditure), ii) outputs (*e.g.*, quality of staff child interactions, quality of child experience), and iii) outcomes (*e.g.*, academic performance, child well-being).

4.2.7. Issues in data development

39. Reviewing the results of these stock-taking and needs analysis exercises, five issues have been identified as orientations for future data development. *First*, it is evident that there is little international data available on ECEC in general. Research has shown that reliable data can help establish facts and evidence about the ECEC sector, ensure accountability on quality ECEC systems, and support national and local decision making (Bennett, 2002; OECD, 2001). The reliable data can also lead to improved learning and well-being environments (Office of Child Development and Early Learning, 2010; Rand, 2008).⁹ This can then lead to positive impacts on child development (Pianta *et al.*, 2008). When the data are used formatively with feedback to practitioners and managers, statistically significant effects were found on children's literacy skills (Frede *et al.*, 2007, Frede *et al.*, 2011).
40. Despite these benefits on data collection and monitoring, ECEC data are lacking in general even within their own countries. For international comparison, the data gaps are identified on: *i)* process quality¹⁰; *ii)* content and methodology of monitoring policies and practices; *iii)* content and duration of initial education for staff; *iv)* actual practical training arrangements; *v)* child development/outcomes; *vi)* child care and younger children; and *vii)* differentiation factors (such as enrolment rates by family income and immigrant status). The question is which indicators are useful to be developed for international comparison and whether it is feasible to do so with a reliable instrument.
41. *Second*, international comparative data might lack contextual information which can lead to misinterpretation of data. This poses challenges in particular for the data on ECEC where there is a wide range of variation of provision, often fragmented, in the sector both across and within countries. Available data could be improved by strengthening methodologies, such as ensuring that methodologies take a country's ECEC system into account when collecting the data and presenting data better within the context of a country.
42. *Third*, different OECD divisions and other organisations often collect the same indicator but often with different definitions and methodologies in use. Due to the use of different definitions or methodologies for data collection, an overlap of certain indicators exists with different data results and figures for the same countries. This is often found to confuse data users.
43. *Fourth*, comparability and knowledge of ECEC systems could be improved by collecting data for more countries. For certain indicators, data is available for a limited number of countries. When data is available for a large number of countries, a better understanding of differences and equalities between ECEC system organisation can be created. This can also lead to improved quality of analyses.

⁹ See, for example, Keystone STARS study (www.pakeys.org/uploadedContent/Docs/STARS/outreach/2010%20STARS.rpt.final.pdf) and RAND study (www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB9343/index1.html).

¹⁰ "Process quality" consists of what children actually experience in their programme – that which happens within a setting, such as interactions between educators and children. It also consists of the relationships with parents, available materials and professional development.

44. *Fifth*, country representation differs between sources. Where Eurydice collects data on a wider range of EU countries, the OECD collects data on non-EU OECD countries. The two sources oftentimes collect data on similar indicators and can therefore complement each other; however, the reference points (e.g. average) may need to be interpreted with caution. Furthermore, how countries are represented differs between these sources. *Starting Strong III* aimed at collecting data at the state or regional level since a certain aspects of ECEC systems differ at state-level in federal countries, while Eurydice presents data only at national country-level. Examples include the data on space per child and curriculum framework for Germany and Canada.
45. To tackle the above issues, Strand 2 will aim to collect data with a focus on: *i)* process quality indicators, staff education and professional development, and child development outcome indicators; monitoring practices well-aligned with Strand 1; *ii)* including data on child care and younger children, which is in line with the efforts made with the new ISCED 0 definition of 2011 towards *Education at a Glance 2015*; *iii)* providing contextual information for better interpretation of the international comparative data; and *iv)* co-operating with other divisions within the OECD and other international organisations on indicator and data development and adapt the same definitions and methodologies so as to align country representation and coverage and aiming to avoid inconsistencies in data. If relevant and feasible within the data collection timeline, data can or will be collected as a joint exercise with other organisations.

4.2.8. *Proposed programme of work on data collection*

46. Based on the above exercises, the programme of work on data collection is proposed below for Strand 2 (2013/14) and beyond (Table 1).

Table 1. Proposed Programme of Work for the ECEC Network on Data Collection

Proposed Indicators	Data Status / Plans	Relevant category(ies) in Annex A
Contextual information required for better interpretation of the international comparative data on learning and well-being environments		
Governance: Split/integrated; Federal/centralised; Starting year of compulsory schooling; Starting year of primary schooling	<u>To update</u> from unpublished data collected for SSIII as well as Table C1.1 of EAG 2012	2.IV
Types of provision: ECEC provision of half/full days; Parent support programmes; Types of access and providers with age coverage	<u>New, For improvement and/or To update</u> Starting Strong III, Table 2.2 of EAG 2012, Family Database and Eurydice	2.I, 2.IV, 3.III
Socio-economic, demographic country background: Gross population coverage with the number of children by age; Family SES or other demographic factors (e.g., immigrant, indigenous)	<u>To update</u> part of the Annexes of Starting Strong II	3.IV
Policy inputs		
Expenditure		
Public spending on early education / child care by age (as a proportion of median working-age household income), per capita (as a % of GDP capita or in equivalent USD using PPP, based on full-time equivalents), etc.	<u>To improve</u> by adapting ISCED 2011 definition, in collaboration with INES and ELS	2.IV
Public spending on cash benefits, tax breaks by age (as a proportion of median working-age household income), per capita (as a % of GDP capita or in equivalent USD using PPP, based on full-time equivalents), etc.	<u>To improve</u> by adapting ISCED 2011 definition, in collaboration with INES and ELS	2.IV
Share of household expenditure on early education / child care as a % of total expenditure	<u>To improve</u> by adapting ISCED 2011 definition, in collaboration with INES and ELS	2.IV
Minimum and maximum cost of public and private grant-aided ECEC settings	<u>New</u> , in collaboration with Eurydice	2.IV, 3.III
Early education / child care fees for a four-year-old attending accredited ECEC services	<u>To improve</u> by complementing the child care fees for a two-year-old attending ECEC services in Chart PF3.4A of the Family Database	2.IV, 3.III
Net early education fees as a % of average wage by different family types – two-earners (both 100%; one with 100%, other 50%; single parent with 100%)	<u>To improve</u> by complementing the net child care fees Figure Chart PF3.4B of the Family Database	2.IV, 3.III
Regulations and minimum standards		
Minimum standards: regulated staff-child ratio; regulated group size; regulated space per child	<u>For improvement and/or To update</u> Figure 1.5-1.8 and unpublished data of Starting Strong III and Table D.2.2 of EAG 2012	2.IV
Professional registration/ licensing	<u>New, For improvement</u> from Table D5.5 of EAG 2012 and from Table 3.7 of Starting Strong II	2.IV

Organisation and management		
Monitoring practices: Instruments in use; frequency; monitoring targets; monitoring agencies; the use of the results	<u>For improvement</u> and <u>To update</u> Tables 5.2-5.8 of Starting Strong III	2.I, 2.II, 2.III
Long-term outcome based data: availability of research/evaluation on whether programmes in place actually make a positive difference in the healthy development of children as well as longitudinal studies starting from early childhood	<u>New</u> and <u>To update</u> Table 5.9 of Starting Strong III	2.IV
Curriculum/learning standards, learning and caring practices		
Curriculum design: age coverage, scope and focus and content areas	<u>To update</u> Figures 2.3-2.5 of Starting Strong III	2.IV
Curriculum implementation: Recommendations on teaching approaches, time tables and classroom organisation/management	<u>New</u> , in collaboration with Eurydice	2.II
De facto ratio (cf. regulated): Actual staff-child ratio; Mixture of qualification levels within settings	<u>New</u> and <u>For improvement</u> from EAG 2012	2.II
Learning resources: Access to materials in ECEC centres for different age groups; Access to trips and visits	<u>New</u>	2.II
Initial education and professional development		
Required qualification for staff: required level for different provision; in-service training requirements, such as examination to enter the training, duration of the programme in years, and teaching practicum required in the programme (yes/no or in hours)	<u>To update</u> Figure 3.1 of Starting Strong III and <u>For improvement</u> from Table D5.4 of EAG 2012	2.II, 2.III
Requirements for a head in an ECEC setting	<u>New</u> , in collaboration with Eurydice	2.III
Availability, structures around provision and delivery of professional development	<u>For improvement</u> from Figures 3.4-3.6 and Table 3.8 and 3.10 of Starting Strong III, and <u>New</u> in collaboration with the exercise for EAG 2014	2.II
Professional development participation and support systems	<u>New</u> and <u>For improvement</u> from Table 3.9 of Starting Strong III	2.II
Working conditions		
Remuneration: remuneration of ECEC staff in comparison with the minimum wage and with that of primary teachers OR Starting salary, salary after 10 years of experience, salary after 15 years of experience, and salary at top of scale	<u>For improvement</u> from Figure 3.7 of Starting Strong III OR Table D.3.1 of EAG 2012	2.IV
Staff time: Time spent in playroom versus time spent on non-ECEC activities (e.g., administrative and preparatory work)	<u>New</u> in collaboration with the exercise for EAG 2013 (i.e., number of weeks of instruction, number of days of instruction, net teaching time in hours, working time required in hours, total statutory working time in hours)	2.II, 2.IV
Staff turnover rate ¹	<u>To update and for improvement</u> Figure 3.8 of Starting Strong III	3.II

Policy outputs		
Staff performance and Quality of pedagogy: monitoring practices of staff performance	<u>New</u> and <u>To update/improve</u> Table 5.2 of Starting Strong III	1.II, 2, II
Quality of interactions, attachments: instruments to measure interaction staff-child	<u>New</u>	1.II
Quality of child experience: monitoring practices of child development	<u>New</u> and <u>To update/improve</u> Table 5.2 of Starting Strong III	2.I
Parent satisfaction: monitoring practices of parental satisfaction	<u>New</u> and <u>To update/improve</u> Table 5.3 of Starting Strong III	1.III
Outcomes		
Child development outcomes	<u>New (instruments)</u>	1.I

1. The definition currently used is “Number of workers that had to be replaced over a given period of time, calculated as the number of employee departures divided by staff members and multiplied by a hundred” Capko, J. (2001), Identifying the Causes of Staff Turnover”, *Family Practice management*; Vol. 8, No.4

47. Where data already exist, they can be either updated or improved. To update, the same definition will be used to capture more recent data or ensure wider country coverage than the current data. To improve the quality of the data, the definitions currently in place will be re-visited. Where there is no data, new indicators will be developed. In this case, the process will be carefully thought through to develop a well-designed conceptual framework and to collaborate with agencies that are in the process of developing the new data.

4.2.8. Expected tasks

48. This strand would be carried out in close collaboration with INES (OECD) and Eurydice (European Commission) and aims to:
 - Define a scope and pilot for new data on early learning and development.
 - Identify a set of internationally-comparable indicators for early learning and development that can stimulate discussions to enrich domestic policy development.
 - Establish a road map for developing, in close collaboration with INES, an enhanced set of early learning indicators for future inclusion in *Education at a Glance*.

4.3. Strand 3: Country Reviews

49. This strand will involve working with individual countries to provide tailored country-specific policy advice for ECEC systems and practices to ensure better child development.
50. As the focus of the country review, the Secretariat set out three options and asked countries for their preferred priority:
 1. Monitoring quality
 2. Enhancing quality
 3. System evaluation
51. Countries indicated their interest either in “monitoring quality” or “system evaluation”. No preference was given to the topic of “enhancing quality”. Considering the efficient use of resources, as well as coherence with Strand 1, the Secretariat suggests that the focus be “monitoring quality”.

Strand 3 will be launched with a minimum number of **four countries** to ensure value added by international comparison and peer policy learning.

52. Countries that opt for “system evaluation” are invited to express their firm interest at the network meeting. With additional funding to support the required research to enlarge the scope, the Secretariat would consider conducting a country-specific review on ECEC (Annex E).

4.3.1. Proposed key overarching questions and suggested scope

53. The overarching question will be:

- What are the most effective policy options to monitor the quality of early learning and development in the country concerned?

54. This review will provide opportunities to carry out an in-depth study, focusing on monitoring quality. The review will draw on findings from Strand 1 of the activity. It will also draw on the findings from the *OECD Policy Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes* where relevant.¹¹

55. The review will provide a description of monitoring system and practices in the country concerned in comparison with peer countries; analyse strengths and weaknesses of different approaches; and suggest options for improvement. This will be included in a country-specific output, *i.e.*, Country Note. The scope of monitoring will be aligned with Strand 1.

4.3.2. Methodology

56. The work will follow the methodology of the *OECD Thematic Reviews*, which employs a combination of desk-based analysis and country visits.

57. It is proposed to organise the work in three phases. See Annex F for detail.

- 1) An *Analytic Phase* – establishing or strengthening the knowledge-base with latest research, international and domestic data, country experiences with recent reforms, analysis of policy issues, contextual factors, stakeholder behaviour, etc.
- 2) A *Country Review Phase* – consolidating the knowledge base by country-specific facts and providing policy advice to individual countries tailored to the issues specific to the country concerned, combined with evidence obtained by a team of experts visiting the country.
- 3) A *Country Comparative Phase* – with the preparation of a final report to blend analytic and review evidence and provide overall policy options, lessons and conclusions.

58. This will be complemented by the ECEC Network meetings to discuss progress and share experiences. Furthermore, thematic working groups are expected to contribute to consolidating the knowledge base of the project.

5. Resources and expected outputs

59. The new activity was broadly supported by the members of the Education Policy Committee at its 11th meeting that took place from 26-27 April 2012 (Annex 2 in [EDU/EDPC(2012)1]). As a result, the planned budget allocation from *Part I Core Funding (assessed contributions)* includes:

¹¹ While the scope of the study is limited to primary and secondary education, some countries use the same framework for pre-primary education from the primary education.

- EUR 400K for 2013-14 for Strand 1 and the operational costs of the biannual OECD Network meetings.
- EUR 200K 2013-14 for Strand 2.

Network meetings

60. The mandate of the network has been adjusted to emerging needs and renewed for 2012-17 [[EDU/EDPC/M\(2011\)2](#)] as follows:
- Develop, share and disseminate information on country experiences on policy, research and good practice to support effective policy development and implementation;
 - Identify topics and aspects where additional research and analysis is required to underpin effective policy development; and
 - Assess data developments required to support effective policy development and implementation and advice on the development of such data.
61. The PoWB 2013/14 states that the network is tasked to carry out the new activity under the Education Policy Committee. It is therefore important that the network members be fully aware that the network is expected to produce outputs that are directly linked to the expected outputs of the PoWB 2013/14. Network meetings can be covered towards the delivery of the outputs and be financed by the Part I Core Funding, that is, to discuss, provide feedback and give guidance on the progress of the new project.
62. Seven thematic working groups have been established by the network members on the basis of country interest expressed at the 10th meeting of the network. Participation in these working groups is on a voluntary basis. These working groups are expected to produce outputs that are directly linked to the expected outputs of the PoWB 2013/14 as well as to facilitate peer learning.
63. The group on “definition and selection of foundation skills” is still open for participating members. The theme was suggested to investigate and provide a sound conceptual framework to inform policy by identifying key skills required for young children as a foundation for lifelong learning. This could be a task similar to the *DeSeCo* Project (the acronym of Definition and Selection of Competencies: Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations) but with a special focus on younger children.¹² If there will not be sufficient countries that contribute to this group, this theme could be relevant to data development and, thus, could be included in the working group on data. If relevant, other thematic groups are encouraged to join efforts to streamline the administrative process.

¹² See www.oecd.org/pisa/35070367.pdf.

Table 2. List of thematic working groups with participants

Theme (Relevance to Programme of Work)	Participants (Moderator is marked with *)
Data development (Strand 2)	Richard Walley* (NZL) Katie Hamm (USA/OECD), Anne-Marie Dieu (BEL - French), Stefan Haddick / Philipp Rogge (DEU), László Limbacher (HUN), Rosalyn Harper / Steve Hamilton (UK - England), Christele Van Nieuwenhuyzen (BEL - Flanders)
Monitoring quality (Strand 1/3)	David De Silva*(AUS) Anne-Marie Dieu (BEL-French), Irena Borkovcová (CZE), Viera Hajdúková (SLV), Lars Hornung Bahn (DNK), Tiina Peterson (EST), Duncan Aitchison (UK), Sandra Collins (NZL)
Workforce quality (Strand 1/2/3)	Wyske Boomsma* (NLD) Katie Hamm (USA/OECD), Florence Pirard (BEL - French), Theresa Ryan (IRE), Laszlo Limbacher (HUN), Jo Van Heel / Tegan Johnson (AUS)
Strategies for increasing access/ scaling up participation (e.g., inclusion, social equity, targeted/ universal policy)	Kathryn Chisholm/Donna Bell* (UK - Scotland) Viorica Preda (ROM), Anne-Marie Dieu (BEL - French), Mária Pákozdi (HUN)
Integration and transition in early learning and development (e.g., integration of ECEC, transition from ECEC to compulsory schooling, transition from "learning to read" to "reading to learn") (Strand 1/2/3)	Jim Grieve * (CAN) Mugyeong Moon (KOR), Claude Sevenig (LUX), Kiyomi Akita / Riyo Kadota / Fumiaki Nakayasu (JAP)
Definition and selection of foundation skills (Strand 2)	Mugyeong Moon* (KOR)
Quality services for ages 0-3 (Strand 1/2/3)	Manuel Achten* (LUX) Florence Pirard (BEL - French), Pedro Cunha / Portuguese Delegation (Portugal), Márta Korintus (HUN), Arturo Saenz / Mexican Delegation (MEX)

64. The basic cost for 2013/14 (with two meetings per year) is estimated to be EUR 138K, which includes: conference rooms, interpreters, translation of documents, administrative staff cost to manage logistics of meetings (excluding staff time to provide analytical support), coffee and knowledge mobilisation, such as disseminating the network's work to raise its profile among its target audiences. The cost of the meetings is shared between Strands 1 and 2 in the costings that are set out in the remainder of this document.
65. The country consultation has indicated that the network may wish to invite external experts as keynote speakers and to receive analytical support from the Secretariat (staff time) to support the work of the thematic working groups, e.g., facilitating a group where a moderator is missing or providing comments on the draft working papers. Within the stated budgets, the Secretariat will support the work of the working groups to the extent that they contribute to the programme of work for Strands 1-3. Possible links between the thematic working groups and the programme of work are indicated in Table 2; the degree of relevance varies across the themes. Other than this, additional support or requests for external speakers and experts will need to be funded by additional voluntary contributions.

Strand 1

66. The intermediate and final outputs proposed for Strand 1 are as follows:

Intermediary outputs

- Literature review on research related to monitoring policies and practices of monitoring (Q1 2013)
- Guidelines for a country survey, building on the literature review and the findings of *Starting Strong III*, piloting of the survey and finalisation of the survey (Q2-3 2013)
- Country responses to the survey, followed by clarification and validation (Q1 2014)
- Analytical framework for suggesting policy options and policy lessons in early learning quality (Q2-3 2014)
- Review and development of materials during network meetings

Final outputs

- List of policy options that can encourage better quality monitoring (Q4 2014)
- List of policy lessons in monitoring quality (Q4 2014)
- Spotlight policy report (for those who provided the VCs)
- Final report, which provides analytical policy messages where relevant outputs will be synthesised. If Strand 3 will be also undertaken with country reviews, the final reports of Strands 1 and 3 will be merged, drawing on the broad international comparative analysis of Strand 1 and the in-depth country review analysis of Strand 3.

67. The estimated total expenditure that would be required to deliver these outputs is EUR 535K over 2013 and 2014. Given the Core (*i.e.*, Part 1) funding of EUR 400K for this strand, the balance of the costs, EUR 135K, would need to be met from voluntary contributions from the participants in the work. On the assumption that 15 countries contribute, a voluntary contribution of EUR 9K each would be required (or alternatively *in-kind* contributions [Annex G]). Countries providing this voluntary contribution will also receive a ‘spotlight policy report’. This will be a concise, customised summary of the findings of the comparative work that puts their country in the spotlight.
68. Without the requested voluntary contributions, some of the outputs listed above would need to be dropped from the plans. For instance, rather than producing a final synthesis report, the Secretariat could simply produce a document that collates the list of options that can encourage better quality monitoring and the list of policy lessons in monitoring quality.
69. In addition to these outputs, an additional output proposed by one country was a short engaging video clip series on the internet. If countries could provide a video clip of monitoring quality in practice at their own cost and with their own quality assurance and copyright clearance, the Secretariat could provide staff support to draft the guidelines on the format of the video clip as part of the information collection survey and disseminate the video series on the network’s website. This would be subject to an additional, small voluntary contribution.

Strand 2

70. The intermediate and final outputs planned for Strand 2 are:

Intermediary outputs

- Stock-taking of the existing data and untapped survey results for *Starting Strong III* (Q3-4 2012)
- Conceptual paper for data development and for a country survey (Q1-2 2013)

- Development of a survey instrument, after piloting and finalisation (Q1-4 2013)
- Country responses to the survey, followed by clarification and validation (Q1-3 2014)

Final outputs

- A set of internationally-comparable indicators for early learning and development (Q4 2014)
 - A road map for further development of early learning indicators (Q4 2014)
 - Spotlight data report (for those who provided the VCs)
 - Final report with an overview of international comparable data, analytical findings and data issues, challenges and developments
71. Developing indicators requires significant resources for careful planning, implementation and management of data surveys with a pilot run as well as quality validation for international comparison.
72. The country consultation suggests an ECEC-data specific publication as an output of Strand 2, as ECEC data needs international recognition and attention, drawing on the successful case of raising visibility of ECEC data in *Education at a Glance 2012*. Such a report is therefore included in this list of final outputs. It is argued that the publication could provide an overview of international comparable data, analyse the findings and highlight certain issues, challenges and developments.
73. The estimated total expenditure that would be required to deliver these outputs is EUR 500K over 2013 and 2014. Given the Core (*i.e.*, Part 1) funding of EUR 200K for this strand, the balance of the costs, EUR 300K would need to be met from voluntary contributions from the participants in the work. On the assumption that 15 countries contribute, a voluntary contribution of EUR 20K each would be required (or alternatively *in-kind* contributions [Annex G]). Countries providing this voluntary contribution will also receive a ‘spotlight data report’. This will be a concise, customised summary of the comparative data that puts their country in the spotlight
74. Without the requested voluntary contributions, some of the outputs listed above would need to be dropped from the plans. For instance, rather than producing a final report, the Secretariat could simply produce a document that collates the list of indicators that have been developed.

Strand 3

75. Strand 3 is designed to be fully financed by voluntary contributions from participating countries. However, the analytical phase on monitoring quality (*i.e.*, literature review and country survey) is covered/financed by the work of Strand 1 with the OECD Core Funding.
76. The comparative analysis set out for Strand 3 (country review phase and country comparative phase, excluding the above mentioned analytical phase) is estimated to cost EUR 127K per country, which would be financed by a voluntary contribution from each country requesting a review (Annex G). Assuming a minimum of four country reviews, this implies a total expenditure for this strand of EUR 508K. Apart from the voluntary contributions, the country is expected to pay directly for: domestic transportation of the country visits; interpretation costs during the country visits; translation of the country note into their own language; any costs for the dissemination of the country note, such as a national seminar (optional).
77. To ensure quality in-depth comparative analysis and delivery of the country review reports, as well as financial viability of the project with the available resources, it is necessary to undertake a

minimum number of **four** country reviews. If Strand 3 will be undertaken, the final reports of Strands 1 and 3 will be merged, drawing on the international comparative analysis of Strand 1 with the in-depth country review analysis of Strand 3.

78. To be able to carry out the country reviews, including assigning appropriately qualified Secretariat staff to the project, it is necessary to establish at an early stage in the project how many countries wish to have such a review. Countries are asked to formally confirm their interest to the Secretariat no later than **31 January, 2013**.
79. Countries will receive the following outputs.

With voluntary contributions:

- Comparative analytical framework, drawing on the established knowledge base, as well as new findings, and guidelines for short country background reports (Q1 2013)
- Short country background reports prepared by countries (to be clarified and published on the website Q2 2013 and to be highlighted in the final report in Q4 2014)
- Fact-finding mission with a team of four members (Secretariat + external experts) (Q3-4 2013)
- Policy evaluation framework (Q 4 2013)
- Policy mission with a team of one to three members (Secretariat and, if appropriate, an external expert) (Q1-2 2014)
- Country note for each country with country-specific policy suggestions (Q2-3 2014)
- Final report (Q3-4 2014) (provided that the minimum number of participating countries is four). If Strand 1 will be supported by the required voluntary contributions, the final reports of Strands 1 and 3 will be merged, drawing on the broad international comparative analysis of Strand 1 and the in-depth country review analysis of Strand 3.

6. Key links with other work

80. The PoWB indicates key links with other elements of the Directorate for Education's programme of work as stated below.

The outputs would draw on:	The outputs could feed into:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Starting Strong III • INES/EAG • OECD Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes • OECD Review on Policies and Practices to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INES/EAG • GPS • PISA analysis • Skills development

81. The project would also take account of work carried out in the Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs, including *Doing Better for Families* and the OECD Family Database. To be mutually beneficial, this project could feed into their work, such as *WikiChild*.
82. This project will work in close collaboration with other organisations, such as the European Commission, Eurydice, UNESCO and the World Bank when appropriate and feasible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, D.J. (2006), “The costs of being a child care teacher: Revisiting the Problem of Low Wages”, *Educational Policy*, 20, 2006.
- Barnett, W. S. *et al.* (2010), “The Effects of Preschool Education: What We Know, How Public Policy Is or Is Not Aligned With the Evidence Base, and What We Need to Know”, *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, Vol.10, No. 2, pp. 49-88.
- Belsky, J., D. Vandell, M. Burchinal, K.A. Clarke-Stewart, K. McCartney, M.T. Owen and The NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (2007), “Are There Long-term Effects of Early Child Care?”, *Child Development*, Vol. 78, No. 2, pp. 681-701.
- Bender *et al.* (2007), “Teachers’ Education, Classroom Quality, and Young Children’s Academic Skills: Results From Seven Studies of Preschool Programmes”, *Child Development*, Vol. 78, No. 2, pp. 558-580.
- Canadian Council on Learning (CCL) (2006), “Why is High-Quality Child Care Essential? The link between Quality Child Care and Early Learning”, *Lessons in Learning*, CCL, Ottawa.
- Elliott, A. (2006), “Early Childhood Education: Pathways to Quality and Equity for all Children”, *Australian Education review*, 50, 2006.
- Frede, E. and W. S. Barnett (2011), “New Jersey’s Abbott Pre-k Program: A model for the nation”, in E. Zigler, W. Gilliam, and W. S. Barnett (eds.), *The Pre-k Debates: Current controversies & issues*, Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.
- Frede, E. C., G. S. Walter and L. J. Schweinhart (2011), “Assessing Accountability and Ensuring Continuous Program Improvement: Why, How and Who” in E. Zigler, W. Gilliam and W. S. Barnett (eds.), *The Pre-K Debates: Current controversies & issues*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.
- Frede, E., W. S. Barnett, K. Jung, C. E. Lamy and A. Figueras (2007), “The Abbott Preschool Program Longitudinal Effects Study (APPLES)”, Interim Report, New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.
- Glass, G. (2004), “More than Teacher Directed or Child Initiated: Preschool Curriculum Type, Parent Involvement, and Children’s Outcomes in the Child-Parent Centres”, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, Vol. 12, No. 72, pp. 1-38.
- Love *et al.* (2003), *Child Care Quality Matters: How Conclusions May Vary With Context*, Department of Child, Youth and Family Studies, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Melhuish *et al.* (2004), “The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project: Findings from Pre-school to end of Key Stage 1”, *Sure Start*, United Kingdom.
- NIEER (2006), “Increasing the Effectiveness of Preschool Programmes”, *Policy Brief*, NIEER, New Jersey.

- OECD (2001), *Starting Strong: Early Childhood Education and Care*, OECD publishing, Paris.
- OECD (2006), *Starting Strong II: Early Childhood Education and Care*, OECD publishing, Paris.
- OECD (2011), *Starting Strong III: A Quality Toolbox for Early Childhood Education and Care*, OECD publishing, Paris.
- Office of Child Development and Early Learning (2010), “Keystone Stars: Reaching Higher for Quality Early Education”, *Program Report*, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare.
- Pianta *et al.* (2009), “The Effects of Preschool Education: What We Know, How Public Policy Is or Is Not Aligned With the Evidence Base, and What We Need to Know”, *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, Vol.10, No. 2, pp. 49-88.
- RAND (2008), “Assessing Child-Care Quality: How Well Does Colorado’s Qualistar Quality Rating and Improvement System Work?”, *Policy Brief*, RAND, Santa Monica.
- Shonkoff, J. P. and A. D. Philips (2000), *From Neurons to Neighbourhoods*, National Academy Press, Washington DC.
- Smith, A. (2003), “School Completion/Academic Achievement-Outcomes of Early Childhood Education”, *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development*, Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development and Strategic Knowledge Cluster on Early Child Development, Montreal, available at: www.child-encyclopedia.com/Pages/PDF/SmithANGxp.pdf, accessed 22 September 2011.
- Sylva, K. *et al.* (2004), “The Effective Provision of Preschool Education (EPPE) Project: Final Report”, Report No. SSU/FR/2004/01, Department for Education and Skills, Nottingham.
- UNESCO (2004), “Curriculum in Early Childhood Education and Care”, *UNESCO Policy Brief on Early Childhood*, No. 26, UNESCO, Paris.

ANNEX A. ORGANISING FRAMEWORK OF DATA COLLECTION

The four suggested areas are aligned with the framework (Table 1) and corresponding chapters in the *Education at a Glance* publication.

- Governance and system/programme management (corresponding to part of Chapter D “*The Learning Environment and Organisation of Schools*”: 2.I, 2II, 2III, 2IV)
- Financing (2IV, corresponding to Chapter B “*Financial and Human Resources Invested in Education*”:
- Access and participation (corresponding to Chapter C “*Access to Education, Participation and Progression*”: 1I, 1IV, 2IV)
- Learning and well-being environments for children (corresponding to part of Chapter D “*The Learning Environment and Organisation of Schools*”: 1I, 1II, 2I, 2II, 2III, 2IV, 3I, 3II)

Table 1. Adapted (from EAG) organising framework for collection of data on the early learning and development sector

	1. Early childhood education and care outcomes	2. Policy levers and contexts shaping early childhood development	3. Antecedents or constraints that contextualise policy
I. Individual children in early childhood education and care	1.I. The quality and distribution of individual child development and child outcomes (e.g., early literacy/ numeracy, non-cognitive development, healthy development, enrolment rates)	2.I. Individual child engagement and behaviour to education and care (e.g., monitoring child development, support types for parental engagement with children)	3.I. Background characteristics of the individual children and ECEC staff (e.g., family backgrounds, average age / gender of ECEC workforce)
II. Learning and caring settings	1.II. The quality of early learning and care delivery (e.g., quality of staff-child interactions and attachment, quality of child experience)	2.II. Pedagogy, learning and caring practices, and room climate (e.g., monitoring staff performance, initial education and professional development, learning resources)	3.II. Early childhood education and care conditions and staff working conditions (e.g., staff turnover rates, de facto staff-child ratio)
III. Providers of early childhood services	1.III. The output of early childhood education and care institutions and institutional performance (e.g., parental satisfaction, smooth transition from ECEC to primary schooling)	2.III. Early childhood development environment and organisation (e.g., types of subsidies for providers, monitoring service quality, accreditation of services)	3.III. Characteristics of the service providers and their communities (e.g., location of service providers)
IV. Early childhood education and care system as a whole	1.IV. The overall performance of the early childhood education and care system (e.g., equity in education [enrolment rates, child outcomes], decrease in child poverty, increase in fertility rate, increase in female labour force participation)	2.IV. System-wide institutional settings, resource allocations and policies (e.g., ECEC governance, public spending on ECEC, legal framework for access, minimum standards, qualification level, curriculum, price ceiling, remuneration, research and programme evaluation)	3.IV. The national educational, social, economic and demographic contexts (e.g., growth of immigrant children, decrease in fertility rate, ageing population, number of children by age)

ANNEX B: EXISTING DATA FOR INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON

Policy input			
<i>Regulations and minimum standards</i>	Regulated staff-child ratio		
	Regulated group size		
	Regulated minimum indoor and outdoor space		
	Health and standards in place for accredited and subsidised provisions (yes/no)		
<i>Organisation and management</i>	<i>Monitoring</i>	<i>(subject)</i> What aspects of the ECEC system are subject to monitoring, such as child outcomes, regulation compliance and staff performance	
		<i>(methods)</i> Different monitoring methods in place for different aspects subject to monitoring, such as inspection and standardised testing; characteristics of monitoring methods: frequency and who conducts the monitoring	
	<i>Family and community engagement</i>	<i>(methods)</i> Different methods to involve parents and community in ECEC (providers, assessment, etc.)	
		<i>(types of decision making)</i> Power exercised by parent and/or community in councils/boards (decision on educational plans and content, recruitment of staff, etc.)	
<i>Curriculum/learning standards, pedagogy, learning and caring practices</i>	<i>Curriculum framework</i>	Existence and nature of curriculum framework (compulsory or not binding)	
	<i>Curriculum content</i>	<i>(areas included)</i> Values and principles; expected staff input; child outcomes; contents (early literacy, etc.); objectives (adaption to school life, socio-affective development, etc.); guidance on child assessment (criteria for school readiness, how to record child development, etc.); guidance on teaching approaches (timetables, teamwork, etc.)	
	Actual staff-child ratio in place (cf. regulated staff-child ratio)		
	<i>Staff type/ category</i>	Kindergarten teacher, child minder, pedagogue, etc.*	
	<i>Staff profile</i>	Share of male and female staff	
		Average age	
Percentage of staff who have the minimum ISCED level			
<i>Initial education and professional development</i>	<i>Initial education requirements</i>	Minimum ISCED level requirement for ECEC staff	
		Entrance requirements to enter initial education (examination or not)	
	<i>Initial education characteristics</i>	Full- or part-time provision	
		Public or private provision	
	<i>Initial education structure</i>	Duration (length in years)	
		Topics/subjects covered in programmes*	
		Teacher practice requirement (yes/no)	
		Specialised training to work with children at risk (integrated in initial education or separate training)	
	<i>Professional development characteristics</i>	Incentives (mandatory or not)	
		Forms (online, formal education etc.)	
Provider types (government, professional bodies, etc.)			
<i>Professional development structure</i>	Most common subjects/topics covered in programmes		
<i>Working conditions</i>	<i>Remuneration</i>	Annual statutory salaries at start of career, after 10 and 15 years of experience, and maximum statutory salary	
		Average wage of child care professionals and kindergarten teachers	
		Average wage as compared to primary school teachers	
	<i>Job entry requirements</i>	Requirements to work in public institutions (teaching practicum; obtaining a credential or license; registration)	
	<i>On-the-job requirements</i>	Requirement to renew teaching license (yes/no, and frequency of renewal)	
	<i>Recognition of prior learning and skills</i>	Recognition of prior learning: yes/no (used for up-skilling, recruitment or qualifying the unqualified)	
<i>Staff turnover</i>	Staff turnover rates		

Outcomes		
<i>Child outcomes</i>	<i>Education/ learning outcomes</i>	PIRLS - performance in reading at age 10 and by immigrant status
		TIMSS - performance in mathematics and science at age 10; by immigrant status
		PISA - performance in reading, mathematics and science at age 15; performance difference between children who have attended ECEC for at least one year and those who have not; performance by immigrant status
		Youth literacy rate of 15-to-24-year-olds
	<i>Health outcomes</i>	Obesity and overweight rate at age 15
		Smoking rate at age 15
	<i>Social outcomes</i>	Child poverty rate of children below the age of 18
		Suicide rates among 15-to-19-year-olds
		Percentage of 15-to-19-year-olds who were not in education or work
		Volunteering rate
Voter turnout		
<i>Labour market outcomes</i>	<i>Female labour force participation</i>	
	<i>Maternal labour force participation</i>	
	<i>Gender gap in wages</i>	
<i>Demographic outcomes</i>	<i>Fertility rate</i>	

Notes: Data on indicators marked with * have been collected through *Starting Strong III* / the Quality project survey, but these results have not been published and are therefore not publically available.

ANNEX C: NEW OR TO BE UPDATED DATA FOR INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON

Policy input		
<i>Regulations and minimum standards</i>	Regulated group size	
	Regulated minimum indoor and outdoor space	
	Regulated equipment and materials	
<i>Organisation and management</i>	<i>Capacity for planning</i>	Demand/supply analysis; sources used for capacity planning; aspects considered in capacity planning (demographic projections, staff, etc.)
	<i>Family engagement</i>	Methods for involving parents in designing pedagogical and curriculum frameworks
		Provision of support for parents in place (home visits, support for reading, training, etc.)
<i>Transition from ECEC to school</i>	Parties involved in decision to postpone admission to first year of primary school; recommendations in place on handing over child development records from ECEC provisions to primary schools	
<i>Curriculum/learning standards, pedagogy, learning and caring practices</i>	<i>Curriculum content</i>	Recommended teaching approaches stipulated in the curriculum/framework, such as whether there is a timetable to be followed, recommendations on organisation of activities included etc.
	<i>Staff profile</i>	Percentage of staff who have tertiary education
Programmes in place to diversity the workforce		
<i>Initial education and professional development</i>	<i>Initial education requirements</i>	Alignment of initial education or qualification of ECEC staff with primary school staff etc.
<i>Working conditions</i>	<i>Requirements</i>	Official requirements to be a head in an ECEC setting (professional experience requirement; administrative experience requirement; specific training needed; etc.)
	<i>Working time</i>	Organisation of working time (teaching/caring time versus non-teaching time, etc.)
	Strategies to improve working conditions	
Outcomes		
<i>Child outcomes</i>	<i>Education/learning outcomes</i>	PISA 2012

ANNEX D. COUNTRY RESPONSES FOR PRIORITY INDICATORS

Organisation and management

- **Minimum standards** (Australia, Wallonia-Brussels Federation [Belgium], Finland, Germany, Korea, Norway, Prince Edward Island [Canada], Sweden). *Space per child* was mentioned in particular (French Community of Belgium; Korea)
- **Monitoring practices** (Australia, CMEC, Finland, Wallonia-Brussels Federation [Belgium], Norway, Prince Edward Island [Canada], Sweden)
- **Long-term outcome based data**, reflecting whether the programmes in place actually make a positive difference in the healthy development of children (CMEC)

Curriculum/learning standards, pedagogy, learning and caring practices

- **Curriculum content** (Wallonia-Brussels Federation [Belgium])
- **Materials in ECEC centres for different age groups** (Wallonia-Brussels Federation [Belgium])
- **Actual staff-child ratio** (Wallonia-Brussels Federation [Belgium], Korea)
- **Process quality**, such as interaction staff-child, kind of curriculum in place, how child development is evaluated (Wallonia-Brussels Federation [Belgium], Finland, Germany, Korea, Sweden)

Initial education and professional development

- **Staff initial education requirements (qualifications)** (Wallonia-Brussels Federation [Belgium], Korea)
- **Continuous education participation and possibilities** (Wallonia-Brussels Federation [Belgium])

Working conditions

- **Organisation of staff time**: Staff time spent in playroom versus time spent on non-ECEC activities, such as administrative and preparatory work (Wallonia-Brussels Federation [Belgium])
- **Number of team meetings** (Wallonia-Brussels Federation [Belgium])

Outcomes

- **Child development outcomes** (Alberta [Canada], Government of Canada, CMEC, Netherlands)

In addition, four jurisdictions expressed the importance of collecting cultural and contextual information. ECEC systems can vary widely between jurisdictions and countries. It is necessary to understand a country or jurisdiction's ECEC system and put its data in the proper context, as contextual differences are of great importance to take into account when collecting information in the data collection process.

ANNEX E. COUNTRY REVIEW ON ECEC SYSTEM EVALUATION

For country reviews on **system evaluation**, the overarching policy question will be:

- What are the most effective, relevant and feasible policy options to improve equity, quality and efficiency of the early learning and development system in the country concerned?

The OECD Policy Review on Early Childhood Education and Care was carried out in two rounds (1998-2000 and 2002-04). Since then, a number of countries have made significant efforts to improve their ECEC systems, such as by channelling more public investment, integrating ECEC services, designing a comprehensive curriculum framework covering both child care and early education (often inclusive of the early years of primary education), launching targeted policies for disadvantaged children, etc. It may be timely to launch a comprehensive policy review looking at the ECEC system as a whole.

This review will draw upon the knowledge base already established through the *Starting Strong* series as well as new findings from Strand 1. On efficiency-related issues, this review can also draw on new findings that may emerge from the *OECD Review on Policies and Practices to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools*, if relevant.

The reviews will provide not only an update of the ECEC system in place but also describe policy trajectory of reforms for ECEC to date and identify key issues for the country concerned with respect to equity, quality and efficiency of the ECEC system. This will be included in a Country Note. The scope of the review will be aligned with policy frameworks used for the *Starting Strong* series to tackle different policy aspects of an ECEC system, such as governance, financing and funding, quality standards and qualifications, curriculum, professional development and monitoring.

ANNEX F. TYPICAL COUNTRY REVIEW METHODOLOGY

Country reviews typically consist of three phases:

Phase I: Analytical Phase

The Analytical Phase uses several means – country background information, literature review and information analyses.

The literature review will take stock of the existing knowledge base within the OECD and member countries as well as academic research. It will look at the quantitative and qualitative evidence available on the different approaches used for a selected theme of the review.

To obtain country background information, *Country Background Reports* (CBRs) will be prepared. These are prepared following guidelines prepared by the Secretariat in response to a common set of issues and questions and use a common framework to facilitate comparative analysis and maximise the opportunities for countries to learn from each other.

Phase II: Country Review Phase

Country reviews provide value to the individual country and important input into the comparative work. Countries are invited to request a Country Review, which involves an OECD-led review team providing, from an international perspective, an analysis of the early learning and development system policies in the country and recommendations for policy development and implementation.

The precise scope and focus of each review, as well as the selection of experts for a Country Review, will be defined, discussed and determined in close collaboration with the country concerned and will be based on country priorities. By providing an external perspective on a country's early learning and development system, the Country Reviews are also intended to contribute to national discussions and inform other countries about policy innovations underway.

Each Country Review would include an intensive country visit to fully understand the country's context, policies and practices and would include meetings with all major stakeholders. Each country hosting a Country Review would be expected to appoint a National Co-ordinator to take responsibility for co-ordinating the review with the OECD. For each Country Review, the Secretariat will deliver a short draft country note to the country for comments, within a set timeframe, after the review visit has taken place. Country comments are taken into account before the report is finalised and published.

In some countries, education policy is, in part or in whole, a regional/provincial/state responsibility. Subject to the approval of national authorities, the Secretariat may carry out a "country review" at a sub-national level rather than at the national level.

Phase III: Country Comparative Phase

The Country Comparative Phase involves the Secretariat using the earlier steps to analyse policy options and lessons and highlight good practices across countries. This phase will be carried out with feedback and validation from countries. The findings will be published in a final report.

ANNEX G. INDICATIVE BUDGET PLAN

	2013/2014 Total (K EUR)
Income	
Strand 1: Monitoring Quality and network meetings (2/3)	
Allocated budget from Part I Budget	400
Required VCs	
* assuming 15 countries contributing EUR 9K each	135
Sub-total	535
Strand 2: Data Development and network meeting (1/3)	
Allocated budget from Part I Budget	200
Required VCs	
* assuming 15 countries contributing EUR 20K each	300
Sub-total	500
Strand 3: Country Reviews on Monitoring Quality	
Strand 3: Country Reviews on Monitoring	
* assuming 4 countries contributing EUR 127K each	
Sub-total	508
Total	1543
Expenditure	
Strand 1: Monitoring Quality and network meetings (2/3)	
Staff costs	310
Direct costs (e.g. experts' travel, printing and translation)	61
Experts	164
Sub-total	535
Strand 2: Data Development and network meetings (1/3)	
Staff costs	375
Direct costs (e.g. experts' travel, printing and translation)	44
Experts	81
Sub-total	500
Strand 3: Country Reviews on Monitoring Quality	
Staff costs	167
Direct costs (e.g. 2 review missions, experts' missions,)	176
Experts	125
Overhead	40
Sub-total	508
Total	1543

Note: The meeting costs will be shared by Strand 1 and Strand 2, in proportion of the allocated Core Funding, *i.e.*, 2/3 of the costs will be covered by Strand 1, 1/3 of the costs will be covered by Strand 2.