



MONITORING QUALITY IN ECEC

Ineke Litjens, Analyst
Early Childhood and Schools Division
Directorate for Education and Skills



The review

- Overview of monitoring practices
- Uses of monitoring practices and results
- Users of monitoring results
- Research evidence
- Design and implementation



Monitoring practices

Service quality	Staff quality	Child development
Inspection (procedures, processes, combined)	Observations: inspections, peer reviews	Summative vs. formative assessments
Self-assessment (internal)	Self-assessment/evaluations	Tests: standardised or not
Surveys by staff/management (internal) or parents	Tests (staff/child test results)	Observations: rating scales and checklists
Self-assessment and surveys independent or part of wider monitoring practice	Interviews –view of the child (NOR)	Narrative assessments: portfolios and storytelling (NZL, FIN, NOR, BEL-FL)
In some countries, particular attention within quality to meeting special needs (NZL)	Surveys (internal and external)	Screening



Effects of monitoring service quality

- Difficult to identify the impact of a monitoring practice per se
- Use of QRIS in USA: quality improved over time
- Particularly provisions with a large share of low SES/immigrant children can benefit from inspections (UK)
- Literature points out to importance of family engagement and good understanding of quality



Effects of monitoring staff quality

- Monitoring is important in furthering development of staff but:
- Little consensus on the effects of monitoring staff quality
- UK: use of self-assessment materials no significant impact on quality
- NJ: observation and rating scales were found to have a positive impact on staff practices and significant effects on language and literacy skills
- FL – BEL: process-oriented self-evaluation instrument contributed to prof development, teamwork, and better taking into account children's needs



Effects of monitoring staff quality (cntd)

- Child test results are found to be insufficiently valid and reliable in making any fair conclusions about staff quality: child outcomes is not a direct result of activities of staff
- Linking monitoring staff quality to professional development can have positive effects:
 - exposes weaknesses in staff knowledge, and can improve staff practices



Effects of monitoring child outcomes

- Little research available on effects of monitoring early child development
- Impacts differ according to practice and purpose
- Positive relationships are found between the use of non-formal practices and child outcomes/ quality:
 - Use of portfolios – significant improvements on classroom quality (Head Start)
 - The use of EDI in Australia: increased community awareness on importance of ECEC, better collaboration between stakeholders, results informed staff practices, and better able to meet children's needs



Effects of monitoring child outcomes (cntd)

- EDI in Vancouver (CAN): led to development of support programmes on literacy skills and parental support programmes on how to stimulate these
- Monitoring to define school readiness/ possibly delay entry to school: can have negative impacts and was found to not have any academic benefits
- Single monitoring practice at one point in time – no valid predictor of children's potential
- Some research points to monitoring child development through ongoing observations in natural child environments



Design and implementation of monitoring systems

- Defining quality
- Aligning purposes and practices
- Ensuring practical relevance (action)
- Involving stakeholders
- Training evaluators
- Developmental appropriateness (age, different skills, cultural differences)
- Piloting before implementation
- Dissemination of results (linked to purpose)



Where do we go from here?

- International analytical report on monitoring in ECĒC: first quarter of 2015
- International data collection on staff and process quality (2015 -)
- Study on transitions between ECĒC and primary school (2015/16)

E-mail: ineke.litjens@oecd.org

Telephone: +33 1 45 24 86 19