

Brief: CCR Reporting Methodology 2016-2017


Released: Jan 2017

Series 001

Summary: In fall 2016, CCR Analytics changed DRDP reporting methodology. The new methodology is aligned to the California Early Learning Foundations and allows agencies to make meaningful comparisons across sub-domains and expectations around development at different ages.

Why Change the Reporting Methodology? CCR Analytics' 2015-2016 DRDP 2015 reporting was based on rough estimates of age appropriate development. For 2016-2017 we utilize an alignment to the California Early Learning Foundations. This allows for a much more nuanced understanding of a child's development. The alignment also allows us to make more meaningful comparisons across domains. We recognize that changing metrics will create transition problems, but firmly believe that the advantages of the new reporting are worth it.

Percentage of Children at or Above Foundation Level Expectations CCR Analytics reports refer to the *Percentage of children at or above Foundation Level Age Expectations*. This is the percentage of children who are observed to be at or above developmental expectations for their age at the time of assessment. In rare cases, reports may show 0% or very few children at or above age expectations. In these cases, we suggest a review of the assessment as may be indicative of artificially low assessment. For example, preschoolers are typically rated in the Building and Integrating range of development and almost never in the Responding range.



CA Early Learning Foundations. In order to meaningfully interpret the assessment results, the DRDP 2015 was aligned to the California Preschool Learning Foundations and the California Infant-Toddler Learning & Development Foundations. The alignment allows us to understand a child's development within an age appropriate context and to meaningfully compare results across the DRDP domains and sub-domains. The specifics of the alignment are available at www.ccr-analytics.com/presentations/

More Accurate Developmental Expectations. The CA Early Learning Foundations are established for 5 different ages (8 months, 18 months, 36 months, 48 months, & 60 months). After we established the alignment between those ages and the DRDP 2015, we were able to estimate the expectations in between those age groups. This allows us to assess whether a child who is 54 months old is on track to meet the 60 month age expectations. This step is important because of the rapid growth typical of young children. Six months can make a big difference in development. You would not use a 54 month bench mark to assess a child 42 months old. As a result, as children age in your program, the development expectations increase under our reporting. Increases in group scores between two assessment periods indicates that children are developing faster than developmental expectations.

Domain Scoring. In order to meet the requests of the California Department of Education, the domain and subdomain scores are based on a sophisticated scoring model developed by the UC Berkeley BEAR Center. The scoring model takes into consideration the different difficulty levels of different steps in the developmental continuum. It is not a simple average of measure scores that could be replicated in Excel. In addition, for some of the domains, the domain score is impacted by the results of other domains. For example, the score for Approaches to Learning – Self-Regulation is partially impacted by the results in the Social and Emotional Development.

Comparing Across Domains. It is difficult to make meaningful comparisons across domains which are built on very different concepts. This is one of the reasons that we aligned the DRDP 2015 to the CA Early Learning Foundations. The alignment acts as a Rosetta Stone making meaningful comparisons across the domains possible. Applying the alignment to the domain scores allows for a whole new level of insight. This is also one of the issues with DRDPtech reporting – the domain scores are not aligned with one another to allow for meaningful comparisons between the domains.

Comparing Measures to Domains. A tricky part to understanding these reports is the relationship between measure and sub-domain results because the sub-domain scores are not an average of the measure scores. Visually comparing domain and measure results may be confusing. Generally you will find that measure scores are higher than domain scores. We recommend not trying to compare measure scores to domain scores, but rather look at Domain scores in relationship to each other and look at measure scores in relationship to each other.

Using Measure Results. The DRDP 2015 is expected to be reliable and valid at the domain level. Measure level results are not considered reliable (in the psychometric sense), especially at the child level. However, most early educators find domain level results too high level to fully inform their often detailed planning. We recommend using a combination of domain and measure results to take advantage of the strengths offered by each, while being careful not to read too much into measure level results.

The next brief, to be released in February 2017, will focus on how to use CCR Analytics DRDP reports.