

Offord Centre for Child Studies EDI Reports Summary of report modifications in 2011

For the 2011 reporting year, the EDI team at the Offord Centre has updated the report templates. These modifications were necessary to make descriptions clearer, to update our terminology so that it is more inclusive, and to improve consistency among reports.

Specifically, these changes included:

1. In **ALL** reports: removing the term “School Readiness (to Learn)” and replacing it, where appropriate, with terms referring to developmental health.
The term “school readiness” implies that children are either ready or not ready for some universally understandable ideal of “school”. Our team at the Offord Centre has always attempted to be clear that when we talk about “school readiness” we use the term as a proxy for optimal developmental health at school entry. Developmental and educational research fields are still split on whether we simply need to be more precise on the definition of “school readiness” or whether we should dispense with this term altogether as an outdated one in a world where so many diversities play into children’s development. Without taking sides on this debate, we have nevertheless acknowledged that the term “school readiness” is rather narrow and requires clarification to prevent misunderstanding and misuse. Consequently, the group of children “on track”(scoring above the 25th percentile) has been divided into “middle” (between the 25th and 75th percentile) and “top” (above the 75th percentile), rather than into “ready” and “very ready”.
2. In **ALL** reports: referring to children as “vulnerable” instead of “low” to be consistent with the language of the EDI.
3. In **Report #1**: modifying the flow chart to provide clearer and more descriptive information about where the final number of valid questionnaires comes from.
4. In **Report #3**: reporting on effect size instead of statistical significance between comparison groups.
Taking into consideration the wide range of communities and contributing groups, we will now report on the effect size of the difference between the two groups, rather than the statistical significance. Unlike statistical significance, the effect size statistic is independent of the group size and therefore considered more informative. It is a more appropriate measure considering that the size of the contributing communities varies widely. It shows the degree of a “meaningful” difference between the two groups.

5. In **Report #4**: changing the subdomain category labels from “very ready”, “middle”, and “not ready” to “children who reach all/almost all of the developmental expectations”, “those who reach some”, and “those who reach few/none”, respectively.

The labels of the subdomain categories were changed to a more accurate and inclusive language, in keeping with the overall terminology update. The new category labels are a description of what the categories actually reflect: whether the children reach all/almost all of the developmental expectations, reach some, or reach few/none.

6. In **Report #5**: using both site and normative cut-offs on children with Special Needs to be consistent with the population of children without Special Needs.
7. The FAQ document (Frequently Asked Questions), included with the report set, has also been updated to provide answers to issues that may be generated by the modifications in reports.