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This Early Development Instrument Community Report was developed by Erikson Institute with specific content provided by the Offord Centre for Child Studies at McMaster University; the Human Early Learning Partnership at the University of British Columbia, Raise DC, and the Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities at the University of California Los Angeles.
About Erikson Institute

Erikson Institute (Erikson) is the premier independent institution of higher education committed to ensuring all children have equitable opportunities to realize their fullest potential. Recognized for groundbreaking work in the field of early childhood, Erikson uniquely prepares child development, education, and social work leaders to improve the lives of young children and their families. Erikson’s impact and influence are further amplified through innovative academic programs, applied research, knowledge creation and distribution, direct service, and field-wide advocacy. Because nothing matters more than a child’s early years, Erikson Institute educates, inspires, and promotes leadership to serve the needs of children and families so that all can achieve optimal educational, social, emotional, and physical well-being.

About the Early Development Instrument

Advances in neuroscience and the behavioral and social sciences indicate that early life experiences form the foundation for educational achievement, as well as lifelong health, economic productivity, and responsible participation in society.”1 The Early Development Instrument (EDI) is a population measure administered in kindergarten that provides a snapshot of children’s health, development and school readiness in the context of their neighborhood.

The EDI process fosters a community-level understanding of child development that can inform more precise ways to support positive child outcomes. It compels stakeholders to look at the supports and resources available to young children prior to entering school and assess how the community, as a whole, can better support early child development and prepare children for school. The EDI can also inform how to address the needs of the current cohort of kindergarten children as they progress through school.

The EDI was created in 1998 by Dan Offord and Magdalena Janus at the Canadian Centre for the Study of Children at Risk (now known as the Offord Centre for Child Studies at McMaster University) in Toronto and remains in use throughout Canada and many countries around the world. The University of California Los Angeles’ (UCLA) Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities has been implementing the tool in more than 55 communities across the U.S. since 2009.

© McMaster University, The Offord Centre for Child Studies

ERIKSON AND THE EDI

The Maasai people in East Africa greet each other by asking, “KASSERIAN INGERA.” It means “AND, HOW ARE THE CHILDREN?” If the children are well, then it is implied that those who care for them are well and the environment that surrounds them is set up for them to thrive.

This question serves as a reminder about the high value placed on the well-being of children because they serve as a barometer of community well-being. At Erikson Institute, we ask the same question of local communities through the Early Development Instrument (EDI) Project.

In 2016, Erikson launched a project to provide the Early Development Instrument to communities throughout Illinois. Erikson is the second institution in the United States to hold a license under the copyright of McMaster University for implementing the EDI. This project, the first of its kind in Illinois, is an extension of Erikson’s commitment to improving the lives of young children by illuminating opportunities for community-driven policy recommendations.

Erikson works with local residents and community groups, as well as the public and private school systems and community collaboratives, to engage a cross-sector of stakeholders who are committed to strengthening and uplifting young children and their families by creating safe and healthy environments. The community’s active engagement drives the implementation process and the action steps needed to support optimal child development. The EDI is implemented in communities every three years, during the school year, and has been implemented in the following communities:

- **Pilot Year 1 (2016-2017):** Greater East St. Louis and the Kankakee County Area*
- **Pilot Year 2 (2017-2018):** Village of Oak Park
- **Pilot Year 3 (2018-2019):** Central Skokie-Morton Grove Neighborhoods and the City of Rockford

During the 2019-2020 school year, Erikson revisited communities from the first pilot year to collect second-wave data to show changes and trends over time.

EDI results informs strategy to help community collaboratives effectively respond to local early childhood issues. Data is transformed into action by using it to inform:

- Community planning;
- Resource alignment;
- Systems coordination; and
- Policy development.

Communities find value in the EDI because it provides precise data to inform strategic interventions, a common language and point of reference for how to support child development, and a process that unifies and activates diverse stakeholders to rally around young children.

ERIKSON’S SUPPORT FOR EDI COMMUNITY PARTNERS

Erikson provides community partners with resources and tailored support to implement the EDI and coordinate action based on results. Support includes but is not limited to:

- Training, coaching, technical assistance, and resources:
  > Fostering data literacy
  > Developing or refining community actions plans based on EDI results
  > Facilitating community EDI discussions
  > Identifying complementary partners to advance action plan
  > Reviewing grant applications and strategic plans
- Opportunities for community partners to participate in Erikson’s Early Childhood Leadership Academy programs to enhance capacity of local leaders to influence early childhood policy
- Data collection and scoring
- Cross-learning exchanges with other EDI partner communities through the EDI Communities of Practice Summit

*In this instance, for Year 1, Kankakee County Area represents the City of Kankakee, Village of Bourbonnais and Village of Bradley. Beyond this instance, Kankakee County Area represents just the areas within the county that participated in EDI collection during the 2019-2020 school year. Those areas are the City of Kankakee, Village of Bourbonnais, Village of Bradley and Pembroke Township.*

Kankakee County Area, School Year 2019-2020

Erikson Institute EDI Project
The Early Development Instrument, a validated and reliable research tool, is a questionnaire with a baseline of 103 questions that is completed online by kindergarten teachers during the second half of the school year. Communities can add up to four customizable questions to increase their understanding of local factors. The EDI measures the ability of a child to meet age-appropriate developmental expectations in the five EDI developmental domains.

Results for individual children are never calculated nor reported. The data is aggregated, geocoded and reported at the neighborhood level, providing a precise and holistic snapshot of child development in the context of community conditions.
**Vulnerability**

EDI results are reported as the percentage of children who are “on track,” “at risk,” and “developmentally vulnerable” in each of the five developmental domains.

EDI scores above the 25th percentile are considered on track, scores between the 11th and 25th percentiles are categorized as at risk, and scores at or below the 10th percentile (see glossary) of the national EDI data in each domain are categorized as vulnerable. The combination of at risk and vulnerable can be thought of as “not on track.” The percentiles for these categories have been established by the developers of the EDI at the Offord Centre for Child Studies.

In large-scale studies using EDI data, these categorizations have been shown to be related to later school performance, that is, children whose EDI scores suggested that they were on track developmentally in kindergarten were much more likely to be meeting expectations in subsequent grades. Conversely, children whose EDI scores were in the “at-risk” and “vulnerable” categories were less likely to be meeting developmental and academic expectations, and without interventions they may experience increased challenges if they met the threshold for vulnerable in multiple areas.5

---

COMMUNITY REPORT OVERVIEW

In partnership with the Success by 6 Coalition of Kankakee and Iroquois Counties, the EDI was implemented during the 2016-2017 school year in the Kankakee County Area which consisted of the City of Kankakee, Village of Bourbonnais, and the Village of Bradley. Success by 6 and its stakeholders wanted to gain insight on the child development resources available to children before entering kindergarten, and to better prepare them to enter school ready to succeed.

The results collected in 2016-2017 helped capture social, emotional, and mental health data for children, which was one of the key reasons for implementing the EDI. Having data specific to child development in these domains informed conversations with service providers and funders on meeting the needs of young children and their families. The results helped Success by 6 identify priorities and develop a strategic action plan. Results also identified areas in need of resources, informed grant proposals and funding allocations, and led to the development and retooling of programs.

For the second wave data collection that took place during the 2019-2020 school year, Pembroke Township was included as community advocates and the leadership of Pembroke Community Consolidated School District 259 felt participation would strengthen organizing efforts to solidify a community sustainability plan.

The EDI approach allows for a perspective that looks at children and their development in the context of their neighborhoods. It compels us to look beyond schools and expands the responsibility of our children’s development to a communal one that aligns with the African proverb, “It takes a village to raise a child.”

This report contains:

- This report reflects all valid records for children who live or go to school in the identified community boundaries and participated in the school districts that signed on to implement the EDI.
- Maps that illustrate vulnerability across each of the five EDI developmental domains, including a composite map that shows vulnerability in one or more domains.
- Tables of children’s characteristics and percentage of children vulnerable by each domain.
- Community demographics.
- Suggestions for using and understanding the data, and examples of communities currently using the EDI data to inform their strategic planning and early childhood initiatives.

To dive deeper into the data, the maps and tables in this report can be found in the EDI Gallery Walk Report-- a map and table book that includes additional data on customized questions, community assets, demographic details from the Census, and metadata.
The following pages will:

1) Explain how the community identified neighborhoods;
2) Describe how the ranges of vulnerability used in EDI maps were established; and
3) Provide a set of six maps illustrating the EDI data across the Kankakee County Area.

The maps show vulnerability across each of the five EDI developmental domains, including a composite map that shows vulnerability in one or more domains.

How the Neighborhoods Were Named

The EDI is administered every three years in participating communities, and each round of data collection is referred to as a “wave.” EDI communities equate to the geographic areas served by public school districts and private schools, and the proximity in which children live to local resources. EDI data is visualized by neighborhood using maps and tables.

A “neighborhood” is defined as a distinct and relatively small geographic area that community members recognize as their neighborhood. A neighborhood is often bound by some level of social interaction and shared institutions. For the purposes of the EDI Project, neighborhoods align with Census tract boundaries because they cover the entire geographic area and support the identification of neighborhoods. Census tracts also provide consistency and:

- They are small enough to be aggregated into neighborhoods that resonate with local residents;
- They can be used to track data trends throughout the life of community-level plans; and
- This unit of analysis is used for numerous community indicators, which can be essential for effective planning and evaluation of activities.

*The use of the term “Kankakee County Area” represents just the areas within the county that participated in EDI collection during the 2019-2020 school year. Those areas are the City of Kankakee, Village of Bourbonnais, Village of Bradley and Pembroke Township.
NAMING KANKAKEE COUNTY AREA
Written by the EDI Project Team in collaboration with the Community Team of the Kankakee County Area

Wave 1: 2016-2017
Success by 6, which represents the EDI Community Team of the Kankakee County Area, met once to define and name neighborhoods. Members of the Success by 6 collaboration were present at the meeting, including members who represent the three contiguous school districts participating the EDI Project.

Maps from city and village halls were procured in order to support this naming process as well as tapping into members’ knowledge of the neighborhoods within each school district. Members representing school districts approached the naming process in various ways, which included utilizing:

- Existing names of local city and village voting districts/wards
- Landmarks, such as shopping centers and the local YMCA
- Names of housing subdivisions
- Names of home developments

School names were not used to identify a neighborhood because the EDI is meant to situate children within the context of their neighborhood and inspire broader, community-wide responsibility for addressing vulnerability.

The following names of the neighborhoods were chosen:
1. Aroma Park
2. Blatt Subdivision
3. Bordeaux
4. Briar Cliff
5. Charlton
6. Eastridge
7. Evergreen Acres
8. Hunter’s Run
9. Meadows
10. North Kankakee
11. Old Bourbonnais
12. Riverview
13. Royal Kankakee
14. Sunnyside
15. West Kankakee

Wave 2: 2019-2020
In each subsequent EDI wave, it is ideal to keep the original neighborhood names for consistency; however, there is an opportunity to revisit the neighborhood names in Wave 2. Wave 1 sets the baseline and, as communities contextualize the data and gain deeper insight, there may be a need to make modifications.

For Wave 2, neighborhood names may be added to with a slash or hyphen (-, /) in order to most accurately describe how current residents refer to their neighborhood. The original name is only replaced in rare circumstances, such as when the name reflects a landmark that has moved or no longer exists, or the community feels the name was a misnomer in Wave 1.

The EDI Community Team (Success by 6) met three times from September 2019 to January 2020 and discussed the existing neighborhood names. There were over 40 participants representing various sectors across the county at these workshops. Additionally, there was a shared Google document where team members and residents could add comments as well as follow up conversations to gain consensus on these names.

Pembroke Township was added for Wave 2 of EDI data collection to help provide guidance on the areas that needed to be prioritized in terms of family supports and resources. Residents of Pembroke Township are making strides in community organizing and solidifying
a community sustainability plan, and local advocates and the leadership of Pembroke Community Consolidated School District 259 felt that participation in the EDI Project would strengthen these efforts.

As a result, the following additions and one change were made to the neighborhood names:

- Charlton became Charlton/Fifth Ward because Fifth Ward was a more common way to refer to that neighborhood.
- Eastridge became Eastridge/East Court because East Court is included in that neighborhood.
- Evergreen Acres became Evergreen Acres/Central and East Bradley.
- Hunter’s Run became Northfield Meadow/Behind the Mall because residents and administration from the Bradley School District felt strongly that Hunter’s Run was an inaccurate name for the population represented, resulting in confusion when relating to the maps.
- Meadows became Tri-Star Meadows.
- North Kankakee became North Kankakee/Northside because that area is generally known as the Northside.
- Royal Kankakee became Royal Kankakee/South Kankakee because it is a broad area and also encompasses South Kankakee.
- Sunnyside became Sunnyside/Riverfront/Downtown because the residents felt that Sunnyside was not as accurate as Riverfront or Downtown, so the title includes all of those names.
- Pembroke is a new neighborhood added to this round of data collection.

The final neighborhood names for Wave 2 are as follows:

1. Aroma Park
2. Blatt Subdivision
3. Bordeaux
4. Briar Cliff
5. Charlton/Fifth Ward
6. Eastridge/East Court
7. Evergreen Acres/Central and East Bradley
8. Northfield Meadow/Behind the Mall
9. Tri-Star Meadows
10. North Kankakee/Northside
11. Old Bourbonnais
12. Riverview
13. Royal Kankakee/South Kankakee
14. Sunnyside/Riverfront/Downtown
15. West Kankakee
16. Pembroke
Each map is accompanied by a color-shaded legend. Each color shade represents a percentage range of EDI scores that reflect concentrations of developmental vulnerability (see glossary). The color-shaded categories for each of the five EDI domain maps, as well as for Children Vulnerable in One or More Domains (composite map), were determined by an analysis conducted by the Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities at the University of California, Los Angeles using data collected in the United States in 2009-2010 (N=10,244). This analysis included determining the average score for each of the five EDI domains, as well as for Children Vulnerable in One or More Domains, and established the EDI norms for the United States.

As a part of this analysis, a statistic called a standard deviation was calculated for each dataset to be mapped (see glossary). When reading the maps, it is important to keep in mind that:

1) The standard deviation statistic allows for the creation of standard categories to assist in making comparisons across domain maps; and

2) It is also important to understand that the percentage ranges of vulnerability that go into these categories are different on each map because the distribution of vulnerability in the national sample differed both by domain and by Children Vulnerable on One or More Domains as shown in the above figure.

For example, when looking at Physical Health and Well-Being (Map 2), the middle of the five color-shaded categories represents the expected norm (a range of 12-15% vulnerable). Therefore all of the neighborhoods in a community with vulnerability percentages that fall within 12-15% (just for the Physical Health and Well-Being example), would be consistent with the national expectations. The two lighter-shaded categories above the expected norm reflect neighborhoods with less than expected vulnerability. Conversely, the two darker-shaded categories reflect neighborhoods with progressively larger percentages of vulnerability compared with the national norm.
MAP 1:

Children Vulnerable in One or More Developmental Domains

Data Source: EDI Results, School Year 2019-2020.
MAP 2: Children Vulnerable in the Physical Health and Well-being Domain

Data Source: EDI Results, School Year 2019-2020.
MAP 3:
Children Vulnerable in the Social Competence Domain

Data Source: EDI Results, School Year 2019-2020.
### Map 4: Children Vulnerable in the Emotional Maturity Domain

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aroma Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blatt Subdivision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Briar Cliff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Charlton/Fifth Ward</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eastridge/East Court</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evergreen Acres/ Central &amp; East Bradley</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Northfield Meadow/ Behind the Mall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tri-Star Meadows</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Kankakee/ Northside</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Old Bourbonnais</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Royal Kankakee/ South Kankakee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sunnyside/Riverfront/ Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>West Kankakee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Community-wide</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: EDI Results, School Year 2019-2020.
MAP 5:
Children Vulnerable in the Language and Cognitive Development Domain

Data Source: EDI Results, School Year 2019-2020.

Erikson Institute EDI Project
Kankakee County Area, School Year 2019-2020
MAP 6:
Children Vulnerable in the Communication Skills and General Knowledge Domain

Vulnerable in the Communication Skills and General Knowledge Developmental Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aroma Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blatt Subdivision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Briar Cliff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Charlton/Fifth Ward</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eastridge/East Court</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evergreen Acres/Central &amp; East Bradley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Northfield Meadow/Behind the Mall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tri-Star Meadows</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Kankakee/Northside</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Old Bourbonnais</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Royal Kankakee/South Kankakee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sunnyside/Riverfront/Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>West Kankakee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-wide</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: EDI Results, School Year 2019-2020.
Valid Records and Scoring

Determining which EDI records are valid for analysis.

The following two criteria are applied:

a) the child must have been in the classroom for more than one month; and

b) the EDI questionnaire must have at least four of the five domains completed by the teacher.

Scoring each record.

For each child’s record, an average score on each of the five domains is calculated by adding up the scores for all of the core items in that domain and dividing by the total number of core items comprising the domain. This average score then allows each record to be compared to the normative population cutoffs, specifically the “on track,” “at risk,” and “vulnerable” cutoffs. For detailed information on the cutoffs, see the explanation of vulnerability on page 8.
This table reflects the EDI data reported for 675 children in kindergarten, providing background information about the children surveyed.

### School Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms collecting EDI information</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children who are English Language Learners (ELL)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children who have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for children with disabilities</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bi-racial or Multi-racial</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American, Black</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latino/a/x</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>54.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FIGURE 3:**

**Summary of EDI Results by Developmental Domain**

Kankakee County Area, 2019-2020 School Year

Figure 3 on the following page summarizes the results for each of the five EDI developmental domains and, for each, displays the percentage of children who are on track, at risk or developmentally vulnerable. The top bar in each category represents the data from the Kankakee County Area, while the lower bar represents the national EDI data for the United States.

The **GREY** portion of the bar chart represents percentage of children considered on track. Children are categorized as “on track” in a domain if the mean of their EDI items for that domain falls above the 25th percentile cutoff.

The **ORANGE** portion of the bar chart represents the percentage of children considered developmentally at risk. Children are categorized as “at risk” in a domain if the mean of their EDI items for that domain falls at or below the 25th percentile cutoff or is above the 10th percentile cutoff.

The **BLUE** portion of the bar chart represents the percentage of children considered vulnerable. Children are categorized as “vulnerable” in a domain if the mean score of their EDI items for that domain falls at or below the 10th percentile population cutoff.

The final bar provides a composite measure across all domains that divides the population of children into one of the following three, mutually exclusive categories: (1) the percentage on track on all valid domains; (2) the percentage at risk on one or more domains; and (3) the percentage vulnerable on one or more developmental domains.
**FIGURE 3:**
Summary of EDI Results by Developmental Domain
Kankakee County Area, School Year 2019-2020*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>KC Area - Wave 1</th>
<th>KC Area - Wave 2</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Health and Well-Being</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Competence</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Maturity</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Cognitive Development</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Skills and General Knowledge</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or More Developmental Domains</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The data for this table represents only the City of Kankakee, Village of Bourbonnais and Village of Bradley. Pembroke Township was not included in this calculation because this is its first year participating in the EDI Project and only has one set of data. A Summary of EDI results for just Pembroke Township can be found in Figure 3a.*
FIGURE 3A:
Summary of EDI Results by Developmental Domain
Pembroke Township, School Year 2019-2020

Pembroke Township collected its first wave of EDI data during the 2019-2020 school year. To allow for a more accurate comparison between its first wave of data and national data, EDI results for Pembroke are reported separately from the City of Kankakee, Village of Bourbonnais and Village of Bradley.

**PHYSICAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PT - Wave 1</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL COMPETENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PT - Wave 1</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EMOTIONAL MATURITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PT - Wave 1</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANGUAGE AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PT - Wave 1</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS AND GENERAL KNOWLEDGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PT - Wave 1</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ONE OR MORE DEVELOPMENTAL DOMAINS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PT - Wave 1</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Track: 100th — 26th Percentile
At Risk: 25th — 11th Percentile
Vulnerable: 10th < Percentile
FIGURE 4:
Summary of EDI Results by Domain and by Neighborhood
Kankakee County Area, School Year 2019-2020

Figure 4 on the following page shows, by neighborhood, the number (n) and percentage of EDI results that met the threshold for developmentally vulnerable. It also provides a composite measure across all domains that divide the population of children into one of the following three, mutually exclusive, categories:

- The number and percentage of children on track on all valid domains;
- The number and percentage of children at risk on one or more domains; and
- The number and percentage of children vulnerable on one or more developmental domains.

The Number (n) of Children Makes a Difference

When evaluating neighborhood-level findings, it is important to consider both the percentages and the number of children surveyed. High percentages of vulnerability may translate to a small number of children meeting vulnerability thresholds because few children live in the neighborhood. In contrast, moderate percentages of vulnerability may translate to a large number of children meeting vulnerability thresholds when many children live in the neighborhood. Consideration should also be given to the reasons some communities may have lower vulnerability. It may be that they have achieved positive results because of sustained and effective prevention and intervention programs.
### FIGURE 4:
Summary of EDI Results by Domain and by Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD NAME</th>
<th>n²</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aroma Park</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blatt Subdivision</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Briar Cliff</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54.39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Charlton/Fifth Ward</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eastridge/East Court</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Northfield Meadow/ Behind the Mall</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tri-Star Meadows</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Kankakee/ Northside</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Old Bourbonnais</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Royal Kankakee/South Kankakee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sunnyside/Riverfront/ Downtown</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>West Kankakee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Wide</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>39.11</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: EDI Results, 2020. Totals of 99 percent and 101 percent are due to rounding.

1 EDI data are organized according to census-designated boundaries (i.e., census tracts). For more information on how neighborhood names were developed, please see How the Neighborhoods Were Named section of this report on page 10.

2 Total “n” is the number of valid records by neighborhood. The actual “n” for each domain may vary because it reflects the actual number of students reported as vulnerable for that particular domain; each child has different strengths in different domains so they will vary across domains.

3 “n” of Developmentally On Track on All Domains refers to children on track on all valid domains. A record may be valid with just four completed domains.
COMMUNITY USE OF THE EDI DATA

Once a community receives their precise data in the form of maps and tables, the conversation can begin around identifying strengths, common needs, gaps in services and opportunities for change. The data compels early childhood providers, school administrators, elected officials, local leaders and residents to ask questions, reflect and collaborate on solutions.

Using the Data to Support a Strategic Vision

The EDI data does not provide specific solutions to challenges faced by a community. Rather, it gives a foundation for deepening the understanding of children’s development, and serves as a common starting point for new areas of inquiry and collaborative conversations across sectors. From this process of planning and decision-making, new ideas for investment and action can emerge.

Using Multiple Data Sources

The EDI data are particularly valuable when used alongside other data and information, including Census data, student assessment reports and community knowledge. Additionally, listening to the experiences of families, teachers and caregivers can also provide important context to guide conversations and planning efforts. While looking at patterns the data present on a larger scale, it is important to keep in mind the actual number of children meeting vulnerability thresholds in each neighborhood. This number is referred to as “n” in the tables and maps throughout this report.

The EDI data can bring various stakeholders together to strategize next steps to ensuring children and families have the local resources they need.
Community Conversations

The EDI data provides a platform for facilitating discussion and inquiry across sectors on the status of early child development in communities. Conversations should include stakeholders such as community members, parents, teachers, and other interested parties to gain a variety of perspectives. Begin the dialogue by highlighting strengths in the data and identifying long-term trends. Through discussion, patterns begin to emerge that challenge assumptions about childhood vulnerability. The following inquiry questions were developed by Erikson to help facilitate these important conversations.

Inquiry Questions

What stands out to you on this map?
A wide range of factors including social and economic differences, variations in community networks that support children and families, and also the number, quality and accessibility of programs can explain neighborhood differences.

WHERE ARE THE STRENGTHS LOCATED THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY?
Investigate the areas that have the lowest concentrations of vulnerability. This can be a great starting point to utilize local and contextual knowledge about what is happening in those neighborhoods, and to understand what lessons can be learned about what is going well.

Where are the gaps in service and opportunities for change located in the community?
The asset maps can be helpful when visually looking at resources in neighborhoods. Conversations are essential to understanding the context of what is going well in the community, where there might be challenges, and if more information is needed to gain a better perspective. The maps can prompt discussion on resource allocation, which requires thoughtful consideration on how to address gaps in services without draining funds from effective initiatives and programs.

What is happening in the neighborhoods that might explain the trends you are noticing?
Conversations about history, structure, racial and ethnic characteristics are all important when thinking about differences and understanding the context of them. Only community members and those with local knowledge can provide insight into the complexity of these factors.

What patterns do you see across the community?
Identifying patterns is one of the keys to deriving meaningful information from the EDI data. Can connections be made from the different variables?

What other questions do these data raise?
Next steps can be to develop more detailed questions and researching what resources or who can help provide answers.
Decision-Making and Action

Through these critical conversations, a stronger and shared understanding of child vulnerability materializes, deriving from the community or region. This shared understanding can move the community toward a collective plan of action.

Turning Data into Action

By using various lenses to interpret the EDI data, communities can turn facts and figures into collective action to help:

- **STRENGTHEN** the understanding of a community’s role and influence in child development and the importance of investing in young children;
- **INFORM** curriculum and program needs to best prepare children entering kindergarten;
- **IMPROVE** professional development offerings and supports for those caring for young children;
- **MAP** local resources (E.g. early childhood providers, hospitals, libraries, etc.);
- **IDENTIFY** gaps in programs and services available to children and their families;
- **BUILD** networks of school-readiness advocates and create partnerships between organizations;
- **DETERMINE** strategic planning for organizations and community initiatives;
- **ADVOCATE** for changes to policies, systems, and funding at the local, county, and state levels;
- **PROVIDE** a community-level perspective on early childhood that compliments existing individual student assessments; and
- **ASSESS**, over time, how the community’s cumulative efforts are impacting children’s development.

“The EDI is a pivotal point for communities. It is gratifying to see each of them develop and expand their unique early childhood agenda as they dig into the data.”

- Tonya Bibbs, Assistant Professor and Research Principal Investigator for the EDI Project, Erikson Institute
HOW COMMUNITIES IN ILLINOIS USE EDI DATA

Erikson Institute’s EDI Project team provides support to community partners to move EDI data into action. The EDI data provides a deeper understanding of child development that local municipalities, schools, service providers and other stakeholders can use to inform strategic planning and resource allocation.

The following are select examples of how first-wave EDI data has ignited meaningful change.

Kankakee County

**Kankakee County awarded six-year grant of $2.1 million for Children’s Mental Health Initiative 2.0.** The grant, awarded in December 2019, enables mental and physical health providers, schools, parents, youth and other community organizations to develop a coordinated system of care for children and families. EDI data showing high rates of vulnerability for children’s social-emotional development was included in the grant proposal and strengthened the case that environmental trauma and stress, anxiety, or depression can affect a child’s ability to meet their full potential. Businesswire article: bwnews.pr/2Q6v0zi

**EDI data was used to inform strategic plan.** Success by 6 of Kankakee County, an early childhood community collaborative, incorporated EDI data at various stakeholder meetings to increase engagement across sectors and developed steps to resolve issues drawn from the data in their 2019 Strategic Action Plan. One specific item addressed in the strategic plan was to use EDI asset maps to identify gaps in resource allocations, such as transportation barriers, in order to ensure equitable distribution of resources throughout the county. See strategic plan: bit.ly/2WaQleV.

**County-level applications for grants address public health.** Partnership for a Healthy Community incorporated EDI data in their annual Community Health Status Assessment for 2018, a report on the state of the local public health system, which reveals issues and informs action plans to address them. The Partnership also used the data in several grant proposals focused on child and adolescent health.

Village of Bourbonnais

**Professional development on trauma incorporated into teacher training schedule.** As a result of looking at EDI data, in August 2018 early childhood advocates brought in Theraplay to partner with District 53 in order to provide training to teachers throughout the county on Sunshine Circles, a teacher-led technique that incorporates playful, cooperative and nurturing activities that lead to better social, emotional and cognitive development in the classroom. In 2019, Theraplay initiated fundraising efforts to invest in the professional development of the mental health professionals serving the community.

“**It’s such an honor to partner with communities, tailor supports to meet their needs, and learn alongside them as we support their data use.”**

- Rebecca Halperin
  Knowledge Manager,
  EDI Project,
  Erikson Institute

---

[5] This is a select list of examples on how communities used the EDI to inform action.
Greater East St. Louis

$1 million increase in Early Childhood Block Grant funding for Greater East St. Louis. EDI data was included in the Illinois early childhood block grant application, which resulted in nearly $6 million allocated to East St. Louis School District 189 for preschool expansion for the 2018-2019 school year—a $1 million increase from the previous year. The grant supports increasing the number of slots for preschool programs, ensuring high-quality care and programs, professional development for teachers, family education programs and strengthening support systems.

Key Systems Alignment. Representatives from the family courts and program service providers met in July of 2018 to begin the discussion on ways to ensure that courts are providing accurate and adequate referrals to families. The EDI data has unified organizations that have typically worked in silos to approach the work with children in unison, with the idea that an “all our kids together” mindset will be what is best for children, families, and the community.

OAK PARK

Inspiring community-driven housing development that keeps residents top of mind in Oak Park. In 2018, Village officials looked to EDI data to help determine the best location for a new housing development for families with limited economic resources. The EDI maps showed that the initial location of the development could isolate children and families from early childhood programs and services and prompted the exploration of other sites.

Oak Park Public Library supports families with social-emotional initiatives. In the spring of 2019, the Oak Park Public Library announced the continuation of its Social-Emotional Learning Series in addition to launching a Community Empathy series aimed at focusing on community care alongside self and family care. Library officials cited the EDI data collected during the 2017-2018 school year, which showed kindergarteners in the area had challenges in social emotional development, as one of the reasons to include this learning in their programs. Read article: bit.ly/2Q8r15d.

Rockford

Dedicating staff to ensure short and long-term outcomes are derived from EDI data. The Ready to Learn initiative — a joint effort of Rockford Public Schools, Alignment Rockford and Transform Rockford — used EDI data in a grant proposal to the Community Foundation of Northern Illinois. In January 2020, the initiative announced it will receive $210,000 over the next three years to hire a project director. The project director will focus on turning the EDI data into actionable items that result in short-term and generational improvements for children in education readiness, quality of life, and prosperity. Responsibilities include guiding the initiative’s vision and strategies, supporting aligned activities, establishing shared measurement practices, building public will, advancing policy, and mobilizing resources.

Erikson Institute

Providing opportunities for EDI partners to nominate key community leaders to promote grassroots efforts driven by EDI data. EDI partners can build their capacity through Erikson’s Early Childhood Leadership Academy programs, which equip early childhood advocates, decision-makers and influencers with the resources, skills, and deep knowledge about the field to support efforts to effect policy and systems change.
**ADDITIONAL RESOURCES**

**GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

**Assets**
Assets is a term used in community development to refer to community resources, which can include physical infrastructure (e.g., parks); key people in a neighborhood (e.g., an influential pastor); or key institutions (e.g., health care). During the EDI process, representatives from partner communities engage in identifying key institutional assets they would like to see mapped in relation to the EDI results. Once results are released, consideration of people who are assets becomes important for identifying key people to include in discussions about the EDI results and who might be effective messengers about the community collaboration’s work (see asset mapping; community collaboration).

**Asset Mapping**
Asset Mapping is an inventory of the businesses, organizations, and institutions that help create a community. In the EDI process, these are mapped in relation to EDI results to stimulate thinking about potential partners to add to a community collaboration, resource allocation, and the accessibility of services and supports to families (see community collaboration).

**Community/School Champions**
Community/School Champions are the identified members of the community collaborative or local public school district who work as the liaisons between Erikson Institute, the local collaboration, and other community groups (see community collaborative).

**Community Collaborative**
A cross-sector group of individuals working together to coordinate a collective response to complex issues in a community. It can include nonprofits, local businesses, government agencies, philanthropic institutions, and community residents (see assets).

**Community Knowledge**
While the EDI results can show important patterns of children’s well-being across a community, these results can only be interpreted by engaging people who have intimate knowledge of a community and its neighborhoods such as parents, faith leaders, business owners, local law enforcement, etc.

**Developmentally At Risk (for becoming vulnerable)**
While the term “at risk” is commonly used, it has a very specific meaning when used with the EDI. The EDI scores are categorized as “developmentally at risk” in a domain if the average of the questions for that domain falls between the 11th and 25th percentile cutoffs. These cutoffs were established in 2010 and are regularly checked by the Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities at the University of California, Los Angeles [UCLA] (see EDI cutoff scores; percentiles; valid for analysis).

**Developmentally On Track**
The EDI scores that are at or above the 26th percentile (i.e. are “developmentally on track”) on all valid domains. A record may be valid with as few as four completed domains (see EDI cutoff scores; percentiles; valid for analysis).

**Developmentally Vulnerable**
The EDI scores are categorized as “developmentally vulnerable” in a domain if the mean of his/her EDI items for that domain falls at or below the 10th percentile cutoff for the U.S. EDI data. These cutoffs were established in 2010 and are regularly checked by the UCLA’s Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities (see EDI cutoff scores; percentiles; valid for analysis).

**EDI Cutoff Scores**
Each of the five domains in the EDI has a population cutoff for “on track,” “developmentally vulnerable,” and “at risk.” The normative population cutoffs for the U.S. were determined by the Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities at UCLA using the 2009-2010 EDI data. These scores are checked annually and have not significantly changed year-to-year. Having fixed cutoff scores helps with comparisons of how children are doing developmentally, both across and within schools and across years. The figure on page 13 shows the cutoff scores for each domain (see percentiles).
EDI Community Team (formerly Pilot Team)

Each community collaborative has a smaller team of people, key stakeholders, representing different perspectives (e.g., parents, school district representative, health care, municipal government, early childhood education, etc.) who act as a local steering committee and work with the Erikson Institute EDI Project team (see community collaborative).

EDI Participation Rate

The participation rate is calculated by dividing the total number of students living in the neighborhood with valid EDI records (the numerator) by the estimated total number of eligible children living in the neighborhood (the denominator), based on U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year estimates (Table B09001: Population Under 18 Years of Age). Following procedures established by the Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities, the number of 5-year-olds from this ACS table is used. This is based upon analyses that the standard portions across age groups included in the table did not differ more than 10% up to age 10 across multiple years.

Data Literacy

The understanding of reading data and ability to derive meaningful information.

Metadata

Metadata is information about a data source that helps people to find and understand the data. Metadata can include information on the source of data such as titles, abstracts, authors, dates of data collection, and keywords.

Neighborhood

For the purpose of the EDI Community Profile, a neighborhood is a Census tract. Using Census tracts allows for comparisons with Census data. Neighborhood names were determined through a group process in which community representatives discussed their understanding of how residents identify neighborhoods, such as by key geographical features like a particular intersection or major landmark. The purpose of these designations is to help local residents orient themselves to the EDI maps (see “How the Neighborhoods Were Named” section in this report).

Percentiles

Percentiles are numbers that tell what percentage of scores fall below a particular score. For example, a score at the 75th percentile means that this score cuts off the bottom 75 percent of scores. In the U.S., the percentile ranks for the EDI have been established by the developers of the EDI at the Offord Centre for Child Studies and cut scores by UCLA’s Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities using the 2009-2010 national data (see developmentally at-risk, developmentally on-track, developmentally vulnerable, EDI cutoff scores).

Suppressed Data

Suppressed Data are records with valid addresses but which are not reported in the maps because they are in neighborhoods with fewer than 10 valid records for analysis.

Standard Deviation

Standard Deviation is a statistic that describes how spread out a dataset is from its mean (average). For the purposes of the EDI, this statistic is important as it allows for the creation of comparable categories for a community’s mapped data in relation to the expected norms in the United States. The EDI maps are color-shaded based upon the unique distributions for each domain, as well as for the analysis of Children Vulnerable on One or More Domains. Each color-shaded category is one-half of a standard deviation (SD), with the middle color-shaded category on each map representing the national norm (.25 SD above and below the average range of percentages identified as vulnerable). The two lighter shaded categories represent .25-.75 SD and .75-1.25 SD below the expected norm (i.e., a lower concentration of vulnerability than the expected norm). The two darker shaded categories represent .25-.75 SD and .75-1.25 SD above the expected norm (i.e., a higher concentration of vulnerability). This analysis was conducted by the Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities at UCLA using data collected in the United States in 2009-2010 (N=10,244).
Pilot Year 1
School year 2016-2017 was Erikson’s first pilot year of the EDI project. This was conducted in partnership with UCLA’s Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities. The first-year communities were the City of Kankakee, the Village of Bourbonnais, the Village of Bradley and Greater East St. Louis (GESTL).

Pilot Year 2
School year 2017-2018 was Erikson’s second pilot year of the EDI project. During this period, Erikson was able to acquire the second license issued to the United States to independently collect data with the EDI in Illinois. The second-year community was the Village of Oak Park.

Pilot Year 3
School year 2018-2019 is Erikson’s final pilot year of the EDI project. The third-year communities were the City of Rockford and Central Skokie-Morton Grove Neighborhoods.

Valid for Analysis
For a child’s record to be valid for analysis: 1) the child must have been in the classroom for more than one month, and 2) the EDI must have at least four of the five domains completed by the teacher.
**EDI Resources**

Erikson Institute is grateful to have worked closely with the following institutions throughout the development of the EDI Project.

**Human Early Learning Partnership (HELP)**
earlylearning.ubc.ca/maps/edi

**Offord Centre**
edi.offordcentre.com

**Raise DC**
raisedc.org/ourchildren

**Telethon Kids Institute**
telethonkids.org.au

**University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities**
healthychild.ucla.edu/pages/edi

---

**Where to Find Additional Data**

**EDI Gallery Walk Report:** Provides additional maps, data tables and metadata that assists with focusing on specific content areas.

**edi.erikson.edu:** Erikson’s EDI website provides access to EDI data and maps for all Illinois partner communities as well as resources to help understand results and turn data into actionable items.
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451 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60654 USA
edi@erikson.edu
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