

Missouri Even Start Family Literacy Programs

2009-2010

Local Program Evaluation Template

Framework for Data Collection and Analysis for the Local Independent Program Evaluation

*Note: Please revise this cover page for the local program evaluation. Include the program name and address, contact information for the coordinator and evaluator, program funding year (2009 – 2010) and the date of the evaluation. **DUE: July 31, 2010** to Kathy Parris at DESE, two paper copies. Please send an electronic copy to Dr. Jeri Levesque at JALsails@aol.com.*



LIFT

www.lift-missouri.org

For Additional Information Contact

Jeri A. Levesque, Ed.D. JALsails@aol.com 314-703-7473

State Evaluator, Missouri Even Start Family Literacy Programs

Guidance for Conducting the 2010 Local Program Evaluation

Note: Numerous issues regarding the quality of Even Start evaluations have been raised nationally as the program continues to be under federal scrutiny and an uncertain funding future. I am working with Andrew Hayes, perhaps the most well-known family literacy expert in the United States to study how local program evaluation can meaningfully contribute to program improvement. As with all federally funded programs, there is the expectation that programs will work toward self-sufficiency in the communities they serve. Throughout the 2010 FLIPQs are questions posed to help evaluators determine to what extent the local program meets rigorous design standards and performance indicators for adults and their children who participate in the family literacy program.

I am indebted to Dr. Hayes for his support of this statewide effort to provide family literacy in Missouri. JAL

Requirements for a Valid Family Literacy Model

The purpose of family literacy programs is not to help the adults solve their problems, or to solve problems for them; but rather, to help them learn to solve their own or family problems. Except if there is a social services component to the family literacy program that is expected to provide helping services, the staff should focus on teaching problem-solving skills that may include learning a variety of solutions to the classes of problems they are currently having and not on finding solutions to personal or family problems. A. Hayes, 2010

First, and foremost, a valid family literacy service model will have a clearly specified target population with all of the identifying details that are necessary to determine their needs for family-literacy improvement, their own commitment to improvement and capability to engage programs as needed for effective learning, their barriers to engagement in services, and any details that are needed for goal setting and for planning methods for assessing their achievement. Next, there must be a clear set of goals with operational translations of them to reflect the meanings that will be used for assessing achievement and for estimating the amount of time required to achieve the goals by persons who enroll. Then, there must be a theoretically valid operational model for intervention. The selected model must meet any requirements for a valid “logic model” that underlies it. The process of logic modeling includes the development of a rationale for all of the methods used including a justification for why those selected should be expected to produce the stated results for the people who will be enrolled. This process includes the definition of the model as a set of theoretical constructs and the principles for relationships among them. The resulting operational model must correspond to those design principles as demonstrated by objective comparison.

Once the general model is designed, the component parts of the model should, themselves, be empirically-validated models, or they should be ones known through theoretical analyses to be consistent with the best standards for instructional design and principles of intervention for the target population and set of goals. This standard ensures that the models that are adopted are consistent with the characteristics of the people who will be served by the components and with their respective goals.

Evaluation of family literacy program operations and effects are both critical and complicated. The first focus of evaluation should be on clarifying the service design and practices to such an extent that they can be monitored during implementation with a high degree of precision. This task should be accomplished by using conventional means for defining the logic model for an intervention. After determining that the model design corresponds fully to sound theoretical principles, the first evaluation question should be, “Are we implementing (Did we implement) the program as it was designed?” This question cannot be answered unless the design is explicit and with operational details specified. Furthermore, the question probably cannot be answered by using a checklist of indicators. Model elements are not purely descriptive; rather, they have purposes, relationships, and qualities that are linked to their design principles. An evaluation of implementation requires professional judgment and critical analysis of the degree to which those principles are actually represented in the implementation and the degree to which the implementation actually serves the intended purposes. Merely saying that “an activity occurred” (even if the number of times and for how long is added) is not the same thing as describing an activity fully, presenting evidence of its quality, and presenting clear documentation of effects.

There should be no attempt to interpret outcomes of intervention until the quality of implementation has been established. Of course it is always important to address the evaluation question, “What did we get for the money we spent?” But there should always be a framework provided for understanding “*why* we got what we got.” Answering that “*why*” question usually requires knowing explicitly the characteristics of those who were enrolled, what services were actually implemented, to what extent the clients participated in the services, and why there were variations from plans, if there were variations. The goals set for a family literacy program, and assessed through program evaluation, should always reflect the meaning of *family* literacy rather than *individual* literacy. That is not to say, however, that individual literacy acquisition is not both important to the learner and family and important to assess. Indeed, over the short term, individual gains are probably necessary for ensuring longer-term family literacy gains, but those individual gains may not be sufficient for ensuring the long-term changes in family literacy *unless* those short-term gains are conceived broadly to include a wide range of problem-solving skills and other abilities and sentiments that are known to be *causally-linked* to changes in family literacy.

Operations and evaluations that focus mainly on the indicators of individual development are likely to lose sight of the family-development intentions of family literacy services and focus more on both the individual components and the outcomes expected directly from the components. For example, if the adult basic skills or the child academic

outcomes are the focus of attention emphasized by measures and claims of effectiveness, then those *separate components* rather than the *family literacy program* probably will receive priority attention. While those components and their respective effects are important both to individual and family development, for family literacy program goals, those outcomes should not be given priority over the family development goals. AEH, 2010

Note: Do not include Guidance Notes or Appendix A in the final report submitted to DESE.

<Name Here> Even Start Family Literacy Program
Independent Local Evaluation
2009 - 2010

Program _____

DUE DATE: JULY 31, 2010

Date of Upload to DESE _____

Date of Report _____ **Evaluator** _____

Evaluator Email _____

Program Director/Contact Person _____

Phone* _____ **E-mail*** _____

**Please include alternatives if phone number or e-mail address above will change after July 31st.*

Executive Summary

Evaluators are required to submit a one page Executive Summary that includes a brief summary of the outcomes, conclusions and recommendations.

Family Literacy Indicators of Program Quality (FLIPQs)

The key task in planning and conducting high-quality evaluations of effects of family literacy services is to determine explicit and clear goals with operational meaning that specifies the indicators of effects. The validity of the goals that are set should be established to determine that they are both reasonable to expect as outcomes from the services that are being offered and important and appropriate for the families who will be enrolled. A. Hayes

The 2009-2010 local evaluation analyzes program quality with the criteria set forth in the Family Literacy Indicators of Program Quality (FLIPQs) in compliance with policy set forth by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Even Start Program. The data collected and reported in this report are drawn from adults' and children's records kept on file at the local program. Confidentiality is ensured as only local identification codes are reported. Program quality is determined by adult and children's performance outcomes as well as the program's operational schedule, daily attendance records, interviews with staff and families, and observations by the evaluator.

For any area rated "Technical Assistance Required," an action plan should be developed and sent to the Even Start State Coordinator within 30 days following submission of the report to DESE. Contact LIFT-MO, Phyllis Harris at pharris@webster.edu or pharris@webster.edu for technical assistance when completing the action plan.

Program Overview

History of the Family Literacy Program and Demographics of the School District

The **NAME** Even Start Program was established in **DATE** with funding from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) Even Start program. The program is in the **X** year of its **first/second** funding cycle (year X of continuous program operation). *Indicate whether the program was funded for the 2010-2011 program year.*

Program Services and Collaborations

Suggested evaluation Questions (Coordinator and the Independent Evaluator are encouraged to pose and probe others):

- ✓ How do you determine families most in need within your service area?
- ✓ What makes your program special and unique to the community?
- ✓ Who are your partners for each of the four components? How does each contribute to participants' success?
- ✓ What is your schedule for services? School year? Summer?
- ✓ What do families expect to achieve by enrolling in your program? How long do they expect to participate, and what sort of weekly commitment must parents make in order to achieve their goals?

Grant Award Information

- a. Amount of federal share. \$ _____
- b. Amount of local match funding. \$ _____
- c. 2008 – 2009 Cost Per Family \$ _____
- *Divide total budget by number of families served*
- d. Program year in funding cycle. _____
- e. Program located in an empowerment zone? _____ Yes _____ No
- f. Percent of students in LEA on free/reduced lunch _____

Enrollment

Evaluation Question:

- ✓ *What are enrollment patterns and do they indicate programs are reaching families most in need as defined by low levels of literacy, poverty and other need related factors?*

Even Start Families Participating During the Year

In the table below, provide the number of participants for each of the groups listed below. The following terms apply:

“Participating” means enrolled and participating in all required core services.

“Adults” include teen parents.

Table 1

Number of Participants

Families participating	
Total Adults participating	
School aged (teens) adults	
Adults participating who are limited English proficient (LEP)	
Participating children	Total ALL
a. Infants and toddlers (birth through 2 years)	
b. Preschool age (age 3 through age 5)	
c. School age (age 6 through 8)	

Section Content: Evaluators are charged with analyzing program information to determine to what extent enrollment patterns reflect service to families most in need as defined by poverty, low levels of literacy and other need related factors.

Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of families at the time of enrollment for each of the groups listed below. The term “newly enrolled family” means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project at any time during the year.

Table 2

Number of Families at the Time of Enrollment

1.	Number of newly enrolled families	
2.	Number of newly enrolled adult participants	
3.	Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level	
4.	Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	
5.	Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond 9 th grade	

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the families start date and exit date. For families still participating, count the time between the family’s start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2009). **Report each family only once in lines 1-4.**

Table 3

Retention

Time in Program	Number of Families
1. Number of families participating 3 months or less	
2. Number of families participating more than 3 months and fewer than 6 months	
3. Number of families participating more than 6 months and fewer than 12 months	
4. Number of families participating 12 months or longer	
5. Total families participating	

- ✓ *How does 2009 - 10 enrollment compare with past performance? (i.e., different circumstances, ethnic backgrounds)*
- ✓ *Have there been any significant changes effecting participation in 2009 - 10? (i.e., Did a major employer move in/out of the area? Is participation being impacted by military deployment?)*

Section Content: Evaluators are charged with analyzing participant information to determine the extent to which educational or employment gains correlate to levels of participation.

Discussion

- ✓ *What patterns emerge in programs with parents who participate enough to make gains leading to self-sufficiency? Conversely, what patterns emerge when parents do not participate sufficiently?*
- ✓ *How does this year's enrollment compare with past performance? (i.e., different circumstances, ethnic backgrounds)*
- ✓ *Does the staff have any concerns and successes regarding recruitment of families?*
- ✓ *What are your most effective ways to recruit the target number (per grant application) of families who qualify enroll and remain long enough to meet their goals?*
- ✓ *What do these data reflect in terms of program quality? Program quality is composed of a) meeting target enrollment, b) serving most at need, c) for an adequate time (minimum six months, with a weekly schedule for all program components), d) with appropriate four component services throughout the year (two week breaks are the maximum time between operating/seasonal schedules).*

Adult Education

Component Definition: Adult Education provides the information and instruction necessary to support the improvement of literacy and learning skills in adult learners. ("Literacy skills" are defined as the adult's ability to read, and speak in English, and compute and solve problems at levels of proficiency needed to fulfill responsibilities as parent/family member, citizen/community member, and worker.) The adult education component also works in concert with the other family literacy components to support adult's transfer of acquired skills and knowledge to home and community.

Evaluation Questions:

- ✓ *How well are adults progressing as defined by the National Reporting System?*
- ✓ *How knowledgeable are staff about the characteristics of adult learners as demonstrated by ongoing participation in professional development?*

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. To be counted under "pre- and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre- and post-tests. Do not include LEP adults.

Table 4

Adults With Significant Learning Gains on Reading

Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation of Progress
TABE			# met the indicator (Level gain)

The definition of “significant learning gains” for adult education is determined by Missouri’s adult education program in conjunction with the Department of Education’s Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

Evaluators are encouraged to identify pre and post differences by level.

Table5

Adult Education Reading Performance Levels Pre and Post

Participant ID	Date of PreTest	TABE Level/Score and NRS Level	Subjects tested	Date of PostTest	TABE Level/Score and NRS Level	Subjects Tested	Level Gain? Y/N

2.2.2.2 LEP Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of LEP adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

Table 6

LEP Adults With Significant Learning Gains on Reading

Measure <i>Measurement tool</i>	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation of Progress

<i>used to assess progress for indicator</i>			
BEST			
CASAS			

Evaluators are encouraged to report learner progress on other content areas measured.

Table 7

Adult Progress in Reading on the TABE

Test _____ BEST _____ CASAS

Participant ID	Date of PreTest	Test Level/Score	NRS Level	Date of Posttest	Level/Score and NRS Level	Score /Level Difference	Level Gain? Y/N

Discussion

- What do the pretest scores indicate about the literacy needs of English Language Learners upon enrollment?
- Explain the degree of success achieved by the “class” as a whole.
- What barriers impacted adults who were not successful in making level gains?

Table 8

Adults who are English Language Learners Performance on a Reading Assessment

Test _____ BEST _____ CASAS

Participant ID	Date of Pretest	Test Level/Score	NRS Level	Date of Posttest	Level/Score and NRS Level	Score /Level Difference	Level Gain? Y/N

Evaluators are encouraged to report learner progress on other content areas measured.

Discussion

- What do the pretest scores indicate about the literacy needs of English Language Learners upon enrollment?
- Explain the degree of success achieved by the “class” as a whole.
- What barriers impacted adults who were not successful in making level gains?

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

In the table below, provide the number of school-age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED.

The following terms apply:

“School-age adults” is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State’s compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.

“Non-school-age” adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of “school-age.”

“Cohort” includes only those adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

Table 9

School-Age Adults

Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation of Progress
HS Diploma			
GED			
Grade Promotion			

Discussion

If serving teen parents in high school, explain how the adult education component is linked with parenting, PCIL, and early childhood services.

Table 10

Non-School-Age Adults

Measure	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation of Progress
<i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>			
* Indicate diploma or GED	* Indicate diploma or GED	* Indicate diploma or GED	* Indicate diploma or GED

*Applies to school age adults (teens) for whom the GED/diploma is a goal.

Section Content: Evaluators are charged with analyzing participant information to determine how well adults are progressing (as defined by the National Reporting System). Evaluators will also analyze staff knowledge of the characteristics of adult learners as demonstrated by ongoing participation in professional development.

Program coordinators may ask the evaluator to address the following questions:

- ✓ *Do the data reflect a cohort of adults most in need of literacy intervention?*
- ✓ *Does the program serve a range of abilities or are the data skewed toward a particular level of adult learners?*
- ✓ *Does the program meet benchmark? If not, what factors impede program success? (Refer to program demographics, recruitment and retention analysis.)*

FLIPQ Performance Indicators for Adult Learning

Data: Photos of student engagement and sample lesson plans may be useful to illustrate the classroom environment. TABE and CASAS scores per adult learner document student achievement. LEA records must be collected to verify high school diploma. AEL records verify GED. Copies kept on file at the program.

** For any area rated "Technical Assistance Required," an action plan should be developed within 30 days after the report is filed and a copy sent to the State Even MO Even Start Evaluation Template 2009-2010*

Start Coordinator. Contact LIFT-MO staff for technical assistance when completing the action plan. *Please note data source for each item or group of items.

Adult Learner Performance Outcomes

Of ALL adults who have completed at least 100 hours of AEL instruction, 50%

Demonstrate a gain of at least one grade equivalent level on the *Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE)* or *Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS)* (reading or math) based on their entry-level assessment scores.

Tally from below.

1. Beginning Literacy ABE (0 - 1.9)

___ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

___ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

___ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (38%) Achieved ___ Yes ___ No ___ NA

2. Beginning ABE (2 - 3.9)

___ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

___ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

___ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (37%) Achieved ___ Yes ___ No ___ NA

3. Low Intermediate ABE (4 - 5.9)

___ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

___ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

___ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (36%) Achieved ___ Yes ___ No ___ NA

4. High Intermediate ABE (6.0 - 8.9)

___ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

___ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

___ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (41%) Achieved ___ Yes ___ No ___ NA

5. Low Adult Secondary Education (9.0 - 10.9)

___ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

___ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

___ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (48%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

6. High Adult Secondary (11.0 - 11.9)

___ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

___ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

___ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (50%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

Performance Indicators for Adult Learning and English as Second Language (ESL)

LEP Performance Outcomes

Of the adults who complete at least 100 hours of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), instruction 50% demonstrate at least a five (5) point gain on the CASAS Reading test based on their entry level assessment score.

- 1. The percent of adult learners enrolled in **Beginning ESOL Literacy** who complete this level meet or exceed 35%.

_____ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

_____ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

_____ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (50%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

- 2. The percent of adult learners enrolled in **Beginning ESOL** who complete this level meet or exceed 34%.

___ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

___ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

___ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (34%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

- 3. The percent of adult learners enrolled in **Low Intermediate ESOL** who

complete this level meet or exceed 39%.

_____ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

_____ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

_____ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (39%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

4. The percent of adult learners enrolled in **High Intermediate ESOL** who complete this level meet or exceed 39%.

_____ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

_____ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

_____ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (39%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

5. The percent of adult learners enrolled in **Low Advanced ESOL** who complete this level meet or exceed 24%.

___ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

___ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

___ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (24%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

6. 17. **High Advanced ESOL**

___ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

___ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

___ Number who met indicator

Percent Achieved _____ Yes _____ No NA

Scoring

Exceeds Expectations 7 indicators met

Meets Expectations 6 indicators met

Technical Assistance Required 2 or fewer indicators met

Performance Indicator for GED Completion (required)

Of the adult learners at the Low and High Adult Secondary Education levels who complete a minimum of 100 hours and have a high school equivalency as a goal, 48% pass the GED or earn a high school credential.

_____ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

_____ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

_____ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (48%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

Placement in Postsecondary Education or Training

Of the adult learners whose primary or secondary goal was postsecondary education or vocational training 27% meet the benchmark.

_____ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

_____ Number of adults with this goal

_____ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (27%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

Entered Employment

45% of unemployed adult learners enrolled (and in the workforce) will obtain unsubsidized employment.

_____ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

_____ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

_____ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (45%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

Retained Employment

51% of adults were retained on the job or advanced on the job.

_____ Cohort number of adults for whom the indicator is applicable

_____ Number of adults with matching pre and posttests

_____ Number who met indicator

Benchmark (51%) Achieved _____ Yes _____ No _____ NA

Adult Education Conclusion

Refer to evaluation questions at the beginning of this section.

- ✓ *Do the data reflect a cohort of adults most in need of literacy intervention?*
- ✓ *Does the program serve a range of abilities or are the data skewed toward a particular level of adult learners?*
- ✓ *Does the program achieve the FLIPQs?*
- ✓ *If not, what factors impede program success? (Refer to program demographics, recruitment and retention analysis)*

**Evaluator determines from evidence whether or not the indicator was achieved and provides brief explanations where indicated in blue.*

Participants are provided adult education by..

The program offers ___ hours per month of adult education, which *meets/ exceeds* the FLIPQ Standard for Adult Education program intensity of 60 hours per month. *(Or, the program needs technical assistance if it offered less than the FLIPQ Standard)*. _____ Percent of adults made level gains on the TABE, _ percent made level gains on the CASAS (if applicable). For _____ adults who had the goal of achieving a GED, ___ percent met this goal. For teens who had the goal of achieving a high school diploma, ___ percent met this goal.

Children's (Early Childhood) Education

Component Definition: Children's education promotes young children's growth and development, engages parents in their child's educational program by nurturing meaningful involvement, and relating the importance of parents' role in their children's development and achievement. Young children who are living in circumstances that place them at greater risk of school failure (including poverty, low level of maternal education, maternal depression, and other factors) are much more likely to succeed in school if they attend well-planned, high quality children's education programs. Ideally, the children's education component uses a curriculum that focuses on the whole child and emphasizes the development of literacy.

Evaluation Question:

- ✓ *How well are young children progressing?*
- ✓ *How are infants and toddlers developmental milestones measured?*
- ✓ *What evidence verifies that children are participating in a high quality early childhood environment?*
- ✓ *What curriculum is used for every age group served?*
- ✓ *Do school age children require supplemental educational services? If so, how are they coordinated with the Even Start program?*

Identify the age ranges (must be at least three years, ex. Birth to three) of students served, transportation, special needs, ELL, curriculum, screening tools. Identify the agency that provides early childhood education.

Did the numbers of children, per age group, change significantly since last year?

No *Yes *Please explain:

Does your program have a waiting list for any age group?

Infants/toddlers Yes No Preschool Yes No

School age Yes No

Who provides the early childhood education program? Even Start Head Start
 Other* (specify) _____

2.2.2.4 Children Entering Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development

In the table below, provide the number of children who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.

The following terms apply to 2.2.2.4 through 2.2.2.7:

A “significant learning gain” is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points with a minimum 6 months between pre- and post-test.

” Age-Eligible” includes the total number of children who are expected to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year.

“Tested” includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre- and post-test with at least 6 months of services in between.

“Exempted” includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Table 12
PPVT III or IV Receptive Language Scores

Student Name/ID	Date of Pretest	Standard Score	Date of Posttest	6 months Y/N	Score Difference => 4 Scaled Score pts?	=> 85?

If a child was not post tested provide an explanation.

Table 13
PPVT III or IV Receptive Language Outcomes

	# Age-Eligible	#Tested	# Who Met Goal	# SS is =>85	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)

PPVT-III or IV						

2.2.2.5 The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

All children whose birth date (October 1, 2004) makes them eligible for kindergarten for the 2009-2010 school year must be assessed for gains in alphabet knowledge over a six month period of enrollment in Even Start.

Table 14
PALS Pre-K Uppercase Alphabet Recognition

Student Name/ID	Date of Pretest	Standard Score	Date of Posttest	6 months?	Score Difference	=+ 14?

The term “average number of letters” includes the average score for the children in your program who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average and rounded to one decimal.

Table 15
PALS Pre-K Uppercase Alphabet Recognition

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case				# Outcomes meet target of 17 Upper Case letters

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

In the table below, provide the number of school-age children who read on grade level. The source of these data is usually determined by the State and, in some cases, by school district. Please indicate the source(s) of the data in the “Explanation” field.

Table 16
School Age Reading Achievement

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K			
1			
2			
3			

FLIPQ Children’s Education Performance Indicators

Component Definition: Children’s education promotes young children’s growth and development, engages parents in their child’s educational program by nurturing meaningful involvement, and relating the importance of parents’ role in their children’s development and achievement. Young children who are living in circumstances that place them at greater risk of school failure (including poverty, low level of maternal education, maternal depression, and other factors) are much more likely to succeed in school if they attend well-planned, high quality children’s education programs. Ideally, the children’s education component uses a curriculum that focuses on the whole child and emphasizes the development of literacy.

Program Activity

Children’s Education [narrative...](#)

** For any area rated “Technical Assistance Required,” an action plan should be developed ASAP following submission of the report. A copy of the report is sent to the State Coordinator. Contact LIFT-MO staff for assistance when completing the action plan.*

**Please note data source for each item or group of items.*

Infants and Toddlers

Discussion:

- ✓ *What curriculum frames the infant/toddler program?*
- ✓ *What is the quality of the learning environment?*
- ✓ *What instruments are used to screen children?*
- ✓ *What does the screening data indicate about the developmental progress of infants and toddlers enrolled?*

Performance Indicators for Child Readiness

80% of children entering kindergarten achieved significant learning gains on measures of language development (PPVT).

80% of children entering kindergarten can identify 17 Uppercase Letters on the PALS Pre-K

80% of school-aged children are reading on grade level.

Scoring

Meets Expectations 3 standards met

Technical Assistance Required 2 or fewer standards met

Children's (Early Childhood) Conclusion

- ✓ *To what extent is the program providing a quality early education component?*
- ✓ *What age groups are served?*
- ✓ *What learning opportunities are provided for young children, infants, and toddlers (applicable)?*
- ✓ *Are children making significant learning gains on measures of language development (Reading readiness/Reading gains)?*

The program offers ___ hours per month of early childhood education, which **meets/exceeds** the FLIPQ Standard for early childhood education program intensity of 80 hours per month. (Or, the program needs technical assistance if offering less than the FLIPQ Standard).

Parent Groups for Education and Support

Component Definition: Parenting Education provides information, instruction, and support for parents regarding how to be their child's first teacher and full partner in the education of their children.

The federal *No Child Left Behind* Act (NCLB) requires parents to learn what state standards mean in terms of the knowledge, skills, behaviors, and attitudes their children are expected to develop.

Notice: In response to questions posed regarding Parenting and PCIL Participation, evaluators and program staff are encouraged to review APPENDIX A:

Evaluation Questions:

- ✓ *How well are parents supporting their child(ren)'s learning as well as improving their understanding of their child(ren)'s development?*
- ✓ *What does the program offer for parenting?*
- ✓ *How does the program get parents to participate regularly in this component?*

Subject: Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children’s learning in the home, school environment and through interactive learning activities. Applies to all enrolled adults.

2.2.2.7 Parents Who Show Improvement on Measures of Parental Support for Children's Learning in the Home, School Environment, and Through Interactive Learning Activities

In the table below, provide the number of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities.

While many states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please describe results and the source(s) of any non-PEP data in the “Other” field, with appropriate information in the Explanation field.

Table 17
PACT/Parenting

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I			
PEP Scale II			
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV			
Other: Parent Observation Guide			

Parenting Education Program Standards & Performance Indicators

** For any area rated “Technical Assistance Required,” an action plan should be developed ASAP following submission of the report. A copy of the report is sent to the State Coordinator. Contact LIFT-MO staff for assistance when completing the action plan.*

**Please note data source for each item or group of items.*

FLIPQ Parenting Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator: 90% of parents affect their child's ability to learn as evidenced by informal assessment and self-assessment in 2 or more of the following (check those met):

1. Participate in parenting education monthly.
2. Provide support and encourage structure for the home learning environment.

3. Select books, toys, and activities, based on the child's interests and abilities.
4. Talk with and read to their children.
5. Support children's decision-making skills.
6. Listen to children and encourage the expression of ideas.
7. Identify their own strengths and those of their children.
8. Increase awareness of school expectations.
9. Communicate effectively with school personnel.
10. Advocate for their children.
11. Demonstrate preparation and continuous involvement in children's school
12. Activities such as conferences, meetings, home visits, and volunteer
13. Opportunities.

Conclusion

Discussion

The program offers ___ hours per month of parenting education, which *meets/exceeds* the FLIPQ Standard for parenting education intensity of 20 hours per month, including 8 hours literacy based (grounded in SBRR). *(Or, the program needs technical assistance if offering significantly less than the FLIPQ Standard and parents fail to make sufficient progress).*

Evaluators are encouraged to provide a brief narrative of program highlights as well as unmet challenges.

Parent and Child Interactive Literacy (PCIL)

Component Definition: PCIL Time consists of regularly scheduled opportunities for parents and their children to play and work together as a way to promote literacy and language development. PCIL activities build adult understanding of the critical role parents play in positive adult-child interactions.

Program Activity: *Evaluators provide a brief narrative of the PCIL component. Examples of special family activities and scheduled may be provided.*

Parent and Child Interactive Literacy (PCIL) Performance Indicators

- *For any area rated "Technical Assistance Required," an action plan should be developed ASAP following submission of the report. A copy of the report is sent to the State Coordinator. Contact LIFT-MO staff for assistance when completing the action plan.*
-

PCIL Performance Indicators

**Please note data source for each item or group of items see monthly schedule for supporting documentation.*

Check all that are met.

1. Families participate in PCIL Time monthly
2. Interactive literacy activities occur within each PCIL Time (such as story-reading, story-telling and retelling, singing, and finger plays).
3. Programs collect and display students' work. *(Photo documentation given to the evaluator or first hand observation by the evaluator)*
4. Staff observe parents applying strategies discussed during parenting sessions.
5. Staff provide a print rich literacy environment.
6. Parents focus on child's interest during play.
7. Parents listen to and communicate with their child.
8. Parents express reasonable expectations for children's development.
9. Staff reflect (debrief) with parents following parent-child experiences.

Scoring

Exceeds Expectations	8 indicators met
Meets Expectations	7 indicators met
Technical Assistance Required	3 or fewer indicators met

Parent-Child Reading Behavior

Parent educators regularly observe parent-child reading interactions during PCIL time or home visits. The five items *PCIL Parent Observation Guide (POG)* categorized scientifically based reading research driven (SBRR) parenting behaviors related to reading to children at PACT time and during home visits. Staff observing PACT and during home visits focused on the following Parenting Behaviors: fluency, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, phonics, and text comprehension. The observations were dated and scored as:

5 Always 4 Often 3 Sometimes 2 Rarely 1 Never

Cohort number of parents observed with the *Parent Observation Guide* _____

Number of parents who made progress on all items between pre and

Post measures Number _____ _____percent

Summary of Evidence

Provide a brief narrative of PCIL Program component services.

Conclusion

The Parent and Child Interactive Literacy component <meets, exceeds or needs technical assistance> the FLIPQs and is/is not cited as a program strength

The program offers ___ hours per month of PCIL Time, which meets/exceeds the FLIPQ Standard for PCIL Time program intensity of 20 hours per month, including 12 hours literacy based (grounded in SBRR). (Or, the program needs technical assistance if it offered significantly less than the FLIPQ Standard).

Note: The evaluator should verify this standard by reviewing samples of activities and curricula provided under this program component. For more information regarding scientifically based reading instruction visit HYPERLINK "http://www.familit.org" www.familit.org

Home Visits

Component Definition: Home visits are linked to all other program components. The home visit is used as an opportunity for the parent and child to learn and play together with literacy as a primary focus.

Families receive at least one home visit a month for every month of program participation.

Home visitors receive on-going professional development.

Summary of Evidence

Provide a brief narrative of the nature and purpose of home visits as well as significant outcomes and impacts that result from these services.

Conclusion

The program offers ___ home visit(s) per month, which meets/exceeds the FLIPQ Standard for home visits program intensity of at least one home visit per month for every month of program participation. (Or, the program needs technical assistance if it offered significantly less than the FLIPQ Standard).

Design and Administration Standards

The Program demonstrates high quality by meeting the following standards:

**Please note data source for each item or group of items. Check all that are fully operational on a consistent basis. The program coordinator may verify these with the staff and evaluator.*

1. Use content standards and curriculum frameworks that focus on the knowledge and skills adults need to carry out life roles and meet community needs.
2. Use developmentally appropriate standards and curriculum frameworks that focus on the knowledge and skills children need to be successful in school.
3. Enhance children's exposure to and concepts about print and literacy.
4. Attend to educational and developmental needs of each adult through effective curriculum, social services referrals, and the elimination of any barriers to participation.
5. Address barriers to participation in a variety of ways, such as providing flexible hours for the four components (Adult Education, Children's Education, Parenting Education and Parent Child Interactive Literacy (PCIL)), transportation, convenient location, meals, and counseling/referrals.
6. Use scientifically based curriculum and instructional programs.
7. Provide services year-round.
8. Maintain appropriate staff/student ratios for instruction in each component area.

Scoring

Exceeds Expectations	8 standards met
Meets Expectations	7 standards met
Technical Assistance Required	5 or fewer standards met

Narrative Explanation

Collaboration

The Program demonstrates high quality by meeting the following standards:

1. Work with collaborating agencies to integrate efforts to ensure the success of common goals and services, and maintain appropriate documentation of this work.
2. Establish an Advisory Board/Committee that is representative of the community and collaborative agencies, and that meets a minimum of twice per year to review program planning and development.

Scoring

Exceeds Expectations	2 standards met
Meets Expectations	1 standard met
Technical Assistance Required	0 standards met

Narrative Explanation

Staff Selection

The Program demonstrates high quality by meeting the following standards:

Assure that the program has procedures in place to recruit and employ staff with appropriate education, licensure, skills, cultural, language, and background or experience.

Document that a minimum of 50% of the program instructional staff have an associate's degree.

Identify credentials for each instructional staff. Add rows to table as necessary.

Professional Development

The Program demonstrates high quality by meeting the following standards (check all that are met):

1. Develop and implement an Organizational Training Plan that includes comprehensive family literacy training, individual staff development training and programmatic staff development.
2. Support participation in staff development by providing paid time and flexible scheduling consistent with the policies of the fiscal agent.
3. Collaborate with agencies to maximize training resources to promote mutual understanding of programs and high quality instruction.
4. Provide supervision, training, guidance, and resources to volunteers.
5. Evaluate staff development in terms of meeting the National Staff Development Standards

For more information about NSDS

<http://www.nsd.org/standards/index.cfm>.

Scoring

Exceeds Expectations	5 standards met
Meets Expectations	4 standards met
Technical Assistance Required	2 or fewer standards met

Narrative Explanation

Intake and Orientation

The Program demonstrates high quality by meeting the following standards (check all that are met):

1. Assess community and school district needs to identify and target families in most need of family literacy services.

2. Discuss program participation requirements and available services individually with prospective participants.
3. Use an established procedure to match family needs with program services.
4. Provide confidentiality procedures for families.

Scoring

Exceeds Expectations	4 standards met
Meets Expectations	3 standards met
Technical Assistance Required	2 or fewer standards met

Narrative Explanation

Integration of Components

The Program demonstrates high quality by meeting the following standards:

Identify and continually reinforce common messages to be emphasized across components, for example, the (check all that are met):

1. Value of literacy,
2. Central role of the parent in a child's development,
3. Use of individual strengths.
4. Involve staff from all program components to plan an integrated curriculum.
5. Ensure all team members meet together regularly for program planning and integration.

Meet all four of the following intensity standards per month:

1. 60 hours of adult education;
2. 80 hours of early childhood education;
3. 20 hours of parenting education, including 8 hours literacy based (grounded in SBRR);
4. 20 hours of PCIL Time, including 12 hours literacy based (grounded in SBRR).
5. Make all core components available year round.

Scoring

Exceeds Expectations	5 standards met
Meets Expectations	4 standards met
Technical Assistance Required	2 or fewer standards met

Narrative Explanation

Children's Learning Environment

Meets Expectations	3 standards met
Technical Assistance Required	2 or fewer standards met

Narrative Explanation

Performance Indicator for Transitions

80% of families with children ages birth to 8 years old expected to experience a transition during the program year participate in at least 2 transition activities.

Exceeds Expectations +80%	Meets Expectations 80%
---------------------------	------------------------

Technical Assistance Required Less than 70%

Program Evaluation

The Program demonstrates high quality by meeting the following standards (check all that are met):

1. Develop an evaluation plan compliant with the Missouri FLIPQs.
2. Collect, analyze and report quantitative and qualitative data to determine the extent to which the program achieves the purposes for which it was funded and accomplishes the program goals associated with the program process, output, and outcomes.
3. Use reliable and valid evaluation methods, appropriate to the program goals and objectives, to support continuous local program improvement.
4. Share evaluation findings and recommendations with participating families, staff, community and statewide collaborators, the local school district, and state and federal legislative representatives.

Scoring

Exceeds Expectations	4 standards met
Meets Expectations	3 standards met
Technical Assistance Required	2 or fewer standards met

Narrative Explanation

General Program Design and Administration Conclusions

The General Program Design and Administration component *<meets, exceeds or needs technical assistance>* the FLIPQs and *is/is not* cited as a program strength.

Summary of Program Strengths

Narrative...

Conclusions and Recommendations

Narrative supported by discrete evidence presented under each program component. Key questions answered in this section are:

- ✓ *Does this program demonstrate adequate yearly progress towards the FLIPQ's? (In what areas? If not, what are the targeted areas in need of technical assistance?)*
- ✓ *Did the program improve since the previous funding years?*
- ✓ *If YES, then what specific aspects of the program were improved?*
- ✓ *What are the impacts of these programmatic improvements?*
- ✓ *Did the Even Start program successfully promote children's and adults' language and literacy learning?*
- ✓ *Were families most in need of intensive literacy services served to the extent that they were able to achieve their educational and work related goals?*
- ✓ *What are the barriers to success that impeded progress in any given area?*

Recommendations are grounded by the data. Evaluators are encouraged to discuss these recommendations with the coordinator to determine whether or not they are feasible given the current resources. A formal action plan (with a time table, identified resources (ex., LIFT site visits with TA Plan form completed) should be drawn up within 30 days of receipt of the final report.

Appendix A

Accommodations Needed for Providing High-Quality and Intensive Services to Families in Which the Children are in Grade School or the Adults are Employed

Andrew E. Hayes, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus

University of North Carolina-Wilmington

Distinguished Board Member, National Center for Family Literacy

April 2010

Used with Permission

First, if the adults are unemployed, or for other reasons can participate in services during the normal school day, and have school-age children, then only minor variations in the original Kenan or Even Start models are required. The complicating factor when implementing a four-component integrated model, most commonly thought of as “the Kenan Model,” for school-age children has been the PACT time (parents and children together) component, in which children meet as a group in their common location and

their parents came into that setting to work with their own child or children. In grade school, it often proves difficult to have a single class time when the children from the various families can meet together, especially when they might be at different ages and grades and in classes throughout the school. This approach to PACT time (all the parents meeting together as a group and working with their own children) has been common among four-component family literacy models and represented the “conventional wisdom” that it is best to have parents work with their own child as they try to learn new principles and ways of working with their children.

However, that approach is not essential, nor does it conform well to the best principles of instructional design for selection of content for learning. According to those design standards, the content for learning new principles should present as few distracting features as possible. However, if a parent and child are trying to work together within the school, all of their history of experiences and relationships and ways of working together, *good or bad, positive or negative*, come into their attempt to work together during PACT time. Instructional design principles indicate that if parents are learning a new principle for working with their child, then *initial* learning probably would occur best with simulated examples followed by practice with children *other than their own*. Once the principle has been learned and used successfully in simulated experiences and with other children, then it can be practiced with their own child following careful planning with the program staff. The application of the principle with their own child could be done outside of the program context including in the home or during visits to their child’s classroom. That experience applying the principle with their own children would then be the subject for reflection in the next meeting with the adults in which they analyze critically what they had planned to do, what they thought their child’s responses would be, what they actually did, how their child responded, and why they think any differences from planned or expected actions or outcomes might have occurred. That critical analysis would then be followed by a new cycle of attempts to implement the principle in another setting with their own child or children. That “plan-do-review” cycle would continue until there was confidence among the adults that they can use the new principle in their daily life.

It is important to add here that it is equally important to teach children to engage adults who are using principles and practices that are being learned by their parents before they are asked to engage their own parents when they are trying to learn those new practices or principles. Ideally, both the parents and the children would learn to expect and behave consistently with the new principles or practices before they were put together to engage each other with their use.

In summary, in a grade-school-based context, the children do not need to meet together in a single class setting for PACT time. Rather, the adults can go into selected classrooms and practice their new skills with other children while they are also doing other important work in those classrooms, such as tutoring, reading to the children, or doing other work that is planned with their teachers. Generalization of the skills can follow with their own children outside of the schooling context, and that experience followed by a review with

their teacher. This plan-do-review cycle will continue until the skills have been acquired and the practice is adopted.

On the other hand, if parents are employed with a work schedule that does not permit participating in a family literacy program during the operating time of schooling for their children, then hard and important decisions must be made by service providers about whether a comprehensive four-part family literacy program can be implemented well enough to meet design standards. The program that is ultimately designed and implemented must meet the standards for serving effectively important needs and goals of those who enroll. An hour or two a day for a few days each week or month probably cannot meet an extensive set of needs and goals for “the most needy” as described for Even Start models. Therefore, the needs and goals that are selected for addressing must be ones that can be achieved reasonably by the services that can actually be delivered to families with adults who are employed. If all that can be delivered is a high quality adult education program, then that should be provided, but only for those for whom that is an appropriate service for achieving important goals. If an occasional parenting meeting is all that can be held, then enroll only those people for whom that is an appropriate intervention and set goals that are appropriate for the low intensity and duration of those services. If there cannot be sufficient intervention relating to some of the goals of a comprehensive family literacy program, then those components should not be offered and there should be no claim that those goals are being addressed.

An hour or two a day for a few days each week or month probably cannot meet the needs and goals for “the most needy” ...

The needs and goals that are selected must be ones that can be addressed reasonably by the services that can actually be delivered to families with adults who are employed.

If there cannot be sufficient intervention relating to some of the goals of a comprehensive family literacy program, then those components should not be offered and there should be no claim that those goals are being addressed.