

FIRST 5
Sacramento Commission
EVALUATION COMMITTEE
2750 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 330
Sacramento, CA 95833

AGENDA

Monday **March 15, 2010** **1:00 PM**

Members: Robert Bonar, Terry Jones, Marcie Launey, Scott Moak, Marilyn Ratkay

Staff: Toni Moore, Carmen Garcia-Gomez

Consultants: Fred Molitor, Lisa Branton, Gary Resnick

Clerk: Cheryl Rookwood

1. Approve February 22, 2010 Draft Action Summary (*5 minutes*)
2. Commission Staff Update (*5 minutes*)
3. Results of Strategic Plan Discussion and Impact on Evaluation Plan (*10 minutes*)
4. *Proposed Procedure for Funding Requests outside of Scheduled Funding Process (10 minutes)*
5. [WRMA Monthly Progress Report](#) (*5 minutes*)
6. CTK Proposal Discussion (*30 minutes*)
7. Committee Member Comments (*5 minutes*)
 - a. Miscellaneous
 - b. Future Agenda Items
8. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Matters (*5 minutes*)

The meeting is voice recorded in its entirety. A CD will be available for checkout from the First 5 Sacramento Commission offices at 2750 Gateway Oaks Dr., Suite 330, Sacramento, the day after the meeting.

The on-line version of the agenda and associated materials are posted for your convenience at <http://www.first5sacramento.net/default.htm>. Some documents may not have been posted on-line because of their size and/or format. As they become available, hard copies of all documents are available from the Clerk of the Commission at the First 5 Sacramento Commission offices.



Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc.

Contract #06/07-ADM-031

First 5 Sacramento Evaluation

Monthly Progress Report for:
February 2010

March 2, 2010

Prepared for:

First 5 Sacramento Commission

Prepared by:

Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc.

2720 Gateway Oaks Dr., Suite 250

Sacramento, CA 95833

fmolitor@wrma.com

916-239-4020, ext. 246

First 5 Sacramento Evaluation Contract

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The Sacramento County First 5 Commission has contracted (Contract #06/07-ADM-031) with the team of Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc. and Harder+Company Community Research for evaluation services during the 2007-2010 period. For this deliverables-based contract, our team submits monthly progress reports as a key communication tool for all concerned stakeholders. In the monthly progress report we identify the status of major deliverables in the contract. We also preview deliverables that are expected to be submitted in the subsequent month and identify key questions or challenges that need to be resolved.

For this work period, our primary activities related to Tasks 3, 5, and 6.

SECTION II: WORK PLAN

The work under this contract is organized according to the following tasks.

- Task 1 Strategic Planning Activities
- Task 2 Evaluation Design, Scope and Report
- Task 3 Funding Processes
- Task 4 Contract Negotiations
- Task 5 Evaluation Support, Planning, Collecting and Reporting
- Task 6 Data Collection Management System, Outcomes Collection, Analysis and Reporting
- Task 7 First 5 Sacramento Commission Evaluation Annual Report
- Task 8 State Evaluation and First 5 California Annual Report

SECTION III: PROGRESS

Task 1 Strategic Planning Activities

Scheduled Period of Activity: Phase 2/Year 3 & 4

Deliverables: Monthly Progress Reports

Status: Completed

Task 2 Evaluation Design, Scope and Report

Scheduled Period of Activity: Phase 1/Year 1 & Phase 2/Year 2 & 3

Deliverable 1: Draft Evaluation Design Report

Deliverable 2: Final Evaluation Design Report

Deliverable 3: Evaluation Design Report (Year II)

Deliverable 4: Evaluation Design Report (Year III)

Status: Completed

Task 3 Funding Processes

Scheduled Period of Activity: Phase 2/Year 2

Deliverables: Monthly Project Reports

The Project Director continues to review and score the applications submitted to First 5 Sacramento.

Task 4 Contract Negotiations

Scheduled Period of Activity: Phase 1/Year 1

Deliverable: Completed

Task 5 Evaluation Support, Planning, Collecting and Reporting

Scheduled Period of Activity: Phase 1/Year 1 & Phase 2/Year 2, 3 & 4

Deliverable: Monthly Progress Reports

The Project Director attended a meeting of Debra Payne and Julie Field, and Martha Hass and Alicia Blanco of Child Protective Services, on February 2 to discuss issues related to consent and obtaining demographic, service, and outcome data. The outcomes of this meeting include that children would be entered into Persimmony by unique client identification number rather than name, and the family would be excluded from the Parent Interview. In addition, demographic information on each child would not be collected using the Family Intake Form, but the specific data elements eventually entered into Persimmony would match those on the form.

The dates of March 16 and 17 were identified at the February 18 School Readiness Coordinators' meeting as ideal for holding the two, one-day Child Assessment trainings. The trainings will be conducted at the First 5 Sacramento office by Gary Resnick. We have asked that all school staff who will be assessing children participate in these trainings, even those who were trained last year.

On February 23 and 24 we conducted the training of field staff for the 2010 Parent Interview. As noted in the February 2010 Evaluation Newsletter, our team includes three returning field interviewers, and two new field interview staff.

On February 24 the Project Director attended the Strategic Planning Work Group meeting. Since this meeting WRMA staff have completed the one action item related to a brief description of the evaluation design, and we are currently updating the Trends report for the March 10 Work Group meeting.

On February 25 we met with Julie Field to discuss proposed changes to the evaluation. We have outlined these changes in the attached memo and stress the importance of getting the Evaluation Committee's approval of these changes as soon as possible.

On February 25 the Project Director attended a meeting including Jennifer Kwan and Joil Xiong. At this meeting the slides for the March 8 presentation to the First 5 Sacramento Commission were reviewed, and strategies for obtaining data to address the *Health Access* indicators (other than the Parent Interview) were reviewed.

Task 6 Data Collection Management System, Outcomes Collection, Analysis and Reporting

Scheduled Period of Activity: Phase 1/Year 1 & Phase 2/Year 2, 3 & 4

Deliverables: Monthly and Quarterly Progress Reports

Per the request of Carmen Garcia-Gomez, the Data Manager made small changes to one contract milestone for Natomas Unified School District and one milestone for Elk Grove Unified School District. In follow-up, the Data Manager provided training to Kendra Shelton at Natomas to explain how to calculate and report the new data requested.

The Data Manager worked with Sacramento City Unified School District to migrate data from various fields to new data fields. Upon completion of the migration, the Data Manager modified the “service site” data field options to contain only school site names.

Julie Field requested that we develop a table to display all clients served in fiscal year 2008/09 by zip code and contractor. This table was sent to Julie on February 5.

Task 7 Annual First 5 Sacramento Evaluation Report

Scheduled Period of Activity: Phase 2/Year 3 & 4

Deliverables 1: Annual First 5 Sacramento Evaluation Report (Year 3)

Status: Completed

Deliverables 2: Annual First 5 Sacramento Evaluation Report (Year 4)

Status: Completed

Task 8 State Annual Report

Scheduled Period of Activity: Phase 2/Year 2, 3 & 4

Deliverables 1: Annual First 5 Sacramento Evaluation Report (Year 2)

Deliverables 2: Annual First 5 Sacramento Evaluation Report (Year 3)

Deliverables 3: Annual First 5 Sacramento Evaluation Report (Year 4)

Status: Completed

SECTION V: WORK TO BE PERFORMED IN THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD

Task 5 Evaluation Support, Planning, Collecting and Reporting

Key Tasks:

- Implement two-year follow-up Parent Interview.
- March Evaluation Newsletter.
- Retrieve consent forms.

Task 6 Data Collection Management System, Outcomes Collection, Analysis and Reporting

Key Tasks:

- Provide additional Persimmony training to contractor

SECTION VI: KEY CHALLENGES OR QUESTIONS TO BE RESOLVED

- None to report.

Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc

To: Evaluation Committee Members

From: Fred Molitor

Date: March 2, 2010

Subject: Proposed Changes to Evaluation, 2010 through 2015

As discussed in our proposal for evaluation services, fiscal years 2010 through 2015, we recommend that decisions and activities related to changes to the current evaluation design be completed as soon as possible to facilitate the initiation of the revised, IRB-approved evaluation on July 1, 2010. Toward this end we met with Julie Field on February 25 to obtain her feedback on proposed modifications to the current protocol and forms before her maternity leave; each of the following items she supported:

1. **Notification of WRMA staff of scheduled contract negotiation meetings.** These meetings provide an excellent opportunity for WRMA staff to meet provider staff, and discuss ongoing evaluation activities and introduce new changes to the protocol and forms. In addition, they provide information beneficial for developing contract milestones and determining which services should be reported at the client-level. At a minimum, we hope to accompany First 5 Sacramento staff to one (the final) contract negotiation meeting, however there is value to attending all contract negotiation meetings, and on February 25 we requested that Julie remind planners and analysts to let us know when these meetings are being scheduled so we can plan accordingly.
2. **Consent form(s).** WRMA's IRB has requested some changes to the current consent form. These are relatively minor and include identifying the number of families we anticipate recruiting per year, and a brief explanation of WRMA. WRMA's IRB will also require a separate consent form for the Parent Interview. We plan to send the randomly selected parents this form by mail soon after sampling and contacting them by phone to verify a mailing address. Field interviewers will obtain the signed form before face-to-face interviews; the telephone interview would not take place until the signed form was returned by the parent. Both the revised intake and Parent Interview consent forms are attached to this memo for your review.
3. **Doing away with the Teen Assent and Grandparent Consent forms.** Consenting non-emancipated minors has turned out to be a very time-consuming activity with very limited return. Lisa and provider staff have spent a lot of time following-up to obtain all the necessary documentation (signed Teen assent and Grandparent consent forms) for valid consent of teen parents. Of the 466 teen parents, less than two-thirds have valid consent information to date. Our recommendation is that we classify non-emancipated minor as ineligible for the evaluation. This will also cut down on the logistics associated with distributing and retrieving an increasing number of consent forms between WRMA and providers, especially in light of the new Parent Interview consent form. We still plan to include emancipated minors in the evaluation, which currently number 27 clients.
4. **Family Intake Form.** Attached is a revised version of the Family Intake Form. Changes include a simplified method for recording parent and child race/ethnicity, and greater emphasis placed on the importance of obtaining contact information. We have excluded from the form the item related to dental insurance and replaced it with items to assess

reading and book sharing. These School Readiness-related questions would be used to conduct within and between group comparisons among School Readiness families. Finally, the items related to children's special needs remains on the form, but we have eliminated the subsequent response options that asked parents to select the specific type of special need.

5. **Measuring complete immunizations among 2 and 5 year olds.** We are exploring the possibility of giving Parent Interview parents a mock immunization card prior to the interview to identify those immunizations the child has received. One option is to mail the card to parents along with the Parent Interview consent form. This could represent an improvement in the measurement for the *Health Access* indicator, depending on how many parents have the child's real immunization card available. We would, however, continue to include the current questions on the Parent Interview instrument.
6. **Measuring CBI attendance.** Identifying parents who have attended a CBI event involves a number of time-consuming activities: The related section on the Parent Interview instrument is lengthy, the master list of CBI events is developed from grantee reports and missing information identified and communicated to First 5 Sacramento staff, and reported versus actual CBI events must be carefully compared event-by-event. An alternative methodology would be to provide CBI grantees with some items for distribution to all who attend each event supported by First 5 Sacramento. This item, such as a paint and brush set for children, would have to be exclusive to CBI events and would have the First 5 Sacramento logo. Furthermore, the linchpin to this methodology would be making sure that each CBI grantee is instructed to distribute this item to attendees, a sufficient number of items make their way to the grantees, and the grantees actually distribute the items. CBI attendance would be verified by asking the parent during the Parent Interview if they have ever received the selected item. On February 25 Julie indicated that since First 5 Sacramento staff rarely meet face-to-face with grantees, these items would have to be distributed by mail. Thus, this proposed methodology would shift the time and cost associated with the CBI evaluation from WRMA to First 5 Sacramento. If this new approach appears to be feasible and is approved by the Evaluation Committee, we would still assess CBI attendance through the current methodology, at least for the 2011 Parent Interview. We know that Julie has discussed this approach with Linda and Myel, as we look forward to further investigating this option for the forthcoming evaluation cycle.

We request the Evaluation Committee's feedback on these items at the March 15 meeting. We then propose to develop a brief evaluation design document, which would also include new measures for the forthcoming Parent Interviews, for review and approval at the April 19 meeting. This would give us time to conduct the following activities prior to July 1, 2010:

- Finalize a revised Parent Interview.
- Finalize an intake consent form.
- Finalize a Parent Interview consent form.
- Finalize a revised Family Intake Form.
- Develop an application for IRB approval.
- Revise the methodology and forms per IRB.
- Submit the consent forms for review and approval by County Counsel.
- Translate the consents and Family Intake Form.
- Duplicate the consents and Family Intake Form.

- Distribute the consents and Family Intake Form.
- Inform provider staff of the changes to the evaluation protocol and forms at contract negotiation meetings, consent and intake trainings, through Evaluation Newsletters, and at the April 16 Quarterly Contractor Forum.

WRMA

Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc.

Six Month Report

For the period to February 28, 2010

Prepared for:

First 5 Sacramento Commission
2750 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 330
Sacramento, CA 95833

Prepared by:

Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc.
2720 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 250
Sacramento, CA 95833

February 28, 2010

Six Month Report

Prepared for:

First 5 Sacramento Commission
2750 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 330
Sacramento, CA 95833

Prepared by:

Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc.
2720 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 250
Sacramento, CA 95833

February 28, 2010

WRMA

In this report we present evaluation activities for the second year of the Cycle 2 School Readiness evaluation through February 2010. First, the Parent Survey data collection and preliminary data for fall 2009 is reviewed, followed by the Preschool Bridging Model (PBM) Teacher/Provider Survey fall 2009 preliminary analysis. Lastly, an overview of the spring 2010 data collection preparation and timeline is summarized.

Cycle 2 School Readiness Parent Survey

In fall 2009, the second cohort of 450 families was sampled for year two of the Cycle 2 School Readiness evaluation. The majority of parents recruited completed the Parent Survey, a self report instrument that asks parents about their parenting practices, stress, and emotional support. The purpose of the fall Parent Survey is to collect baseline data from parents early on or before they receive School Readiness services. A follow-up survey will be administered in spring to assess changes over time.

Sampling

The Parent Survey sampling pool included all families in Persimmony who enrolled in a Cycle 2 School Readiness program and consented for the evaluation since July 1, 2009. Compared to the 2008/09 Parent Survey, this year's sampling included 126 more families, for a total of 450 families. The increase from 54 to 75 families per district was based on the attrition rate from the previous fiscal year and increased the probability that each district would include at least 25 families with children ages 4 to 5 years.

Recruitment Rate

From October 16 to November 17, a total of 407 Parent Surveys were completed, resulting in an overall recruitment rate of 96.0% (Table 1). This rate was based on the number of completed surveys out of the number of eligible families sampled for participation.

Table 1. Recruitment Rate of School Readiness Parent Survey, Fall 2009

District	Complete	Incomplete	Refused	Unable to Locate	Ineligible	Recruitment Rate
Elk Grove	68	2	0	1	4	95.8%
Folsom Cordova	60	5	0	2	8	89.6%
Robla	65	1	0	1	8	97.0%
Sac City	74	0	1	0	0	98.7%
San Juan	69	0	1	1	4	97.2%
Twin Rivers	71	1	0	1	2	97.3%
Total	407	9	2	6	26	96.0%

Ineligible families were those who moved out of the district. Incomplete surveys represent contacted, eligible parents who did not fill out a survey. After multiple attempts to contact parents, those with disconnected numbers and no confirmation that the family moved outside the district, were considered “unable to locate.” Parents who verbally declined to participate were noted as “refused.”

Preliminary Data

New features to the fall 2009 Parent Survey data collection, compared to fall 2008, included the timing of the administration of the survey and an additional question regarding book sharing. In the “Evaluation of School Readiness Services, Fiscal Year 2008/2009” report, we suggest that the limited period of time between the fall and spring Parent Surveys may have diminished the chance of detecting significant changes in parent outcomes. Data collection in fall 2009 began a month earlier than in fall 2008, and as seen in Table 2, the 2009 cohort of parents reported a lower reading frequency and duration, compared to the 2008 cohort. This expected decrease supports the assumption that parents early in enrollment of School Readiness services would read less often and for less time compared to parents who had the opportunity to be exposed to School Readiness programs (i.e., encouraged to read to child) for a longer period of time.

Table 2. Preliminary Parent Survey Analysis, Fall 2008 & Fall 2009

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009
Family read to child every day during past week	42.7%	38.8%
Family book share with child every day during past week		43.4%
Average number of minutes family read to child per sitting	23.7	23.0
Average number of activities with child in past week out of 10	9.0	9.0
Average number of activities with child in past month out of 5	2.9	3.2
Percent of parents who reported never or rarely spank child	84.3%	85.1%
Average Prosocial discipline score	3.1	3.1
Average Harsh discipline score	1.7	1.6
Percent received development/behavior screening in past year	26.4%	23.8%
Percent of children with special needs who have an IEP or IFSP	46.2%	47.1%
Average Emotional Support score, higher # = higher support	3.9	3.9
Average Parental Stress score, higher # = higher stress	2.3	2.2

Figures in bold represent Parent Survey findings significantly lower in fall 2009 compared with fall 2008.

In fall 2009, Doris Reese, School Readiness Coordinator for Sacramento City, brought to us the concern of possibly bypassing the low literate parent population, who are encouraged to “book share” with their children, in the data that reflects the amount of time parents spend reading to their children. With half of the districts already distributing their Parent Surveys, the surveys for the remaining districts were changed to include the question “How many times have you or someone in your family spent time book sharing or book cuddling (opening up a book, looking at pictures) with your child in the past week?” Table 2 shows a greater percent of parents who book share daily with their child compared to parents who read daily to their child. This supports that the book sharing question includes not only parents who read to their child, but also parents who

spend time looking over books with their child even if they do not, or are not able, to read the story.

Preschool Bridging Model Teacher/Provider Survey

The Sacramento County Office of Education piloted the Teacher/Provider Survey for their Preschool Bridging Model (PBM) program in spring 2009. This 2009/10 fiscal year, the new cohort of teachers and child care providers assisted by PBM staff to improve the quality of care for children attending their facilities will participate in the pre-post (fall/spring) Teacher Provider Survey. This measure will be used to assess changes over time in teachers'/providers' beliefs and practices, educational attainment and goals, and classroom quality and curriculum.

Fall 2009 data collection included 102 teachers/providers from 100 private child care facilities assisted by PBM. The majority of sites receiving PBM services were family child care homes, followed by preschools (Table 3).

Table 3. Types of Facilities Served by PBM Specialist, Fall 2009

	%
Family Child Care Home	41.2
Preschool	36.3
Child Care Center	14.7
Pre-kindergarten	14.7

The Preschool Bridging Model strategy includes promoting workforce development and program improvement in child care settings. Teachers'/providers' baseline knowledge or participation in professional development trainings or education programs is presented in Table 4. Reports of having a child development permit, current enrollment in teaching related training, professional association member, and knowledge and participation of CARES were expectedly lower compared to the teachers/providers who participated in the 2009 Teacher/Provider Survey pilot last spring. The follow-up survey for this year's cohort will occur about 8 months after working with PBM specialists, and improvements in professional development will then be assessed.

Table 4. PBM Teachers'/Providers Responses to Education Questions, Fall 2009

	%
ECE Degree, BA or Higher	10.8
CDA Credential	7.8
Child Development Permit	27.5
Currently Enrolled in Teaching Related Training	25.5
Member of a Professional Association	13.7
Heard of CARES	68.6
Participant of CARES	10.8

One indicator of environment quality is the number of activity areas a child care facility provides for the children in the classroom; five or more is considered to contribute a high quality classroom. Over two-thirds (76.5%) of PBM sites had at least 5 different learning centers in their classroom. Teachers/providers were asked which of 9 learning centers they offer to children in their classroom. The percent of facilities that provide each activity center is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. PBM Teachers'/Providers' Responses to Number of Activity Centers in Classroom, Fall 2009

	%
Reading area	93.1
Dramatic play area	86.3
Art area	80.4
Writing center	75.5
Private area for one or two children to be alone	65.7
Math area	62.7
Science area	58.8
Computer area	34.3
Listening center	33.3

Greater parent involvement in the child's classroom has been shown to relate to preliteracy development. Teachers/providers indicated a number of methods they initiate in their class to keep involved with the parents including conducting "regular parent-teacher conferences" and "keeping written notes on information from the parent-teacher conference." Out of the 6 methods possible, the average parent-teacher communication score was 2.4, indicating the average teacher used at least 2 methods to involve parents (Table 6). Teacher/providers were also asked to indicate a number of activities parents participate in to keep involved in the classroom, such as "volunteering or helping in classrooms" and "observing in classrooms for at least 30 minutes at a time." The average parent involvement score was 2.6 out of 6, indicating on average parents participated in at least 2 of the 6 participation activities (Table 6).

Table 6. PBM Teachers'/Providers' Responses to Parent Involvement Questions, Fall 2009

	Average Score
Parent-Teacher Communication Score	2.4
Parent Involvement Score	2.6

Spring 2010 Timeline and Data Collection

Timeline

Spring data collection activities for the Cycle 2 School Readiness evaluation consists of the direct Child Assessment, Teacher Child Report, follow-up Parent Survey, district Teacher/Provider Survey, and follow-up PBM Teacher/Provider Survey. The proposed timeline of activities are presented in Figure 1. These dates, which were developed by reviewing each school district’s 2010 calendar and the dates the spring 2009 evaluation activities took place, will be presented to School Readiness Coordinators for feedback and approval. All schools will be closed for one week at the end of March, with the exception of Robla Preschool which will be out through April 9.

Figure 1. Proposed Timeline for School Readiness, Spring 2010

	March				April					May				June
	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7	Week 8	Week 9	Week 10	Week 11	Week 12	Week 13	Week 14
	3/1 to 3/5	3/8 to 3/12	3/15 to 3/19	3/22 to 3/26	3/29 to 4/2	4/5 to 4/9	4/12 to 4/16	4/19 to 4/23	4/26 to 4/30	5/3 to 5/7	5/10 to 5/14	5/17 to 5/21	5/24 to 5/28	5/31 to 6/4
Child Assessment Training														
Child Assessment														
Parent Survey														
TCR														
Teacher/Provider Survey														

Shaded areas represent periods of time when tasks could take place; actual duration may be shorter than specified.
 Week of March 29 – April 2 is spring break for most schools.

Data Collection Preparation

Current preparation for spring data collection includes reviewing and modifying the surveys and distribution lists. Survey modification will reduce the time parents and teachers need to complete the survey but still retain the core information collected. For example, demographic information such as ethnicity on the baseline survey would be removed from the follow-up survey. The distribution lists to School Readiness Coordinators, which include the parent and child names to be recruited, are organized in specific order unique to each School Readiness Coordinator’s request. The varying list organization, either by name, school or language, will aid in efficient location of children and distributing the list to teachers and staff. This will also occur for the distribution of Target cards for parents as requested by School Readiness Coordinators.

One component of the evaluation includes a direct cognitive assessment of the 4 and 5 year-old children from families who completed the Parent Survey in fall 2009. This assessment will be administered by school staff who have completed a Child Assessment training. The proposed training dates are for the week of March 15. The evaluation team will coordinate training times and locations with School Readiness Coordinators’ that best accommodate the school staff’s

schedules. If needed, multiple training dates will be offered to optimize training availability for school staff.

Children recruited for the cognitive Child Assessment and social-emotional Teacher Child Report measure will be sampled from the fall 2009 participating families. Table 7 displays the number of 4 and 5 year old children to be sampled in each district. Although increasing the original number of families sampled for each district from 54 to 75 attempted to acquire at least 25 children ages 4 to 5 years for each district, Folsom Cordova only had 23 families with 4 and 5 year old children participate in the fall. This could be due to the types of School Readiness services that Folsom Cordova provides, in that they serve a greater number of younger children, such as in playgroups, than other districts that have preschool programs for older children.

Table 7. Number of 4 and 5 Year Old Children to be Sampled for Child Assessment in Each District, Spring 2010

District	4-5 Year Olds
Elk Grove	47
Folsom Cordova	23
Robla	30
Sac City	41
San Juan	30
Twin Rivers	46
Total	217

Spring analysis will compare baseline and follow-up parent reports of parenting practices, stress and emotional support; child cognitive and social-emotional outcomes to services; teacher/provider beliefs and practices among public school districts; and changes in teacher/provider beliefs and practices participating in the PBM strategy.



EVALUATION NEWSLETTER

February 2010

2010 Parent Interview

2010 marks the two-year follow-up for our Parent Interview. In February we conducted our annual preparations for this three-year longitudinal survey, which included posting and screening for field interviewers. We also conducted our comprehensive two-day training of the selected field interviewer staff on February 23 and 24. This training included an extensive review of the Parent Interview instrument and a number of practice sessions to ensure that the interviewers were comfortable with administering the instrument before interviewing First 5 Sacramento parents. We hope to interview over 400 parents by the end of May, and will again be giving every parent who agrees to participate in the Parent Interview a \$20 Target gift card.

Our interviewers include Janet Aguirre (bi-lingual Spanish; WRMA staff), Cinthya Ammerman (bi-lingual Spanish), and Kathleen Elliott. Janet and Kathleen interviewed First 5 Sacramento parents in 2008, and all three interviewed parents in 2009. The remainder of the interview team is Xong Thao (bi-lingual Hmong) and Emiliya Russu (bi-lingual Russian).

2010 Child Assessment

Spring of 2010 marks the second year of the Child Assessment for the Cycle 2 School Readiness evaluation. The School Readiness Coordinators and evaluation team staff have identified March 16 and 17 for the training on administering the assessment. The training will again be conducted by Gary Resnick from Harder+Company Community Research. The data from the Child Assessment turned out to be the centerpiece of the fiscal year 2008/09 School

Readiness report. This year we hope to assess a greater number of children, which will allow us to expand our analyses in relation to services.

Additional 2008/09 Evaluation Findings

Following are some additional findings from our 2008/09 annual report, which is available as a PDF document on the First 5 Sacramento website.

Bright Futures Services: Bright Futures services were provided at five community events during the year, attracting 10,636 children and adults. A total of 449 dental, 135 vision, 110 hearing, and 72 developmental screenings were offered at no-cost to families of children ages 0 to 5 years at these events.

Children's Health Insurance: As you know, the Family Intake Form asks parents whether their child has health insurance. Of the 14,878 children received First 5 Sacramento services during the year, 16% did not have health insurance at enrollment. This translates into roughly 2,400 children without health insurance. The findings from our Parent Interview showed that, over time, the proportion of First 5 Sacramento families without health insurance decreased to 6%. In other words, through direct services by Cover the Kids or/and through referrals by other providers, about 1,500 children were able to get health insurance after enrollment into First 5 Sacramento services.

Linkages to Community Resources: The percent of services in the community obtained through the assistance of First 5 Sacramento provider staff increased significantly from 18% to 22% over a year's time.

THE EVALUATION TEAM:

The evaluators of First 5 Sacramento represent a team from Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc. (Sacramento) and Harder+Company Community Research (Davis). The evaluation team is dedicated to assessing the impact of First 5 Sacramento services on families throughout Sacramento, while minimizing the amount of time that contractors have to spend on evaluation activities. Please call us if you have any questions about the evaluation of First 5 Sacramento services: WRMA 916.239.4020; H+Co 530.757.8420.



Consent to Participate in the Evaluation of the First 5 Sacramento's Programs

First 5 Sacramento supports many programs to help improve the health and development of young children and families in Sacramento County. First 5 Sacramento has asked a company called Walter R. McDonald & Associates (WRMA) to study these programs. WRMA is located in Sacramento and studies many programs that improve the lives of children and families.

This form asks your consent to include information in the study about you and the child(ren) you care for as parent, guardian, or person with legal custody. Your participation is voluntary. All information about you will remain confidential, meaning that only the staff working here at this service provider and those conducting the study will see you or your child(ren)'s names. About 10,000 parents like you will sign this form every year over the next 5 years. If you do not want you or your child(ren)'s information to be in the study, you and your child(ren) will still be eligible for services.

Procedures

- You will be asked some questions about you and your child(ren) on a Family Intake Form. These questions include you and your child(ren)'s race/ethnicity and the languages you speak. This information helps to let WRMA know the number and types of families who receive First 5 Sacramento services.
- The Family Intake Form also asks for your name, address, and telephone number(s). WRMA will use this information to contact over 1,000 First 5 Sacramento parents in the future. These parents will be asked to participate in one or two interviews that will last about one hour. If you are contacted and agree to participate in an interview, you will receive a \$20 Target gift card.
- This First 5 Sacramento service provider will give WRMA information about you related to the number and types of services you receive.
- You don't have to be in this study. At any time you can tell someone at this First 5 Sacramento service provider that you want to stop being in the study. If you are one of the 1,000 parents contacted by WRMA and ask to be interviewed, you can say no.

Benefits: Your participation in the study may help to improve First 5 Sacramento's services for children and families.

Risks of Harm: This First 5 Sacramento service provider and WRMA will do all they can to keep your information private. The only time WRMA would share your information is if we believe you or your child(ren) were in danger of being hurt, you were a danger to someone else, or a court orders it. Information such as your child(ren)'s name will never be used in reports.

Questions: If you have questions about this form or this study, please contact Julie Field of First 5 Sacramento at (916) 876-6526 or Fred Molitor at WRMA (916) 239-4020 ext. 246.

My signature below indicates that I am the person who has authority to release information about my child(ren). I agree that information about me and the child(ren) that I care for will be included in the above study.

I am the ___ parent
___ guardian
___ an adult receiving services other than a parent/guardian

Names of Children Age 5 and Under:

Signature: _____

Today's Date: ___-__-__

Printed Name: _____



Consent to Participate in the Parent Interview

A few weeks ago you agreed to allow information about you and your child(ren) to be included in the evaluation of First 5 Sacramento services. This information included you and your child(ren)'s race/ethnicity and the languages you speak. We also asked that you give us your address and phone in case we randomly selected your name to participate in an interview.

You are one of the 1,000 parents we will select at random to participate in an interview over the next three years.

The purpose of the interview is to learn more about how First 5 Sacramento programs provide different kinds of services to children and families, and more about the programs attended by any of your children who are 5 years or younger. We want to talk with you so we can understand First 5 Sacramento programs from a parent's point of view, including some information about your children's experiences. Information from this interview will be used to help First 5 Sacramento better serve all children and their families.

No one from the program or from First 5 Sacramento will see or hear your answers. All of the study results will be reported for groups of parents; no results will be analyzed or reported for individuals. Your decision to participate in the interview is completely voluntary.

Procedures

- If you agree to participate in this interview, a member of our evaluation team will call you to schedule the interview. The interview will be conducted at a place that works best for you. This could be where you live, or at another place such as a fast food restaurant or local library. We can also ask you the interview questions over the phone if you decide you would rather be interviewed that way.
- You will be asked questions about yourself and your child(ren). Questions about you will include things like the types of activities you do with your child(ren). Questions about your child(ren) will include things like when they last went to the doctor.
- You don't have to participate in the interview if you do not want to. If you decided not to be interviewed, you and your child(ren) can still receive First 5 Sacramento services.
- If you decide to participate in the interview, you can refuse to answer any questions.
- The interview will last about 45 minutes.
- You will receive a \$20 gift card from Target for participating in the interview, even if you decide to not answer all questions. If you decide to participate in the interview over the phone, the \$20 Target gift card will be mailed to you.
- If you participate in the interview, we will be contacting you in about a year and ask you to participate again; answering the same set of questions. We will also contact you one final time in 2014 and ask you to participate a third time. You can say no to the second or third interview if you want to. Each time you participate in one of our interviews you will get a \$20 gift card from Target.

Benefits: Your participation in the interview may help to improve First 5 Sacramento's services for children and families.

Risks of Harm: WRMA staff do all they can to keep your information private. The only time WRMA would share your information is if we believe you or your child(ren) were in danger of being hurt, you were a danger to someone else, or a court orders it.

Questions: If you have questions about this form or this interview, please contact Julie Field of First 5 Sacramento at (916) 876-6526 or Fred Molitor at WRMA (916) 239-4020 ext. 246.

My signature below indicates that I agree to participate in the interview and that information about me and the child(ren) that I care for will be included in the above study.

Signature: _____

Today's Date: ____--____--____

Printed Name: _____



Family Intake Form

PARENT/LEGAL GUARDIAN/ADULT INFORMATION

First Name: _____ **Middle:** _____

Last Name: _____

Date of Birth (month\day\year) ____ \ ____ \ ____

Gender: Male Female  **If female, are you Pregnant?** Yes

Relationship to Child:

Mother (01) Father (02) Grandparent (05) Foster Parent (07) Other Relative (09) Other Adult Not Related (10)

Race/Ethnicity: (select all that apply)

- Hispanic/Latino (01)
- Black/African American (02)
- Alaska Native/American Indian (03)
- Asian Indian (04)
- Chinese (05)
- Filipino (06)
- Vietnamese (07)
- Hmong (08)
- Other Asian (09)
- Native Hawaiian (10)
- Other Pacific Islander (11)
- Russian/Ukrainian (12)
- Other Slavic (13)
- Other White (14)
- Other(16) (please specify): _____

Language Most Comfortable With: (select ONLY one)

- Spanish (01)
- English (02)
- Hmong (03)
- Russian (04)
- Ukrainian (05)
- Vietnamese (06)
- Lao (07)
- Mien (08)
- Tagalog (09)
- Hindi (10)
- Korean (11)
- Cantonese (12)
- Mandarin (13)
- Other(14) (please specify): _____

Contact Information So We Can Reach You:

(This is how we will contact you if you are selected to participate in an interview and get a \$20 Target gift card. Your phone number is very important. Your information will NOT be shared with others.)

Home Phone: (_____) _____ - _____ Cell Phone: (_____) _____ - _____

Another Phone Number: (_____) _____ - _____

Mailing Address: _____ Apartment: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____

TURN PAGE OVER



Complete this form for your child/child you came with, age 5 or under.
More than one child age 5 or under? Ask for additional sheets and complete the back for each child.

CHILD INFORMATION

First Name: _____ **Middle:** _____

Last Name: _____

Date of Birth: (month\day\year) ____ \ ____ \ ____ **Gender:** Male Female

Relationship to You:

Son (03) Daughter (04) Grandchild (06) Foster Child (08) Child (not related) (11)

Race/Ethnicity: (select all that apply)

- Hispanic/Latino (01)
- Black/African American (02)
- Alaska Native/American Indian (03)
- Asian Indian (04)
- Chinese (05)
- Filipino (06)
- Vietnamese (07)
- Hmong (08)
- Other Asian (09)
- Native Hawaiian (10)
- Other Pacific Islander (11)
- Russian/Ukrainian (12)
- Other Slavic (13)
- Other White (14)
- Other (16) (please specify): _____

Language Child Most Often Speaks: (select ONLY one)

- Spanish (01)
- English (02)
- Hmong (03)
- Russian (04)
- Ukrainian (05)
- Vietnamese (06)
- Lao (07)
- Mien (08)
- Tagalog (09)
- Hindi (10)
- Korean (11)
- Cantonese (12)
- Mandarin (13)
- Other (14) (please specify): _____

How many times have you or someone in your family spent time reading or book sharing/cuddling (opening up a book, looking at pictures) with your child in the past week?

Not at all (01) Once or twice (02) Three or more times (03) Every day (04)

About how many minutes per sitting do you or other family members spend reading or book sharing/cuddling to your child?

|__|__| minutes per sitting

Does child have health insurance?

Yes Medi-Cal (01) Healthy Families (02) Healthy Kids (03) Other Insurance (mark this if you don't know type) (04)
 No (05)
 Don't Know If Child Has Insurance (06)

Does child have any special needs or disabilities?

Yes (01) No (02) Don't Know (03)