

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

**AGENDA**

**Monday**

**May 17, 2010**

**1:00 PM**

---

**Members:** Robert Bonar, Marcie Launey, Scott Moak, Marilyn Ratkay

**Advisory Committee Members:** Terry Jones, Betsy Uda

**Staff:** Toni Moore, Carmen Garcia-Gomez

**Consultants:** Fred Molitor, Lisa Branton, Gary Resnick

**Clerk:** Cheryl Rookwood

---

1. Approve April 19, 2010 Draft Action Summary (*5 minutes*)
2. Commission Staff Update (*5 minutes*)
3. [WRMA Monthly Progress Report](#) (*5 minutes*)
4. [Proposed Items to the New Parent Interview](#) (*10 minutes*)
5. Report back: Update of CPS – Hearts For Kids program (*5 minutes*)
6. Update on Dental Clinics (*10 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:  
April 2010

May 4, 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](mailto: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 4, 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

Status: Completed

#### **Task 4 Contract Negotiations**

Scheduled Period of Activity: Phase 1/Year 1

Deliverable: Completed

2010/15 Funding Cycle: The Project Director and Data Manager participated in the following contract negotiation meetings in April: Child Action, Inc (April 8); DHHS WIC (April 8); and Health Education Council (April 12 & 29). These meetings have been especially fruitful as we have gained a valuable understanding of how the services within the various programs interrelate. They have also helped us in other areas, such as identifying what should be included in the new CARES module of Persimmony for Child Action, Inc. and the potential challenge of tracking food stand and food demonstrations for Health Education Council services.

#### **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 status of completed and ongoing data collection activities for the 2009/10 School Readiness evaluation is presented in our Quarterly Report.

The two-year follow-up Parent Interview went extremely well. From March through April we interviewed 315 parents. As noted in our April Evaluation Newsletter, the one-year retention rate for the Parent Interview was 74.9% and the two-year rate was 57.3%.

The Project Manager conducted a presentation at the April 15 Quarterly Contractor Forum which included summarizing the forthcoming changes to the evaluation come July 1.

We are pleased to report that the revised evaluation protocol and forms were approved by WRMA's Institutional Review Board (IRB) on April 20. We subsequently sent the revised Intake Consent Form and Family Intake Form, and new Parent Interview Consent Form to Carmen Garcia-Gomez to forward to Michelle Bach for approval.

The Data Manager participated in a conference call with Martha Haas and Alicia Blanco from Child Protective Services (CPS) on April 16 to begin discussions on how various data will be collected and reported for the evaluation. The discussion included obtaining client-level data for services provided to children. On April 21 the Data Manager had a follow-up call with Program Planners Linda Fong-Somera and Debra Payne as well as Contract Analyst Jennifer Auld to discuss changes to the contract milestones and what would be required for client-level data entry. The Data Manager, First 5 Sacramento staff, and CPS staff met by phone on April 22 to finalize changes to the contract milestones and discuss the client-level data collection and entry. On April 22 the Data Manager distributed the revised, final contract milestones to First 5 Sacramento and CPS staff, and on April 23 sent to Martha Haas of CPS a revised Individual Evaluation Plan and draft service/assessment form.

#### **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

On April 5, the Data Manager trained new Program Administrator staff at Health Education Council in consent/intake procedures and entering client-level data in Persimmony. In addition, training on entering milestone data in Persimmony were provided on April 7 to First 5

Sacramento staff Linda Fong-Somera, and on April 9 to SmileKeepers. On April 14 the Data Manager provided client-level data entry training for the new supervisor of data entry staff at Nurse Family Partnership. The Data Manager also trained a new staff person of Continuing Development Incorporated (CDI) on April 27 in the client-level data entry.

Based upon contract negotiation meetings with Child Action, Inc., and conversations with the Program Planner, the Data Manager has designed some new fields for the CARES module of Persimmony to be used in the upcoming contract period. Persimmony is currently working on developing the fields and making the necessary changes for the CARES module to be fully-functional for the use of Child Action, Inc.

**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:

- Begin to clean and code two-year follow-up Parent Interview data.
- May Evaluation Newsletter.
- Monitor data collection on School Readiness fall Parent Survey, Teacher Child Report, and Teacher/Provider Survey.
- Conduct analyses on Child Assessment data.
- 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.



# EVALUATION NEWSLETTER

April 2010

## ***New CPS Services Funded By First 5 Sacramento Begin Soon***

The First 5 Sacramento Commission has funded Child Protective Services (CPS) to provide medical clearance exams to children entering the children's receiving home. Services will also include home visits while in foster care, including developmental assessments for children. Trainings will be provided for a broad group of caregivers, covering topics such as dental health of children, nutrition, and early childhood development.

## ***Parents' Knowledge of Their Children's Dental Coverage***

The Family Intake Form asks parents to indicate whether their children have health and dental insurance. By comparing the responses to these questions we found that many parents are unaware that they have dental insurance for their children. For example, only 63% of children with Medi-Cal were said by their parents to have dental insurance. In addition, 86% of children with Healthy Families and 79% of children with Healthy Kids were reported by their parents to have dental insurance. Given that health coverage through Medi-Cal, Healthy Families or Healthy Kids typically includes dental insurance, this points to a lack of awareness about all services available to children through these insurance programs. Moreover, our Parent Interview has found that only 59% of First 5 Sacramento children saw a dentist in the previous year. Thus, too few children are seeing a dentist on a regular basis. The availability of dental services through health insurance programs is something that would be beneficial to explain to your clients.

## ***Changes to the School Readiness Evaluation Come July 1***

School Readiness sites are currently completing the last few Child Assessments and have begun to administer the Parent Survey, Teacher Child Report, and Teacher / Provider Survey. The new 2010/13 contract cycle will not include the Parent Survey or the Teacher / Provider Survey. Two important measures on the Parent Survey related to reading and book sharing with children will now be on the Family Intake Form and Parent Interview. This will allow us to examine changes over time in these behaviors among School Readiness families, and to compare levels of reading and book sharing among School Readiness families with those reported among parents from the other Result Areas.

## ***Two-Year Parent Interview Completed***

We have completed the 2010 Parent Interview ahead of schedule with 315 parents interviewed from March through April. A total of 146 parents were interviewed in Spanish, 142 in English, 21 in Russian, and 6 in Hmong for this two-year follow-up survey. Our one-year follow-up retention rate was 74.9%, and our two-year retention rate was 57.3%. In August of this year we will be taking a new sample of parents for the Parent Interview. In fact we plan on sampling and interviewing 500 randomly-selected parents by the end of 2010. As discussed at the April 15 Quarterly Contractor Forum, we will need to have families recruited for the evaluation after July 1 entered into Persimmony as soon as possible.

### ***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; Harder+Company 530.757.8420.*

**WRMA**

Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc.

## **Quarterly Report**

For the period of February 1 to April 30, 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

## Quarterly 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

# WRMA

---

## Status of Spring 2010 School Readiness Evaluation

Recruitment for the *Child Assessment* stood at 83.5% at the end of April (Table 1). However, Twin Rivers has requested an extension to the April 30 deadline, and thus the final recruitment rate should increase. Table 1 also displays the reasons for those few children not assessed this spring.

Table 1. Status of *Child Assessment*, April 30, 2010

District	Number Completed	Percent Completed	Unable to Locate	Moved Out of District	Refused
Elk Grove	33/35	94.3		2	
Folsom Cordova	22/23	95.7		1	
Robla	29/30	96.7		1	
Sac City	34/35	97.1	1		
San Juan	21/30	70.0	6	2	1
Twin Rivers	18/35	51.4		2	
Total	157/188	83.5	7	8	1

Note. Shaded area indicates data collection completed.

Shortly after the March 16 and 17 trainings, all School Readiness Coordinators were asked to provide a list of scheduled Child Assessments and assist us with coordinating on-site observations of the procedures implemented with selected children. One purpose of the observations was to provide feedback to staff, as necessary, to ensure that proper procedures were followed so as to not introduce bias, for example. Another purpose was to be able to provide confirmation in our final report that our “spot checks” demonstrated that school staff were implementing the related procedures as instructed. Unfortunately, only two of these observations were conducted during 2010. We have attached to this report the Observer Assessment forms completed for these two observations.

# WRMA

---

On April 21, we distributed to the School Readiness Coordinators copies of the *Parent Survey*, *Teacher Child Report*, and *Teacher / Provider Survey*. The six school districts (not PBM) were also given \$10 Starbuck's gift cards for completing the *Teacher / Provider Survey*, and in appreciation of their assistance with all other evaluation activities for the School Readiness evaluation. Table 2 presents the status of data collection with these instruments at the end of the month.

Table 2. Status of *Parent Survey*, *Teacher Child Report*, and *Teacher / Provider Survey*, April 30, 2010

District	<i>Parent Survey</i>	<i>Teacher Child Report</i>	<i>Teacher / Provider Survey</i>
Elk Grove	0/68	0/35	0/8
Folsom Cordova	1/60	0/23	0/8
Robla	31/65	14/30	3/8
Sac City	0/74	0/35	0/13
San Juan	0/69	0/30	0/13
Twin Rivers	0/71	0/35	0/31
PBM	--	--	15/101
Total	32/407	14/188	18/182

# Attachment

# OBSERVER ASSESSMENT, SPRING 2010

## COVER PAGE

Date of Observation:	4/13/10
Observer's Name:	Karley Lewis
School Name	Sierra View Elementary
School District	Twin Rivers
Language	English
Assessor's Name	--
Start Time: 12:47PM	End Time: 1:10PM

### General Notes on Observations:

#### Behavior / Concentration Problems

Concentration Problems were evident at very few points during the assessment, and this was only due to the fact that there were so many children in the library at the time of the assessment

#### Special Needs / Disabilities

#### Distractions / Disruptions

We were told that the library would be a good place to conduct the assessment, but after the assessment was already underway it was evident that this was not the ideal location. The noise level was distracting to the child at times, and there were a few points at which other children attempted to interact with the child being assessed. -- did a good job managing the distraction and re-focusing the child's attention.

**PreLAS – Simon Says**

	Correct	Incorrect	Notes
Verbatim	☑		
Coaching	☑		
Neutral Praise	☑		No neutral praise provided in this section, but it was clear that the child did not need it, and he was moving at a good pace without praise.
Pointing	☑		
Scoring	☑		

**PreLAS – Art Show**

	Correct	Error	Notes
Verbatim		☑	Instead of “Point to...” used “put your finger on...”
Coaching	☑		
Neutral Praise	☑		Only scripted praise used
Pointing	☑		Pointing and Circling should be more pronounced. A wave of the hand vs. circling on the actual page
Scoring	☑		

**PPVT (Adapted)**

	<b>Correct</b>	<b>Error</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Verbatim	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Did a great job remembering to read the instructions allowed to the child for the PPVT. This is something we worked on at the recertification.
Coaching	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Neutral Praise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Only scripted praise used
Pointing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Scoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

**Letter Naming**

	<b>Correct</b>	<b>Error</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Verbatim	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Coaching	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Neutral Praise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Only scripted praise used
Pointing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Scoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Great job remembering to prompt the child after the child finished pointing/saying the letters. "Do you know any more?"

**Early Math Skills**

	<b>Correct</b>	<b>Error</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Verbatim	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Coaching	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Neutral Praise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Only scripted praise used
Pointing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Scoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

**Additional Notes / Recommendations:**

At the end of the assessment, I went over the scoring with --. She was very interested in anything that may have gone wrong and showed a great appreciation for the ability to conduct the assessment reliably and accurately. Overall, I thought she did a good job sticking to the script and re-focusing the child's attention when there were distractions. -- was able to utilize what we had discussed during recertification for the assessment.

-- had a suggestion for future assessment trainings that she wanted me to pass along. She thinks it would be beneficial to have fewer assessors at the trainings and do have it be more in depth, this way there would be less room for inconsistency among assessors.

# OBSERVER ASSESSMENT, SPRING 2010

## COVER PAGE

Date of Observation:	4/21/10
Observer's Name:	Karley Lewis
School Name	Howe Avenue Elementary
School District	San Juan Unified
Language	English
Assessor's Name	--
Start Time: 2:25PM	End Time: 2:40PM

### General Notes on Observations:

#### Behavior / Concentration Problems

#### Special Needs / Disabilities

#### Distractions / Disruptions

During the course of the assessment, the school bell went off one time, and 2 announcements were made over the loud speaker.

**PreLAS – Simon Says**

	<b>Correct</b>	<b>Error</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Verbatim	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Coaching	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Neutral Praise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No neutral praise provided in this section, but it was clear that the child did not need it, and was moving at a good pace without praise.
Pointing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Scoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Assessor did a great job remembering to score the PreLAS before moving on to the next section

**PreLAS – Art Show**

	<b>Correct</b>	<b>Error</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Verbatim	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Coaching	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Neutral Praise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Yes, neutral praise provided: "Thank you for helping me."
Pointing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		All pointing and circling was correct
Scoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

**PPVT (Adapted)**

	<b>Correct</b>	<b>Error</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Verbatim	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Assessment moved at a really great pace, and assessor did a great job keeping the child focused, despite some distraction
Coaching	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Neutral Praise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Neutral praise provided at the beginning of the section
Pointing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Scoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

**Letter Naming**

	<b>Correct</b>	<b>Error</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Verbatim	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Coaching	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Neutral Praise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Neutral praise provided at the beginning of the section: "I really appreciate your help with this..."
Pointing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Scoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Assessor did a good job remembering to prompt the child appropriately..."do you know any more?"

**Early Math Skills**

	<b>Correct</b>	<b>Error</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Verbatim	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Coaching	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Neutral Praise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Neutral Praise provided: "thank you"
Pointing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Pointed and circled correctly, and as instructed by the instrument
Scoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Prompting was used appropriately and as instructed at the trainings..."Give it your best try..."

**Additional Notes / Recommendations:**

At the end of the assessment, I briefly went over my observations with --. All of my feedback was positive, as she did a really accurate job with the assessment.

# Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc.

**To:** Evaluation Committee Members  
**From:** Fred Molitor  
**Date:** May 3, 2010  
**Subject:** Old and New Parent Interview Items to Assess Result Area and Cross-Cutting Indicators

---

The following tables identify the items we have selected to address the Result Area and Cross-Cutting Indicators for the upcoming 2010/13 funding cycle. As we discussed in the April 19 Evaluation Committee meeting, we will be sending you the revised Parent Interview instrument in a separate email.

Table 1. 2010/15 Result Area Indicators and Related Parent Interview Items

Indicator	Item #	New
<b>Health Access Result Area</b>		
Percent of children with complete immunizations at ages 2 and 5.*	F6	
Percent of children who have received all age appropriate well-child visits.	F1, F2	
Percent of children who have seen a dentist by one year of age.	F3-F5	
<i>Dental insurance question requested by Evaluation Committee at April 19 meeting</i>	F13	X
<b>Nutrition Result Area</b>		
Percent of women who are exclusively breastfeeding at 6 months after delivery.	G1-G4	
Percent of women who are breastfeeding 1 year after delivery.	G1-G4	
Percent of children who engage in health promoting behaviors that address nutrition and physical activity.	B5-B8 G5-G7	X
<b>Effective Parenting Result Area</b>		
Percent of parents who report supportive and positive parenting attitudes and behaviors.	B9, B10 C1, C2	X
Percent of parents with a risk profile indicating sufficient social capital.	C5, C7 D1, D2, D5	X
Percent of parents who report social support.	C4	
Percent of parents who report adequate emergency care services are available when needed.	E4-E6	X
Percent of parents who report low levels of stress in their parenting role.	C3	
<b>School Readiness Result Area</b>		
Percentage of parents who provide a stimulating literacy and material environment for the child in the home.	B1, B2 B3, B4	X
Percent of parents participating in child's preschool/school activities.	J2	X
<b>Community Building Result Area</b>		
Percent of parents who report connectedness to their communities.	D3, D4, D6 D7-D10	
Percent of parents who report utilization of formal and informal resources.	E1-E3	

\*New methodology will include mock immunization card sent to parents prior to interview, possibly just to those with children ages 2 and 5 years.

Table 2. 2010/15 Cross-Cutting Indicators and Related Parent Interview Items

Indicator	Item #	New
Percent of children enrolled in health insurance.	F12	
Percent of children with complete immunizations at age 2 and age 5.	F6	
Percent of children who have received all age appropriate well child visits.	F1, F2	
Percent of women with children under three who were exclusively breastfeeding at 6 months and breastfeeding one year after delivery.	G1-G4	
Percent of children who have seen a dentist in the past year.	F3-F5	
Percent of parents who report connectedness to their communities.	D3, D4, D6	
Percent of parents who report that the service provider helped them increase knowledge and utilization of formal and informal resources in the community.	E1-E3 D7-D10	
Percent of children who have received a health or developmental screening in the past year.	F7, F8	
Percent of parents with decreased stress.	C3	
Percent of parents who report supportive and positive parenting attitudes and behaviors.	B9, B10 C1, C2	<b>X</b>
Percent of children ages 3-5 enrolled in an Early Childhood Education, pre-Kindergarten, or Head Start program.	J1	<b>X</b>
Percent of parents with perceived self-efficacy.	C6 C7	<b>X</b>
Percent of parents who report utilization of formal and informal resources.	D7-D10 E1-E3	