



# **Nebraska Even Start Family Literacy Program**

## **Evaluation Report 2009-2010 Program Year**

## The Nebraska Even Start Family Literacy Program

Even Start Family Literacy is a program of the United States Department of Education administered through the Office of Early Childhood at the Nebraska Department of Education. The Even Start Family Literacy Program (ESFLP) is intended to help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy to improve educational opportunity for low income families. This is accomplished by integrating intensive early childhood education, parenting education and adult literacy or basic education.

ESFLPs are implemented through cooperative projects that build on existing community resources to create a new range of services that assist children and adults from low-income families to achieve on challenging state content standards and student performance standards. In Nebraska, ESFLPs are expected to operate in congruence with best practice for early childhood, adult, and parenting education. ESFLPs provide an opportunity for communities to craft family-centered programs designed to ensure the success of all of the

**Two Even Start Family Literacy Program sub-grantees across Nebraska are represented in this report, including one urban sub-grantee (Lincoln) and one rural sub-grantee (Crete).**

community's children in their schooling. Eligible applicants utilize partnerships comprised of local education agencies<sup>1</sup> and community-based organizations, public agencies, institutions of higher education and/or other non-profit organizations.

Professional development is supported by state technical assistance funds provided through the Nebraska Department of Education and by regional professional development partnerships.

The purpose of an ESFLP is to provide assistance to parents to: 1) be the primary and most significant teachers in their children's learning; 2) provide a family literacy environment for their children; 3) achieve their personal goals related to literacy and education; 4) locate services for the health, nutrition, safety and well being of the family; and 5) assure quality education for their children. The primary design of ESFLP is through instructional programs that promote adult literacy, provides parental training on how to support the educational growth of their children, and engages children in regular early childhood and school programs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Including Educational Service Units (ESUs)

## Opportunities for Nebraska Even Start Families in 2009-2010

This year's grantees provided a number of programming opportunities for families. For family literacy, parents and children regularly engaged in interactive literacy activities including learning activities at a local library. Parent education and adult literacy classes included Adult Basic Education, GED, high school courses, and ESL programming. Parent education was provided in a culturally appropriate and linguistically accessible way to address the needs of



the predominantly migrant families from Spanish and Arabic speaking countries served by Nebraska's ESFLP. To facilitate parent involvement services were provided to address parent need. For example, early childhood staff within the public school system provided childcare so that parents could attend family literacy classes during the school day. Home visits were a key component of this continued education which provided opportunity to discuss parenting, ask questions and monitor progress. Children's educational needs were met by enrollment in public schooling and other community center based programs such as Head Start and Early Head Start. This year's sub-grantees included Lincoln and Crete Public Schools.

## Who Participated in Nebraska Even Start?

**Eligibility** Individuals eligible to participate in the ESFLPs are parents in an adult education program and their children, ages birth through age seven (7). At least one parent and one or more child must participate together in all components of the ESFLP (early childhood, parenting, and adult education). Parenting teens under age 16 are also eligible to participate with their children as long as the school district provides the basic education component for the parent. Once a family's eligibility is established and that family is participating as required, all members of the family may continue as members of Even Start until all the eligible family members are ineligible (i.e., no members of the family are eligible for adult education or ancillary services, and all children have reached 8 years of age).

**Families Served** During the past year, 75 families, including 119 adults and 153 children, were served across the two sub-grantees in Nebraska. Participation of

children by age group was as follows:

*Total Distribution of Children Served in ESFLP Across Programs*

	Under 1	Age 1	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4	K through Grade 2	Total
Total	14	10	30	21	24	54	153

Many of the parents or adult family members served were English language learners (46 or 61%). There were 34 newly enrolled families. Of these, 34 or 100% of the families were at or below the federal poverty level. Of the 59 newly enrolled adults, 29 or 49% did not have a high school diploma or GED, and 20 or 34% had not attended school beyond the 9<sup>th</sup> grade.

## Program Evaluation Findings

### Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the statewide Even Start program evaluation was to provide: (a) descriptive information regarding these programs, (b) process data that will assist state staff in continually improving the quality of services to families and their children, and (c) outcome data that will assist the state in determining the extent to which the grantees achieved their anticipated outcomes. Key to monitoring program outcomes was the establishment of state standards and performance indicators. Data collection was accomplished through the joint efforts of ESFLP and program evaluation staff to gather information across multiple sources using both qualitative and quantitative approaches. In addition, each program has a local evaluator to assist with connecting data results to program improvement efforts. There are four standards, which address adult education, English language learning, child, and parenting outcomes.

## Quality Environments for Young Children

Quality early childhood programs have been linked to immediate, positive developmental outcomes, as well as long-term positive academic performance (Burchinal, Peisner-Feinberg, Bryant, & Clifford, 2000; Ramey & Ramey, 1998). Three instruments were used to observe and rate classrooms used by ESFLP children across Nebraska. These included the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO), the Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ITERS-R), and the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R).

**Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation** The Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (Smith, Dickinson, et al, 2002) is used to measure the language and literacy practices of early childhood classrooms. The ELLCO is composed of three interdependent research tools: the Literacy Environment Checklist (summarizes the organization and contents of the classroom); the Classroom Observation and Teacher Interview (gathers objective ratings of the quality of the language and literacy environment of the classroom); and the Literacy Activities Rating Scale (summarizes information on the nature and duration of observed literacy activities). The Nebraska Department of Education, Office of Early Childhood, established quality indicators for the ELLCO, which are 67% of possible score on each of the domains.

### *Summary Scores on ELLCO*

Average of Percent of Possible Score	Literacy Environment Checklist	Classroom Observation	Literacy Activities Rating Scale	# of Classrooms Observed
<b>Fall</b>	90%	99%	100%	1

Overall, the program met the state indicators of quality for the Literacy Environment Checklist, Classroom Observation, and the Literacy Activities Rating Scale portion of the ELLCO. High scores indicate that this program’s literacy efforts exceed the state’s standard.

**Environment Rating Scales** The Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ITERS-R, Harms, Cryer & Clifford, 2005) and Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R, Harms, Clifford, & Cryer, 1998) are observation measures designed to assess a broad variety of areas. These

areas include space and furnishings, personal care routines, language and reasoning activities, learning activities, interactions, program structure, and meeting adult needs (parents and staff). Ratings are on a 7-point scale, with 7 being excellent. The Nebraska Department of Education, Office of Early Childhood, has established state indicators of quality on these measures. For the Environment Rating Scales, the quality indicator is 5 or higher overall.

This year each program used the measure appropriate for the ages of children observed in the classroom. Unlike previous years, each program utilized a different tool, so the scores reported reflect the individual programs. These data are reported independently. This section reports the ITERS-R data first, then the ECERS-R.

***Infant-Toddler Classroom Quality Rating Scores (ITERS-R) - Program A***

Space & Furnishings	Personal Care	Listening	Learning	Interaction	Program Structure	Adults	Overall Average	# of Classrooms
5.80	6.0	7.0	5.63	6.75	7.0	6.14	6.33	1

***Preschool Classroom Quality Rating Scores (ECERS-R) - Program B***

Space & Furnishings	Personal Care	Language Reasoning	Learning	Interaction	Program Structure	Parents & Staff	Overall Average	# of Classrooms
4.38	4.00	6.25	5.70	7.00	7.00	6.83	5.88	1

Overall, the quality of both the infant-toddler and preschool classrooms ranged between good to excellent with an average score of 6.1, exceeding the Nebraska Department of Education indicator of quality score of a 5.0. The infant/toddler classroom met the indicator of quality across all subscales while the preschool classroom had two scores rated below the indicator, Space and Furnishings and Personal Care. For each classroom type, the majority of scores were above a 5.0 (12/14).

**Children’s Language and Literacy Progress**

Outcomes for preschool and school-aged children were monitored through the use of multiple assessments. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition) (PPVT-III) and the Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening were used to collect outcome data on preschool children from each program. Teacher surveys were completed to assess educational outcomes for school-age children.

**Preschool Children’s Vocabulary** The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test III (PPVT-III) was used to measure children’s progress with vocabulary development. The PPVT is a standardized measure where the average score is 100 and the average range of scores is 85 – 115. Fall and spring data were collected for a total of 2 four year old children served for a minimum of six months. Both children gained more than four standard score points to meet the federal Even Start indicator.

**Preschool Children’s Early Literacy Skills Development** The Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS-PreK) was used to assess the uppercase letter identification skills of kindergarten bound children (i.e., 4 and 5 years old). The PALS-PreK provides end-of-the-year developmental ranges appropriate for four year old children for the Uppercase Letter subtest of the instrument. This year only four children were eligible to participate in this assessment. Of those tested, the children were able to recognize an average of 23 letters which is greater than the average range appropriate for that age group.

**School Age Children’s Language and Math Performance** Teachers were asked to rate student performance outcomes on school-age children served by ESFLP. Teachers determined if students met or exceeded district objectives in language, writing and mathematics. A total of 16 teacher surveys were collected from both sub-grantees. All children were in kindergarten, first, second or third grade. These measures were used as an indicator of academic success. The majority of students met district standards in reading, writing, and mathematics.

*Statewide Percentage of Students Meeting District Objectives*

Subjects	Met
Reading (reading, speaking, listening)	65%
Writing	59%
Mathematics	71%

## Parenting Skills to Support Children’s Development and Learning

**Parent Literacy Skills to Support Children’s Learning** Parent education and parent-child interaction skills were evaluated by staff completion of the Even Start Family Literacy Parent Education Profile (PEP) (Dwyer, 2002) [Scales I and II]. The PEP Scale I: Parent’s Support for Children’s Learning in the Home Environment addresses four areas: (1) Use of Literacy Materials, (2) Use of TV/Video, (3) Home Language and Learning, and (4) Priority of Learning Together. Scale II: Parent’s Role in Interactive Literacy Activities evaluates three areas: (1) Expressive and Receptive Language, (2) Reading with Children, and (3) Supporting Book/Print Concepts. Ratings are based on a five point scale with 1 = little or no evidence of desired behaviors; limited awareness; limited acceptance and 5 = ability to work desired behaviors into daily life, adaptability to child’s interests and abilities, extends learning, makes connections for child. The results are summarized in the following table.



### *Summary of PEP Ratings of Family Literacy Skills*

PEP Scale	Fall Avg	Spring Avg	Gain Score
Scale I: Parent’s Support for Children’s Learning in the Home Environment	2.06	2.65	.59
Scale II: Parent’s Role in Interactive Literacy Activities	2.05	2.68	.62

Matched PEP scales (fall to spring) were reported for 31 families for Scale 1 and for 25 families for Scale 2. Overall, families showed improved literacy skills from fall to spring. Gains across both scales were nearly equal indicating that parent support for learning in the home and parent role in interactive literacy were similarly demonstrated.

## Parent Improvement in Educational and Occupational Skills

**Parent Participation** One of the primary goals of the parents enrolled in ESFLP was to improve their literacy skills. To do so, the adults participated in a variety of educational services including parenting education, intermediate and secondary education, GED preparation and/or ELL classes. The goal for average



monthly hours of participation in adult education is 60 hours monthly and the goal for parent education is 20 hours monthly.

*Average Hours Participated Monthly*

Program	Adult Ed Direct	Adult Ed Self-Direct	ESL	Parent Ed
Program A	41.1	13.5	71.0	8.4
Program B	32.0	Not reported	Not reported	13.0

There was great variability across the programs in the participation rates. The adult education hours were less than the 60 hours recommended by the US Department of Education, Even Start Family Literacy Program, and GPRA Indicators. Participation hours in parent education were also less than the GPRA indicator recommendations of 20 hours monthly.

**Time Enrolled** Of the 75 families participating in the ESFLP, a slight majority were enrolled for 180 days to a year (59%). This year boasted 34 new families of whom 59% have not gone beyond the 9<sup>th</sup> grade at time of enrollment.



**Accommodating Parent Need** Non-traditional means of trying to accommodate parent needs were reported by grantees. Some offered self-directed learning opportunities, both for adult education and for parent education and interactive literacy activities. Some offered adult education directly, rather than relying solely on partners.

**Additional Services** Non-educational support services utilized by adults include: transportation to the program or other services, child care, employment assistance (referrals, placement and vocational counseling), family support (counseling and support groups), health referrals, screening, social services (public assistance such as food pantries, emergency relief, WIC, etc.) and interpreters. Non-educational support services utilized by children of the ESFLP include transportation, health care, meals, counseling, and interpreters.

**Adult Literacy** A central component of this program is adult literacy. Parents participated in adult education programs that were offered through a wide variety of classes. Adult education outcomes were evaluated through assessments such as Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) and Basic English

Skills Test (BEST). A range of outcomes were reported on the performance indicators for adult education and English language learning. Primary goals included Adult Basic Education, learning English, obtaining at GED, attending middle or high school, improving basic literacy, and post-secondary education or employment goals.

Primary Goal	Number of Adults	Outcomes
Adult Basic Education	88	4 were enrolled for 60 hours or more and 3 advanced at least one level
English as a Second Language	46	29 advanced at least one level
High school	13	Eighty percent (80%), 4 out of 5 parents, graduated from high school
<b>TOTAL</b>	134	

Sixty-three percent (63%) of ELL participants improved at least one level and 3% of ABE participants improved at least one level. Of the five eligible students, 80% graduated from high school. Barriers for those not attaining goals often included participation. Sixty hours of participation are required between testing and retesting opportunities, both with the TABE and with the BEST in adult education. For some parents, attaining and maintaining this level of participation was difficult.

**A Success Story** An evaluation strategy that can exemplify the impact a program can have on a participant is a success story. The following account represents the impact the Even Start Literacy Program has on a family. Although this family member’s experience is not reflective of all participants, it is an effective way of illustrating the myriad affect the program has on one family and serves as a reminder of how each Even Start family’s own journey toward change is a meaningful process for them.

### ***One Family's Journey...A Success Story***

*Z.A. started the Even Start program September of 2009. In Iraq, she finished 2<sup>nd</sup> grade and was dropped from the academic schooling because of a speech-impairment. Z.A.'s speech impairment is noticeable when she speaks both Arabic and English. Her family qualifies for the free and reduced lunch program. Z.A. has four children, one who is in the ExCITE program and will begin Kindergarten this fall. Her other children are currently in Kindergarten, 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, and she has a three year-old beginning the ExCite program. Z.A. walks to school with her children in all kinds of weather. Her understanding of English has improved more than her scores show. She reads with more confidence when she doesn't feel pushed. She understands enough to help other students with translation and doesn't need an interpreter.*

*Her spelling has progressed from a few letters to several words and most of the words are phonetically close. She is a motivated journal writer, and maintains daily entries. The picture dictionary that was given to all class members has been a very good tool for Z.A.; she uses it at home and at school. She likes to cook and brings cookbooks that she has checked out from the library. Her cooking vocabulary continues to be quite accomplished. She includes examples of her children's learning in the family literacy portfolio. She is also an enthusiastic computer user.*

*One of the difficulties for all class members is remembering to use English. Z.A. makes a consistent attempt. She even brought a bell to ring in class when students speak English. That has helped encourage other students to speak English, and the class gets a chuckle when the bell rings. This shows great leadership skills.*

*Although Z.A. did not pass the driving permit test, she did review the mistakes during a home visit and used a website for additional practice. When she is consistent with timeout and consequences for her children she notices better behavior from them. Her oldest child pushes the boundaries frequently and Z.A. is getting better about not giving in to the behavior. She always has great questions during home visits, which demonstrates a strong interest in family connection and improvement.*

*Z.A. has developed comfort in her partnerships with school staff. She eagerly talks to the principal and ask questions of other staff members. She works hard to help her son succeed. He was having behavior problems early on in the year and she was like a sponge wanting to know how she could help him at home. Due to the efforts of many, including Z.A., her son turned his behavior around and had a successful year.*

## Summary and Recommendations

This evaluation highlights the performance of the Nebraska Even Start Family Literacy Program (ESFLP) in accomplishing its identified outcomes. There are two sub-grantees across Nebraska. They serve an at-risk population of children and families. Most adults served were English Language Learners, low income, and had limited education.

Overall, ESFLP classrooms were of mid to high quality, providing the type of learning environment and interaction associated with positive outcomes for children. Strengths were identified in program structure, listening, and interaction. Literary activities as measured by the ELLCO were also of high quality, positioning children to do well on literacy measures. Classroom quality measured by the ITERS and ECERS indicate that the infant classroom met the state's indicator of quality while the preschool classroom could benefit from technical assistance targeted towards Space and Furnishings and Personal Care.

Young children showed progress on broad, developmental measures, including improved vocabulary (English) and letter identification. Although few children were eligible for assessments due to age and participation requirements, those tested showed positive literacy outcomes. Children gained at least 4 standard score points on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Kindergarten-bound children could identify an average of 23 letters of the alphabet by the spring.

Results for school-age children (n=16) were also positive. Sixty-five percent of children were at or above district standards in reading. Fifty-nine percent were at or above district standards in writing. In mathematics, 71% of children were at or above district standards.

Families achieved positive outcomes. Parents made gains (.59 to .62) on the Parent Education Profile Scales (Scale I and Scale II). Four of five eligible high school students earned their diploma (80%). Sixty-three percent of English as a Second Language participants improved at least one level (29/46).

Overall, the Nebraska Even Start Family Literacy Program met the needs of the families it served. The majority of children served were three and under, so limited outcome data is available. Those children assessed showed positive growth in literacy areas. Parents increased their own parenting knowledge and skills and made gains in adult education and English language learning, while most children evidenced positive developmental outcomes.

Submitted by Statewide Evaluator  
Kate E. Golden  
Department of Education & Child Development  
Munroe-Meyer Institute  
University of Nebraska Medical Center  
985450 Nebraska Medical Center  
Omaha, NE 68198-5450  
(402) 559-3807



## References

- Burchinal, M., Peisner-Feinberg, E., & Bryant, D. (et. al) (2000). Children's social and cognitive development and child-care quality: Testing for differential associations related to poverty, gender, or ethnicity. *Applied Development Science*, 4, 149-165.
- CTB/McGraw-Hill (2005). *Test of adult basic education*. Monterey, CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill.
- Dunn, L. & Dunn, L. (1997). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Third Edition*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Services.
- Harms, T., Clifford, R., & Cryer, D. (1998). *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, Revised Edition*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Harms, T., Cryer, D. & Clifford, R. (2005). *Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale, Revised Edition*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Henderson, A. & Mapp, K. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX: National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Ivernizzi M., Sullivan A., Meier J., & Swank, L. (2004). *Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening*. Richmond, VA: University of Virginia
- Kenyon, D., Stansfield, C., Johnson, D., Grognet, A., & Dreyfus, D. (1988). *Basic English skills test*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Ramey, C. & Ramey, S. (1998). Early intervention and early experience. *American Psychologist*, 58, 109-120.
- Smith, M., Dickinson, D., Sangeorge, A., & Anastasopoulous, L. (2002). *Early language and literacy classroom observation, ELLCO Toolkit, Research Edition*. Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Brookes Publishing.

APPENDIX: FEDERAL CSPR

## 2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)

### 2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010

#### 2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	2
---	---

#### 2.2.1.2 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:

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2009. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages.

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	75
2. Adults participating	119
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	46
4. Participating children	153
a. Birth through 2 years	54

b. Ages 3 through 5	45
c. Ages 6 through 8	54
d. Above age 8	-

### 2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families 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 or who had previously been in Even Start and re-enrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	34
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	59
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	34
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	29
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9 <sup>th</sup> grade at the time of enrollment	20

### 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 family’s start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family’s start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2010). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family’s original enrollment date. **Report each family only once in lines 1-4.** Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	14



2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	17
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	12
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	32
5. Total families enrolled	75

## 2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This Section collections data about the Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

### 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**. Only report data from the TABE reading test on the TABE line. Likewise, only report data from the CASAS reading test on the CASAS line. Data from other TABE or CASAS tests or combination of subtests should be reported on the “other” line.

To be counted under “pre- and post-test”, an individual must have completed **both** the pre- and post-tests.

The definition of “significant learning gains” for adult education is determined at the State level either by your State’s adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), or as defined by your Even Start State Performance indicators.

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

Note: Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	3	3	
CASAS			
Other			

### 2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	5	1	
CASAS			
BEST	28	22	
BEST Plus			
BEST Literacy			
Other			

### 2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

1. "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.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of 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.

School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	5	4	
GED			
Other			

Non-School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma			
GED			
Other			

### 2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for 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:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre- and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post- Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	2	2	2		
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					

#### 2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills

In the table below, provide the number of children age-eligible for kindergarten who demonstrate age- appropriate oral language skills.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year, and who have been enrolled in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III PPVT-IV or TVIP in the spring of or latest test within the reporting year.

3. Who met goal includes children who score a **Standard Score of 85 or higher** on the spring (or latest test within the reporting year) TVIP, PPVT-III or PPVT-IV.
4. “Exempted” includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	2	2	2		
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					

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

In the table below, provide the average number of letters children can identify as measure by PALS subtask.

The following terms apply:

1. “Age-Eligible” includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year, and who have been enrolled in Even Start for at least six months.
2. “Tested” includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2009 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. “Exempted” includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English
4. “Average number of letters” includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted)	Explanation (if applicable)

				<b>Average)</b>	
PALS Pre-K Upper Case	4	4		23	

### 2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

Grade	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	5	4	
1	7	5	
2	1	0	
3	3	3	

### 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 (“met goal”) 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.

	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	25	20	
PEP Scale II	31	23	
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV			
Other			