Family Support and Literacy Indicator Survey Results

Overall Summary

- The survey was "viewed" – 42 times (Meaning some people began the survey and returned to continue completing it)
- The survey was started – 28 times
- The survey was completed by 20 participants
- Completion Rate – 71.43%
- Drop-outs After Starting – 8 participants
- Average Time to Complete Survey – 16 minutes

Results: Among the eleven goals

- Four goal / indicators received 90% or more Strongly Agree or Agree responses
- Five goals / indicators received 80-89% Strongly Agree or Agree responses
- Two goals / indicators received 70-79% Strongly Agree or Agree responses

Next Steps

All comments have been reviewed and either addressed (as indicated below) or included in the following tables under 'Items for Discussion'.

1. Comments that were about rewording, condensing individual indicators for clarity, and consideration regarding ability to measure were reviewed and revised accordingly by staff with the help from a technical assistance consultant.
2. Several comments indicated some of the indicators appeared to be performance measures. The indicators are being categorized by a.) performance measure, b.) child outcomes, and c.) system development measures for review at the June 1, 2011 meeting.
3. There were several comments regarding there being too many indicators for some of the goals. We will review all the indicators on June 1, may eliminate some if that is the desire of the committee and will prioritize child outcome and system indicators.
4. Comments regarding how we will measure were reviewed. Many of the indicators are performance indicators that would be part of First Things First reporting by grantees. Others are focused on family access to information and services which would be answered through the Community and Family Survey or other local surveys. We will be spending more time on baseline and benchmarking as part of the future work of the Committee.
5. Remaining items to be addressed are included in the Items for discussion column on this document and will be reviewed at the June 1, 2011 meeting. Included are:
    a. New indicators that were suggested
    b. Revised indicators
    c. Indicators to be removed

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
Role 1 - Information				
Goal 1a. To increase families' belief that accessing information, resources supports or services is a regular part of raising young children. 1. #/% of families accessing information about services and supports in their community. 2. #/% of families who report they are comfortable accessing information, resources and supports.	90.91%	9.1%	Be more clear about what kind of services and supports. *(See definition of Family Support and Literacy)* I have no idea how we would measure these indicators so it is hard to say that they are good ones. If we are using a survey of parents, I wonder if we should ask them about their beliefs since that is in the goal. Suggested Indicator: #/% of families that believe accessing information about services and supports helps them raise their child. The second indicator talks about what makes parents "comfortable." Are you looking for something here about ease of getting information? Level of understanding of information? Presentation of information? My memory about this goal is that we were defining 'accessing' as seeking-out information. (Yes) SD: 1st indicator: # is fine, if you want to know how many seek-out information, but I question how we can accurately measure this other than it would be the number of families who self-refer to FTF-funded programs? % will be 100% so why have %?	1. Suggested: # of families seeking information about services and supports in their community 2. No changes

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
			Do we have baseline information on 'families belief about whether getting help to raise children is "regular?"	
Goal 1b. To increase access to timely, culturally responsive and accurate information regarding early childhood development, early care & education and developmentally appropriate parenting. 1. # /% of families who report that providers of family support and literacy services specifically provide timely, relevant information about services and supports in their community 2. Parent rating of child development and parenting knowledge	71.43%	28.57%	This is a compound indicator and should be split between timely and relevant. It seems like this 'accessing' is more related to enrollment in a service vs seeking out services/information However, timeliness, culturally responsive and accurate information are 3 distinct areas that I think each deserve its own indicator. I am struggling with the definition of 'access' and what the intent is. . What is meant by culture? How do you measure the accuracy of information provided? Who's interpreting this? Were families provided information that resulted in them accurately accessing the information they needed? Goal statement and measure are different. Parents want information about THEIR child, not "timely relevant information about services and supports in the community." This question does not measure the listed goal. I do not see anything that measures the level of cultural responsiveness.	1. Suggested revision; pull apart this indicator: # /% of families who report that providers of family support and literacy services specifically provide timely information about services and supports in their community # /% of families who report that providers of family support and literacy services specifically provide accurate information about services and supports in their community # /% of families who report that providers of family support and literacy services specifically provide culturally responsive information about services and supports in their community Also: The question is limited to "providers" who are providing information. What about other information & referral sources?

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
			The question is limited to "providers" who are providing...information. What about other information & referral sources? Not sure the measure is getting to everything in the goal statement - (access to timely, relevant and culturally responsive). Also measuring families who access family support programs may not be the best or only demographic to be surveyed to measure outcome. What about those who couldn't access services?	2. Suggested revision: #/% of families that report receiving helpful information about early childhood development
Goal 1c. Revised 4/27: To increase family knowledge and ability to access quality programs by providing specific information about what a quality family support or literacy program consists of and where quality programs are available in their communities. 1. # / % of families who report that family support and literacy programs provide information about what quality programs are and what quality programs do 2. # / % of families who report their family support and literacy needs are met 3. # / % of families who report family support and literacy referral services are effective	90%	10%	First bullet is not a sentence - suggest families who report that providers of service provide information about. 1st indicator. (This indicator defines 'access' as seeking-out and/or enrollment in). 2nd indicator. This indicator relates 'access' as enrollment in. 3rd indicator. This indicator relates 'access' as seeking-out. Just curious how this will be measured? Should we include a measurement about families believing they have access to these programs within their communities? i.e. not feeling isolated or that they need to drive long distances to access these. See Goal 2	1. Suggested Revision: #/% of families who report receiving useful information about what quality programs are and what quality programs do 2. No changes 3. No changes

SA – Strongly Agree; A – Agree; D – Disagree; SD – Strongly Disagree

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
			Again first bullet is limited to FS/L providers -- should it be? Not sure we should limit measures to self reports by providers and families that a program is 'a quality program'	
Role 2 - Services	%	%		
Goal 2a. To increase the availability of a continuum of high quality family support and literacy services for families with young children. 1. # / % of children with newly diagnosed developmental delays at kindergarten entrance 2. #/% of children birth to five screened for developmental delays 3. #/% of children birth to five screened for sensory delays 4. # of family support and literacy education opportunities designed to meet specific needs of children birth – age five and their families. (cultural, values, special circumstances/needs intensity level) 5. # of quality family support and literacy programs available. Will need to identify the baseline: where are the gaps in family	88.89	11.11%	I don't think the indicators specifically address the goal to have family support and literacy services available for families. Are we trying to apply that if children enter school with unscreened delays they didn't receive services? This may be true, but is a bit of a stretch unless a very high percent of children enter without a screen. Probably the second and third indicators are easier to measure and could show progress over tiem. I'm not sure what indicator four means or how it could be measured. The top three do not seem to measure the goal statement and don't seem relevant. The last two seem more appropriate. How will "quality" be defined for a program? How will we know when a program is a "quality" program? First bullet - is there a valid target %? Suggested indicator: #/% of families that report having access to programs within their communities.	1. Revised for consistency with health committee and survey comments: #/% of children with identified as eligible for special education in kindergarten 2. No changes 3. No changes 4. Suggested revision: # of family support and literacy programs serving families of children birth through age five Capacity to serve = # of families served vs. # of vacancies in family support and literacy programs serving families of children birth through age five e.g. 100 families served vs. 0 vacancies 5. Suggested revision: #/% of families that report having access to programs within their communities

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
support and literacy? 6. % of families who report they are competent and confident about their ability to support their child's safety, health, and wellbeing.				6. No changes
Goal 2b. To increase family access and participation in a continuum of high quality family support and literacy services. 1. # of children/families referred to family support and literacy programs 2. # /% of children/families referred who are participating in family support programs 3. # of children/families who were referred who are participating in literacy programs 4. # of children ages 0-5 at risk for special needs / disabilities – penetration rate; i.e. are they getting to services. 5. # of referrals of children ages birth to five to AzEIP, Child Find directly from their parent/ families 6. # of families who report they	73.69%	26.32%	Too many indicators and use of the word "continuum" is confusing and meaningless unless there is a universal definition. Dropouts don't measure increase. This number could be helpful, but doesn't tie in well with the goal. Some indicators are not easily measured. Too many indicators and it is almost impossible for me to tie these to the goal. Many of these are more like performance measures/reporting requirements and not indicators. An indicator would be more like #% of families who report being able to receive information and support to successfully raise their child. Even this is a bit nebulous and not really about the outcome you are looking for – Suggested indicator: #/% of parents who report being better able to support their child's development and education. The list is overwhelming. I would suggest rolling some of these indicators up. Are you	Suggested Goal change: To increase family access and participation in high quality family support and literacy services. 1. No changes 2. No changes 3. No changes 4. No changes 5.&6. Suggested revision: # of parent initiated referrals for developmental screenings and services

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
recognized their children needed developmental or sensory screening for delays 7. % of families who report trying to access services 8. #/% families who report they did access services 9. % of families who report barriers to accessing family support or literacy services • Location – language • Affordability • Not "comfortable venues" – hours of delivery (child care) 10. % of families who report waiting lists or that they were turned away from family support and literacy programs 11. # of families by continuum type that report family support and literacy services are meeting their needs (Continuum Type=Universal to targeted programs, Awareness – is it comprehensive; and age continuum) 12. #/% of families who drop out of programs by reason for dropping			including early intervention and preschool special education services in the continuum of high quality family support and literacy services? Have you discussed the data you need from these programs? How are you defining services as there is a continuum of services through AHCCCS, private insurance, AzEIP, ADE preschool special education programs. # of children ages 0-5 at risk for special needs / disabilities – penetration rate; i.e. are they getting to services. # of referrals of children ages birth to five to AzEIP, Child Find directly from their parent/ families. The goal statement is too broad, hence there are too many measures that do not provide focus. Why are CPS staff singled out in last indicator (versus other providers)? Unclear what this indicator means. Need to narrow down this long list. Second to fourth bullet - don't we want to know % of those referred as well? Does the next to last bullet belong in 1c instead? DCYF is guarded in regard to surveying CPS staff. I am unsure if this	7.&8. Suggested revision: % of families referred who are participating in family support and/ or literacy programs 9.10. Suggested revision: % of families who report barriers to accessing family support or literacy services 11. Suggested revision: % of families who report their family support and literacy needs are met 12. Suggested revision: % of families who drop-out before completing program

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
out 13. # / % of parents who report they use the information to make informed decisions and to chose quality programs 14. # / % of parents, caregivers, foster parents and CPS staff who report receiving information about the availability of services and the referral process			measure will be approved by DCYF Administration.	13. Suggested revision: % of parents who report they chose to participate in family support and literacy programs based upon knowledge of quality programming 14. Suggested revision: # of families who report receiving information about the availability of services and the referral process
Goal 2c. To increase the ability of families to promote positive child development, health & literacy outcomes for their children. (Possible indicators could be measuring the increase in knowledge, skills, attitudes and behavior.) 1. # or % of children who enter kindergarten who are demonstrating age appropriate social emotional development 2. % of children who enter kindergarten demonstrating age appropriate competencies in language and literacy, cognitive, motor and physical development. 3. #/% of families with children birth to age 5 who report reading to	94.11%	5.88%	Again too many indicators, but some of them are measures of success. I'd eliminate all that are just outputs # of self-referred families, e.g. Of those on the list, I'd include the first, fourth (without including "in their primary language," and maybe sixth (although 3rd grade reading isn't a fantastic measure either). Again, this is overly broad and the language needs to be better defined. For instance, what exactly is a "literacy rich home environment?" Also, there is as great deal of self-reporting rather than actual data. How will a "literacy rich home environment" be defined and measured? Suggest deleting the measure on self-	1. No changes 2. No changes 3. No changes

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
their children daily. 4. % of families with children birth through age five who report speaking to their children in their Native language. 5. #/% of families with children birth to age 5 who report a literacy rich home environments (e.g. children hear language throughout the day, children have opportunities for listening and talking with family members, books and other literacy tools and materials are available and accessible to children) 6. #/% of families who report they are competent and confident about their ability to support their child's safety, health and well being 7. #/% of children reading at grade level by 3rd grade 8. #/% of self-referral to family support and literacy services			referral considering there are several other proposed measures addressing referrals. May want to add an indicator related to health literacy. Suggested Indicator: #/% of families that report they understand basic health information and services needed to make appropriate health decisions. Health literacy is defined in *Health People 2010* as: "The degree to which individuals have the capacity to obtain, process, and understand basic health information and services needed to make appropriate health decisions".	4. No changes 5. Suggested revision: % of families who report a literacy rich home environment (composite measure) 6. No changes 7. No changes 8. No changes Suggested New Indicator: #/% of families that report they understand basic health information and services needed to make appropriate health decisions Health literacy is defined in *Health People 2010* as: "The degree to which individuals have the capacity to obtain, process, and understand basic health information and services needed to make appropriate health decisions".
Goal 2d. To continuously improve the quality of family support and literacy services. 1. Increased use of evidence-based /	88.89%	11.11%	I don't like the first indicator, if it is an indicator? And I don't think the last indicator is measurable. The second and third are better, but not altogether clear.	1. Suggested revision: #/% of family support and literacy programs that are evidence-based and/or have

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
programs with established outcomes 2. #/% of families who report improvements in the programs serving them and their children 3. #/% of programs who demonstrate fidelity to the evidence based model they are providing 4. #/% of programs that are meeting their stated outcomes (at what level are they meeting them; i.e. minimally, partially, completely, etc. • Family outcomes • Child outcomes • Questions about why not meeting the outcomes Note: (FTF could define outcomes for all family support and literacy programs – could identify assessment / measures to be used across all programs.)			The measures do not match the goals. The measures are broad and not well defined. Please use SMART goals. First bullet - the way this is worded it appears that you would be following the SAME families and asking them this question. But some family's participation or service need may be short-term. Perhaps this needs different wording.	established outcomes 2. No changes 3. No changes 4. Suggested revision: % of parent education, family support and literacy programs that are evidence based
Goal 2e. To expand the use of evidence based practice in the early childhood family support and literacy service system. 1. # of Birth to 5 parenting educational opportunities that are evidence-based and/or demonstrating specific	94.11	5.88%	As long as we have a good baseline on this and have agreement on what is evidence based. The measures will not tell the success of the goal statement. There are too many variables.	1. Suggested revision: to add percent as well as # of birth to 5 parenting educational opportunities that are evidence based and/or demonstrating specific outcomes. 2. No changes 3. No changes

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
outcomes 2. # of family support and literacy programs that are accredited and/or evidence-based 3. % of family support and literacy programs that are accredited and/or based on proven practices			Do we need % of total programs as well? Is there room for promising practices? It is difficult to see expansion without having a baseline.	
Goal 2f. To increase coordination of planning, developing, funding and delivery of family services and supports to best meet the needs and preferences of families and to leverage available resources. 1. Partner rating of integration and coordination 2. %/# of system partners collectively leveraging funding 3. Amount of funding leveraged among system partners 4. Common set / definition of desired outcomes with process to track across partner agencies / provider agencies 5. Ratio of community investment to state and federal investment	83.33%	16.67%	Cross-referrals should be added. Again, too many indicators and some are pretty nebulous or not measurable. I guess I like the third indicator. You might want to include something like the: Suggested Indicator: %/# of system partners who report a positive change in the development, coordination, and delivery of family services. Need to clearly define what "leveraging" means. Delete "ratio of community investment to state and federal investment." What does it say about coordination? The federal home visiting grant defines indicators for coordination and referral. A couple of examples we may want to consider adding:	New Suggested Indicators: %/# of system partners who report a positive change in the development, coordination, and delivery of family services. # of formal agreements (e.g. Memoranda of Understanding) between family support & literacy programs and other social service agencies in the community. # of completed referrals for which receipt of services can be confirmed (i.e. the family support provider is able to track individual family referrals and assessment their completion by obtaining a report of the service provider). Need to clearly define what "leveraging" means. 5. Delete "ratio of community investment to state and federal investment." What does it say about coordination?

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
			Number of formal agreements (e.g. Memoranda of Understanding) between family support & literacy programs and other social service agencies in the community. Number of completed referrals for which receipt of services can be confirmed (i.e. the family support provider is able to track individual family referrals and assessment their completion by obtaining a report of the service provider).	
Goal 2g. To increase the number of family members who are actively participating in the development of the system of family support and literacy services. 1. # of opportunities provided for family participation 2. # of families actively participating in systems planning efforts (councils, task forces, focus groups, etc.)	88.89%	11.11%	Not sure how to make this better, but these seem like outputs to me. Is the purpose of including families in planning and development to make services better and more responsive to family needs? If so, you might want to measure whether: Suggested indicator: #/% of families that believe they are able to help make changes to when and how services are delivered; or #/% of families that believe they can make comments or participate in making changes to programs. You may want to add in culturally-appropriate strategies. Accessibility is missing. A family cannot participate if it is not available. Suggest one additional indicator:	New Suggested indicators: #/% of families that believe they are able to help make changes to when and how services are delivered; or #/% of families that believe they can make comments or participate in making changes to programs. # of family support and literacy programs that provide training and compensation to support family members to actively participate in systems planning efforts.

SA – Strongly Agree; A – Agree; D – Disagree; SD – Strongly Disagree

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
			Suggested Indicator: # of family support and literacy programs that provide training and compensation to support family members to actively participate in systems planning efforts.	
Role 3 – Professional Development				
Goal 3a. To increase professional development for family support and literacy providers through coordination of a professional development system. 1. # of professional development opportunities offered specific to family support and literacy services 2. # of family support and literacy providers participating in ongoing professional development and assistance 3. Turnover rate for family support and literacy providers 4. # of partner agencies collaborating in the coordination of a family support and literacy professional	84.21%	15.79%	Still think there are too many indicators. The goal is to increase professional development of workers. I think # 1 is okay, but hard to measure. Not sure turnover rate can be correlated to professional development. Collaboration doesn't necessarily increase professional development but could, still not much of an indicator. I'm a bit stumped on this one overall. In ECE, measurements include number of professionals with CDA, AA, or BA degrees in ECE. Is the goal with family support personnel to increase the level of their education (higher education) or to be sure that family support workers learn about ECE or??? These are process indicators rather than outcomes related to professional development and retention of staff.	Does turnover rate fit; i.e. Turnover rate for family support and literacy providers New Suggested indicator: #/% of family support providers that demonstrate core competencies in early childhood development. Delete – duplicative of the 2nd measure: # of participants in specialty education and training

GOAL AND INDICATORS	SA/A #/%	D/SD #/%	COMMENTS	Items for Discussion
development system 5. #/% of shared funding to support a family support and literacy professional development system 6. #of cross-agency family support and literacy providers participating in related professional development opportunities 7. # of specialty training sessions offered 8. # of participants in specialty education and training Notes: • Look at endorsements that are currently available. # of people with those endorsements. • # of specialty training sessions offered. What in particular – e.g. • Indicators of quality • Subset? • Professional development – geographically and accessibility • A continuum available • A rich array of training opportunities available • Advanced professional training • Core competencies vs. specialty topics such as special teens • Caregivers needs • Professionals needs			Important to include a measure that speaks to core competencies as well as specialty topics. Suggested indicator: #/% of family support providers that demonstrate core competencies in early childhood development. The last measure on "cross-agency" seems redundant with the second measure.	