



**Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy:  
Annotated Bibliography  
Research Section F:  
Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs**

**Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs** – This section of the annotated bibliography provides practitioners and government agencies with the answer to the following question: “Are family literacy programs effective?” Because programs are many and varied, there are no simple answers to this question.

Annotations are also cross listed as it is possible that a single document addresses several of the research strands identified in the annotated bibliography.

**Dr. Esther Prins  
Dr. Eunice N. Askov (Founder)**

**Joy Marie Bechtold  
Brendaly Drayton  
Elisabeth L. Grinder  
Ramazan Gungor  
Randi Jones  
Shara Kinney  
Maria Leonor Marvin  
Faith Miller  
Marcela Movit  
Eugenio Longoria Saenz  
Blair Willson Toso**

**Goodling Institute for Research on Family Literacy  
The Pennsylvania State University  
College of Education  
208 Rackley Building  
University Park, PA 16802  
<http://www.ed.psu.edu/goodlinginstitute/>**

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Alamprese, Judith. (2004). Understanding Adult Education in the Context of Family Literacy. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.), *Handbook of family literacy* (pp. 253-269). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This chapter presents an overview of adult education services as components of family literacy programs, particularly those programs that fall within the Head Start framework. Alamprese describes main funding sources, typical services, populations served, agencies that offer these services and the effectiveness of these services. Also highlighted are: participant enrollment and stability of enrollment; considerations and problems regarding assessment, instructional and curriculum issues; program effectiveness; and participant outcomes. These topics are discussed within the context of family literacy (Even Start) and contrasted to adult education programs which do not provide the additional services incorporated into Even Start programs. The author bases her discussions on research findings and delineates areas for future research that will serve the field. This article is of use to researchers, program administrators, curriculum developers, evaluators, and practitioners as it provides insight into the population represented by Head Start programs, their motivations and relevant family literacy issues with which the field continues to try to understand.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment & Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

Section H: Government Policy

Alamprese, J. A., & Tao, F. (2001). Family Independence Initiative (FII): Lesson learned about developing and delivering family literacy services to welfare recipients. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates.

This study is a continuation of the Family Independence Initiative instituted by the National Center for Family Literacy to address welfare policy changes. In this phase, eleven pilot sites were funded to further study how family literacy services can assist adults develop skills, obtain and retain employment, and assist in their children's social and academic development. The objectives of this pilot phase were:

1. Document adaptations family literacy programs must make to adjust to welfare reform and serve welfare recipients;
2. Identify positive and negative factors in the adaptation process;
3. Develop recommendations for family literacy programs

Lessons learned from the Family Independence Initiative:

Organizational Infrastructure

- A strong organizational infrastructure is needed with key administrators who understand rationale and operational requirements, and attend to core components such as staff, facilities, and funding;

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

- Organizations need to identify populations of clients so that services can target specific needs.

#### Program Coordination

- Programs need more specific training in collaborating with other agencies;
- Family literacy staff may need assistance identifying incentives offered to collaborating partners;
- Programs need to have a strategy for identifying clients who can participate in activities with business and training partners.

#### Integration of Services

- Staff should incorporate work preparation activities in adult education and parenting education components;
- Staff need time to coordinate activities between components;
- Staff need to understand underlying skills and use work-related applications;
- Staff should strengthen individual components before integrating components.

#### Overall Family Independence Initiative

- For programs adding family literacy components, staff need to develop an understanding of a complete program delivery system;
- Technical assistance is critical to building the infrastructure of a complete family literacy program; -Family literacy services may need to be sequenced for families who must address multiple barriers to participation;
- Programs need guidance in program evaluation and using data to manage services they deliver;
- Organizations need to plan sufficient time and resources to develop or reconfigure each component of a work-focused family literacy program;
- Programs must consider particular needs of their target population;
- Programs need to develop partners to provide non-educational services;
- Programs should schedule sufficient time for delivery of services to meet participants' needs.

#### **Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section E: Collaboration Within Programs and Among Social Service Agencies

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

##Askov, E. N., Kassab, C., & Weirauch, D. (2005). Women in Pennsylvania's family literacy programs: Effects of participant characteristics on extent of participation. *Adult Basic Education, 15*(3), 131-149.

The authors, using data from the 2001- 2002 Pennsylvania statewide evaluation of family literacy (FL), used a quantitative research design to establish the correlation between participant characteristics and duration or intensity of participation. Participation is considered one of the leading factors in successful achievement outcomes. The study was limited to adult female participants (1,142)—male participants make up a small percentage of FL participants. Some findings were: ESL students were more likely to participate in FL programs (both in intensity and duration), employed women and single-head of households participated less in FL programs, age positively impacted intensity of participation, African American women were less likely to participate in Parent Education and PACT components. These and other findings led to an inquiry of structural, cultural, content, and availability components of FL programs which may create barriers for women not only in FL but the wider field of AE.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs  
Section G: Culture & Context

Auerbach, E. R. (1989). *Toward a sociocontextual approach to family literacy*. Harvard Educational Review, 59, 165–181.

Based on her study of family literacy, which included the examination of current models of family literacy programs, ethnographic literature, and interactions with immigrant and refugee students, Auerbach proposes a broadening of the definition for family literacy, and a reevaluation of the family literacy model. Instead of a family literacy model that attempts to transmit school practices to the home, Auerbach supports a sociocontextual approach that incorporates family, culture, and community. The author discusses this new model of family literacy and provides examples and suggestions for its implementation.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models  
Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

## indicates that the article is a research study

Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy. (1989). *First teachers*. Washington, DC: Author.

This book contains a brief introduction which discusses the problem of illiteracy in the United States, the intergenerational transmission of literacy, the beliefs underlying family literacy programs, and how family literacy programs address illiteracy. The book consists of "snapshots" of the following 10 family literacy programs:

1. Parent and Child Education (PACE) Program
2. The Kenan Trust Family Literacy Project
3. SER Family Learning Centers (FLCs)
4. Parent Readers Program
5. MOTHERREAD
6. Mother's Reading Program
7. Arkansas Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY)
8. Parents as Partners in Reading
9. Parent Leadership Training Project
10. Avance Family Support and Education Program.

For each program, information is provided regarding how and why the program was developed, the setting, funding, and components of the program, evidence for the success of the program, and advice for policymakers and practitioners. A summary chart which details the goals, population, outreach efforts, funding, support services, materials, special features, and outcomes is also presented. A list of program contacts and other sources for information on literacy conclude the book. This book is helpful to individuals interested in learning about the different types of family literacy programs and efforts, as well as how to contact programs or centers for more information.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section H: Government Policy

Biancarosa, G., and Snow, C. E. (2004.) *Reading Next—A Vision for Action and Research in Middle and High School Literacy: A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

There are fifteen key elements that make an adolescent literacy program successful. While not all fifteen must be present in any single program, there are three that are crucial for achievement: professional development, formative assessment, and summative assessment. This article provides critical information for program developers.

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

**Cross-reference:**

Section C: Program Description and Models

Section D: Curriculum and Instruction

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

Brooks, G., Gorman, T., Harman, J., Hutchinson, D., & Wilkin, A. (1996). *Family literacy works*. London, England: The Basic Skills Agency.

This book reports on the evaluation of The Basic Skills Agency's Family Literacy Demonstration Programs by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER). The first part of the book describes the family literacy initiative in general and the various programs and their evaluations. The latter half is devoted to answering the following questions: (1) How effective were the Family Literacy Demonstration Programmes?; (2) Why were they effective?; and (3) What lessons and recommendations can be drawn from this information?

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Brooks-Gunn, J., Berlin, L. J., & Fuligni, A. S. (2000). Early childhood intervention programs: What about the family? In J.P. Shonkoff, & S.J. Meisels (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

The authors note that discussion pertaining to parent and family roles in early childhood initiatives appear to be missing or distorted. To address this omission, the authors depict ways in which families are critical to early childhood program access and how the programs influence parents' well being. This chapter also highlights how child outcomes are mediated through program effects on parents. It also shows how parent involvement is contingent on the relationships among parents, staff, and children. The authors review four types of programs: parent-focused home-based programs, parent-focused combination center- and home-based programs, intergenerational family literacy programs, and parent-focused literacy programs. These programs are discussed in relation to parent and family outcomes. The authors also examine the role of parents as catalysts of change in early intervention programs. The final two sections focus on policy, implications for practice, and recommendations for programs and their evaluations

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section A: Parent and Child Interactive Literacy

Section H: Government Policy

Section J: Parent Involvement

Chen, C., Seaman, D., & Perry, Y. (2003). Using evaluation data to document the value of Even Start family literacy programs. *Family Literacy Forum*, 2(1) 25-30.

Evaluations are the primary format used when assessing the effectiveness of a program, and are particularly useful to policy-makers in their decision-making relative to funding and the continuation of the program.

In this article, the authors argue the importance of evaluation data in Even Start Family Literacy programs. In fact, they propose that a program becomes strengthened through an effective evaluation process which ultimately leads to program direction, development, and the ability to make informed decisions about future program changes.

Chen, Seaman, and Perry describe the evaluation efforts of the Even Start program through the use of a variety of assessment tools including the Pre-school Language Scale, Basic English Skills Test (BEST), and Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE) describing each tool individually. However, the authors also noted the need for alternative forms of assessment. They propose that using only standardized assessment does not provide a complete picture of the effectiveness of a program, and suggest non-standardized forms of assessments such as interviews, surveys, and observations by the staff and evaluators to provide useful information in determining progress and possibly needed changes.

Ultimately, the effectiveness of the Even Start programs must be determined using solid data which needs to come from both qualitative and quantitative assessments. Evaluation reports that employ both qualitative and quantitative assessment provide a complete picture to policy-makers, the public, and other family literacy programs.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy

Section H: Government Policy

Comings, J. (2004). The process and content of adult education in family literacy programs. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.) *Handbook on Family Literacy* (pp. 233-252). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Comings writes of the four differences between children and adults as students. Adults choose to be in school and will “vote with their feet” to leave when they are not engaged. Authentic content must be present that is relevant to their life roles (in family, at work,

7

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

and within the community). The skills and knowledge base that adults bring to the classroom are much more diverse than those the children bring; therefore, more individualized instruction is necessary. Also, they must work towards goals that are personally important to them, and it must be convenient for them to participate.

Persistence is necessary for change so programming must support persistent behaviors. Force-field analysis should be used early to identify individual barriers and supports. Self-efficacy needs to be built and clear goals developed. When those are in place, persistent student effort needs to be measured in order to show growth. Most assessments are for accountability; however, adult student assessments should also indicate progress clearly and be self-evident for the student.

Comings suggests instruction that reaches students through their strengths rather than their weaknesses and programming that helps students plan how they will engage in both formal study and self-study. They should become aware of those opportunities to learn that exist beyond the classroom but connect with it. This chapter is of interest to anyone wishing to investigate the application of adult education within the context of family literacy.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section B: Parenting Education

Section C: Program Description and Models

Section D: Curriculum and Instruction

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation

Connors, L. J. (1993). *Project Self-Help: A family focus on literacy* (Rep. No. 13). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 380 230).

This document describes Project Self-Help, a school-based family literacy program serving parents and grandparents and their preschool and elementary-aged children. During the year, adult literacy classes and child classes met 2 times a week. During the summer, families had the opportunity to participate in a summer reading program that included educational field trips. The author describes the program in detail and provides information regarding the gains of both adults and children while enrolled in the program. Three case studies are included to highlight the different outcomes of adults depending upon their individual situations. The last part of the document includes a section about the lessons the program coordinator was able to learn from the implementation of Project Self-Help and is useful for individuals implementing school-based or other types of family literacy programs. Issues related to implementing family literacy programs and discussion of further research needed are also presented in this article.

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Daisey, P. (1991). Intergenerational literacy programs: Rationale, description, and effectiveness. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 20, 11–17.

Educators have acknowledged that a continuing focus on the mechanics of reading will not alleviate the literacy problem. As a result, the focus of attention has shifted to the family and the critical role it plays in the acquisition of reading skills. This article discusses the rationale behind the growing number of intergenerational literacy programs and how they target adult strengths to facilitate the literacy of an entire family. The three intergenerational projects evaluated were the Family Literacy Center at Boston University, the Parent Readers Program at the City University of New York, and the Kenan Trust Family Literacy Project. In addition, Daisey describes the Even Start legislation that provides funding for the continuing evaluation of family literacy programs.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Darling, S. (1992). Family literacy: Parents and children learning together. *Principal*, 72, 10–12.

Darling states that a mother's literacy is the best predictor of a child's academic success. In addition, parents who are undereducated or intimidated by schools often do not become involved in their child's learning. Darling states that the most effective literacy programs are intensive and include the whole family. The author discusses the Kenan Family Literacy Model and how its goal of breaking the intergenerational cycle of illiteracy is addressed by the program's components. The literacy programs based on the Kenan Model include the following four components: adult basic skills instruction; early childhood education; parent time; and Parent and Child Interactive Literacy. Preliminary results indicate that this model is effective for both the children and the adults. Darling reports that parents are more likely to continue with family literacy programs than with other adult education programs.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section J: Parent Involvement

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

DeBruin-Parecki, A. Assessing adult/child storybook reading practices [Electronic Version], 1-18. Retrieved Nov 8, 2005 from <http://www.ciera.org/library/reports/inquiry-2/2-004/2-004.html>.

This article describes the design of The Adult/Child Interactive Reading Inventory (ACIRI). It is a quantitatively scored tool that is supported by qualitative data in the form of written notes/observations. The ACIRI is “an observational interactive reading instrument” which measures parent/child joint storybook reading behaviors (p 7). The author states that research has shown that literacy habits and academic success of young children are linked to specific parent behaviors occurring during joint book reading; yet, there are few, if any, systematic measurements of these skills in place today. The author first reviews research on different aspects of joint storybook reading, such as the importance of practiced behaviors, the effects of diversity, and measurement of joint storybook reading behaviors. She then provides a description of the site location, participants, design of the instrument, procedures used in testing the evaluation tool and an examination of data gathered (interactivity, reliability, criterion validity, and consequential validity). The last part of the article provides a discussion on parent, teacher and the researcher’s reactions to the evaluation tool. This article is pertinent to those involved in parent/child evaluation.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment & Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

DeBruin-Parecki, A., Paris, S. G., & Seidenberg, J. L. (1996). *Characteristics of Effective Family Literacy Programs in Michigan*. (NCAL Technical Report TR96-07). University of Michigan, National Center on Adult Literacy.

This report reviews major models and practices in family literacy programs in Michigan and describes how programs adapt their instruction and services to their participants’ individual needs. Four case studies of different programs (Maple Tree Even Start – Kenan Model, Allen Prison - Parents as Partners in Reading Model, the Michigan HIPPIY Program, and the Christian Outreach Center) represent the range and variety of Michigan’s family literacy programs. The four representative programs as well as other programs, revealed the following strengths:

- Responsiveness to cultural, familial, and community characteristics
- Collaboration with surrounding agencies
- Good referral system
- Overcome barriers that would otherwise hinder increased access and participation
- Attempt to make curricula meaningful and useful to participants

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

- Balance of program components to include a significant amount of time spent on age interactive activities, which include good instruction and modeling
- Emphasis on understanding developmentally appropriate materials
- Provision of age-appropriate materials to families
- Increase self-efficacy through successful learning experiences
- Build bridges between parents and teachers, home and school
- Secure funding source
- Stable, collaborative staff with varied credentials and areas of expertise including community members with practical knowledge

In addition to these strengths, several weaknesses in Michigan family literacy programs were revealed. Recommendations based on the persistent program problems lead to the following suggestions:

- Theory and research is needed to guide services and practices, not commercial interests alone
- A greater integration of emergent literacy and adult literacy is needed to make practices interactive and intergenerational
- Curricula need to be individualized, goal oriented, meaningful, and relevant to participants' lives
- Programs need authentic, process-oriented assessments that are outcome based, and reflect progress accurately
- Programs need to consider the wider range of needs of their clients in order to help improve the standard of living in their communities.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Debruin-Parecki, A., Paris, S. G., & Siedenburg, J. (1997). Family literacy: Examining practice and issues of effectiveness. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 40, 596– 605.

The authors of the article work on the assertions that the field of family literacy struggles to define goals and practices and that single descriptions of family literacy are not possible because individual programs must tailor goals and services to the target population. To address these issues, the purpose of this study was to examine the broad range of family literacy programs throughout Michigan. Of 700 literacy programs contacted, only 50 programs fit criteria selected by the authors as family literacy programs, and 11 programs were selected for further in-depth analysis. Information on program processes was collected through classroom observations, interviews, and surveys. This article elaborates on two case studies to describe how family literacy program processes are implemented under different circumstances. This article ends with

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

four factors important for the design of an effective family literacy program: access to participation, curriculum with meaning in participant's lives, collaborating staff and administration with varied backgrounds, and stable funding.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section H: Government Policy

Dickinson, D.K., St. Pierre, R., and Weyl, J. (2004), High-quality classrooms: A key ingredient to family literacy program's support for children's literacy. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.) *Handbook on Family Literacy* (pp. 137-154). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

The authors argue that the changes made by intervention efforts must be much larger in magnitude than have been realized in the past. As intervention needs to begin earlier in support of emergent literacy and early literacy, they stress that high-quality "center-based" early childhood experiences must be available to those children who are at risk. As intervention needs to involve the family, they suggest that searching must continue for effective ways to enhance parents' role in fostering children's growth, but that the emphasis must be placed on creating high-quality classrooms.

"High-quality" in this context means assurance that children acquire "language skills, attitudes toward books and literacy, and knowledge about print that are needed for success in the early grades", as these skills are implicit in long-term literacy success. They are usually described as "structural variables", (including teacher training and teacher-student ratios), or "process variables" (access to varied materials, teacher-student relationships that are close and also exhibit engagement).

After reporting the levels of quality that can be found in early childhood classrooms, the authors review efforts to improve quality. They report that the Literacy Environment Enrichment Program (LEEP), a course one of the authors developed for teachers and their supervisors, significantly affected children's phonemic awareness and print knowledge. As teachers are the agents of change to boost children's literacy and to assist parents' use of effective practices, they need to access professional development that will help them define their own pedagogy. The lack of literacy-focused professional development limits the capacity of teachers to engage the families.

This chapter is of interest to anyone involved in early literacy practice or program development as well as those who are concerned with the professional development of early childhood teachers.

**Cross-Reference:**

- Section A Interactive Literacy
- Section C Program Descriptions and Models
- Section D Curriculum and Instruction
- Section F Assessment and Evaluation
- Section J Parent Involvement

Dion, J. A. (nd). *Cultivating Habits of Parental Involvement*. Retrieved January 25, 2002, from [http://courses.ed.asu.edu/nakagawa/FT\\_Parent.htm](http://courses.ed.asu.edu/nakagawa/FT_Parent.htm)

Currently, there is an emphasis on parental involvement in education. Goals 2000: Educate America Act states that “by the year 2000, every school will promote partnerships that will increase parent involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional and academic growth of children” (p. 1). The purpose of this research was to examine the effectiveness of early intervention family literacy programs in sustaining parental involvement habits. This paper was a research study that is based on the Family Tree program, which is an Even Start program, in Mesa, Arizona. The findings were measured by the teachers’ parental involvement reports.

Dion examined two major questions in this study. “Does participation in a family-literacy, early intervention program affect the typical pattern of parental involvement throughout a student’s primary grades? Does the intensity of the family intervention affect the relative patterns of parent involvement?” (p. 5) The research was based on an exploratory retrospective review of data collected and maintained by the Mesa Family Tree Program. The participants spanned a seven-year period in four separate groups, mixing genders in each group. The results of the study confirmed the researchers hypotheses. On the first question, parental involvement was found to be above or on average across the range of participants. With the second question, the study found a positive correlation between exposure to the intervention program and parental involvement. The greater intensity of exposure, the better the parental involvement. The paper also includes a chart with the survey questions and reported percentage of parental participation.

This paper would benefit researchers in the family literacy field because the study provides a step in evaluating the efficacy of the parental involvement component of the Family Tree program. It provides background data on family literacy and the Family Tree program. It also implies the need for more research to be conducted in this area.

**Cross-Reference:**

- Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs
- Section J: Parent Involvement

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Dwyer, M. C. (2000). The parenting education profile. *Family Literacy Forum*, 1(1), 5-8.

The author proposes a new observational approach to assessing parental behaviors associated with children's literacy outcomes—Parenting Education Profile (PEP). She argues that the value-added aspect of the parenting education and interactive literacy components of family literacy programs has been overlooked in formal evaluation. To address this issue, a team developed an approach that measures the growth of parents in their roles as their children's educators and advocates. PEP consists of four scales that are based on research about the parental behaviors associated with literacy learning outcomes for children:

1. Supporting children's learning in the home environment
2. Engaging in interactive literacy activities
3. Supporting children's learning in formal educational settings
4. Taking on the parent role

Each scale has three or more subscales that further define the constructs. The full instrument includes seventy-five descriptions of behaviors in fifteen different subscales. The descriptions are used to help summarize the status of parent progress. The intent is to identify the highest level of typical behaviors within each area of development, that is, the level of behaviors that represents patterns that are consistently observable. Parents are scored using a rubric ranging from 1 (the lowest score) to 5 (the highest score). Using the developmental level on the subscales as a guide to understand progress, those who are most familiar with the parent, such as family workers, home visitors, classroom teachers, and program evaluators, make assessments at six to twelve month intervals. As with any observation framework, the key in meaningful use of the PEP is full discussion and documentation of the patterns of behavior. Results of the use of this instrument have been successful so far.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section A: Parent and Child Interactive Literacy

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Fagan, W.T. (2001, July). *Family literacy programs: The whole is more than the sum of its parts*. Paper presented at the 12<sup>th</sup> Annual European Reading Conference, Dublin, Ireland. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED458584)

The author of this paper asks that we question “IF” and “WHY” a family literacy program is successful. He suggests that we take a reflective stance when viewing these programs. The author's purpose for writing this paper is to offer one critically reflective approach to evaluating all family literacy programs. In evaluating the success of a family literacy program one must consider the program's two main components: 1) its content/format and 2) its participants, both of which suggest that the “program is more than the sum of its parts” (pg. 2). The program that formed the basis for the author's study is the PRINTS (Parents' Roles Interacting with Teacher Support) Program, which

14

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

was started by the author in an attempt to meet the “perceived gap between homes and schools in terms of parents supporting the literacy development of their young children” (pg. 2).

The author describes the PRINTS Program as comprehensive and holistic in nature. It is based on five steps in which parents can take advantage of literacy opportunities: talk/oral language, play, books and book sharing, environmental print, and scribbling/writing/drawing. Within these steps the parent can assume five roles: providing opportunity for sharing with children, providing recognition/positive feedback, interacting in effective ways, modeling literacy, and setting guidelines. The program is structured but flexible, allowing parents to have an input about their child’s literacy experiences in suggesting modifications due to their child’s age and maturity.

The author introduces the concept of “Transfer of Learning.” The author states that “Transfer of Learning” across the different participants is linked like a chain. Therefore, parents can only provide adequate training to their children if they themselves were adequately trained, and in turn, their adequate training is dependent on the family literacy facilitator’s own training. In order to determine “Transfer of Learning,” reverse learning effects (methodology used by in the study) were used. This methodology allowed the researcher to determine how learning of one cohort group at one link of the chain affected the learning of the group following.

In closing, the author states that family literacy programs are not “gimmicks.” They need to be well-planned using theoretical and experiential frameworks that reinforce positive attitudes about children and literacy learning. Family programs need to focus on all participants (children, parents, family literacy facilitators) involved at different points along the “chain of learning.” The author states that to understand how a family literacy program works is to understand how the impact of one group of participants affects another.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section E: Collaboration Within Programs and Among Social Service Agencies

Section J: Parent Involvement

Fuligni, A.S. & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2004). Early childhood intervention in family literacy programs. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.) *Handbook on Family literacy* (pp. 117-136). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

This chapter summarizes research supporting early intervention for those children, from birth to age seven, who are economically disadvantaged, with focus on research relevant to family literacy. The overview includes types of intervention, research base for intervention and any implications for family literacy.

Research suggests that children from low income backgrounds do make gains – including reduction of delinquency and behavior problems. As research results support early intervention, the implications for supporting family literacy are positive. If young children and their families are involved in intensive programs of high quality, the effects are stronger than if the children alone are involved.

The authors stress that most research has studied the cognitive outcomes for preschoolers in specific environments. They suggest that the social, emotional and behavioral outcomes are equally of importance, as are the effects on children of other ages.

Ten recommendations for practice and implementation, and seven for evaluation studies are listed in detail at the end of this article before the extensive reference section. This information would be of value to anyone wanting access to a broad survey of research available within one document.

**Cross-Reference:**

- Section A: Interactive Literacy
- Section C: Program Description and Models
- Section F: Assessment and Evaluation
- Section H: Government Policy
- Section J: Parent Involvement

Gamse, B. C., Conger, D., Elson, D. & McCarthy, M. (1997). *Follow-up study of families in the Even Start In-depth Study*. Final report. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

This report discusses the findings of a study designed to follow-up the children of families studied in the original In-Depth Study (IDS) done in the first National Even Start Evaluation. In the IDS, families from five sites were randomly assigned to either Even Start programs or a comparison group. For the follow-up study, data was collected on 128 of the 179 children (72 percent) included in the random assignment group of the IDS. The majority of the children in the follow-up study were in the first or second grade. Data was collected from school records and included attendance rates, grades and achievement tests. In addition, information was obtained from school staff on school-level policies.

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

The authors report that the school environments attended by both the intervention and comparison groups were relatively homogenous. There were no significant differences between the Even Start and comparison group for level of participation in special programs. There was great variation in the type of achievement tests given as well as the purpose of administering the test. However, when children were given the same test, no significant differences were found. No grade differences were found between the two groups when controlling for a number of child and family variables. While the average rate of participation did not differ for children in Even Start and the comparison group, the average tardy rate was significantly less for the Even Start children. The authors conclude by explaining that these findings are not surprising, because programs demonstrating significant effects used a wider variety of measures and had a longer duration between completion of the program and follow-up studies. They suggest that with a longer interval and more comprehensive measures, "meaningful differences" may emerge.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

##Grinder, E. L., Sáenz E. L., Askov E. N., & Aldemir J. (2005) What's happening during the parent-child interactive literacy component of family literacy programs? *Family Literacy Forum*, 4 (1), 12-18.

In compliance with federal legislation that requires that Even Start programs use instructional programs that are based on research, this study aims to provide a prerequisite step in identifying "high quality" practices in interactive literacy experiences. It considers the process that occurs during the parent-child interactive literacy component in family literacy programs across Pennsylvania.

Through phone interview questionnaires with sites that previous research had identified as meeting the majority of the Family Literacy Performance Standards required by the state, the researchers were able to gain insight into key aspects of parent-child interactive literacy relating to purpose, sources of information used to develop/plan activities, ways staff plan and prepare, and assessment. The study showed that these programs stress the importance of parent-child interactive literacy time as a means of helping parents become accustomed to promoting their children's literacy. Despite this goal, most do not use scientifically-based research to inform their development or planning. Collaboration is crucial for all four family literacy components to be used appropriately and effectively. Assessment of these programs tends to be informal. The ones that are most successful use activities that reflect parents' and children's needs and goals, implement the activities, and debrief parents after the event. The information Grinder, et al, provide is invaluable as a starting point for researchers who plan to do further studies in this area and as a guide for program developers as they work to find "best practices" for their own programs.

## indicates that the article is a research study

**Cross-reference:**

Section A: PACT (Parent & Child Together) Time

Section C: Program Description/Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Griswold, K. & Ullman, C.M. (1997). *Not a one-way street: The power of reciprocity in family literacy programs*. CUNY, Bronx. Lehman College Institute for Literacy Studies. ERIC document ED413420.

This report describes the Family Literacy Involvement Through Education (FLITE) program, based on a partnership between a public school in the Bronx and the City University of New York. The success of the program was attributed to the following:

- Employing women from the community as family workers
- Extended opportunities for examining real-life issues and questions
- Comprehensiveness and flexibility
- Reflecting the diversity of participant observations
- The responsiveness and fluidity of staff development

Program development rational and case studies provide the bulk of evidence for why this program was successful and promotes the use of their techniques as applicable for other learners when adapted for their needs and strengths.

There were five main components to the program:

1. Home visits- these visits created a bridge between the home and the programs school-based parenting workshops. This was an original component of the program.
2. Parenting workshops- weekly two hour workshops in English and Spanish; it's a place where parents can come to discuss with each other the trials and tribulations of raising children as well as the "how to's" of accessing of educational and social institutions for parents who are new to the U.S.; the create a literacy context where parents can share and discuss their experiences and are given the tools in which to engage in critical discourse.
3. Staff development- Similar to the home visits and parenting workshops, these sessions evolve around staff questions and observations about their work. These sessions developed the family worker's literacy skills as well, by mirroring activities that they would use with their families (dialogue journals, etc.) they began to understand themselves as readers and writers too; the workers were able to find meaning in thought, action, and product; family workers were comprised of women from the community.
4. The preschool classroom- this was designed to do two things: 1. Provide the necessary free-time for the parents to attend adult education classes and 2. For FLITE staff to observe and interact with the children in another context, while

- introducing more learning experiences in a group setting to the children; it supports children's emergent literacy skills.
5. Adult education classes- These classes provide a forum for participants to exchange ideas on issues of critical importance, while continuing to develop their skills in discussion, reading, and writing; it helped forge linkages among literacy, learning, and their lives.

Findings:

- As time passed FLITE staff realized that adult education was an even more critical part of a family literacy effort than they had first imagined.
- It benefits children by reshaping relationships between mother and child.
- Multiple points of entry provide the ability to meet the variety of needs that students have entering a program and thereby continuing down the path of social-contextual curriculum development

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation

Hannon, P. and Bird, V. (2004). Family literacy in England: Theory, practice, research, and policy. In B. Wasik (Ed.) *Handbook on Family Literacy: Research and Services*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum. 23-39

In this article Hannon and Bird recall the past 30 years of family literacy research and practice in England both its developments and challenges. They begin by discussing some of the theoretical aspects of family literacy by distinguishing two basic meanings of the term. The first being *literacy practices within families* and the second being *literacy programs involving families*. From there they go on to explain how the practice of family literacy evolved from two separate strands of education, early childhood and adult literacy.

They explain how during the 1980s “family literacy programs in the broad sense were established,” and prescriptive approaches—paired reading, shared reading, and pause, prompt and praise, and family reading groups—to literacy emerged. Hannon and Bird highlight the significance of the ALBSU, a government funded agency, when it “imported a model of family literacy from the United States.” They discuss how the ALBSU went about developing and implementing programs through research, and that through this research and other projects like it the idea was to establish “a national prominence for family literacy.”

In terms of program evaluations, Hannon and Bird posit that enough research has been conducted in order to conclude that early childhood forms of family literacy programs are effective. In spite of this claim they argue that not enough research has been conducted in other areas relating to parental literacy development—take-up and participation. They

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

continue by admitting that not enough research has been conducted which examines the “synergistic benefits of the intergenerational program” as compared to stand-alone programs.

The authors then address four key policy issues—*funding, flexibility in program development, professional development, and research and evaluation*. They explain that in order for family literacy to grow it “needs to catch up with the rapidly changing policy climate and restate what it is for and where it fits” (p.34).

In conclusion they settle on the idea that up until now there seems to be the promotion of one main model of family literacy practice, and that what the field needs is more of an international exchange of ideas and experiences in order for family literacy to meet the developing and diverse needs of families around the world.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

Section G: Culture and Context

Section H: Government Policy

Hayes, A. E. (nd). *A rationale for comprehensive family literacy services: Theoretical and philosophical foundations and a summary of findings from follow-up studies*. Wilmington, NC: University of North Carolina, Watson School of Education.

One goal of evaluating family literacy programs is to analyze both the long- and short-term effectiveness of programs. Many evaluations (national, state, and local) have been performed on family literacy programs. Hayes’ report is a review of previous evaluations and literature, as well as, a summary of his research findings from family literacy programs.

The National Center for Family Literacy evaluated high quality, comprehensive family literacy programs and found that programs have had a significant impact on participants. However, National Even Start evaluations have uncovered mixed results of the effectiveness of family literacy strategies. Hayes states in his report that the strategies are not ineffective, but rather how these strategies are implemented. When programs implement family literacy models effectively and family participation is sustained, family goals are met and long-term effects achieved.

Hayes also proposes a model that describes a “system of influences” on children’s future, which is connected to the family literacy models. The “system of influences” is both social and personal and ranges from the family structure and environment to literacy development and formal education. Hayes offers the Kenan Family Literacy Model Program as an example of a comprehensive family literacy program. Hayes uses the

Kenan Family Literacy Model in the paper to demonstrate how the “system of influences” operates in a family literacy program.

Hayes suggests that for family literacy programs to be successful, they should evaluate how they implement their model of instruction. Hayes also suggests that program models should reflect legislative policies. Programs should build a family literacy model that suits the needs of the target population and is successful in creating both short- and long-term positive effects.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Hayes, A. (1996, January). *Longitudinal Study of Family Literacy Program Outcomes. Paper presented at the symposium for Family Literacy: Directions in Research and Implications for Practice*, Washington, DC. Retrieved September 10, 2002, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/FamLit/long.html>

Hayes asks the question “Are family literacy programs effective?” There is no simple answer to this question. Hayes suggests that to be effective, a research study must first define evaluation, research, and family literacy. Hayes discusses the evaluation as providing information, which can be useful in decision-making functions. The author then defines research as all the processes through which the project can reach error-reduced conclusions. The study addressed a working definition of focusing “...on literate families only. This working definition was arrived at by determining the capabilities needed by family members” (p.1). Hayes has a list of eighteen capabilities including communication and development goals. Family literacy programs are those that address family capabilities and have intergenerational family goals and effects. Because family literacy programs are designed to offer many services for all generations, other more focused programs appear to have more efficient effects. However, a researcher must consider the long-term and combined effects that family literacy programs have on families.

When framing long-term goals, plans, or research, some points need to be considered. Hayes lists eleven points including correlational studies and population considerations. Hayes proceeds to describe the designs, conditions, dangers, purposes, and approaches for longitudinal evaluation and studies. The dangers section is particularly interesting. Researchers fall into a pitfall when comparing groups of participants when, in fact, participants are very different. Another danger is not specifying a clear purpose for evaluation.

Longitudinal studies in family literacy should have a purpose and reflect on the needs, goals, and conditions of the family. The studies should be based on the theoretical design

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

of the program. Longitudinal studies should be conducted to achieve quality results; otherwise the studies are useless and time-consuming. This paper is pertinent to researchers especially those in family literacy. The author provides many factors, dangers, and approaches to consider when conducting a longitudinal study.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Hendrix, S. (1999/2000). Family literacy education-Panacea or false promise? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 43(4), 338-346.

This article is not a research report but a critique of family literacy programs. The author points out that although the current family literacy programs based on the National Center for Family Literacy's four-part model are popular, research "indicates several additional concerns that make this model of education more likely to further fragment than to unite the field of literacy" (p. 340).

Hendrix states that there are four major categories of concerns. The first category of concern is that the current family literacy program model is a compensatory model. He expresses a concern that current programs "single out particular families as 'in need' of specific kinds of help, and within these families, further selects specific individuals (generally a young child and mother) (p. 340). The author cautions that family literacy programs should be careful of labeling families or family members as "at risk" by someone else's standard and not to try to fit all families into narrow, ethnocentric, and bourgeois models of education.

As a second concern, the author believes that the current model that usually focuses on a mother and a pre-school child is isolationist in that it does not include the participation of other family members. Hendrix says that programs should not overlook older siblings or other adults. He feels that programs would benefit from working with whole families and communities.

A third concern stated by Hendrix was that although the family literacy program model includes an interactive literacy component, many programs are omitting this component. The author feels that programs keep adults and children separate most of the time and that programs should be more interactive and intergenerational. He also believes that the adult literacy component often replicates high school settings in which the adult had previously failed and did not meet necessary instructional goals that would make it possible to escape the cycle of poverty. In particular, Hendrix expressed a concern for a lack of job skills and search assistance.

The final concern, mentioned by Hendrix, was the lack of and temporary nature of funding for family literacy programs. He proposes that families and communities should

22

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

take ownership of family literacy programs. He states that although the concept of family literacy will remain very popular, “family literacy education as currently configured and practiced will not likely heal the fractures within the field of literacy education, nor will these programs produce sweeping national social or economic changes” (p.343).

In conclusion, Hendrix proposes a family literacy program model based on research would be one that included: (1)multiple family voices reflecting culture, ethnicity, race, and gender, (2)socially responsible and family-responsive programs that are learning-centered and focus curriculum on issues such as women’s issues, (3)imagine and develop programs that “we are willing to give away” to families and communities.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Holt, D.D. (1994). *Assessing success in family literacy projects: Alternative approaches to assessment and evaluation*. McHenry, IL: Delta Systems.

This handbook serves as a resource for staff members interested in evaluating family literacy projects as it presents alternative approaches to assessing and evaluating family literacy projects. Alternative approaches are defined as those that are flexible, represent the curriculum, are relevant to learners, and indicative of the abilities and knowledge acquired. Chapter two offers a model for integrating program planning, implementation and evaluation activities. Chapter three presents the use of initial assessments at intake of a family literacy project. Chapter four demonstrates the use of alternative assessment and evaluation for documenting learners' progress. Chapter five presents four alternative approaches to assessment and evaluation, and discusses the processes involved with collecting data, analyzing data, using data, and reporting data and findings. Chapter six provides a description of the process used to design this handbook.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Horn, B. V., Kassab, C., & Grinder E. (2002). *Pennsylvania’s family literacy programs: Results of a statewide evaluation 1999-2000*. University Park, PA: Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

This is a statewide evaluation report of Even Start Family Literacy Programs and Pennsylvania’s Adult Literacy Act 143 Family Literacy Programs funded by federal and state monies, respectively, during the 1999-2000 program year. Data were collected and analyzed from survey and focus groups that included parents, family literacy partners, and their community partners. The evaluation focused on determining the effectiveness of Pennsylvania’s family literacy programs in providing integrated family-centered adult

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

literacy and early education and related support services to meet the educational needs of eligible families.

Six questions were designed to determine the effectiveness of these family literacy programs:

1. To what extent did family literacy programs identify and recruit eligible and “most in need” families?
2. To what extent did families participate in the educational and support services offered through the family literacy program?
3. To what extent did participation in the family literacy program result in positive outcomes for parents and their children?
4. To what extent were family literacy providers able to establish and maintain partnerships with existing community resources to support participating families?
5. To what extent was the Family Literacy Summer Reading Program successful in supporting partnerships between family literacy providers and public libraries?
6. To what extent was the Family Literacy Summer Reading Program successful in engaging families, both those enrolled in family literacy programs and those not enrolled, in participating in reading activities during the summer months?

Evaluation findings indicated that family literacy programs did make a difference:

1. Programs served families most in need of services.
2. Families participated fully in the family literacy program and gained access to needed support services.
3. Pennsylvania’s family literacy programs were successful in providing education leading to statistically significant improvements in adults’ academic skills; however, changes to families’ economic status were mixed. Overall, changes in family income were minimal; however, significantly higher percentages of working parents received employer benefits.
4. These programs also had a positive impact on preschool children’s readiness to learn and school-age children’s success in school.
5. Parents who had participated in family literacy for over one year made significantly larger gains than short-term participants in the frequency with which they read to their children, their children read to them, and their children read for fun.
6. Overall, family literacy programs were successful in establishing partnerships with agencies and organizations providing educational and support services.
7. The Family Literacy Summer Reading Program was successful in establishing new and building existing partnerships between family literacy programs and public libraries.

The findings also suggested several broad areas in which family literacy programs might improve services:

1. Family literacy providers should identify and address changes in their communities that affect delivery of family literacy services.

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

2. Family literacy providers continue to need assistance in building effective local collaborations that move beyond simple referral services.
3. Providers should identify and implement strategies to increase parents' and their children's participation in family literacy services.
4. Efforts should be made to support the family literacy professional development and program improvement systems.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Johnson, R. L., Willeke, M. J., & Steiner, D. J. (1998). Stakeholder collaboration in the design and implementation of a family literacy portfolio assessment. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 19(3), 339–353.

Despite the strong advocacy for stakeholder input in collaborative, participatory, and empowerment forms of evaluation, little is documented in the literature describing the involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making processes that occur in evaluation. This case study examines the implementation of portfolio assessment in an Even Start Family Literacy Program in Nebraska. Unique to this evaluation is the strong degree of collaboration between staff and evaluator. Staff and evaluators collaborated by (1) identifying what was to be assessed, (2) the decision of the use of the portfolio as a means of assessment, (3) designing the portfolio assessment, and (4) reviewing the portfolios. Participants in the family literacy program also assisted staff by selecting and collecting items to go into the portfolio. This article ends by offering several lessons learned from this collaborative evaluation experience.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

##Karther, D. (2002). Fathers with low literacy and their young children. *The Reading Teacher*, 56(2), 184-193.

Parents play an important role in the literacy development of their children. In the past, studies have focused on the maternal influence. However, there is a recent interest in the paternal influence. This article is a phenomenological study that was conducted with the West Virginia Even Start Family Literacy program. It presents two families that have similar demographic variables. Each family is European American, consists of married parents with two preschool children, and who is on some form of public assistance.

The Even Start Family Literacy Program is a federally funded program that offers educational opportunities for low-income families. It provides early childhood education, adult education, and parenting education. The West Virginia program specifically

## indicates that the article is a research study

addresses the literacy skills of parents and children, parent roles, and self-sufficiency. Services from the program include home visits every one or two weeks from a family educator. Each visit contains developmentally appropriate literacy activities for the children and parents to do during the visit and to continue to do after the home visitor has left.

The study specifically focuses on the father's interaction with his children and the effect that this has on the children's development. The article describes the two families in depth and the responses of the fathers to the home visits. The study was conducted on home visits because the fathers were not the primary participants in the program. Each family valued education and realized the need for their children to possess the skill of reading. Each family wanted their children to succeed. "Despite their own school failures and frustrations with learning, the fathers attempted to support their children's literacy learning" (p.191). Even though the effects of the study did not yield statistical differences, the fathers did initiate some reading habits and actively participate in their child's learning. The parents also claimed to see an improvement in their children's literacy development after participating in the program.

The author provides some program implications that evolved from this study. First, fathers should not be excluded from literacy activities with their children. Second, family educators should include activities and books that match fathers' reading abilities and deal with traditional male roles to spark interest. Third, program planning should be considerate of fathers' benefits. Fourth, providers should be aware that children can encourage the fathers' efforts in literacy activities and provide positive reinforcement. Finally, parents who read to children and participate in literacy development will positively affect children's literacy development.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section A: Parent and Child Interactive Literacy

Section B: Parenting Education

Kerka, S. (1991). *Family and Intergenerational Literacy* (ERIC Digest No. 111). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED334467)

"Teach the parent, reach the child." This is the theory behind family and intergenerational literacy programs. The difference in family literacy programs is the focus on the parent and child. Intergenerational programs involve other family members, neighbors, guardians, and adult volunteers as well as parents and children. The concept of family and intergenerational literacy can be theoretically justified, but research evidence is slow to emerge. This digest outlines the different types and characteristics of literacy programs, as well as the issues surrounding each program.

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

This digest reviews four types of literacy programs. The types involve the approach that the program takes to literacy. First, there is a direct adult-direct children approach. This type is the most highly structured and it involves intense instruction, although there is a high amount of interaction between parent and child. An example of this type of approach is the PACE (Parent and Child Education) program. A second approach is an indirect adult-indirect children approach. This type is voluntary and it requires a short-term commitment and a less formal learning atmosphere. Skills are not directly taught in this type. An example of this is the library storytelling programs. The third type is a direct adult-indirect children approach. The theory behind this approach is that if the adults are coached on how to do a skill, then the child will reap the benefits by participating in activities with the adult. This type could include seminars, workshops, and instruction for adults. The last type is the indirect adult-direct children approach. Children directly receive instruction on reading skills during school, in after-school programs, or preschool. Parents may be involved in workshops and other events. A specific example of this approach is the Running Start program, which is offered by Chrysler plants. This program targets first graders who are learning to read. The students participate in reading contests, while the parents are given tips on helping their children read at home.

Literacy programs need research to support them. Studies show that children's achievement and motivation are linked to family characteristics such as morals, values, standards, and attitudes towards education. These findings support a holistic approach to teaching rather than separating by skills. This digest also raises some questions for further study including whether or not the replication of the program model would produce similar effects. Other issues exist that can affect the design of the program including the definition of literacy, type of literacy, and locus for change. This digest provides many definitions for literacy including measurable skills, tools, school-like activities, or construction of meaning. The definition that a program subscribes to affects the curriculum that is developed.

This digest is a useful tool for practitioners because it provides definitions and issues of family and intergenerational literacy programs. However, because the digest was written in 1991 some of the research questions and assumptions may be out-dated.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section J: Parent Involvement

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Kerka, S. (1992). *Family literacy programs and practices: Practice application brief*. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 347 328).

This Practice Application Brief serves as an overview of some of the basic components of family literacy programs. The brief begins by discussing the philosophy that underlies family and intergenerational literacy programs and perspectives from which the programs are modeled. The author espouses programs based on an empowerment model (drawing on family strength) rather than those based on the "deficit" model. The author classifies effective family/intergenerational literacy programs into four categories based upon Nickse's model. The four models (adult direct-children direct, adult indirect-children indirect, adult direct-children indirect, and adult indirect-children direct) are discussed with a description and example provided for each type. Also included in this brief are strategies for effective program implementation. Topics discussed with regard to implementing and maintaining an effective program are audience, recruitment and retention, subject matter, and recognition.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Kuy, K. (1999). Using technology in family literacy programs. *Literacy Practitioner*, 5(2).

The author of this article discusses how practices in 50 GTE Family Learning Centers in seventeen states have responded to three primary goals:

- Increasing the literacy skills, computer skills, and parenting skills of parents
- Increasing the pre-literacy, reading, study skills, and computer skills of children
- Increasing parent-child interaction around reading and school

Comments regarding technology use in family literacy programs:

- Using technology in family literacy programs gives parents and children opportunities to be active participants in their own learning processes
- Programs can provide access to computer technology that might not otherwise be available
- Technology can assist enrollment and persistence
- Parents have applied newly learned skills to family issues and activities
- Parents have reported increased time reading to their children, helping with homework, and talking about books, reading, and computers at home
- Parents have attained employability skills and used computer skills in their communities
- Parents have developed a greater awareness of the part computers play in their lives and learned patience and care in working with computers

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

- Parent and Child Interactive Literacy activities can include parents and children working together on computers
- Parents with low literacy skills and high-risk children often have limited opportunities to access technology. Integrating technology into family literacy programs can address this issue.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Langer, A. (2003). Adult education theory and family literacy practice. *Family Literacy Forum*. 2(1) pp. 12-18.

Understanding the relationship between family literacy and adult learning is paramount in the services provided by Family literacy practitioners. This relationship impacts the work ethic, dignity, solidarity, culture, cognition, and self-esteem of individuals participating in literacy programs. The author looks at adult learning using the following four theories:

- Transitions and transformations
- Learning preferences and experiential learning
- Ways of knowing
- Life histories and intercultural communications

Based on the above theories, the bridge between theory and practice can best be accomplished when practitioners:

- Understand adult learning preferences
- Recognize the value of experiential knowledge that adults process and how adults can apply this knowledge
- Recognize linear and non-linear adult development

Theories relative to adult education are considerably valuable to programs that offer family literacy services. When effectively used, adult education theories can support practitioners as they plan and implement programs that will successfully meet the diverse needs of the participants. This article supports the above statement and is relevant for staff developers.

**Cross-reference:**

Section I: Professional Development

Section C: Program Description and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Levesque, J. (2000, December). Across the great divide. *Focus on Basics*, 4, 1,3-5.

In this study, Levesque sought to answer the question: “How do family literacy projects integrate educational technologies and prepare families for success in a society increasingly dependent upon, even driven by, technology?” This study was conducted over a one year period in which time, the author, working as a state evaluation consultant for Even Start family literacy programs, visited nine programs, interviewed staff, conducted workshops for practitioners, e-mailed a technology survey to 12 projects, and reviewed local programs’ annual evaluation reports. The findings of the study are as follows:

- Didn’t observe adult learners using the Internet
- Few computers were wired for Internet access
- Adult learners did practice keyboarding
- Adults with less education, especially those with low-income in family literacy programs, have fewer skills and familiarity with technology
- Attendance increased significantly with free email and daily Internet access
- There were higher retention and attention rates as consequence of increased access to educational technology
- There was some technical support from local school districts
- There is still a gap between practitioners willing to integrate technology into their teaching and those who shun computers
- Many parents perceive computer literacy as important for employability and for their children’s success in school
- Low-income families who cannot afford computers at home feel their children are at a disadvantage in school
- Many programs acquire their technology secondhand from schools and businesses
- There was a lack of reference to computer-assisted instruction in 7 of 12 programs reviewed
- Computers were not allowed in infant/toddler rooms for safety reasons where they previously were used during Parent and Child Interactive Literacy time
- Loaning computers to families can be helpful educationally but may cause financial problems if families try to purchase computers without financial planning

Summary:

- Funders must make family literacy programs’ access to high-quality technology resources and professional development a high priority
- Access to technology can provide learner motivation
- Family literacy programs can match personal learning goals with educational technology
- Family literacy practitioners and tutors need paid professional development opportunities

- Family literacy programs can integrate educational technologies with Parent and Child Interactive Literacy time
- Programs can help adults to use technology to achieve personal learning goals, develop communication skills, accommodate individual learning styles and disabilities, enhance self-esteem, and increase employability skills.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Levin, M., Gamse, B., Swartz, J., Tao, F., & Tarr, H. (1997). *National evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program: Report on Migrant Even Start Projects*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates and Fu Associates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 411 118).

This report evaluates three Even Start Migrant Education Programs: the Arizona Migrant Even Start Project, the Pennsylvania Migrant Even Start Project, and the Wisconsin Migrant Even Start Project. Discussion of each project includes: program structure and administration, characteristics of the communities served, family recruitment, content and delivery of services, staff characteristics, service component coordination, participation and follow-up strategies, evaluation of Even Start Information System, and conclusions. The challenges faced by programs are as follows: hiring qualified staff, adapting service delivery to families' schedules, interagency collaboration, continuity of services between home base and receiving site, providing support services, dealing with isolation in the community, and obtaining Spanish language curriculum. Recommendations from this report include: increase collaboration across Even Start sites, encourage communication between migrant Head Start and Even Start programs, provide more technical assistance, and provide opportunities for Migrant Even Start projects to share experiences with other Even Start Projects.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Levin, M., Moss, M., Swartz, J., Khan, S., & Tarr, H. (1997). *National evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program: Report on Even Start Projects for Indian tribes and tribal organizations*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates and Fu Associates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 415 084).

This report presents an evaluation of three tribal Even Start projects: The Cherokee Nation Even Start Project, Makah Even Start Project, and Pascua Yaqui Even Start Project. The Cherokee Nation Even Start Project was based on home-based services and

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

the Makah Pascua Even Start Projects implemented a combination of home-based and center-based services. The report covers the following: community characteristics (economics, education, health), family recruitment, staff characteristics, content and delivery of services, coordination of service components, participant and follow-up strategies, project impacts, and features important to success and challenges faced.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Lonigan, C. J., & Whitehurst, G. J. (1998). *Getting ready to read: Emergent literacy and family literacy* (Contract No. 1HD-RO3-36067-01A1; 91-01249-0000; 90-CD-0957; 90-YD-0026). Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families. Philadelphia, PA: Pew Charitable Trusts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED450418)

The goal of family literacy programs is to improve family performance and opportunity while at the same time enhancing child and adult literacy using intergenerational intervention strategies. It is important that programs help families get food stamps or medical assistance and also teach adult participants about disciplining children and how to handle stress. A recent study of Even Start programs concluded that many programs have shifted too far away from the focused efforts to enhance literacy skills and instead have adopted an agenda that focuses too strongly on background issues of family functioning.

Reading skills are the foundation for children's academic success. Children are more successful and acquire more knowledge in a variety of areas when they read well and with higher frequency. Children who read less and have trouble with reading fall farther and farther behind their peers and develop negative attitudes about reading. The author makes a comparison to Stanovich's "Matthew Effect" (the rich get richer while the poor get poorer).

A "strong continuity between the skills with which children enter school and their later academic performance" (pg. 4) is evident in research. A high correlation occurred (.88) that children who were poor readers at the end of first grader would become poor readers at the end of fourth grade. Here, the authors make the distinction between the traditional approach to teaching reading and emergent literacy. Emergent literacy conceptualizes literacy acquisition as a developmental continuum, rather than as an all-or-nothing phenomenon that begins when children start school. Finally, reading well is dependent on the development of the "inside-out" (semantics) and "outside-in" (pragmatics) processes that are necessary to create meaningful comprehension.

The authors discuss in detail two “outside-in” elements (oral language and print motivation) and two “inside-out” elements (phonological processing and letter knowledge) as components of emergent literacy. They also discuss the implications of social class differences in emergent literacy stating that “school readiness” is strongly linked to family income and that children from low-income families have relatively low levels of emergent literacy when compared to peers from middle-income families. The authors ask what can be done, then provide a rich literature review of best practices focusing on the home literacy environment and parental involvement. In conclusion, all evidence highlights the success of intervention programs for preschool and early grade school children as having significant impact on key emergent literacy skills

**Cross-Reference:**

Section D: Curriculum and Instruction

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section J: Parent Involvement

McDonald, B. A., & Scollay, P. A. (2002, April). *The focus on family in adult literacy improvement*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

This paper was a longitudinal narrative research study based on interviews with 123 learners and 121 tutors in the California State Library Families for Literacy Program (FFL). Data were recorded and analyzed into both qualitative and quantitative formats. The emphasis of this study was on the learners’ views of their own lives and their views of how this program has influenced their lives. The authors challenged the traditional model of family literacy that conceptualizes the improvement of parental literacy on children’s literacy as a straight line. Instead, they propose a modified model in which learners’ changes are multifaceted and indirectly affect their children including the identity, social context and goal changes of the parents.

The focus of this research is on the long-term effects of family literacy and the reasons these effects occur. Three aspects of change in the lives of family literacy participants were addressed:

1. How does learner identity change during this transitional phase? How do the learners describe themselves? How do the narrative self-descriptions given by the learners reveal identity shifts?
2. What are the social contexts for these transitions? Specifically what types of social networks exist for adult learners? How does the relationship with the tutor impact the learner’s life?
3. How does participation in the literacy program impact the learners’ family? How might improved parental literacy interact with children’s developing literacy?

Findings from this study suggest that benefits learners gain occur both personally and for their children. The path from learners to their children may reflect indirect parental changes in identity, social context, and goals, as well as gains in literacy. First, the way learners describe themselves suggests they are more confident as a result of the program. Second, learners' social networks are less extensive than those of the tutors; they have fewer members in their social network than those of similar aged groups in this study. The authors then point out that learners may have difficulty learning due to lack of social support. Finally, the goal the learners set for themselves and their children appear to change with participation in the program. It seems that the desire to help their children brings these adults into this learning program; therefore, they reported their major role as "parent" more often than any other roles. Participants believe they are in a better position to help their children if they are also learning.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

McIvor, M. C. (Ed.). (1990). *Family literacy in action: A survey of successful programs*. Syracuse, NY: New Readers Press.

This book intends to cover a variety of family literacy programs that value the adult role in shaping a child's literacy development. The author highlights eight innovative intergenerational and/or family literacy programs: Marion County Library Family Literacy Program; Beginning with Books; Parent Readers Program; Motherhead; Project WILL; The Kenan Family Literacy Project; Mothers' Reading Program; and Take Up Reading Now. Included is a list of the funding sources, participants, and outcomes for each program.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Meyer, B. J. F., & Wijekumar, K. (in press). A Web-Based Tutoring System for the Structure Strategy: Theoretical Background, Design, and Findings. In D.S. McNamara (Ed.), Reading comprehension strategies: Theories, interventions, and technologies. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Intelligent Tutoring of the Structure Strategy (ITSS) teaches middle school students the structure strategy (identifying the overall top-level structure of expository text and using that structure to organize their reading comprehension) through a web-based tutoring program. Meyer and Wijekumar review two previous studies, for both of which Meyer was the principal investigator, that tested whether ITSS was an effective tool for teaching fifth and seventh grade students the structure strategy. Specifically, they considered the

34

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

effects of different feedback and motivation conditions during delivery. They further identified reading related metacognitive strategies used by 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> graders, some of the key motivational factors for middle school students, and how to adapt ITSS to students' preferences based on students' suggestions. Students' responses seemed to indicate that ITSS provided them with a formal understanding of the reading structures they had experienced.

**Cross-reference:**

**Section D:** Curriculum and Instruction

**Section F:** Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

Morrison, F. J., Bachman, H. J., & Connor, C. M. (2005). *Improving Literacy in America: Guidelines from Research*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

The authors (professors at U. of Michigan, U. of Pittsburgh and Florida State, respectively) examine the changing policies, educational reforms and practices in the arena of literacy. Their central argument is that in seeking answers to the literacy crisis occurring in the U.S., one should look to the proximal (parent involvement, childcare, etc.) rather than the distal (social economic status, reducing class size, etc.). The authors promote: literacy learning from a very young age, effective parenting, quality daycare, and effective teaching and training strategies, such as mentoring, professional development. The researchers emphasize the need for and the application of continued research in all the aforementioned areas, particularly in teacher education. While the authors make useful suggestions for the improvement of successful literacy learning, they underplay both the socio-cultural aspects of literacy and the policy and financial aspects of implementing these changes.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Description and Models

Section B: Parenting Education

Section D: Curriculum and Instruction

Section A: Parent and Child Interactive Literacy Time

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

Section H: Government Policy

Morrow, L. M. (Ed). (1995). *Family Literacy: Connections in Schools and Communities*. New Brunswick, NJ: International Reading Association, Inc.

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

This book was referred by a number of participants coming to the meeting, so it is included in this collection. For your reference, the chapters included in the book and their authors are listed here.

Part One: Perspectives on Family Literacy

1. Family Literacy: New Perspectives, New Practices—Lesley Mandel Morrow
2. Which Way for Family Literacy: Intervention or Empowerment?—Elsa Roberts Auerbach

Part Two: Family Literacy Practices –

1. Programs in Schools
  - a. Implementing an Intergenerational Literacy Project: Lessons Learned—Jeanne R. Paratore
  - b. Combining Parents’ and Teachers’ Thoughts About Storybook Reading at Home and School—Patricia A. Edwards
  - c. The Family Writing and Reading Appreciation Program—Lesley Mandel Morrow with Jody Scoblionko and Dixie Shafer
  - d. Have Your Heard Any Good Books Lately?: Encouraging Shared Reading at Home with Books and Audiotapes—Patricia S. Koskinen, Irene H. Blum, Nancy Tennant, E. Marie Parker, Mary W. Straub, and Christine Curry
  - e. Enhancing Adolescent Mothers’ Guided Participation in Literacy—Susan B. Neuman
  - f. Let the Circle Be Unbroken: Teens as Literacy Learners and Teachers—Billie J. Enz and Lyndon W. Searfoss
2. Organization-Sponsored Programs
  - a. Reading Is Fundamental Motivational Approach to Family Literacy—Ruth Graves and James H. Wendorf
  - b. Helping First Graders Get a Running Start in Reading—Linda B. Gambrell, Janice F. Almasi, Qing Xie, and Victoria J. Heland
  - c. The Even Start Family Literacy Program—Patricia A. McKee and Nancy Rhett
  - d. A Comprehensive Approach to Family-Focused Services—Meta W. Potts and Susan Paull
  - e. Parents and Children Reading Together: The Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy— Benita Somerfield
  - f. Linking Families, Childcare, and Literacy: *Sesame Street* Preschool Educational Program— Iris Sroka, Jeanette Betancourt, and Myra Ozaeta
  - g. The Family Literacy Alliance: Using Public Television, Book-Based Series to Motivate At-Risk Populations—Twila C. Liggett

Part Three: Developing New Practice

1. Research and Perspectives

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

- a. Family Literacy Practice in the United Kingdom—An International Perspective—Colin Harrison
- b. Opportunities for Literacy Learning in the Homes of Urban Preschoolers—Linda Baker, Robert Serpell, and Susan Sonnenschein
- c. Children Practicing Reading at Home: What We Know About How Parents Help—Diane H. Tracey
- d. Shared Lives and Shared Stories: Exploring Critical Literacy Connections Among Family Members—Daniel Madigan
- e. Representations of Literacy: Parents’ Images in Two Cultural Communities—Vivian Gadsen

**Cross-Reference:**

Section G: Culture and Context

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Morrow, L. M., Tracey, D. H., & Maxwell, C. M. (Eds.). (1995). *A survey of family literacy in the United States*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

This book, intended for use by teachers, parents, and policymakers, describes the historical development of the field of family literacy, as well as a current picture of family literacy in the United States. It offers detailed information about specific programs in the field in its more than 100 sources concerning family literacy. In addition to an Overview section, there are several other sections providing informative entries: Parent Involvement Programs; Intergenerational Programs; Research on Naturally Occurring Literacy in Families; Agencies and Associations Dealing with Family Literacy; and Further References About Family Literacy.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section H: Government Policy

Section J: Parent Involvement

Nakagawa, K., McKinnon, A., & Hackett, M. R. (2001, April). *Examining the discourse of strengths vs. deficits in a family literacy program*. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Seattle, Washington. Retrieved August 14, 2003, from <http://courses.ed.asu.edu/nakagawa/AERANakagawa.htm>

Although most family literacy programs attempt to use a “strengths” based rationale, programs often inadvertently fail to truly respect the diversity in literacy and parenting skills of families of other cultures. Instead, these families especially low-income ethnic and language minority families are viewed as having “deficits.” This study is a

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

beginning attempt to explore how deficits and strengths are perceived and reinforced in a family literacy program using two kinds of data: observation notes and written/archival documents. This paper considers the strengths vs. deficits perceptions in relation to one family literacy program, Family Tree (an Even Start model) that serves approximately 150 families, primarily Latina/o, Spanish-speaking population in Arizona's largest school district. The primary questions considered in this study are:

1. Is a "deficit" perspective produced through the Family Tree program? If so, how?
2. Is a "strengths" perspective supported through the program? If so, how?

The exploratory analysis revealed three ways that a "discourse of deficits" is constructed: through the stated program goals, through the required assessments, and through parenting education topics. Without the program's goals and objectives explicitly supporting the strengths based stance, there is no underlying structure to promote a "discourse of strengths." A review of some of the state-required parenting assessments found that the assessments did not account for cultural differences in parenting, so some parents received "deficient" ratings in certain areas. Parenting education discussion topics revealed assumptions that parents were at-risk of poor or harmful parenting practices. The study cites research that suggests going beyond the strengths/deficits models to one that emphasizes a discourse of social change. Unfortunately, although elements that promote social change are sporadically present in the Family Tree program, they are not inherent to the structure of the program. In addition, the teachers recognized the deficit perspectives underlying the required assessments; although they did not recognize the ways in which their own practices (decisions about parenting topics and interactions with families) support either a strengths or deficits perspective. The authors found a tension in the Family Tree program between families' strengths being acknowledged but underlying deficits sometimes assumed.

#### **Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

National Center for Family Literacy. (1996). *Outcomes and measures in family literacy programs*. Louisville, KY: Author.

This publication serves as a resource guide for the evaluation of family literacy programs. Developed by the National Center for Family Literacy, this manual focuses on evaluating those goals that are the embodiment of family literacy programs. To assist with planning program evaluation, the manual is divided into six sections. The first section is entitled "Important Terms and Concepts" and defines literacy, as well as family literacy, in order to identify the outcomes of family literacy programs. The second section, "Assessment Issues," describes the purpose and types of assessments. To aid in the selection of measures, the manual provides lists of advantages and disadvantages associated with different types of assessment. Section 3, "Participant Outcomes and Measures," provides a list of short- and long-term participant outcomes for each of the four components in a comprehensive family literacy program. Sections 4 through 6 provide lists of published

38

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

instruments accompanied by summaries for measures pertaining to adult learner outcomes, parent and parent-child outcomes, and preschool child outcomes, respectively.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

National Center for Family Literacy (2000). *Connecting families and work: Family literacy bridges the gap*. Louisville, KY: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED450945)

A skills gap separates adults from the jobs they need and the employers from the workers they want. These adults are characterized as welfare recipients under the stress of welfare reform, immigrants with limited English language skills, and low-skilled workers unable to transcend poverty. They are also the parents of the children in our nation's public schools. For most of these adults, the biggest obstacle to success in the workplace is poor literacy skills. It is estimated that American businesses lose more than \$60 billion a year due to the lack of basic skills of employees. Employers today are expecting more than ever from their employees. They expect employees to not only have basic academic skills, but also creative thinking, problem solving, and interpersonal skills. Technological advances, too, have raised the standards for the level of skills needed in today's marketplace. To bridge the gap between adults and the marketplace, support needs to be provided to struggling families; parents need to learn to help their children; and families, communities, and employers need to envision brighter futures. This is all possible through multifaceted family literacy programs that focus on literacy and skills development. These programs help meet employers' demands of the workforce and at the same time improve the outcomes for families.

Recent studies at the National Center for Family Literacy (NCFL) revealed that adult's literacy gains were far greater and children's probability of school success increased from participation in family literacy programs as opposed to those adults and children who participated in either adult or early childhood education programs delivered in isolation.

NCFL has established and developed powerful collaborative programs with employers and community agencies in order to examine how family literacy programs can be adapted to match the students' skills to employers' needs. In short, these partnerships have proven to be a very effective strategy in the effort by family literacy programs to help families gain economic independence. For example, students in the Careers for Families in Louisville, Kentucky, are developing employment skills through job shadowing and volunteering. At the onset of the program, only 14% of participating adults were employed. By year's end, 40% of the participating adults were employed.

Welfare reform has forced programs to shift in focus towards a more concerted effort to integrate work with learning. This requires programs to be creative and to continue to

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

maximize effectiveness. Many examples of this initiative across the country are cited. The connection between economics and education is clear. People with higher levels of education are more likely to be employed than those individuals with less education.

“Family literacy is a welfare-to-work strategy that focuses on strengthening the family unit while helping the parents become economically stable” (pg. 19). A work-focused program develops skills in people that are applicable throughout all aspects of their lives – work, family, community. Finally, employers are increasingly looking to programs like family literacy to find and train workers.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section E: Collaboration Within Programs and Among Social Service Agencies

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section H: Government Policy

Nickse, R. S. (1990). *Family and intergenerational literacy programs: An update of "the noises of literacy."* Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career and Vocational Education, The Ohio State University Center on Education and Training for Employment. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 327 736).

This report serves as a comprehensive overview of family and intergenerational literacy programs for a wide audience, including policymakers, legislators, program administrators and staff, and individuals interested in family literacy education. The first section of this report provides background information such as definitions, purposes, federal legislation, and sponsorships that have produced literacy initiatives, program expectations, and reasons and motivations for validating program development. The second section of the report discusses research from related fields of study that justify family and intergenerational literacy program growth. In the third section, the author describes family and intergenerational literacy programs in the following five sectors: (1) adult basic education; (2) libraries; (3) family English literacy; (4) preschool and elementary education; and (5) corporations and businesses. A table is included in the report that depicts strengths and challenges for each sector. A typology for classifying family and intergenerational literacy programs based upon the intervention type and target is presented. The result is four models of programs (direct adults-direct children, indirect adults-indirect children, direct adults-indirect children, and indirect adults-direct children) for which the author provides examples and discusses advantages and disadvantages for each.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) programs

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

## Section H: Government Policy

Nickse, R. S. (1990). Family literacy programs: Ideas for action. *Adult Learning*, 1, 9–13, 28–29.

In this article, Nickse addresses factors that perpetuate illiteracy. She then discusses benefits of family literacy programs, including improved attitudes, behavior, and reading skills for parent and child. Although there has been some empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of programs, there needs to be more research in the field. For example, she found no evidence of changes in achievement for participants in family literacy programs. Nickse describes four basic models for delivering family literacy services and provides examples of each type of program. Suggestions for designing programs that address local needs, as well as ways to secure funding for programs are discussed. Nickse also addresses issues related to program design effectiveness (e.g., collaboration and parent participation) and administration and management of programs (e.g., staff, funding, and sites). The author then covers some matters associated with teaching (e.g., collaborative approaches and multiculturalism). The article concludes with tips for program evaluation (e.g., techniques and information dissemination).

### **Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section H: Government Policy

Nickse, R., Speicher, A. M., & Buchek, P. C. (1988). An intergenerational adult literacy project: A family intervention/prevention model. *Journal of Reading*, 31, 634–642.

This article discusses the effectiveness of the Collaborations for Literacy program, an intergenerational adult basic education and literacy program at Boston University. Two important research questions are examined: (1) Does the intergenerational approach have a positive impact on beginning adult readers; and (2) What are the benefits to the children of parents enrolled in an intergenerational program? In addition to its basic teaching curriculum, various other intervention techniques were used in the study, including weekly consultation for tutors and learners, literacy "socials" for parents and their children, and in-service training for tutors on literacy-related topics and techniques. Preliminary data on adult participants suggest that vocabulary and comprehension reading gains were made as a function of the number of hours spent in tutoring. No results were available yet for children. Based on the preliminary analyses, the authors report ten important suggestions to keep in mind in the development of a successful intergenerational literacy program.

### **Cross-Reference:**

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

## Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

### Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Office of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools. (2000). *Family learning: A survey of current practice*. (OFSTED HMI 220). London, UK: Office for Standards in Education.

This is a report of the results of a national survey of 28 family learning (in particularly family literacy) programs, representing just under one-fifth of the total number in England. These programs that focus on the most disadvantaged populations and were inspected from April 1998 – July 1999. The report is organized into four main sections and one appendix. The first section, *Introduction*, reviews background government policies and working definitions, the current family learning context, and simplified inspection methodology. The second section, *Summary*, highlights the main findings and issues for attention at the program, local and national levels. The third section, *The Inspection Evidence*, details the findings in: (1) strategic management and value for the money, (2) educational standards achieved by children and adults, and (3) the quality of the provision. The findings are reported in categories supported with specific statistics or narrative data from the local programs. Findings first discuss program strengths then cover shortcomings. Recommendations for practitioners and policy makers are embedded within the body of the report per category. *Strategic management and value for the money* covers the components of: policy, organizations, partnerships, quality assurances, and value for the money. *Educational standards achieved: children and adults* cover the components of: pre-school, primary phase, and secondary phase. Adult educational progress is addressed through out all the phases. *The quality of the provision* covers the components of: teaching, curriculum, staffing and staff development, and accommodation and resources for learning. The fourth section, *Conclusion*, reports on seven overall points on family learning practice revealed by the survey. The *Appendix* lists the twenty-eight local authorities and the three voluntary organizations included in the survey.

#### **Cross-Reference:**

### Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Padak, N., & Rasinki, T. (2000). *Family literacy programs: Who benefits?* (ERIC Document No. ED438470)

This article summarizes research reviewed by the authors in order to address the questions of “Do family literacy programs really work? And if so, who benefits?” The authors state that research supports the assertion that family literacy programs work and that four groups benefit from these programs: children, parents, families, and society.

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Specific benefits for each of these four groups are listed with reference to specific research studies. Some of the benefits listed are:

#### Children

- School achievement
- Oral language, reading, and writing improves
- Math and science achievements
- Social skills, self-esteem, and attitudes toward school improve
- Children are healthier
- ESL children and parents improve their English skills

#### Parents

- Parents persist in programs longer
- Parents' attitudes toward education improve
- Parents' academic abilities improve
- Parents' knowledge about parenting and child development increases
- Parents enhance their employment or job satisfaction

#### Families

- Learn to value education
- Become more involved in schools
- Become emotionally closer
- Engage in more literacy experiences

#### Society

- Family literacy programs positively affect: nutrition and health problems, school achievement, teen parenting, joblessness, and social alienation.

#### **Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

## Paratore, J. R. (2001). *Opening doors, opening opportunities; Family literacy in an urban community*. Needham Heights, Allyn & Bacon

The author presents the process of creating, tracking and evaluating a particular family literacy program, the Intergenerational Literacy Project (ILP). She addresses practical topics such as partnership with the surrounding community, target participants, recruitment, curriculum and evaluation. Detailed accounts of materials, class structure, intake and exit questionnaire/interviews, student work and evaluation methods are

## indicates that the article is a research study

provided in this book. Additionally, this text provides an excellent overview of current family literacy research and practices in an accessible manner.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Description and Models

Section F: Assessment & Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

Section D: Curriculum & Instruction

Section B: Parenting Education

Section G: Culture & Context

Perry, R. L. & Thompson, K. P. (2004) Listening to families and faculty: A report on family involvement in the Alexandria City Public Schools.

The report presents a summary of the results from focus groups and surveys of the families and faculty of the Alexandria City Public Schools. Perry and Thompson summarize the assets, challenges, barriers, and ideas for improvement mentioned in the 22 focus groups of 100 parents, teachers, students, and community members. Drawing on those findings, families and faculty were asked which areas were most critical to their satisfaction and loyalty to the schools. Parents reported that being treated fairly and with respect, being pleased with the quality of learning and communication, and feeling that their problems and concerns were addressed were crucial. Teachers stressed feeling that their school is working as partners with parents and being pleased with the school's communications with parents. Each group provided recommendations of how to involve more families. Perry and Thompson reinforce these ideas with next steps administrators and program designers can take.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

Section J: Parent Involvement

Popp, R. J. (1992). *Family portfolios: Documenting the change in parent-child relationships*. Louisville, KY: National Center for Family Literacy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 342 819).

This guide proposes a method for family literacy programs to document the evaluation of parent-child relationships. The National Center for Family Literacy advocates the use of portfolios because this method enables parent-child relationships to be examined within a context that encompasses not only the change but how and why the change occurred. The purpose of this guide is to introduce and describe portfolio assessment, explain how to begin this type of assessment, and suggest how it can be implemented in family literacy programs. The author also includes a description of the three problems the National Center of Family Literacy has encountered in implementing portfolio assessment and

44

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

suggestions for solving these problems. In addition, methods for analyzing and summarizing portfolios are discussed. Included in this guide is a reference list of articles discussing portfolio assessment as well as programs using portfolio assessment.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section A: Parent and Child Interactive Literacy

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Potts, M. (2004). Integration of Components in Family Literacy Services. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.) *Handbook on Family Literacy* (pp. 349-371). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Potts focuses on the intention to engage adults and children in educational experiences that integrate the four components of adult education, early childhood education, parenting education, and Interactive Literacy/Parent and Child Together (PACT). Component integration is perceived as maximizing the effectiveness of the overall program in order to positively affect the children's and parents' academic experiences. The end result is stronger than the sum of its parts. The children's learning is validated by the adults' extensions to the curriculum, and the adults can construct their own learning within the non-threatening domain of the children.

What sounds superficially simple is not so simple to implement. Integration requires staff to commit time and energy to team planning as well as program implementation. Integration also requires flexibility in order to capitalize on teachable moments that may arise from the interests of the students. Integration can be considered as the fifth component for family literacy programs. Specific learning takes place and then integration provides ample opportunities for expansion of that learning.

Systems Thinking is employed here as focus on the whole of interrelationships – shifting focus from the individual program components to the total program and from the individual family members to the total nuclear and extended families. Family literacy allows for change to be made within the family – not just within an individual family member.

Staff is encouraged to adopt four approaches for program success:

- The adaptation of a broad definition of literacy
- The utilization of similar educational theories across the components
- A commitment to the use of play, stimulation, and challenge as a means of acquiring knowledge
- The use of a strengths model approach (p.356)

Administration is encouraged to enhance implementation through:

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

- Appropriate facilities
- Planning time incorporated into the staff routine
- Staff development

Several tables are included to assist with conceptualizing the task of integration. The final section deals with the difficulty of evaluating integration alone, suggesting that effectiveness will be evident in component effectiveness – where desired outcomes are identifiable. The chapter is of use for anyone involved in family literacy program planning or implementation.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section C: Program Development and Models

Section A: Interactive Literacy

Section D: Curriculum and Instruction

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation

Powell, D., Okagaki, L. & Bojczyk, K. (2004). Evaluating parent participation and outcomes in family literacy programs: cultural diversity considerations. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.), *Handbook of family literacy* (pp. 551-566). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This chapter discusses the manifestation of personal and cultural beliefs in parenting behaviors and how these beliefs impact parents' views of family literacy programming and evaluation measures. In the first part of this chapter, the authors review research and provide culture specific examples of the interplay of culture, literacy and childrearing. Additionally, the authors examine parental goals and expectations, approaches to literacy, and family roles and relationships. The second part of the chapter outlines suggestions for evaluating parent participation and program outcomes. The authors discuss ways in which social class and cultural variations in beliefs and parenting practices are affecting current areas of evaluation. Included are types of data and investigations that might better reflect the parent group, parent interactions with the program, quality of program, suitability of program and the results of the program. Considerations for developing a family literacy program and appropriate evaluation measures are provided. The authors give concrete and relevant observations and suggestions. This chapter offers a fascinating look at the diversity of cultures and expectations found in family literacy programs. This chapter should be read by teachers, evaluators, program developers and policy makers

**Cross-Reference:**

Section G: Culture & Context

Section B: Parenting Education

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Purton, D. (2000). *Family literacy standards*. Saskatchewan, Canada: Saskatchewan Literacy Network. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED462953)

This report was the result of two years of work spent developing and refining twelve family literacy standards. A committee of family literacy practitioners, program managers, and policy makers developed these standards. Recommendations from the field were integrated into the document throughout the drafting process. This ensured that the standards were reflective of the families and communities that programs served provide guidance and raise important issues for individuals who developing, implement, and evaluate family literacy programs in an array of circumstances and communities.

Family literacy standards are important for several reasons: (1) more family literacy programs are being offered to families (2) a variety of program models are being implemented; (3) provide guidelines to organizations developing programs; and (4) funders need information about “best practices” in order to better allocate monies. Family literacy standards help organizations develop programs with the highest possible quality in mind. Standards need to be used as “educational tools” to develop effective literacy practices, as “program evaluation tools” to judge the areas of strength and weakness within a program, and as guides for the future development and implementation of family literacy projects and programs.

The author states that family literacy is about “encouraging adults to read with their children and to do follow-up activities with them” (pg. 8), but also adds that it includes much more. Family literacy includes the many ways in which adults engage in and use literacy and language in everyday situations. It also includes the many ways children learn to read and use language (emergent literacy). The greatest benefit of family literacy is that it empowers families to participate more fully in all aspects of daily home, work, and community life. Family literacy provides families a framework in which they learn together.

A standards survey/inventory is included as part of this report. Each standard is accompanied by specific questions intended to guide practitioners and program developers. The 12 standards are: 1) effective communication, 2) philosophy, 3) participant and community involvement, 4) content, 5) access, 6) recruiting and supporting participants, 7) staffing, 8) working with volunteers, 9) family support services, 10) assessment, 11) administration, and 12) funding.

Finally, the author does note that programs vary considerably and that only those features that are appropriate and realistic for a specific program should be selected from the standards assessment survey.

### **Cross-Reference:**

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

## Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Quiroa, R. E. (2001). The use and role of multiethnic children's literature in family literacy programs: Realities and possibilities. *New Advocate*, 14(1), 43-52.

In this article, Quiroa examines the presence of children's literature in family literacy programs and the role of multiethnic literature in family literacy. The author studied family literacy program descriptions and annotation published between 1988 and 1999. She describes her findings and provides examples of how three family literacy programs use children's literature in their programs. The author's found the role of children's literature was influenced by:

1. Program assumptions about children and families: from deficits to strengths
2. Program goals: family involvement to family empowerment
3. Types of texts used in programs
4. Pedagogy employed

Benefits of incorporating multiethnic children's literature in programs:

1. Potential to promote critical literacy
2. Promote dialogue and community between educators and parents

The author proposes a number of questions to direct future research relating to the role of children's literature for family literacy programs. Questions are grouped by topic and include:

1. Program Goals
2. Content of books
3. Uses of books
4. Participants' backgrounds
5. Roles of children's literature

### **Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section D: Curriculum and Instruction

Richmond, H. (1999). *Learners at CASP*. Fredericton, NB: St Thomas University, Family and Community Literacy in the Community Academic Services Program (CASP). Retrieved August 20, 2003, from <http://www.nald.ca/fulltext/fa,casp/famcasp.PDF>

This paper reviews two of the objectives of a study that examined the effectiveness of the Community Academic Services program (CASP), a rural community-based literacy program in New Brunswick, Canada. The two objectives reviewed are a comparison of

48

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

the early literacy practices of the adult learners from the program to their current literacy practices and the adult learners' perceptions of their personal outcomes of the CASP experience. Questionnaires were administered to 175 English-speaking adult learners from sixteen of the 100 CASPs in New Brunswick. The paper organizes the participants' responses in tables to illustrate the narrative discussion.

The author discusses the adult learners' perceptions of their early literacy experiences, favorite childhood pastimes, early literacy at school, early literacy at home, and reasons for low literacy. The author then addresses the current practices and perceptions of the adult learners in what helped when learning to read, current literacy experiences, and use of computers. In the outcomes section, the author examines the participants' responses in their personal outcomes and family-related outcomes. In the findings, the author discusses the definition of literacy from the adult learners' perspective and the differences in the definitions based on gender perceptions. The author suggests that broadening the working definition of literacy to include "family/community literacies" and "computer/technological literacies" would better serve the learners.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Riedinger, S. (1997). *Even Start: Facilitating transitions to kindergarten*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service, Office of the Undersecretary.

The purpose of this report was to document and describe effective kindergarten strategies used by Even Start projects, as well as to develop recommendations for the U.S. Department of Education, other federal agencies, and early childhood and parenting education programs that have an interest in the transition to kindergarten. Data was analyzed through the Even Start Information System. Qualitative data was also collected and analyzed through visits to five Even Start projects with transition programs perceived as being high quality. The transition services described were specifically designed to support families as children moved to kindergarten and included such approaches as kindergarten orientation, educating parents about transition services, and meeting with school staff about children's strengths and needs. Approaches considered successful across the Even Start projects include emphasizing family strengths, developing and maintaining long-term relationships with families, empowering families to identify their needs, and being flexible in providing services. Difficulties of transition projects are also discussed, as well as recommendations.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section H: Government Policy

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Rodriguez-Brown, F. (2004). Project FLAME: a parent support family literacy model. In B. Wasik (Ed.) *Handbook on Family Literacy: Research and Services*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum. 213 – 229

A program designed specifically to enhance literacy learning for a community of mostly Hispanic immigrants is described within this chapter. Home literacy cultures, communication styles, interaction and views regarding literacy are examined within the context of this program. Focus on the concept of *familia*, already central to Hispanic culture, provides a convenient vehicle for applying a family literacy model to this community. Funded by the U.S. Department of Education, the program was piloted in the Chicago public schools before disseminating nationally.

The program objectives are 1) to increase parents' ability to provide literacy opportunities for their children, 2) to increase parents' ability to act as positive literacy models for their children, 3) to improve parents' literacy skills so they can more efficiently initiate, encourage, support and extend their children's learning and 4) to increase and improve the relationship between the parents and the schools.

The instructional program included activities to train participants through a routine of semimonthly workshops. The core program was *Parents as Teachers*, which was conducted in the language most familiar to the participants. Twice a week, participants were involved in *Parents as Learners* – two hour sessions focusing on basic skills. *Parents as Leaders* evolved into a summer institute where outside speakers were brought in to address questions or concerns of the participants. *The Trainers of Trainers* program allowed graduate parents to develop leadership for literacy activities in the community. *Parents as Volunteers* enlisted those program participants as aides for classroom teachers who prepare the parents for their roles before they entered the classroom.

The conclusion highlights that increased self efficacy and social networking into the community are major outcomes from this program, which then positively impact success with parenting and community roles. Specifically, "Validation of knowledge is particularly relevant to new immigrant parents who find themselves isolated" (227). The chapter is of interest to those planning programming or curriculum, or to those planning family literacy within specific cultural contexts.

**Cross-Reference:**

- Section B: Parenting Education
- Section C: Program Development and Models
- Section F: Assessment and Evaluation
- Section G: Culture and Context
- Section J: Parent Involvement

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Ryan, K. E. (1991). *An evaluation framework for family literacy programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 029).

This article presents a definition of family literacy programs, a conceptual framework by which components and goals of family literacy programs can be identified, and an evaluation model for family literacy programs. The evaluation outlined by the author includes a five-step approach: (1) needs assessment; (2) accountability; (3) process evaluation; (4) progress toward objective; and (5) program impact. The article applies this evaluation process to a family literacy program. Ryan argues for constructing a portfolio for assessments, which can include work samples selected by an instructor, samples selected by the participant, and universally required samples that can be compared against a normative sample. The author recommends using this portfolio instead of relying solely on standardized test results.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

St. Pierre, R., & Layzer, J. (1996, January). *Informing Approaches to Serving Families in Family Literacy Programs: Lessons From Other Family Intervention Programs*. Paper presented at the symposium for Family Literacy: Directions in Research and Implications for Practice, Washington, DC. Retrieved September 10, 2002, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/FamLit/lesson.html>

This paper is a review of research in family literacy with the goal of improving family literacy programs. The research is divided into four categories: early childhood education, adult education and training, parenting education, and support services. This paper is pertinent to program coordinators and staff because research findings and suggestions for program improvement are included.

Even though studies have been conducted on early childhood education programs, there is little evidence to prove that the programs have an effect on parents. According to the authors, adult education programs do not have significant impact on GED achievement, and job-training programs have small effects on employment. During parent education, educators cannot assume that the parent's curriculum has a direct effect on children's

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

outcomes. Finally, support services do not offer educational material. However, these services do offer the opportunities for the educational learning to occur.

The authors offer suggestions on how to improve family literacy programs. Their recommendations include setting curriculum standards to achieve large effects, creating high-quality, high intensity services, not relying on parent education to improve child education, individualizing instruction, using technology, and combining components so that all services are coordinated. The authors offer these suggestions to create the best possible family literacy programs.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs  
Section D: Curriculum and Instruction

St. Pierre, R. G., Ricciuti, A., & Creps, C. (2000). *Synthesis of Local and State Even Start Evaluations*. U. S. Department of Education.

This is a report of local and state Even Start programs conducted to describe types of evaluations, describe findings, and provide guidance on improving evaluations. Evaluations are conducted to comply with program requirements and track progress of participants. Data from evaluations can be used to direct and drive program improvement. The most common evaluation processes reported program outcomes. Pre and posttests of the participants were reported as were information on project implementation, levels of participation, recruitment and retention, and how programs collaborated with other agencies.

Findings reported in evaluations:

1. Local evaluations showed a consistent pattern of positive gains for child development.
2. Adult development also showed a consistent pattern of positive gains.
3. Local gains were sometimes compared to national data, national, statistics, gains in other evaluations, and to “normal” development.
4. How evaluations were used to improve programs was NOT reported.

Recommendations:

1. Change the Even Start legislation and preliminary guidance to refer to “local continuous improvement efforts: instead of “local evaluations.”
2. Provide guidance to state coordinators and/or local projects on the amount of funding that needs to be spent on a good local evaluation that focuses on program improvement.
3. Help establish a community of local evaluators.

4. Provide training for local grantees in using data collected at the state and/or national level for continuous improvement at the local level.
5. Provide guidance to local projects on the use of data/evaluation for program improvement.

Suggested principles for continuous improvement:

1. Collaboratively set outcome goals for children and families.
2. Devise an intervention to achieve those goals.
3. Set intervention thresholds necessary to achieve goals.
4. Assess progress toward goals with sound measures.
5. Use evaluation to monitor program quality and results, and to target areas for improvement.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section H: Government Policy

St. Pierre, R., Ricciuti, A. & Tao, F. (2004). Continuous Improvement in Family Literacy Programs. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.), *Handbook of family literacy* (pp. 587-599). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

This chapter discusses the evaluation process of Even Start on the national, state and local levels. Even Start programs are required to participate in the national evaluation process, with the data from these evaluations providing insight relative to the performance and effectiveness of programs nationwide. The evaluations are also useful in identifying effective Even Start programs and targeting these programs with technical assistance leading to program improvement.

State evaluations are not required by law; however, recent legislation has emphasized quality and intensity as important factors of the Even Start program, leading states to integrate evaluations as a process to support improvement for local programs.

Local Even Start programs are required to provide an independent evaluation of the program to be used for program improvement. The data from these evaluations provide critical information regarding program strengths and weaknesses and are used to improve the services of the programs and the outcomes of the participants. These evaluations are also useful in providing pertinent information to states, the U.S. Department of Education, and Congress regarding outcomes such as retention of participants, services provided, and the achievement of the families in the program.

The authors end the chapter with recommendations on using the evaluation data for consistent program improvement. They propose that improvement practices need to be accomplished through legislative changes at the federal level, program refinements, and required evaluation activities taking place at the local, state, and federal levels.

**Cross-Reference:**

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy  
H: Government Policy

St. Pierre, R., & Swartz, J.P. (1995). The Even Start Family Literacy Program. In I.E. Sigel (Series Ed.) & S. Smith (Vol. Ed.), *Advances in applied developmental psychology*: Vol. 9. Two generation programs for families in poverty: A new intervention strategy (pp. 37–66). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

This article provides a well-detailed overview of the Even Start program and the Even Start National Evaluation conducted by Abt Associates. After describing the history of the development of family literacy programs, the authors define core components as well as describe a comprehensive model placing Even Start in the context of population, community, and service characteristics. A description of the National Even Start Evaluation is also provided. Some highlighted areas from the Evaluation include: characteristics of Even Start participants, descriptions of core services (early childhood education, adult education, and parent and child time together), home-based services, support services and special events, service integration, program participation, recruitment strategies, retention strategies, and participation rates.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs  
Section H: Government Policy

St. Pierre, R., Swartz, J., Gamse B., Murray, S., Deck, D., & Nickel, P. (1995). *National evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program: Final report*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates, Inc.

The Even Start Family Literacy Program was authorized in response to the conceptualization of "family literacy" that united two previously separate areas of adult education and early childhood education. This report presents a 4-year national evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program (1989–92) and provides detailed information about the first four cohorts studied in the project. The 13 chapters discuss the following: (1) background information on the program; (2) program design and the components of evaluation; (3) characteristics of families and project activities; (4) the population served by Even Start; (5) characteristics of Even Start projects and staff; (6) the depth of Even Start services; (7) their approach to the assessment of effects; (8) effects on children served by Even Start; (9) effects on parent literacy; (10) effects on parenting skills; (11) effects on the family as a whole; (12) the cost of Even Start; and (13) a summary and conclusions. The conclusions drawn in this report address only the

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

short-term effects of the Even Start project on families. The authors recommend a longitudinal study to examine the long-term impact of the program.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs  
Section H: Government Policy

Tao, F., Gamse, B., & Tarr, H. (1998). *National Evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program, 1994–1997 Final Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service.

This final report for the second national Even Start evaluation covers the program years 1993–97. During this time period, the number of projects participating increased from 439 to 605. At least 90 percent of projects submitted data on participant characteristics, services, implementation, costs and participant outcomes for analysis in the Universe Study for each year of the study. For the most part, the programmatic trends reported in the first evaluation remained constant. In addition, 57 Even Start projects were selected to submit more comprehensive data on child cognition, adult educational progress, and parenting education. Following new families for up to 3 years beginning in 1993, participant outcomes were determined based on pretest-posttest differences and growth curve analysis. Children continuing to participate in Even Start made greater gains than expected on the basis of development alone. The educational gains for adults in Even Start were modest and comparable to those seen in the first evaluation and other adult education programs. Positive gains were seen in scores in parenting education for parents with children between birth and 3 years of age and parents with children ages 3 through .

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Tao, F., Swartz, J., St. Pierre, R., & Tarr, H. (1997). *National evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program: 1995 interim report*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education Planning and Evaluation Service.

This report discusses the second national 4-year (1993–97) evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program at the completion of its second year (1994–95). Data from a sample of 57 out of 513 programs across the U.S. operating during 1994–95 were used for the evaluation. The report addresses several key issues in its 10 chapters, beginning with an introduction to the Even Start Program and description of both the previous and current evaluation. A comprehensive description of the Even Start families is included as well as ways in which these families are served by the program and participant use of services. One chapter addresses whether or not those families in greatest need were

55

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

served by and benefited from Even Start. Next, educational and developmental outcomes are provided for the 57 projects in the Sample Study. A discussion of how the findings relate to the results of the first 6 years of the program and ways in which these outcomes vary as a function of participant and project characteristics are included. The report concludes with a discussion of technical, administrative, and other issues involved in the implementation of Even Start programs as well as important evaluation findings.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Tao, F. & Alamprese, J. A. (2005) Work-focused family literacy programs: participant outcomes. *Family Literacy Forum*, 4 (1), 27-34.

The Family Independence Initiative (FII), developed by the National Center for Family Literacy (NCLF), is meant to enhance the services NCLF already provides with work-preparation and work-experience. In this article, Tao and Alamprese describe the findings from a follow-up study of the initiative that examined participants' achievements in education and employment one and two years after their enrollment in FII services.

The Follow-Up Study of FII was conducted by Abt Associates Inc. and consisted of three parts. The overall purpose was to examine the outcomes of adults who received FII services and adults' parenting activities and involvement in their children's school activities. Data were collected from a representative sample using results from tests of basic skills and participant interviews. The study found that the intensity of the FII work-preparation services was related to participants' employment status, with those who attended well-structured FII programs more likely to have obtained employment than those who attended less structured programs. Overall, after one year, participants' household incomes had increased, their dependence on welfare decreased, a larger percentage was employed, and many had increased their education levels, with most retaining or increasing their basic skills. Most participants were involved in several parenting activities and their child's school events, regardless of whether or not they were working. Many were involved in volunteer work, community activities, and social activities, particularly with relatives. Two year follow-up data showed that the percent employed continued to grow into the second year, and many continued their education while staying employed. A majority of participants reported that their lives had improved since enrolling in FII and attributed the changes to the FII services

Tao and Alamprese suggest that program developers consider work-focused family literacy programs as a means through which to help adults develop their employability, parenting, basic skills, and general life skills to enhance overall functioning of families.

**Cross-reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section J: Parent Involvement

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Tett, L., & St. Clair, R., (1997). Family literacy in the educational marketplace: A cultural perspective. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 16(2), 109–120.

The authors discuss two recent developments, the spread of family-centered approaches to literacy education and the view of the family as a consumer of education. They argue that the view of families as consumers of education has led to a school-centered dominance of family literacy programs. They highlight a number of problems they see as associated with the implementation of family literacy programs that espouse school-centered approaches to literacy. By contrast, they advocate programs that are responsive to the family's culture and that support home-based literacy uses. They also argue against a deficit-based view thought to be guiding current beliefs in the field of family literacy.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Tracey, D. H. (1995). Family literacy: Overview and synthesis of an ERIC search. In K. Hinchman, D.J. Leu, & C. Kinzer (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy: Research and practice, forty-fourth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 280–288). Chicago: National Reading Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 379 611).

To pull together and facilitate further knowledge within the field of family literacy, as well as to better define family literacy, Tracey conducted a comprehensive review of the literature. Using the descriptor "family literacy" on two indexes within the ERIC system (Resources in Education (RIE) and Current Indexes to Journals in Education (CIJE)), 409 references and abstracts were located and reviewed. For the final reporting of the literature, 135 documents were sorted into 3 main categories—research emphasis (19 percent), program descriptions (35 percent), and position papers (38 percent)—and then analyzed. Several strengths, weaknesses, and needs in the literature emerged as a result of the review. The primary weaknesses noted were a lack of clear and agreed-upon definitions in the field; a disproportionately small percentage of documents created from a research perspective; a too narrow focus on topics that would fit more appropriately into areas outside of family literacy; and a lack of research on program efficacy. Primary strengths included the fact that the attrition rate for participants in family literacy programs is considerably smaller than in adult literacy programs, and that documented research consistently supports the finding that participants of family literacy programs are benefited by increased positive literacy interactions in the home between parent and child as a correlate of participation.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section A: Parent and Child Interactive Literacy

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Section B: Parenting Education  
Section C: Program Descriptions and Models  
Section D: Curriculum and Instruction  
Section E: Collaboration Within Programs and Among Social Service Agencies  
Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs  
Section G: Culture and Context Section H: Government Policy

Van Horn, B. L., Kassab, C., Grinder, E. (2000). *Pennsylvania's Family Literacy Programs*. Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

This is a report of the results of a statewide evaluation of family literacy programs during the 1998-1999 program year. Findings are reported as well as tables of statistics collected for the report. The major findings were very positive and include:

- Programs served families most in need of services
- Adults' basic skills improved
- Parents achieved personal goals
- Parents supported their children's literacy development
- Children entered school ready to learn
- Children were successful in school
- Family economic status improved
- Programs built community collaboration
- Families accessed necessary support services

Recommendations suggested in the report:

1. "Newly established family literacy programs need ongoing technical assistance and support to help establish effective procedures for identifying and recruiting families eligible for the program's services;
2. All family literacy programs need assistance in building effective local collaborations that move beyond simple referral services; and
3. Family literacy programs should explore alternative delivery systems (e.g., distance learning, evening or weekend sessions) to meet the needs of parents who find work responsibilities make it difficult or impossible to continue participation in the program.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Van Horn, B. & Forlizzi, L. (2004) Assessment of Adult Literacy Skills. In B. H. Wasik Ed.), *Handbook of Family Literacy* (pp. 567-586). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

Erlbaum Associates

This chapter reviews the planning and implementation needed to choose appropriate tools for assessing adult learners involved in family literacy programs. The authors discuss (a) federal accountability; (b) different types of assessments (standardized and informal) and the strengths and weaknesses of each category; (c) choosing the appropriate assessment tool(s) (What purpose will the assessment serve? Will it be used to place students, drive instruction, or demonstrate progress?); (d) considerations for writing one's own program specific assessment; (e) strategies for implementation, and (f) the importance of a "supportive test environment." (p. 568) A section of the chapter focuses specifically on the evaluation of English-language Learners. Also included are several useful tables relevant to the topic. This chapter is of interest to program developers, administrators, evaluators and practitioners.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment & Evaluation of Family Literacy Programs

Section H: Government Policy

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1992). *Family and intergenerational literacy in multilingual families*. ERIC Q & A. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, National Clearinghouse on Literacy Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 378 848).

In this document, the author addresses five questions related to family and intergenerational literacy programs and the multilingual families enrolled in these programs. Weinstein-Shr first addresses the subtle difference between family and intergenerational literacy programs by explaining that the first term focuses primarily on the parent and child while the second term more broadly includes other adults. She identifies the goals of these programs to be promoting parental involvement; improving of skills, attitudes, values, and behaviors associated with reading; increasing the social significance of literacy; and addressing the unique problems of relocated families. The author suggests that programs build on family strengths, emphasize collaboration, and acknowledge both the native culture of the participants as well as the new culture. In addition, she suggests continuing ethnographic research because the functions and uses of language and literacy in specific communities is becoming increasingly important.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

Section J: Parent Involvement

Winter, M., & Rouse, J. (1990). Fostering intergenerational literacy: The Missouri Parents as Teachers Program. *The Reading Teacher*, 43(6), 382–386.

59

**## indicates that the article is a research study**

There is growing agreement among educators that interventions targeting child literacy must more broadly recognize the entire family as the client, and must respect the culture and value system of that family. The Missouri Parents as Teachers program (PAT) employs this family-centered approach and has become the model for early childhood family education in Missouri. This paper describes the services the program offers, their curriculum, how PAT promotes literacy, and the variety of parent-child activities. Implications for local school districts are discussed. A general evaluation of the project is also included.

**Cross-Reference:**

Section A: Parent and Child Interactive Literacy

Section C: Program Descriptions and Models

Section D: Curriculum and Instruction

Section E: Collaboration Within Programs and Among Social Service Agencies

Section F: Assessment and Evaluation of Family Literacy (FL) Programs

**## indicates that the article is a research study**