

## Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report:

### **“How did hosting the workshop benefit your library and/or community?”**

- Increased library use. Brought new families in and increased number of families with library cards. Those attending workshops checked out more books and become regular library users.
- Greater awareness of library programming and services.
- Taught parents how to help prepare their child to learn to read.
- Good participation from fathers.
- Excellent social setting where parents could get to know one another.
- Partnerships (schools and PTAs were most commonly cited)
- “I began to incorporate new things into my library story time as a direct result of the skills we studied.”
- Stronger relationship with families.
- Local elementary school participated in the program since they lost funding for their early literacy program. They would like it each year. Library presented the program to the school board.
- Reached low-income families.

“Benefits were many and diverse. The most common benefit mentioned was how the workshops brought new people into the library who had not patronized the library in the past or it stimulated people who didn’t use the library much to use it more. For example, one library reported that 50% of workshop attendees were First Book families. Some of these families may have been library users, but undoubtedly some had not been in the past. Another library reported that out-of-district families received library cards and are now using the library regularly. These outcomes are excellent since a primary goal of the workshops in addition to teaching parents about early literacy skills was to increase library usage.” – *Evaluation Report prepared by Dr. Roger Stewart*



## Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report:

### **“What were your biggest challenge(s) concerning the family workshops?”**

#### ***Recruiting Participants and Attendance Issues***

- Maintaining attendance over the 6 weeks.
- New parents appeared each week.
- Parents reluctant to register. Not getting pre-registrations to know how many would attend.
- Pre-registrants didn't show up to any workshops.
- Getting Hispanic families to participate.
- Finding enough families to participate.

#### ***Meeting Space***

- Not enough meeting space or too large sessions—people wanted smaller sessions.

#### ***Workshop Delivery***

- Adult asides in the scripts were difficult to manage--“I think the adult aside talks sometimes got a little long for the children;” and “The biggest challenge for me was keeping the kids' attention while making sure I did all of the ‘Adult Asides’ and gave the parents the information they need for getting their children ready for reading.”
- Large age range of children—“We have such a wide age range that we can't do all of the activities as designed, we have to adjust to the audience;” “It's hard to keep everyone's interest;” and older children who attended could be a distraction. Keeping children's attention is a challenge.
- Adjusting to different needs—learning styles, special needs children, Spanish speakers.
- “Completing the program as written in 45 minutes—the first 2 scripts were definitely over time, so we made sure we fit into our allotted time.”
- Too much noise. Parents talking or not participating in activities. Classroom management skills—children would get excited and presenter would end up “yelling” over them.
- Problems memorizing or reading the scripts.

#### ***Other Issues***

- Many attendees were ELL or had low literacy skills so handouts and the evaluation form were difficult for them to read.
- Workshops at the alternative school had to be shortened because of time issues.
- Two certified teachers attended the workshops and were critical of the scripts.
- Families took more than one book at conclusion of workshop.
- Parents arrive 15-20 minutes late.
- Library staff only working 20 hours per week made workshop implementation tight.

#### **Other Challenges?**

## Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report: “What went well during the workshops?”

- Two person team to present instead of having a single presenter at each workshop.
- Practiced and timed the presentation to make sure they didn't go over time. Started on time instead of waiting for stragglers to come in.
- Level of participation was high--parents were interested and asked questions, children were attentive, high level of parent and child involvement with stories, poems, rhymes, songs, etc.
- Children loved the books/stories, music, and rhymes. Parents and children appreciated and enjoyed getting weekly books, magnetic letters, play-doh, book bags, crowns, etc.
- Crafts were a big success. Great choice of books. Scripts are excellent, well-written, easy to use.
- Parents were comfortable in questioning and sharing. Parents appreciated the asides. Parents liked the books.
- Families signed up children for library cards. Families committed to visiting the library once a week for the rest of the school year.
- Had fewer kids than in previous workshops so things went smoother. 45 min-1 hour time frame was perfect.
- Interaction of adults with infants/children was wonderful to watch. Children had fun watching their parents.
- Children remembered skills from week to week—parents reported success with skills at home.
- Provided snacks for kids while parents filled-out feedback forms. Parents were attentive while children snacked and colored.
- Presented workshops at local Head Start building. They provided cabs or gas vouchers and breakfast.
- Translator/presenter did a good job.
- Having trifold as reminder of skills was effective.
- Moms and kids liked having lunch.



Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report:  
**Comment and suggestions about the ECRTTR Workshops (e.g., script content, presenting information with children and parents present together, etc.).**

***Comments: Scripts***

- Scripts were good, helpful, and easy to follow/present.
- Sometimes content was too high or too much for time.
- Workshop #1 was lengthy. Some of the other workshops were also long.
- Scripts were good to fall back on.
- Scripts are bit cheesy but easy to modify.
- Interactive sections were a huge hit.

***Suggestions: Scripts***

- Content was fine but altered crafts quite a bit. Spring: Suggested activities/crafts weren't effective. They substituted some of their own.
- A list of books for each skill is needed—they found some online from other libraries.
- Parent asides need to include interaction between parent and child.
- They reduced the number of asides and books for large groups.
- Need more songs. Spanish scripts are needed.
- Modified the scripts to hold child and parent attention.
- Altered order of skills as they were presented in the scripts.
- Scripts are best for smaller groups, but for larger groups and the wide diversity of children's ages, the scripts were adaptable.

***Notes from Read to Me Coordinator on the scripts:***

- Feel free to change the order of the six topics to meet your needs.
- Feel free to reduce the number of books you read, change the titles, and change the craft activities to better meet the needs of your families.
- Please do try to incorporate as many of the "golden nuggets" as possible during the workshops. These are noted with the gold miner graphic on the scripts.
- Feel free to reduce the amount of time each script takes. 30 – 45 minutes should be considered the maximum time a workshop should last.
- Feel free to add more interactive activities or sharing time for parents to talk about how they have incorporated some of the early literacy skills into their home life.
- It seems to work better to do the workshop summary and then do the craft activities while the presenter hands out books to parents and answers questions or interacts with families.
- Many libraries hand out the red "Read to Me" book bags at the beginning of the first session. It's fun to see the families come to ECRTTR with their bags. Encourage them to fill them up with library books each week!
- It's also a good idea to pull some books and CDs each week that might relate to the theme and make them available for checkout.
- There are plenty of additional handouts, booklists, and resources that is available to reproduce and provide to interested parents. Please let Stephanie know if you want help locating good supplemental materials.

Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report:  
**Comment and suggestions about the ECRTR Workshops (e.g., script content, presenting information with children and parents present together, etc.).**

***Comments: Presenting to Children and Parents Simultaneously***

- Presenting to children and parents worked well.
- Presenting to children and parents was “tricky”/challenging. It was difficult at times to keep everyone engaged.
- Difficult to get parents to participate with their kids.
- Somewhat distracting to have children of all different ages at the workshop, but on the whole it worked.
- Parents are asking for ECRR 201 for just them without their children.

***Suggestions: Presenting to Children and Parents Simultaneously***

- Most stories were wonderful but a few were too long and a few didn’t appeal to the ages attending (“Some of the titles were difficult to present in a large setting.” Other books were substituted).
- Parents lost attention during nuggets (i.e., parent asides in scripts)—modified the nuggets.
- One presenter presented to the parents (i.e., the nuggets) while the other presented to the children. “It was nice to play off each other’s strengths.”
- For the first workshop, children can be separated from parents during craft time so parents can have questions answered about early literacy, the upcoming workshops, etc.
- Presenters need to keep workshop within time frame so they don’t over-tax the children.
- Presenter split the families into 3 groups and rotated the groups between snack, craft, and story time.
- Presenter did “kid stuff first and then sent them to another table for snacks and projects. Then presenter “was able to read the scripts and do the ‘adult stuff’ more smoothly.”

***Other ideas for presenting to children and adults at the same time:***

## Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report:

### **“What will you do differently in the future in order to increase the attendance of family workshops? / What advertising worked?”**

- Invitations / Personal contacts in library / announcements during story times
- Word-of-mouth (e.g., PTA getting word out) / PTA presentations
- Personal contact by Title I teacher to parents
- Newspaper article / press release / insert / advertisement
- Library website / calendar / Library marquee
- Notice in elementary school newsletter / community newsletter/ library e newsletter
- Announcement on school district web site
- Local television station filmed session and put on nightly news
- Cable TV station advertisement
- Flyers sent to kindergarten classes, elementary schools / Flyers in Friday folders sent home with elementary school students / Flyers sent home with families at daycares/preschools/Head Start
- Flyers in community businesses/post office
- Give presentation about workshops at Head Start
- Kindergarten registration / flyers at school parent/teacher conferences
- Sign on library door
- Advertisement in residential water bills
- Family services agencies (WIC, Family Advocate Programs)
- Sent postcards to schools and daycares
- County fair advertisement / Churches
- Reminder phone calls to those who registered
- Word of mouth from those who completed the workshops
- Word of mouth by staff at the library
- Make more contacts in the community
- Invitations to families in the mail
- Plan a traveling display to rotate at school, daycare and library
- Partner with home-schoolers
- Change locations
- Survey parents of preschoolers and kindergarteners to find best times and dates.

“One final point about advertising. It appears to be relatively easy to fill the workshops with regular library patrons, especially if the library has a popular children’s story time. This population needs the information provided in the workshops just as much as any group of parents and children, but if a goal of Idaho libraries is to reach under-served families, then there is consistent evidence in the reports that reaching these families is difficult. The challenge of reaching under-served families is not insurmountable, however. Four libraries in the spring reported that their most effective advertising was making personal contacts with local daycare providers. Perhaps, direct contact will be what is required to reach under-served families, but then such efforts are extremely resource and personnel intensive, and Idaho libraries are already quite limited in both of these. In summary, to reach all of the families in need of the information provided in the workshops will require an eclectic and dynamic advertising campaign. Different advertising venues are effective at different times and with different constituencies so the words “eclectic” and “dynamic” should be underscored.” – *Read to Me Evaluation*

## Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report:

### Other Recruitment Ideas from Idaho Librarians:

- “Bring the workshop to Hispanic families or present it in the winter when families are not working in the field or processing plants.”
- “Advertise! Advertise! Advertise!”
- “Have a marketing/publicity plan in place and map out the cost of everything you want to do.”
- Partner with schools, Head Start, daycares, and health centers.
- Call each week to remind families.
- Contact all pre-registrants to confirm attendance at first meeting. In fall one library suggested adding from waiting list to keep workshops full.
- Make sure library staff invite those who come to the library to attend the workshops.
- Talk it up in the community. Make presentations about the workshops to as many groups as you can who serve young children—boosts attendance.
- Work hard to promote it to new people—not just regular library users.
- Thank your partners.

### Other incentives provided for families during the pilot year included:

- craft items
- DVD’s of “Code Word Caper” by Leap Frog
- music CD
- puppets
- writing kits / literacy packets
- families who attended all six workshops received a hardcover *Curious George* book and a stuffed hippo
- Food
- Pictures (e.g., pictures taken and offered to parents; kids made crowns and had pictures taken on throne)
- At final workshop gave gift certificates to local merchants (e.g., dinners, haircuts, movies, and local children’s store)
- High school students read to children
- Certificates of completion at Family Reading Night
- During first workshop children received a canvas backpack to decorate

**What will you do to ensure all workshops are filled to capacity and get as many parents and children to attend who don’t normally patronize the library?**

## Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report:

### **“What advice do you have for other library staff who plan/wish to sponsor Every Child Ready to Read Family Workshops at their library?”**

#### ***General Calls to do the Workshops***

- The program was great / “Just do it;” / “Be patient and find out what works best for you.”
- Don’t be overwhelmed—the materials provided make the workshop easy to present.

#### ***Planning and Preparation***

- Be well prepared/organized.
- Practice before each workshop to make sure you are ready.
- Plan ahead for extra staff time needed to prepare materials for advertising, handouts, crafts, etc.
- Know the scripts well so you can go with the flow and enjoy the workshop.
- Set up early--meet 30 minutes before class to prepare room, etc.
- Find out who has done the workshops and contact them via e-mail or phone for ideas.
- Choose the right workshop time for the population you are trying to reach.
- Good to hold workshops during the day. Providing lunch and free books were wonderful incentives.
- Have a student intern for minimum wage assist workshop presenter.
- Get a cart for the teacher for crafts and supplies.
- Get a teacher to do the lessons.

#### ***Workshop Delivery Tips***

- Keep the number of registered families manageable.
- Know your target audience - and how best to reach them (whether it is daycare providers, parents of preschoolers, etc.)
- Start on time. / Keep to the 45 minutes.
- Break up the stories with interactive movement activities (perhaps the songs and nursery rhymes).
- Use a co-presenter model and keep the same presenters each week—consistency is important.
- Serve snacks afterward so parent can socialize and fill-out feedback forms.
- Have everyone sit on the floor—no more chairs.
- Stress to parents the importance of attending all workshops.
- Ask parents what they were able to use or gained from previous sessions. They provided positive feedback that showed the workshops working.
- Musical accompaniment is great for the songs.

#### ***Parent Needs***

- Be personally involved with each child/family. Greet them by name, ask for their input.
- Allow time at end of each session for attendees to talk to presenter, check out library materials, get library cards, etc.
- Parents liked to chat with presenters and with each other—cut the repetitive introduction each week and have a sharing session.
- Have lots of volunteers or staff available so children can be doing one thing while parents discuss and ask questions.

## Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report: Every Child Ready to Read (ECRR) Family Workshops: Surveys for Adult Participants – Summarized from Report

Parents and caregivers were asked to complete a survey at the conclusion of the 6 workshops during both fall, 2008 and spring, 2009. In the fall, 18 of the 21 sites returned a total of 240 surveys. In the spring, 14 of the 23 sites returned a total of 220 surveys.

### Ages of Children Who Attended the Workshops

Adults were asked to circle the number of children they brought to the workshops in various age ranges.

Table 6B-2: Total Number of Children Attending in Various Age Ranges (n=239)

Age Range	Attendance Spring	Attendance Fall
a. Newborn to 23 months	99	127
b. Two to three years	131	163
c. Four to six years	168	151

A few respondents made note on the survey that they brought children older than 6 years to the workshops.

### Adult Early Literacy Behavior Changes as a Consequence of Attending the Workshops

Survey respondents were asked whether or not their early literacy behaviors with their children changed as a consequence of attending the workshops. Table 6B-3 presents the behaviors and a summary of responses.

Table 6B-3: Adult Early Literacy Behavior Changes: Spring, Fall, and Total

<i>As a result of attending these family workshops, I .....</i>	Spring		Fall		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>a.</b> spend more time reading with my child/children. (Spring: n=211; Fall: n=236; Total=447)*	191** 90.5	20 9.5	205 86.9	31 13.1	396 88.6	51 11.4
<b>b.</b> spend more time talking with my child/children about the books I read to them. (Spring: n=215; Fall: n=237; Total=452)	204 94.9	11 5.1	211 89.0	26 11.0	415 91.8	37 8.2
<b>c.</b> spend more time singing with my child/children. (Spring: n=208; Fall: n=237; Total=445)	164 78.8	44 21.2	177 74.7	60 25.3	341 76.6	104 23.4
<b>d.</b> spend more time playing rhyming games with my child/children. (Spring: n=212; Spring: n=236; Total=448)	180 84.9	32 15.1	176 74.6	60 25.4	356 79.5	92 20.5
<b>e.</b> am more likely to use the library to check out books. (Spring: n=216; Fall: n=239; Total=455)	192 88.9	24 11.1	205 85.8	34 14.2	397 87.3	58 12.7
<b>f.</b> am more likely to attend programs at the library. (Spring: n=219; Fall: n=236; Total=455)	213 97.3	6 2.7	218 92.4	18 7.6	431 94.7	24 5.3
<b>g.</b> am more aware of good books to share with my child/children. (Spring: n=216; Fall: n=236; Total=452)	208 96.3	8 3.7	220 93.2	16 6.8	428 94.7	24 5.3
<i>If you <u>only</u> have a child/children age 0-2, please skip to question #4 below.</i>	173 94.0	11 6.0	172 94.0	11 6.0	345 94.0	22 6.0

<b>h.</b> am more likely to ask my child/children questions that will prompt a retelling of a story. (Spring: n=184; Fall: n=183; Total=367)						
<b>i.</b> spend more time “playing” with letters with my child/children. (Spring: n= 184; Fall: n=193; Total=377)	165 89.7	19 10.3	183 94.8	10 5.2	348 92.3	29 7.7
<b>j.</b> show my child/children the print in signs. (Spring: n=181; Fall: n=191; Total=372)	156 86.2	25 13.8	161 84.3	30 15.7	317 85.2	55 14.8

\* number of respondents who marked Yes or No. Underneath this is the percentage of respondents who marked Yes or No who responded to the statement.

\*\* n is the number of respondents for the particular statement.

**The workshops both fall and spring were overwhelmingly successful at getting parents and caregivers to adopt more effective early literacy behaviors with their children.** Response profiles were quite similar across fall and spring. Even the two lowest “Yes” response rates for fall and spring, that is responses to “c” and “d” were at or above 75% which represent very positive results.

Playing rhyming games with their children continues to have the lowest yes response rate. It is still very positive with three-quarters of respondents saying yes, but **libraries should make sure that parents receive enough materials, modeling, and practice to feel fully prepared and comfortable to pursue these activities at home.** In future workshops, this important behavior should be given increased attention by providing more modeling, practice, and materials for the caregivers.

One final piece of information is needed so that the table can be interpreted in the most accurate way by readers. A number of the respondents who said “no” to the various prompts under this question put notes out to the side saying that these were common behaviors with their children prior to the workshops, therefore they had not increased the amount of the various behaviors since attending the workshops. These notes did not occur more on some items and less on others so the influence on the items from this phenomenon appears to be consistent across all items. What this means is that the number of actual no responses is less than what is reflected in the table. This means that the positive influence on behaviors may actually be greater. The discussion now turns to the open-ended questions on the survey.

**Survey Question: “What else have you done differently as a result of attending the family workshops?”**

Adults were asked “What else have you done differently as a result of attending the family workshops?” This was an open-ended question so responses were categorized and counted. Table 6B-4 presents the categories and frequencies for spring and fall. It is an extensive table but the high level of detail is important since it shows the great variety of changes in behaviors that participants experienced as a consequence of attending the workshops.

Table 6B-4: Additional Different Behaviors by Category and Frequency: Spring (n=220) and Fall (n=240)

Category	Frequency Spring	Frequency Fall
<i>1. Increased Modeling and Interaction</i> <i>Total</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>21</i>
a. Focus on vocabulary more (e.g., “Using large words” in conversation, explain meaning of words, teach synonyms)	5	1

b. Make child aware of reading and letters (e.g., environmental print; look for letters in child's name; read rules of board games to child)	4	3
c. More time interacting while reading with my child (e.g., share, talk and play more with books, take more time looking at pages/print)	4	2
d. Talk about shapes and colors (e.g., make felts shapes)	4	1
e. Children are encouraged to retell and tell stories	3	0
f. Writing (e.g., creating print and printing out words, daughter is writing more)	2	2
g. Spend more time with communication	1	0
h. Exposed child to more print sources at home	1	0
i. "I spell words now also."	1	0
j. Point with finger to words and pictures	0	4
k. Talk about pictures	0	3
l. Model reading skills and behaviors as I read to or interact with my child	0	3
m. Question child about content of books and stories	0	1
n. Read the book instead of telling about the pictures	0	1
<b>2. Increased Time Reading</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>8</b>	<b>19</b>
a. Read more to and with my children	6	14
b. Let my child read to me	1	1
c. Get other family members to read to children (e.g., father, grandparents)	1	0
d. Read more as a family	0	2
e. Read every night	0	1
f. Read more aloud	0	1
<b>3. Greater Awareness of and Emphasis on Skills</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>34</b>	<b>18</b>
a. Emphasize letters more (e.g., recognizing parts of words, letter-word recognition, teach upper and lower case letters, letter-sound correspondence)	12	3
b. Sing more/sing songs with my child/sing the alphabet	7	5
c. Practice rhymes, play rhyming games, read rhyming books	5	2
d. Syllables (e.g., cutting pictures into syllables, clap syllables)	3	2
e. More aware of skills that need to be taught and reinforced	2	4
f. Play word games (i.e., practice silly words with my child)	2	1
g. Don't quiz over letters	1	0
h. Flash cards of sight words and addition	1	0
i. Let my child predict what will come next in the story	1	0
j. Use magnetic letters	0	1
<b>4. More Positive General Behaviors</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>
a. Come to library more/check out more books from library/make time for participating in library programs/use more library resources	4	3
b. Make reading and learning to read fun and less stressful (e.g., don't rush, am more patient when reading, read more slowly, read books multiple times)	3	4
c. Spend more time with my children/Spend more time as a family	1	3
d. Play more games with my children	1	2
e. "Letting them pick the book out even if it is the same book every time." (at both home and library)	1	1
f. Find different learning activities to use with books	1	0
g. Played library class at home	1	0
h. Started to reserve books at library for older daughter	1	0
i. More children's music in house and car	1	0
j. Practice coloring/cutting more	1	0
k. No change in behavior (i.e., nothing is different)	2	0
l. More positive about reading and learning to read	0	1
m. Pick more appropriate books	0	1
<b>5. No Response to Question</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>183</b>

The list of behaviors that have changed as a consequence of workshop participation is quite impressive and quite diverse. The diversity underscores the broad range of things attendees take away from the experience. Presenters may think they are teaching a relatively constrained and focused set of skills and behaviors, but the lengthy list in Table 6B-4 reveals that the attendee behaviors that change are quite diverse and that the impact of the workshops is wide-ranging.

Both fall and spring, adults reported increased modeling and interaction with their children, increased time spent reading, and greater awareness of and emphasis on early literacy skills. The rather large increase fall to spring in the number of attendees reporting changes in behavior relating to the emphasis they place upon letters is interesting. Additionally, more general behaviors shifted in positive ways. These include utilizing the library more, making reading and learning to read fun and less stressful, and spending more time with their children and family.

### **Usefulness of ECRTR Information**

Respondents found virtually all of the information to be very useful or useful. There is a negligible percentage of not useful responses. This is a very positive outcome for the workshops. The information was perceived by participants as quite helpful.

“Learning about library resources I can use with my child/children” had the lowest percentage in the very useful category, but still well over half the respondents found this information to be very useful. It could be that the participants who attended the workshops in the fall were very active library users, those that are the first to sign-up for any new program, and thus they had a lot of knowledge about library resources. Spring participants were still library users but perhaps not as active as the “early adopters” and thus not as knowledgeable about library resources.

Learning rhymes and songs was second lowest in the very useful category. Again over two-thirds of parents found this information to be very useful, but parents feeling a bit less positive about rhymes and songs continued fall to spring, as has been noted elsewhere. So presenters may want to continue focusing on these activities to help parents understand their importance and to feel comfortable with them.

### **Quality of workshops and presenters**

The overall quality of the workshops and the presenters was extremely high and quality improved fall to spring. The few people who were satisfied instead of very satisfied were negligible. This was especially so in the spring, and in the spring no one checked that they were not satisfied. The presenters should be very proud of their work and the ICFL should be commended for providing excellent training and support for the workshops.



## Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report: ECRTR Surveys for Adult Participants – Summarized from Report

**“Please tell us why you decided to attend the family workshops.”**

Table 6B-9: Reason for Attending Workshops by Category and Frequency: Spring (n=220) and Fall (n=240)

<b>Category</b>	<b>Frequency Spring</b>	<b>Frequency Fall</b>
<b>1. School Readiness</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>51</b>	<b>30</b>
a. Help child get ready for kindergarten/school (e.g., Learn information for kindergarten readiness.)	30	20
b. Help my child get ready to read/get a head start/do well in school	16	10
c. Expose child to a school-like environment	5	0
<b>2. Parent Education to Help Child</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>58</b>	<b>75</b>
a. Educational (Note: These were general statements such as the workshops provide good information and ideas, teach and reinforce literacy skills, and enrich my child’s learning.)	21	21
b. Learned how to teach my child reading skills	13	19
c. Motivation and engagement (e.g., Get child excited to read a book; Motivate my child to read; Foster a love of books in children.)	11	0
d. Parent education (e.g., “Educate myself;” “To learn tips on making reading fun and different;” “To learn something new;” Curious about content;” More tools in my parenting toolbox; Learn how to help my child learn.)	5	2
e. Help my child develop/learn (e.g., Child was ready for more and mother needed practical ideas; To challenge my 5 year old.)	4	2
f. Child needed help (e.g., improve learning for child with disabilities)	1	3
g. Language exposure (e.g., practice English since Spanish is first language)	1	3
h. Husband is not comfortable reading so mother wants to learn as much as possible	1	0
i. Confidence (e.g., Just wanted to make sure we were doing the right things.)	1	0
j. Sets good example for my child (e.g., good modeling and reinforces parents’ reading at home)	0	5
<b>3. Library Related Reasons</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>50</b>	<b>75</b>
a. Attended story time already/Love story time	22	25
b. High regard for instructors and library (e.g., “Show support for the great presenters;” Heard it was a great program; Love library and programs; Children love going to library/doing library activities.)	14	12
c. Received free books (Fall: One person mentioned magnets also)	5	22
d. Get book ideas/exposure to books	3	8
e. Program was free	2	8
f. Schedule (e.g., Workshop was different time than usual so it fit parent schedule; Workshop offered a variety of times.)	2	0
g. Introduce children to library	1	0
h. Introduce children to reading books	1	0
<b>4. General Child Development</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>
a. Social skills development/social interaction for children (e.g., “Great interaction between older and younger children.”)	19	20
b. Child loves books/reading	9	8
c. Child loves to be read to	1	0
d. Children love projects	1	0

e. Child needed to learn to sit	0	2
<b>5. Other Reasons</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>
a. Respondents reported how they found out about workshops (e.g., flyer sent home from school, relative told them about program, invitation from library staff, etc.)	18	23
b. Fun (e.g., Sounded like fun; “Kids love it.”)	16	22
c. Quality time with children and/or family	6	14
d. Adult peer pressure/motivation (e.g., “Light my fire” to begin working with my child.)	2	2
e. Respondent loves reading and understands its importance	1	36
f. Gave us something to do	1	0
g. Free food	0	3
<b>6. No Response to Question</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>52</b>

School readiness continued to be quite important. It was mentioned 51 times by respondents in the spring and 30 times in the fall. Some of this change may be explained by the large number of surveys returned by one library during the spring. This library focused their workshops on kindergarten readiness and advertised the workshops this way. This category reveals a potentially interesting and effective way to advertise and promote the workshops.

Parents learning how to help their child develop early literacy skills and other important behaviors continued to be important. A new category emerged under this heading in the spring that is interesting. Eleven parents attended the workshops to learn how to motivate their children to want to read books and to want to engage with books.

Attending story time at the local library continued to be an important conduit for parents to find out about the workshops and to be motivated to attend them. The high regard patrons have for library staff and programming also remained an important motivation behind attendance. These are very positive outcomes for libraries since these comments directly reflect the high regard their communities have for library staff and programming. In short, for many attendees it is the quality of the local library staff and programming that cause them to attend the workshops.

Under the “General Child Development” category, social skills continued to be important for some. Parents are using library programs to provide social settings where their children can interact with other children and learn how to do this. This could be another way for libraries to advertise and promote the workshops since emphasizing this aspect of the program might draw in additional attendees.

Finally, under the “Other Reasons” category there are other heartening and complimentary reasons people gave for attending. Specifically, attendees’ desire to spend quality time with their children and family and attend a fun, family-oriented activity was a motivating force for attending workshops. This is also quite positive for libraries since these results underscore that they are seen by their patrons as good places to spend time.

The reasons patrons gave for attending reveal that the workshops achieved their intended objectives of informing parents about early literacy while also immersing the caregivers and children in entertaining activities. An important corollary benefit to all of this is the showcasing of local libraries in positive ways. Adults reporting that the workshops provided quality family time, positive social interaction, and important modeling attest to the success of the workshops at attaining their objectives.

Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report:  
**Every Child Ready to Read (ECRR) Family Workshops: Surveys for Adult Participants – Summarized from Report**

**Survey Question: “In order to make these family workshops better, I suggest:”**

Table 6B-10: Suggestions for Improving Workshops by Category and Frequency: Spring (n=220) and Fall (n=240)

Category	Frequency Spring	Frequency Fall
<b>1. Praise and Thanks</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>
a. Nothing to suggest—respondents commented on quality of program, suggested doing more classes because they are so beneficial. Common adjectives were “awesome, great, wonderful.”	54	48
<b>2. Class Size and Management Suggestions</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>
a. Smaller classes (e.g., Add an additional time slot to reduce class size; If smaller class sizes are not possible, gear workshop to larger groups.)	10	13
b. Encourage parents to sit and work with their children (e.g., Parents should participate and not talk; Parents should control younger children better.)	4	3
c. Individual classes for different age groups of children.	2	5
d. With large groups have more than one instructor.	1	0
e. Bigger meeting area.	0	2
f. Have a minimum age requirement.	0	1
g. Have stations and have parents and children rotate among stations.	0	1
h. Add a gate to entrance of room.	0	1
i. Keep tables out of the room—sitting on the floor kept kids less distracted.	0	1
j. Put more chairs in the room.	0	1
<b>3. Curriculum Suggestions</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>14</b>	<b>26</b>
a. More take home materials, give-away items, hand-outs, and books (e.g., Put finger plays in writing to take home; Longer lists of suggested books for each skill area; List of songs to use at home; Send home acronym and what it stands for for each topic.).	6	8
b. More hands-on activities and movement for children (e.g., games, crafts, sing-a-longs, etc.).	2	9
c. More information for parents.	1	0
d. More creative crafts.	1	0
e. More syllable work.	1	0
f. Talk about specific letter sounds that are easy to start with.	1	0
g. “Share more ideas w/ materials that are easy to find or make.”	1	0
h. Provide ideas for newborn/baby-infant books—give away some of these, too.	1	0
i. Too much focus on parents and not enough on the children (e.g., Keep parent instructions shorter. Kids can’t sit and listen that long.).	0	4
j. Shorter books or fewer books—kids get restless.	0	2
k. Include flannel board stories.	0	1
l. Include finger plays.	0	1
m. Too much material.	0	1
<b>4. Instructional Suggestions</b> <i>Total</i>	<b>5</b>	<b>18</b>
a. Spring: More interaction. Fall: “Make presentations more exciting.” “More interactive play w/the reading.”	2	2
b. More demonstration and modeling and better descriptions and	1	3

explanations of early literacy skills (e.g., More time showing techniques with songs and stories.)		
c. Spring: Discuss at beginning of class successes at home trying new techniques. Fall: Give parents a few minutes to share ideas during workshop (e.g., Get mothers involved to share ideas.)	1	2
d. Start each workshop with a song.	1	0
e. Workshops were too long (e.g., Make shorter for younger children; Faster pace for short attention spans; With 1 year old difficult to sit through scripted portion.)	0	7
f. Conduct workshops bilingually and include information for non-native speakers of English.	0	2
g. More information about what is available at the library and how to use it.	0	1
h. Make books being read more visible to all in attendance.	0	1
<i>5. Miscellaneous Suggestions</i>	<i>Total</i>	
	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>
a. Different time slot (Note: There was no consensus. Some wanted it earlier and others wanted it later whether it was a day workshop or an evening workshop.)	6	3
b. Three session format was well-liked.	4	0
c. Provide networking opportunities for parents (e.g., website, lists of community resources, Parents as Teachers, etc.)	1	0
d. Hold workshops in branch libraries.	1	0
e. More advertising.	0	2
f. Include food.	0	1
g. Confusing response—respondent did not address the statement.	0	2
h. Animation or lights.	0	1
i. Music on tape.	0	1
j. More treats.	0	1
<i>6. No Response to Statement</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>140</i>

During spring, 107 respondents provided one or more suggestions for improving the workshops. In fall 100 out of 240 provided suggestions. The lengthy list in Table 6B-10 shows the diversity of responses. They range from the very specific to the quite general. Some contradict one another. For example, one person said to remove tables and chairs from the room so everyone can sit on the floor while another person said to bring more chairs into the room. And in the case of when workshops were offered, some said they needed to start later while others said earlier. When taken in aggregate, however, all of the suggestions represent important and insightful feedback. Readers are cautioned to remember that no individual suggestion or even major category in the table represents a pervasive belief among most parents. The frequency of responses were quite low.

The workshops generated considerable praise and thanks. Many respondents said that nothing needed to be improved and thanked their libraries for conducting the workshops. **Comments about class size and management issues continued to be some of the most prevalent during spring, but the number and range of specific suggestions for addressing this issue went down fall to spring. It appears that smaller class sizes are needed for two primary reasons. First, meeting spaces are not large enough to accommodate all of the attendees. Second, because of the wide age-range of children present and the large number of people in attendance, the workshops become less than optimal at times.** Suggestions for having different workshops for different ages of children, having a minimum age requirement, getting parents more involved during the workshops, and using stations for children and their parents to rotate through are all examples of how to reduce class size and focus the curriculum and instruction more on specific age groups. In the ECRR Family Workshop Interim and Summary Reports, library staff who completed the reports mentioned quite similar challenges and needs.

Curricular suggestions in the area of **attendees wanting more take home materials, give-away items, hand-outs, and books**. Not a large number of respondents requested this so libraries should not spend considerable time and resources on this, but where it can be done efficiently and in a cost-effective way, it would probably be a positive addition that would be well-received.

It is interesting to note that areas needing improvement that were mentioned by library staff in the interim reports and also by respondents on the fall surveys appear to have been addressed. For example, needing more hands-on activities, needing the curriculum (i.e., the scripts) to focus more on children instead of parents, and needing different books for the audience were all mentioned in the interim reports and fall parent surveys. It appears that between the first series of workshops and the delivery of the second series many of these changes were made by libraries. Evidence for this, although not conclusive, is the drop in the number of respondents who suggested “more hands-on activities and movement for children (e.g., games, crafts, sing-a-longs, etc.),” “too much focus on parents and not enough on the children (e.g., Keep parent instructions shorter. Kids can’t sit and listen that long.),” and “shorter books or fewer books—kids get restless.” On the fall parent surveys, 15 respondents had mentioned these things. On the spring surveys, only two mentioned them. It appears that presenters made adjustments to the workshop curriculum to better address the needs of their particular audiences.

The relative lack of instructional suggestions is a credit to the workshop presenters. There were only 5 such suggestions during the spring. This is a large drop from what was already a low number in the fall of 18. Importantly, during fall 7 respondents had mentioned that the workshops needed to be shorter. This concern was echoed in the interim reports by library staff. A few libraries mentioned in their reports that some of the workshops were a bit long. No respondent on a parent survey said this in the spring. It appears that presenters either shortened their workshops in the spring or made them more interactive and engaging so participants didn’t notice the length of the workshops as much.

Only three people in the fall and one in the spring suggested “More demonstration and modeling and better descriptions and explanations of early literacy skills.” It is important to note that the workshops focused directly on describing, explaining, demonstrating, and modeling early literacy skills. So, for so few people over the course of two series of workshops to say more of these things were needed shows how well the workshops were delivered. Similarly, only two people in the fall and two in the spring suggested making the “presentations more exciting.” Again, this shows the quality of delivery.

The miscellaneous suggestions are few in number. But one thing can be said. No workshop offering time will meet all needs. There truly was no consensus concerning best days or times of day. The only thing libraries can probably do to address this issue is to offer as many workshops as possible at a variety of times and on a variety of days. Several libraries experimented with alternative delivery schedules during the spring. Instead of offering the workshops in a series of six 45 minute sessions over a number of weeks, some libraries offered the workshops in 3 sessions of a little over an hour each. Four respondents on spring surveys mentioned that they liked the three session format. Three of these four had participated in a quite unique delivery model where one session was conducted with just parents. This session was devoted to providing parents with the background knowledge that they need to understand the early literacy skills. The other two sessions were held with parents and their children so stories could be read and activities completed while the skills were modeled for and practiced by the parents with children present. The other respondent attended 3 workshops where two topics were covered at each session. Future research into the popularity and the efficacy of a three session delivery model would probably be of value.

Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report:  
**Every Child Ready to Read (ECRR) Family Workshops: Surveys for Adult Participants – Summarized from Report**

**Survey Question about Library Card Applications**

Respondents were asked to check one of three statements about whether or not they had a library card or had applied for one. Table 6B-11 reports the results.

Table 6B-11: Frequency of Library Card Status of Respondents: Spring (n=212) and Fall (n=219)

Statement About Library Card	Frequency Spring	Frequency Fall
1. I received a library card as a result of attending this program.	27	27
2. I already had a library card before attending this program.	177	182
3. I did not get a library card.	8	10

About 12% of respondents fall and spring received library cards as a consequence of attending the workshops. About 4% reported not getting a card. The greatest majority of respondents already had cards, approximately 84% fall and spring.

One goal of the workshops is to increase library card applications and in turn increase library patronage. Given that the overwhelming majority of workshop participants already have library cards, it doesn't leave a lot of potential for recruitment of new card holders and library users. Granted getting 12% of participants to take out library cards is a positive result, but this only represents 27 new card holders state-wide. **In the future, libraries need to continue and enhance their efforts to serve families who are not current card holders and who are not regular library users.** There is evidence from several data sources where libraries are working hard in this area, but are encountering challenges at recruiting new library users. Perhaps the ICFL could focus training and support services in this area so libraries have greater success in their outreach efforts.

**Survey Question: “How did you hear about the workshop?”**

Table 6B-12: Information Source for Hearing About Workshops by Category, Frequency, and Percentage: Spring (n=220) and Fall (n=240)

Information Source	Spring*	Fall
1. At library	108 49.1	119 49.6
2. Word-of-mouth	66 29.5	63 26.2
3. Public school	17 7.7	33 13.8
4. Other (see below for details)	38 17.3	22 9.2
5. Daycare/Preschool	18 8.2	12 5.0
6. Radio/TV	0	0

\* The number of respondents who marked this source is listed first in each cell. Underneath this is the percentage of respondents who marked this point on the scale.

The library was the most common source of information about the workshops. Half of respondents heard about the workshops from this source. Word-of-mouth was second in importance. Fall to spring public schools dropped in importance as a source of learning about the workshops while the “Other” category nearly doubled. Daycares and preschools were not a significant source of information, and no one checked radio or TV at either reporting period. In their midterm reports for the workshops, just a few libraries reported using radio and TV for advertising, so no one hearing about the workshops from these outlets is not that surprising. But more libraries did state in their midterm reports that they would use radio and TV advertising to try to increase enrollment in their spring workshops. It is hard to tell from the spring summary reports if libraries did use more radio and TV advertising compared to fall; but if they did, it was not an effective form of advertising.

The “other” category had a quite diverse listing of information sources both fall and spring. Table 6B-13 reports additional details about this category.

Table 6B-13: Listings Under the “Other” Category: Spring (n=38) and Fall (n=22)

Other Category Detail	Frequency Spring	Frequency Fall
1. Newspaper	21	6
2. Internet/Online/Website (One spring respondent specified a city activities website. The others did not specify)	6	2
3. Library Web Site	5	1
4. Community Center	2	0
5. Library Marquee	1	0
6. Playgroup	1	0
7. Walked in on it at the library	1	0
8. Head Start	0	10
9. PTA	0	3

Newspapers were the most common source mentioned under the “other” category. Its prevalence increased fall to spring. Online sources also increased in importance fall to spring. Additionally, some new sources appeared in the spring but none were prevalent including community centers and library marquees. Two quite interesting sources appeared. One was a playgroup which should have probably been listed under word-of-mouth instead of “other,” and one person walked in on the workshop at the library and decided to join. Two sources that had been listed during the fall were not mentioned in the spring (i.e., Head Start and PTA).

**What this data reveals is that apart from hearing about the workshops at the library there are other effective means for advertising.** Essentially, all but one form of advertising was effective. The one exception being radio and TV advertising. All others showed varying degrees of promise. It appears that when a library uses an advertising channel such as the newspaper, Head Start or the public schools, they get people from those programs to attend the workshops. The same holds true for word-of-mouth and daycares and preschools. Thus the recommendation is for **libraries to dynamically pursue a variety of channels for advertising while maintaining a strong presence on the web.** This puts a significant burden on libraries to come up with the time and resources to launch and sustain a multi-faceted advertising campaign, but it appears that such an approach is necessary if potential attendees other than regular library patrons are to be reached.

## Results from the 2008-2009 Read to Me Evaluation Report:

### Recommendations

1. Although gains were made fall to spring, libraries should continue focusing their efforts on getting parents comfortable and confident in singing and playing rhyming games with their children.
2. Follow-up with libraries and workshop attendees to explore findings of interest should be considered. These follow-up activities could be phone calls or another form of contact to ask people for additional information that would deepen understanding of important findings.
3. Libraries should dynamically pursue a variety of channels for advertising while maintaining a strong presence on the web. This puts a significant burden on libraries to come up with the time and resources to launch and sustain a multi-faceted advertising campaign, but it appears that such an approach is necessary if potential attendees other than regular library patrons are to be reached.

#### Your Ideas:

