



SIXPENCE EVALUATION UPDATE SUMMARY: 2010-2011

This report is a supplement to the comprehensive evaluation report that was submitted to the Sixpence Board of Directors in July 2011. The evaluation provides further information related to the Sixpence Projects progress towards meeting its child and family outcomes based on questions generated by the Sixpence Board of Directors. For more detailed information on the evaluation process and initial analysis, refer to the Sixpence Evaluation Annual Report, 2010-2011 at www.singasongofsixpence.

WHAT VARIABLES INFLUENCE CHILD OUTCOMES?

Are there differential child and family outcomes or time in program based on program service delivery method?



Independent Samples T-Test was used to determine if there were: 1) differences in the mean child outcome scores or 2) differences in time in program based the program service delivery method (home-based vs. centered based). The results found:

Service type comparisons to Time in Program

- There were no significant differences between children's duration of time in program when comparisons were made between the home-based or center-based service delivery methods ($p=.317$).



Service Type Comparisons to Family Outcomes

- There were no significant differences between scores on the gain scores on the HOME Inventory when comparisons were made by service delivery methods ($p=.303$).



Service Type Comparisons to Child Outcomes

- There were no significant differences between gain scores on the DECA Total Protective Factor when comparisons were made by service delivery methods ($p=.106$).
- There were no significant differences between gain scores on the PPVT when comparisons were made by service delivery methods ($p=.556$).



Are differences in Spring PPVT scores based on family language?



- There were no significant differences between the spring PPVT scores of toddlers when comparisons were made between children whose families were English speakers (n=36) or English Language Learners (ELL) (n=13) ($p=.173$). However, the mean score of children whose parents were ELL were lower (94.15) compared to their English speaking peers (100.06).

Cross Program Comparisons on Reason for Exiting Program

Reason Children/Programs Exited from Program (#)						
Program	No preschool program available	Transitioned to Community program	Family Dropped	Family Moved	Poor Attendance	Other
Alliance						
Broken Bow	4	2	6	1		
Crete				3		
Lincoln PS		1	6	4	8	
PACT						
Lincoln PS Student Child Learning		3	3	2	1	6
Loup City	2		3	2		
Macy						5
OPS Continuation		1		1		
OPS Teen Parent	4		1	1	4	3
Plattsmouth			1		2	1
Santee		3		3	1	
Walthill			1			
York		2	1			6
TOTAL	10	12	22	17	16	21
Total-Center Based		7	5	6	2	6
Total- Home Based	10	5	17	11	14	15

What was the attendance of the children and families in the program?

Attendance data was available from 12 of the 13 projects, including five centered-based and seven family engagement projects. Overall, children and families participated in 84% of the services offered. This was an increase from a 79% attendance rate the previous year. Children in center-based programs had a higher participation rate overall than their peers who received services in the family engagement program. This may be a result of one family engagement program that had significant lower attendance than typical of the other programs. Attendance by program is listed below. The attendance rate range was from 49% to 99%. The majority of the programs were over 80%.



Evaluation Report prepared by
Barbara Jackson, Ph.D., Rosie Zweiback, MS, & Lisa Alvarez, BS
Interdisciplinary Center of Program Evaluation
The University of Nebraska Medical Center's
Munroe-Meyer Institute: A University Center of Excellence for Developmental Disabilities

