



FamilyLiteracy

RESEARCH

PROMISING FINDINGS OF TARGETED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE WILLIAM PENN FOUNDATION FAMILY LITERACY INITIATIVE

Elisabeth L. McLean, PhD

Carol Clymer, EdD

Esther Prins, PhD

Jungeun Lee, PhD

Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy

Acknowledgements: The Family Literacy Initiative was funded by the William Penn Foundation. However, the opinions expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect the views of the William Penn Foundation. We are grateful for the involvement of Emily Wolfe and Dr. Anna Kaiper-Marquez in the early years of the evaluation project.

ABSTRACT

Ongoing, customized professional development (PD) is critical to developing high-quality family literacy programs, meeting enrolled families' needs, and promoting learning among staff and participating families. However, few program evaluations on family literacy have examined the role of PD. This article discusses the regular, intensive PD that the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy team provided to five family literacy programs in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania over 5 years. The PD changed as program staff learned about and gained experience with the four-component family literacy model. PD began with understanding how to best serve families (e.g., culturally relevant lessons), continued with supporting parent education and interactive literacy activity (ILA) programming, and culminated with learning how to sustain programming. Findings from a multiyear, mixed-methods evaluation demonstrated statistically significant results from a self-reported pre/post caregiver survey about daily literacy activities and engagement in various parent-child activities. These findings, along with prior research, support the possibility that ongoing, intentional, and customized PD helped improve program quality, which in turn created the conditions for enhanced parent-child language, literacy, and learning interactions. This study suggests that well-planned PD and regular, supportive interactions with program staff are crucial for developing and improving successful, high-quality family literacy programs.

Keywords: family literacy, family learning, interactive literacy, professional development, evaluation

INTRODUCTION

Family literacy programs are based on the premise that adult caregivers play a crucial role in their children's language and literacy development and academic achievement, and that both adults and children need access to educational services. Many family literacy programs are based on the four-component (Kenan) model, which “integrates early childhood education, adult literacy (adult basic and secondary-level education and instruction for English language learners), parenting education, and interactive parent and child literacy activities into a single, unified family literacy program” (U.S. Department of Education, 2003, p. 2). This model encourages parents and children to learn and grow together and supports parents' understanding of the important role they play in their child's education and academic success. In this article, the term “parents” refers to any adult who is a significant caregiver.

The design and structure of family literacy programs vary, and programs offer a combination of the four components (Clymer et al., 2017; Lynch & Prins, 2022). In addition, programs often partner with other service providers, community organizations, and businesses to strengthen these components and provide support services. Consequently, multiple funding streams are now often needed to support adaptations of the four-component model (Clymer et al., 2017).

Historically, family literacy programs have focused on immigrants wishing to learn English and families with limited formal education and income. Substantial funding for four-component family literacy programs was provided through the federal Even Start program from 1988 to 2011 to “address the basic educational needs of low-income families including parents and their children from birth through age seven” (National Center for Education Evaluation, 2004, para. 1). Although Even Start was defunded, family literacy remains a critical strategy to enhance parents' and children's education, especially since it is harder for low-socioeconomic status children in the U.S. to overcome education and income inequality (García & Weiss, 2017).

In 2018, the William Penn Foundation (WPF) invested in family literacy as part of their Great Learning Strategies portfolio to support the vision that “all children from low-income families in Philadelphia have high-quality educational opportunities that lead to improved life outcomes” (WPF, 2023). The Foundation funded five family literacy programs in Philadelphia to implement a 3- or 4-component model, known as the Family Literacy Initiative (FLI). In addition, WPF funded the Goodling Institute (GI) for Research in Family Literacy at Pennsylvania State University to evaluate the FLI and provide professional development (PD) and technical assistance (TA) to the grantees. PD and TA both refer to activities that enable educators to develop knowledge and skills to strengthen programs and organizational capacity. In this article, we use the term “professional development.”

This article highlights the promising findings of the mixed-methods data collection and discusses the PD that was provided to the organizations since the FLI's inception. We also incorporate findings from a brief survey about the PD offerings ($n = 17$). We argue that this support helped organizations create the conditions that fostered positive outcomes for families.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Some researchers have attributed the defunding of Even Start to several poorly designed federal evaluations that did not define program quality or select high-quality programs to test the effectiveness of the four-component model (Paratore & Yaden, 2010; Soliman, 2018; Weirauch, 2003). Although subsequent research on the relationship between the quality of family literacy program implementation and participant outcomes is mixed, some studies have shown a positive relationship (de la Rie et al., 2017). Intensive professional development has been suggested as important to program quality and outcomes (Padak et al., 2002; St. Pierre et al., 2004), yet many program evaluations do not consider PD.

An exception is Durlak and DuPre's (2008) systematic review of 542 mostly quantitative studies of promotion and prevention programs for children and youth. The review did not examine family literacy, but the findings are relevant to family education programs. Notably, the authors identified technical assistance as a crucial link between implementation and outcomes. They defined TA as "the resources offered to providers once the intervention begins. The goals of TA are to maintain providers' motivation and commitment, improve their skills levels where needed, and support local problem-solving efforts" (p. 339). This definition matches what we call PD in this article. Specifically, Durlak and DuPre (2008) posited that "organizations need support in conducting new interventions successfully, and this support comes primarily through training and technical assistance that is provided by outside parties" (p. 335). Therefore, "training and technical assistance" comprise the "support system" for prevention programs and are central to the authors' framework for effective program implementation (p. 335). In addition, their systematic review and three others included in their study agreed on 11 factors that affect program implementation, including training and technical assistance. Similarly, Feinberg and colleagues (2004) highlighted the importance of technical assistance for prevention programs.

Research suggests that PD/TA is also paramount for family literacy. For instance, in their analysis of 11 successful "two-generation" programs for immigrants and refugees, Park et al. (2016) concluded that "data support and technical assistance" enabled programs to "differentiate the needs of diverse program clients, track parent and child outcomes in tandem, support continuous program improvement, and facilitate alignment with community needs" (p. 24). Similarly, Nutbrown et al. (2005) argued that family literacy work requires systematic professional development for teachers on topics such as theoretical understandings, working with families, developing programs to "fit families," teaching parents as adult learners, and resolving challenges, among others. Finally, Beckmann's (1997) study of Even Start underscored the need for professional development, particularly for developing curriculum and aligning programming with "community concerns and cultural practices" of participants (p. 87), topics that we addressed in our PD.

BACKGROUND

The William Penn Foundation FLI is a multiyear initiative that aims to improve parents' and children's language and literacy skills and practices and to expand networks of adult and child literacy programming in Philadelphia. The five FLI community-based organizations

implement family literacy components differently to meet the needs of participating families. Although no two organizations are alike—class length and number of weeks per program sessions vary, organizations use different combinations of instructional modalities, and program partners are diverse—each organization endeavors to provide high-quality programming. Table 1 summarizes the five organizations’ programs. Note that “HyFlex” means hybrid.

Evaluation Methods

Our GI team used a mixed-methods evaluation design to measure parental and child outcomes and evaluate program implementation at each organization beginning in 2019. A pre-caregiver survey (translated into 14 languages) was administered to parents at enrollment. The survey asked about parents’ self-reported frequency of daily literacy activities, reading, comfort with digital literacy, and engagement in a variety of parent-child activities, such as reading and writing together, playing word games, talking about school, having conversations together, asking questions while reading, visiting a library or museum, and so on. A postsurvey was administered upon program exit or in the spring of the program year. Attendance hours were kept throughout the families’ enrollment. We collected additional data that are not reported here, including frequency of parent-child interactions (measured by Weekly Home Activity Logs) and children’s progress in school (End-of-Year School Report completed by teachers). In addition, we scheduled site visits to observe classes (in-person and virtual); interview organizations’ administrators, teachers, and partners; and conduct focus groups with parents.

Professional Development Overview

GI staff provided PD to FLI organizations depending on their needs. Needs were determined by assessing organizations’ capacity to implement quality family literacy programs using the Family Literacy Indicators of Program Quality (Goodling Institute, 2019) as a framework. Organizations also completed a survey regarding their strengths and challenges for each family literacy component in January 2019 after organizations had finished their planning phase. At the beginning of the FLI, we also developed a repository for programmatic resources, data collection tools, and the FLI Access attendance database on Canvas, a web-based learning management system that allows for collaboration and resource sharing.

PD was delivered through site visits, cross-site meetings, webinars, and monthly Zoom check-ins with each organization. Since organizations had different levels of capacity (three had never implemented a family literacy program before, and two had considerable experience), topics and needs changed and evolved throughout the 5 years. In addition, the pandemic hit shortly after the FLI was launched, and organizations had to pivot to remote instruction; to help them do so, we quickly organized appropriate PD. Organizations also had common needs, including PD on integrating the four components, developing culturally and linguistically appropriate lessons, and identifying strategies for recruitment and marketing. We also provided assistance as challenges were identified by the programs. To accommodate staff turnover, new staff received individual coaching and had access to resources and previous PD on Canvas. Monthly check-ins and regular cross-site meetings also helped orient and train new staff. Table 2 summarizes the PD provided during the project.

QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

Demographic Information

Data were restricted to 139 individuals who participated for 12 or more hours and completed both the pre- and post-caregiver surveys from 2019 to 2023. Within our sample, most parents were women (94%) and predominantly in their 20s (26%) and 30s (42%). A significant portion (83%) were foreign-born, with half of these individuals having lived in the U.S. for 5 years or fewer. Additionally, 86% of the parents reported a native language other than English. Among non-native English speakers, 13% spoke both English and another language at home, while 85% spoke only their native language at home. Spanish was the most common native language, spoken by 34% of the sample, followed by Dari (16%), Arabic (15%), and Pashto (8%), with the remaining participants speaking Berber, Burmese, Chinese, Creole, Igbo, Indonesian, Karen, Russian, Swahili, and Urdu. Educational backgrounds varied: 34% had not completed high school, 28% held a secondary degree, and 38% had some college education. The majority of parents (65%) were not active in the labor force, while 21% were employed. Roughly one-third of the parents who disclosed their income reported a total household income of less than \$50,000.

Pre- and Post-Caregiver Survey

As discussed previously, the pre- and post-caregiver survey asked about parents' self-reported frequency of engaging in parent-child interactive literacy activities, participating in cultural activities with their children, and involvement in their children's educational activities. Interactive literacy activities were measured on an ordinal scale (1 = none, 2 = 1–2 times, 3 = 3–6 times, 4 = 7 or more times) and included items such as *reading to the child*, *listening to the child read*, *practicing reading and writing*, *telling stories*, *discussing the child's day*, *talking about school*, and *using digital devices together*. Additionally, parents reported on their child's reading frequency per week, weekly reading time, reading enjoyment (1 = none to 4 = very much), and their interaction with the child while reading, such as asking questions or discussing the story (1 = never to 3 = usually).

Cultural activities included visits to libraries, museums, or attending community events in the past month, measured monthly on an ordinal scale (1 = none, 2 = 1–2 times, 3 = 3–4 times, 4 = 5 or more times). Involvement in educational activities, such as assisting with homework, participating in school events, and seeking information on the child's education, was measured using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 = never to 5 = always.

Parental Engagement in Parent-Child Interactive Literacy Activities

The pre- and post-caregiver survey revealed statistically significant improvements in all areas of parental engagement after participating in the FLI (see Table 3). For example, the frequency of reading to the child or practicing reading and writing together improved ($p < .001$), as did telling stories, discussing the child's day and school activities, and engaging with TV or movies interactively with children ($p < .001$). Parents reported spending more time playing with their children or engaging in arts and crafts ($p < .05$). Additionally, there was a statistically significant improvement in the child's reading time and enjoyment, as well as increased parental interaction during reading sessions through questioning or discussing stories ($p < .05$; see Table 4).

Parent Engagement in Cultural/Community and School-Related Activities

Engagement in cultural or community activities also significantly increased (see Table 5). Visits to libraries or cultural sites such as museums significantly increased ($p < .05$), and family attendance at community activities also saw a significant rise ($p < .001$). Furthermore, parents' involvement in their child's education was enhanced significantly (see Table 6). Parents more frequently checked their child's homework ($p < .05$) and assisted with schoolwork ($p < .10$). Compared to the pre-survey, parents also sought more online information about their child's education and read school communications more frequently ($p < .001$).

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

Our approach to PD was to support organizations' development of high-quality programming for families. The PD topics evolved over the 5 years of the FLI. Initially, the PD focused on helping staff learn about family literacy and how to best serve participating families, whereas in later years PD targeted lesson development, program improvement, and sustainability (see Table 2). One staff member stated on the post-PD survey that "almost every and all topics pertaining to family literacy [were] addressed" during the grant.

We collected evaluation information and maintained ongoing conversations with staff about each organization's programming approach. The check-in meetings and cross-site meetings allowed us to learn which PD topics to focus on throughout the FLI. The post-PD survey respondents rated the check-in meetings as extremely or very helpful, and one person mentioned the check-ins allowed them to "discuss what was currently going on in the session [program] and brainstorm ways to improve." The cross-site meetings were also consistently rated as extremely or very helpful on the post-PD survey. For instance, a staff member appreciated "being able to share ideas and troubleshoot with other grantees with the support of the technical assistance team."

Program Development

At the start of the grant, we provided PD on topics related to launching a program, since some organizations were providing family literacy services for the first time. One topic that many organizations struggled with was recruitment because the program model and services were unknown to many families. For example, Connectedly found recruitment challenging because grandparents were unfamiliar with family literacy and the importance of engaging in literacy activities with their grandchildren. In addition, Connectedly had difficulty finding a convenient location because grandparents lived all over Philadelphia. We addressed recruitment strategies and motivators and deterrents to participation during a cross-site meeting. Several staff stated in interviews that the recruitment tools were useful, "talking about recruitment at the meeting was helpful," and they wanted additional "new strategies to further recruit."

Staff members were also learning about and understanding what it means to provide a four-component program to families. Before the FLI, three of the five programs provided one or two components to families; therefore, we provided PD about each component. For example, since introducing and supporting parent-child interactions was a new concept to several

programs, early PD focused on understanding the educational goals of ILA and how ILA relates to parent education.

The GI team also emphasized how to develop and sustain high-quality programming. At the onset of the FLI, we introduced the Family Literacy IPQs (Goodling Institute, 2019) to help align their program ideas with the IPQs, to use the IPQ rubric to self-assess implementation of the four components, and to learn strategies for continuous improvement. In Year 4, we continued the theme of program improvement and sustainability by supporting organizations in undertaking action research (AR) projects, which involve engaging in a “reflective process of progressive problem-solving that helps to answer questions about issues in a program or practice” (Weirauch, 2010, p. 1). The purpose of AR was to help organizations improve one or more aspects of their program practice and to lay the foundation for longer-term results. Programs identified a problem or question they wanted to address and developed an action plan to solve this problem and test the results. For example, one program wanted to ensure that parents had a good understanding of the program’s structure and expectations, so they developed a marketing and outreach plan with school staff to streamline and clarify information about the family literacy program. Programs later shared their AR projects during an online cross-site meeting. The post-PD survey indicated that staff appreciated this project, rating the two cross-site meetings on AR as extremely or very helpful.

Supporting Cultural Relevance and Differences and Learners in Multilevel Classes

We learned at the onset of the grant that programs were serving learners from different cultures and with differing educational needs (e.g., levels of formal education and English proficiency). As stated previously, 86% of families were foreign-born (with half having lived in the U.S. 5 years or fewer), and many of these families had little understanding of educational programs in the United States. Further, organizations realized that some families were uncomfortable attending unfamiliar programs, so it was important to focus PD on building relationships with and among families.

The topics related to cultural relevance and differences varied over the FLI to accommodate the knowledge instructors needed to support diverse families. Initially, PD presented scenarios of families from different countries so program staff could learn about potential cultural bias. Further, staff discussed the idea that immigrant families might have different perspectives about parenting and thus be unclear about the purpose of parent education and ILA. The intent of this training was to help staff understand that family literacy programs need to support families, regardless of their background and culture. One staff person stated during an interview that it was important “to think outside the box, not being so ‘traditional.’ Not assuming what parents know/don’t know.” As staff began to understand and build relationships with families, PD evolved to develop culturally relevant lessons and provide culturally responsive programming. We regularly shared resources, and program staff were encouraged to integrate these ideas across components. During one cross-site meeting, we introduced a variety of culturally relevant children’s books and provided ideas for using the books in AE, PE, and ILA. The post-PD survey results indicated that staff found the cross-site meetings on culture to be beneficial.

Parents also varied in their educational needs, from emergent literacy learners to those who were seeking a high school equivalency diploma or had some college education and were learning English. These varying educational levels and families' diverse languages made it challenging to develop lesson plans across the components. To address this issue, PD focused on differentiated instruction by outlining tips and examples for providing tailored instruction for learners. Information about using various instructional methods, activities, and assessments to meet learners' needs was offered, along with strategies for presenting concepts in different ways. For example, when teaching reading, using visuals or illustrations can help learners understand a lengthy or complicated text. Or a cloze procedure—leaving words out of a paragraph so that the learner can use context clues to fill them in and build vocabulary and comprehension skills—helps to differentiate instruction. Details about online translation tools to help learners with lessons and encourage translanguaging were also provided.

Supporting Parent Education and ILA Development

The topics related to parent education and ILA are critical to family literacy programming. These two components differentiate family literacy from other family programming (e.g., two-generation programs) and provide the foundation for parents to learn about their child's development and to understand and engage in activities that support their child's language and literacy growth. Organizations often focus on adult education or early childhood education and do not necessarily have the expertise to implement parent education and ILA.

At the beginning of the initiative, GI staff provided basic information about ILA and parent education, including why ILA is important for children's learning, research about parent involvement, and how to connect ILA to children's language and literacy development. This PD laid the groundwork about how to convey to families the importance of engaging in ILA at home and in the program. Further, we developed an ILA Toolkit (McLean & Clymer, 2021) to support lesson development. We continued to cover these topics at subsequent cross-site meetings by discussing lesson development and introducing a template for developing ILAs. The template included writing objectives (for children and parents), time frame, resources/materials, prep time, and debriefing suggestions. A post-PD survey respondent stated, "All of the TA on ILA was informative. Understanding the importance of strengthening interactive learning into practices was very helpful." The post-PD survey ratings also reinforced the helpfulness of this PD topic.

Parent education and ILA PD were often interwoven because the topics are interrelated. One staff member mentioned how they appreciated the "clear and concise examples." As stated on the post-PD survey, "I appreciated the technical assistance in regards to ILA content, ideas, and best practices. It did help with ILA development and implementation. Most of the meetings that had to do with content and development were helpful." For example, one cross-site meeting focused on addressing summer learning loss in parent education, along with parent-child ILAs to combat this "summer slide." The training presented a parent-education lesson plan that included objectives, teacher preparation, the activity, instructions for take-home ILA, and a debrief for parents about the topic. In this lesson, parents discussed the definition of summer slide; read, discussed, and learned vocabulary from an article about preventing the summer slide; and learned how to use comics as a strategy to combat summer learning

loss (i.e., reading comics fosters reading, creating, writing). At the end of the parent education class, parents were asked to develop a comic strip with their child and present their finished product at their next class. Accordingly, parents were provided with information about how to create comic strips and were asked to pay attention to what their child learned while co-creating the comic strip.

Although we cannot attribute the positive findings from the pre/post caregiver survey to the ongoing PD on parent education and ILA, we believe this support provided the conditions and programming for the changes in parents' literacy practices. As the quantitative findings showed, there were statistically significant improvements in all areas of parental engagement after participating in the FLI (see Tables 3 and 4). We suspect that parents were more attuned to the importance of engaging informally in language and literacy activities with their children, indicating that the program's emphasis on ILA and parent education provided ideas for supporting these practices. We also provided PD on parent education, often focusing on helping parents connect with schools, particularly after the pandemic, and these pre/post survey items were also statistically significant (see Table 6). Parents engaged more frequently with schools by seeking online information about their child's education and reading school communications. This information was critical to families as they learned how to support their children's remote learning.

The pandemic in March 2020 was a shock to organizations as they abruptly stopped face-to-face programming. We responded quickly by shifting to remote PD and providing an online cross-site meeting within a few weeks of the shutdown. GI family literacy teachers' experience providing emergency remote instruction in our direct service program was also an invaluable resource for developing PD (Kaiper-Marquez et al., 2020). Program staff rated this training as extremely helpful because the PD provided remote instruction ideas and online resources for implementing the four components, which facilitated their shift to emergency remote instruction. For instance, an administrator wrote, "Your resource list is by far the best I've seen." Programs became successful at providing remote instruction, and a cross-site meeting was devoted to sharing ILA best practices that included lesson ideas and how they used the ILA template. A post-PD survey respondent mentioned that "facilitating the shared resources/ideas among the other family literacy programs" was beneficial, and during a site-visit interview, an individual said that it was "helpful to see the different ILAs everyone is doing."

Due to staff turnover, we provided another training on ILAs in 2022. The purpose was to explain why ILA and parent education are important, how to connect ILAs to the four components, and examples of different ILA topics. We noticed that some programs were struggling with ILA attendance, so a cross-site training emphasized the need for each organization to reflect on and address the underlying reasons.

Integrating Components

High-quality family literacy programs integrate the four components. In doing so, the lessons complement each other and reinforce learning about particular topics. This can be challenging because some components (e.g., adult or early childhood education) are provided by partner organizations and/or staff have trouble connecting with teachers in children's

schools. To address this challenge, the cross-site meetings consistently emphasized integrating lesson plans across components.

We presented staff with a structure for developing an integrated lesson plan for building the ILA and connecting it to adult and parent education. The plan started with identifying an adult education topic and then locating materials and creating class activities (e.g., readings, discussions, grammar lesson). Themes from the topic were identified for parent education and ILA (e.g., a children's book and activity). For example, the adult education topics presented in the cross-site meeting were related to the month of January (e.g., Martin Luther King Jr. Day, Winter Olympics), and the themes could be hopes and dreams, perseverance, and winter sports. Suggestions were provided for how to find a children's book and activities related to the theme. We also introduced a lesson template that identified how each component related to the others so that staff were aware of these connections during lesson development. Staff were eager to learn from each other, so they shared examples of how they integrated lesson plans during the meeting.

DISCUSSION

Since 2019, we have provided PD to the FLI organizations to support high-quality family literacy program development. The PD emphasis progressed from the *fundamentals* of offering the four family literacy components to engaging in organization-directed *continuous improvement*. Further, the PD consistently introduced topics that make family literacy programming distinctive, such as integrating the component lessons, making connections to schools, and developing take-home ILA packets.

Throughout the FLI, we delivered *targeted PD* to meet the specific needs of each organization so that they could better serve the diverse families enrolled in their programs. In particular, we recognized the need to support organizations by translating data collection tools, reviewing strategies to differentiate lesson plans for multilevel learners, and discussing ways to provide culturally relevant programming. In addition, when the pandemic halted in-person instruction, we quickly responded to organizations' immediate need to understand *how to provide instruction remotely*. Finally, the emphasis on *the importance of ILA and parent education* across varied PD topics (e.g., integrating lesson plans across components, developing lesson plans, engaging with schools, supporting parent interactions with their children) helped staff provide high-quality programming for these two components. The post-PD survey and interviews indicated that *FLI staff valued the PD that was offered*, particularly the opportunity to share their challenges and successes with peers in this new learning environment.

Our data cannot prove that the PD provided to programs caused the positive pre/post caregiver survey results. However, prior research, particularly the finding that technical assistance (TA) is the crucial link between implementation and outcomes (Durlak & DuPre, 2008), supports the possibility that ongoing, intentional, and customized PD helped improve the FLI program quality, which in turn created the conditions for enhanced parent-child language, literacy, and learning interactions. In conclusion, this study suggests that well-planned PD and regular, supportive interactions with program staff are crucial for developing and improving successful, high-quality family literacy programs. ❧

Elisabeth L. McLean, PhD, is an assistant teaching professor at the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy, College of Education, at Penn State University. Dr. McLean has over 25 years of experience implementing, evaluating, and providing professional development to early childhood and family literacy programs that serve low-income families. Her work focuses on early language and literacy development, parent engagement, and parent-child interactive literacy activities that enhance children's school success, as well as policy and parent leadership. She may be contacted at elg6@psu.edu.

Carol Clymer, EdD, co-director of the Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy and the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy, College of Education at Penn State University, has over 45 years of experience implementing and evaluating programs to improve the education and employment prospects of adult education learners and their families. She has participated in the design and implementation of professional development projects and large-scale evaluations and outcomes studies related to adult education, family literacy, performance benchmarking, employment retention, sectoral employment, out-of-school youth, and college access. She has also authored numerous publications and made hundreds of conference presentations. She may be contacted at cdc22@psu.edu.

Esther Prins, PhD, is a professor in the Lifelong Learning and Adult Education Program at Penn State and the co-director of the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy and the Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy. Her research interests include sociocultural and critical approaches to adult education, particularly adult and family literacy, and how adult education exacerbates or mitigates social inequalities. She is the co-author of *Teaching and Learning about Family Literacy and Family Literacy Programs* (2022, Routledge), and her co-edited book, *Family and Intergenerational Literacy and Learning: International Perspectives*, is currently in press (UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning). She may be contacted at esp150@psu.edu.

Jungeun Lee, PhD, is the assistant teaching professor at ISAL and the Goodling Institute at Penn State. She completed her PhD in adult education at the University of Georgia. Her research interests include adult literacy and adult learning policy and practices, education policy analysis, educational inequality from comparative and international perspectives, and quantitative and mixed methodologies. She may be contacted at jpl5372@psu.edu.

REFERENCES

- Beckmann, C. D. (1997). *Community concerns and cultural practices: A study of curriculum development in Even Start literacy programs* (Publication No. 9734353) [Doctoral dissertation, Baylor University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Clymer, C., Toso, B. W., Grinder, E., & Sauder, R. P. (2017). *Changing the course of family literacy*. Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy. https://ed.psu.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/Policy%20Paper%201-10-17%20FINAL%20REV%208-15-17_1.pdf
- de la Rie, S., Van Steensel, R., & Van Gelderen, A. (2017). Implementation quality of family literacy programmes: A review of literature. *Review of Education*, 5(1), 91–118.
- Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41, 327–350.
- Feinberg, M. E., Greenberg, M. T., & Wayne Osgood, D. (2004). Technical assistance in prevention programs: Correlates of perceived need in communities that care. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 27(3), 263–274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2004.04.001>
- García, E., & Weiss, E. (2017). *Education inequalities at the school starting gate: Gaps, trends, and strategies to address them*. Economic Policy Institute.
- Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy (2019, updated 2020). *Family Literacy Indicators of Program Quality*. <https://ed.psu.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/Updated%20Family%20Literacy%20IPQs.pdf>
- Kaiper-Marquez, A., Wolfe, E., Clymer, C., Lee, J., McLean, E. G., Prins, E., & Stickel, T. (2020). On the fly: Adapting quickly to emergency remote instruction in a family literacy program. *International Review of Education – Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 66, 691–713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-020-09861-y>
- Lynch, J., & Prins, E. (2022). *Teaching and learning about family literacy and family literacy programs*. Routledge.
- McLean, E., & Clymer, C. (2021). *Interactive literacy activities toolkit*. Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy, Penn State University. https://ed.psu.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/ILA%20ToolKit%20FINAL_6.pdf
- National Center for Education Evaluation. (2004). *Third national Even Start evaluation: Follow-up findings from the experimental design study*. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/even_start/two_program.asp
- Nutbrown, C., Hannon, P., & Morgan, A. (2005). *Early literacy work with families: Policy, practice and research*. Sage.
- Padak, N., Sapin, C., & Baycich, D. (2002). *A decade of family literacy: Programs, outcomes, and future prospects*. Ohio Resource Center. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/ERIC-ED465074/pdf/ERIC-ED465074.pdf>
- Paratore, J., & Yaden, D. B. (2010). Family literacy on the defensive: The defunding of Even Start – omen or opportunity? In D. Lapp & D. Fisher (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (3rd ed.) (pp. 90–97). Routledge.
- Park, M., McHugh, M., & Katsiaficas, C. (2016). *Serving immigrant families through two-generation programs: Identifying family needs and responsive program approaches*. Migration Policy Institute. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/serving-immigrant-families-through-two-generation-programs-identifying-family-needs-and>
- Soliman, J. (2018). The Even Start Family Literacy Program: The rise and fall of family literacy and the need for its return. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law and Policy*, 25(3), 427–450.
- St. Pierre, R. G., Ricciuti, A. E., & Tao, F. (2004). Continuous improvement in family literacy programs. In B. Wasik (Ed.), *Handbook of family literacy* (pp. 587–599). Lawrence Erlbaum.

- U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *Guidance for the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs, Part B, Subpart 3 of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, archived.
- Weirauch, D. (2003). *Even Start revisited: A counter to the third national Even Start evaluation program impacts and implications for improvement*. Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy. https://ed.psu.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/3rd_ESNE2003critique%20full_2.pdf
- Weirauch, D. (2010). *SEQUAL: Practitioner action research, 2009–2010*. Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy. https://ed.psu.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/PAR_Handbook_20092010_FINAL.pdf
- William Penn Foundation. (2023, June 22). *Family Literacy Summit*. Presentation at the Family Literacy Summit, Philadelphia, PA.

Table 1
Overview of the Five Family Literacy Organizations

Organization	Modality	Population Served	Partner
Beyond Literacy (BeLit)	In-person & remote	ESL	Public and Private Schools
Indochinese American Council (IAC)	HyFlex & remote	ESL	KenCrest Early Learning Centers
KenCrest Early Learning Centers	HyFlex & remote	ESL & High School Equivalency	IAC & Temple University
Nationalities Services Center (NSC)	In-person & remote	ESL	Community Volunteers
Connectedly (formerly Supportive Older Women's Network)	In-person & remote	Grandparents	Senior Centers and Faith-based Organizations

Table 2**Summary of Professional Development Provided During the Family Literacy Initiative**

Year	Modality	Topic
Year 1: Fall 2018–2019	In person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessing each organization’s PD/TA needs Introducing data collection and tools Using Canvas Brainstorming strategies for recruitment and marketing Understanding fundamentals of interactive literacy activities (ILAs)
Year 2: 2020	In person Remote (pandemic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning about recruitment strategies and suggestions Developing differentiated instruction lessons for multilingual/multilevel students Addressing cultural differences of families Using the Family Literacy IPQs Pivoting to remote instruction during the pandemic Reviewing online resources for the four components Using the Weekly Home Activity Logs as a teaching tool
Year 3: 2021	Remote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing successes and challenges of data collection during the pandemic Best practices for ILA Exploring how to integrate lesson topics across four components Addressing summer learning loss (summer slide)
Year 4: 2022	Remote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing ILA in different instructional modalities Developing culturally relevant ILA Using the Goodling ILA Toolkit (McLean & Clymer, 2021) Planning for summer programming Sharing creative ideas for summer programming Conducting action research projects
Year 5: 2023	In Person & Remote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Philadelphia Family Literacy Summit (in person) Focus on the Schools to promote partnerships (remote)
Year 1 to 5	Zoom	<p>Check-in meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program updates Data collection updates Support to programs during the pandemic TA/PD needs

Table 3**Parents' Engagement in Parent-Child Interactive Literacy Activities**

	N	Pre-survey		Post-survey		<i>t</i>		% missing
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
<i>Reading, writing, and doing math with child</i>								
Read to child (e.g., a book, magazine, newspaper, comic book, website)	137	2.15	0.98	2.72	0.90	-6.49	**	1.4
Listen to child read or tell stories	137	2.76	1.03	2.96	0.84	-2.10	*	1.4
Practice reading, identify alphabet letters, or talk about words while doing other activities	136	2.49	1.04	2.93	0.82	-4.49	**	2.2
Practice writing the alphabet, words, or other kinds of writing	132	2.37	1.07	2.74	0.90	-3.44	**	5.0
Do things that involve numbers or math (e.g., recipes, counting things)	138	2.49	1.01	2.83	0.88	-3.63	**	0.7
<i>Talking, singing, and storytelling with child</i>								
Tell stories to your child	138	2.30	0.95	2.67	0.85	-3.87	**	0.7
Play word games (e.g., rhyming, jokes)	135	1.96	1.01	2.52	0.90	-5.71	**	2.9
Talk about school (e.g., what they learned, friends, activities, teacher)	135	2.84	1.10	3.27	0.88	-4.37	**	2.9
Have conversations as you go about your day (e.g., during meals, on the bus, walking to school)	138	2.57	1.07	3.01	0.96	-3.62	**	0.7
Talk about nature or science or do a science activity together	136	1.97	0.96	2.42	0.91	-4.67	**	2.2
Sing, listen to music together, or play music together	137	2.71	1.06	2.88	0.99	-1.81	†	1.4
Watch/talk about TV, videos, or movies together	137	2.68	1.04	3.02	0.94	-3.44	**	1.4
<i>Play, art, and digital devices</i>								
Play with toys (e.g., blocks, puzzles) or play games (e.g., board games, cards)	137	2.53	1.08	2.81	0.94	-2.48	*	1.4
Do activities (e.g., arts/crafts, coloring, painting)	136	2.35	0.98	2.62	0.95	-2.68	*	2.2
Use a computer, tablet, smartphone, or other digital device together	138	2.57	1.07	3.01	0.96	-4.02	**	0.7

Note. † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Table 4**Parents' Support for Child's Reading and Child's Reading Enjoyment**

	N	Pre-survey		Post-survey		t/ χ^2		% missing
		M	SD	M	SD			
Reading time with child	131	3.37	2.19	4.59	2.37	-5.89	**	2.4
Stop while reading to ask questions, talk about pictures, point out letters, etc.	119							
Never		9.24		2.52		18.32	*	14.4
Sometimes		52.94		34.45				
Usually		37.82		63.03				
Talk about the story (or other reading material) after you've finished reading	118							
Never		16.95		4.24		17.75	*	15.1
Sometimes		46.61		38.14				
Usually		36.44		57.63				
Reading enjoyment								
Your child enjoys if you read to them	121	2.42	1.26	3.58	.71	-8.93	**	
Your child enjoys reading on their own	94	2.48	1.22	3.55	.76	-7.19	**	

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Table 5
Parents' Engagement in Cultural and Community Activities

	N	Pre-survey		Post-survey		<i>t</i>		% missing
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Visit a library with your child	137	1.18	0.54	1.36	0.65	-2.88	*	1.4
Visit a museum, zoo, or historical site with your child	137	1.33	0.61	1.55	0.82	-2.48	*	1.4
Attend a community educational event (not school-related) with your child	135	1.22	0.50	1.61	0.93	-4.40	**	2.9

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Table 6**Parents' Involvement in Child's Education and School-Related Activities**

	Pre-survey			Post-survey			<i>t</i>	% missing
	N	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Help your child with homework or take-home projects	106	3.47	1.42	3.75	1.02	-1.86 †	23.7	
Check to see that your child's homework or take-home project is done	107	3.92	1.36	4.32	0.93	-3.08 *	23.0	
Attend parent-teacher conferences	109	3.24	1.62	3.65	1.41	-2.83 *	21.6	
Attend activities, events, or meetings at the school, preschool, or after-school program	126	2.51	1.48	2.94	1.43	-3.17 *	9.4	
Contact your child's teacher(s) or other staff	126	2.84	1.53	3.16	1.35	-2.63 *	9.4	
Volunteer in the school or classroom	118	1.80	1.20	1.85	1.24	-0.40	15.1	
Look up information online about your child's school or education (e.g., grades, policies, activities)	123	2.55	1.49	3.39	1.49	-6.21 **	11.5	
Read communication that the school sends to you (e.g., flyers, emails, grade reports, corrected homework)	127	3.47	1.65	3.95	1.32	-4.18 **	8.6	

Note. † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$