**Family Literacy Grant Report – year 1 (2013-4)**

**Narrative:**

**Give a brief (1 paragraph) synopsis of the project purpose, activities, and results:** Mini-grants of $400 each were awarded to 27 libraries were required to collaboratively plan the projects with a new community partner agency before submitting the project to MHLS, and 34 new community partnerships were developed. 3,644 programs were offered by libraries in the system with a total attendance of 63,827. 1,902 of the programs included parents/caregivers (attendance = 16,608). 100% of the libraries reported that their collaborations were successful, that they benefitted from the collaboration, that families in their community benefitted from the collaboration, and that their community partner agency benefitted from the collaboration. 88.5% of the libraries reported that the collaboration with their community partner was responsible for their increase in family involvement in their summer reading programs.

**List the cooperating agencies in this project and identify their role(s) in the project including 1) Planning; 2) Project Activities; 3) Evaluation:** 27 libraries were the direct cooperating agencies involved in this project (Alice Curtis Desmond and Hamilton Fish Library (Garrison); Beekman Library; Brewster Public Library; Cairo Public Library; Claverack Library; Dover Plains Library; Grinnell Library (Wappingers Falls); Julia L. Butterfield Memorial Library (Coldspring); Kent Public Library; Kinderhook Memorial Library; LaGrange Association Library; Mahopac Public Library; New Lebanon Library; NorthEast Millerton Library; Olive Free Library Association; Patterson Library; Pawling Free Library; Philmont Public Library; Phoenicia Library; Pine Plains Free Library; Poughkeepsie Public Library District; Roeliff Jansen Community Library (Hillsdale); Sarah Hull Hallock Free Library (Milton); Staatsburg Library; Stanford Free Library; Tivoli Free Library; Town of Ulster Public Library). PLANNING: The libraries were required to collaboratively plan the projects with a new community partner agency before submitting the project to MHLS for consideration (mini-grant application form for member libraries is attached\*). Libraries who had previously partnered with a school continued that partnership for this program but were also required to include a non-school community agency to be eligible for this round of funding (list of the 27 libraries and their 34 community partners is attached). PROJECT ACTIVITIES: The libraries were responsible for project activities targeted to their specific community, designed to increase the number of families involved in local summer reading programs AND foster collaborations with community agencies in support of “Summer Reading at New York Libraries”. EVALUATION: The libraries conducted evaluations of their programs and were also responsible for evaluative reporting to MHLS.

**Using the OBJECTIVES and the ACTIVITIES as they were stated in the original project application, describe project accomplishments:** Library programs were improved by libraries planning the programs collaboratively with their community partner agency, as together they shared their knowledge of the community and improved the key components of library programs to increase effectiveness. 100% of the libraries reported that their collaborations were successful, that they benefitted from the collaboration, that families in their community benefitted from the collaboration, and that their community partner agency benefitted from the collaboration. Member libraries received System staff support to increase their skills in providing and evaluating summer programs for young people and families through a total of 9 targeted workshops: ‘Encouraging Toddler Language Development through Story Time’; Children’s Readers Advisory for Frontline Staff’; ‘Early Literacy Story Times – Enhancing Programs for Children & their Caregivers’; ‘Orientation for New Summer Programmers’; ‘Family Programming & Gaming – Programming for All Ages’(workshop notices attached\*) with a total attendance of 157. Towards the goal of increasing the number of families involved in local summer reading programs, 88.5% of the libraries reported that the collaboration with their community partner was responsible for the increase.

**How was the project publicized? How effective were these methods?** The project was publicized to all 66 library directors in the Mid-Hudson Library System through MHLS Directors Association meetings and through the MHLS Directors listserv, to the member library youth staff through the MHLS Youth Services listserv, and to all through the MHLS weekly Bulletin. The publicity was started two months before the applications were due, which was an effective way to insure there was time for the libraries to include the mandatory pre-planning with the community partner agencies.

**Describe any problems or surprises you encountered in working toward the objectives for this project. What would you do differently?** We would not do anything differently, but were surprised by the large response to this opportunity. We had originally planned to award mini-grants to 17 libraries, but had 27 applications that scored the maximum of points in the evaluation rubric in the member library mini-grant application (attached\*) used by MHLS for ranking applications. The member libraries were also surprised by the amount of support available in their communities from partner agencies and several libraries partnered with more than one.

**How has planning for the upcoming summer reading season been impacted by activities carried out during the previous summer reading season? (Ex. Adjustment to planning and training for 2014 based on information learned during the 2013 summer reading season.)** 68% of participating libraries reported that they made changes in their 2014 summer reading program as a result of their collaboration. Examples include: “We had two in-school kick-offs in addition to one at the library. Attendance at the kick-offs totaled around 500; our largest ever!” – Cairo Public Library; “This was the first time participation could happen off site - it was a good outreach to promote reading as part of the whole camp experience, especially to overnight campers who are economically disadvantaged kids. They could not participate by coming to the library, so the library came to them!” – Patterson Library; “The changes involved committing staff to extend the summer reading program beyond the physical library. Not only has this collaboration extended to the camp, but it has also involved collaboration with three of the school district’s elementary librarians who have volunteered their time to be guest readers at the camp. I believe this has strengthened the relationship first with the community camp program and with our local schools.” – Staatsburg Library; “We had initially planned to have children from the day care come to us on a field trip. Our partner explained that logistically this was going to be very hard to get full participation. So, we decided to have our story teller performance for the children and their families actually at the day care.” – Phoenicia Library; “We have never had a separate "kick off" event for birth-5 year old children and families: we usually have one event for all age groups. This is an age group that most consistently attends library programs and uses our services. Based on the overwhelming success and positive feedback we received, we plan to continue to offer a kickoff event for birth-5 year olds and a kickoff event for school aged students and their families.” – NorthEast-Millerton Library

**How did the family component impact the program?** 88.5% of the libraries reported that the collaboration increased the number of families involved in their summer reading program. Examples of the impact include: “Increased awareness of the library and of the Summer Reading Program.” – Cairo Public Library; “Our summer program enrollment has seen an increase in new families as well as an increase in parent involvement with their child at our programs and especially for this grant program. Parents were very involved and engrossed with their children at the Lego building project.” – Stanford Free Library; “We had many new families in attendance.” – Beekman Library; “Families in our community who may not have been aware of library programming have received information about how they can participate in our summer reading game, and about special programs we have that may interest their kids. Although we advertise extensively, there are always new ways we can find to reach families! Sending materials home with day campers is a new avenue.” – Patterson Library; "Several families had not participated in any program offerings prior to the Crazy 8's Math Club. They were very pleased that this was offered and that their child(ren) were learning that math activities could be fun. I have encouraged them to participate in some of the adult and family programs, as well as the Homework Help program during the school year." - Grinnell Public Library; “Families were able to spend quality time together, working on a project which produced extremely satisfying results. They also became aware of many of the services that are available, free of charge or for a nominal fee, to participate in as a family. All families said they would seek out programs to attend in the future, both at Kent Public Library and at Arts on the Lake.” – Kent Public Library; “This collaboration has allowed some families to save money on summer camp by sending their children to the combined Summer Recreation/Lunch Bunch program for all or part of the summer. We have also had members of the community comment that they are glad that the village is able to offer a program that lasts nearly all day, when in previous years it has had to be capped at three hours. Even community members who do not have children in the program have remarked on how beneficial it is to the community, and said that they are proud to live in a place that provides such a service to its residents.” – Tivoli Free Library; “It gave the families the opportunity to enhance the learning/reading experience of their children and to become a participant in reaching that goal. These programs offer another form of learning with sometimes a hand’s on approach and provide experiences that might not be readily available to them otherwise. The parents saw the library as more then mortar and books. A place that they could come together to do things as a family and see us as part of the camp experience.” – Pine Plains Free Library; “Families are discovering that the library has changed, that there is now a dedicated children's room as well as loads of family-friendly programming that is fun and interactive. Families are connecting with other families at the library during library programs. They are also finding that there are things to do for all ages at the library, so they come in and tend to stay for a while.” – Olive Free Library; “The families at Astor were aware that our library had children's programming, but they were not aware of the variety we had during the summer and throughout the year. We've seen a 10% increase in the number of Astor Head Start students who are registered for our Summer Reading Program, and we've physically seen more families in the library consistently utilizing our services and checking out items.” – NorthEast-Millerton Library

**You are expected to provide an Outcome-Based evaluation (OBE) of your project, involving outputs and outcomes. Briefly describe evaluation methods used. Include a summary of the quantitative and qualitative evaluation results and user satisfaction data. Please provide a minimum of two outcomes and how they were measured. Please, also, attach a minimum of two samples of your library or system’s evaluation instruments.** 27 libraries partnered with a total of 34 community agencies **-** 100% of the libraries reported that their collaborations were successful, that they benefitted from the collaboration, that families in their community benefitted from the collaboration, and that their community partner agency benefitted from the collaboration. 3,644 programs were offered by libraries in the system with a total attendance of 63,827. 1,902 of the programs included parents/caregivers (attendance = 16,608).

30,000 system generated bookmarks (attached) were sent to the libraries for distribution in their communities, promoting the consortia digital collection for summer reading, and the support of the NYS Library’s Family Literacy Library Services grant program. Included in this project was the creation of a ‘Kids eReading Room’ at <http://mhls.lib.overdrive.com/kids> - a new separate kid-friendly environment (mimicking how juvenile materials are separate in a physical library) for juvenile eBook & downloadable audiobooks, categorized by reading level.

Attached\* are the evaluation summaries from the 9 targeted workshops (‘Encouraging Toddler Language Development through Story Time’; Children’s Readers Advisory for Frontline Staff’; ‘Early Literacy Story Times – Enhancing Programs for Children & their Caregivers’; ‘Orientation for New Summer Programmers’; ‘Family Programming & Gaming – Programming for All Ages’) -100% of attendees reported it was worth their time. The ‘Early Literacy Story Times – Enhancing Programs for Children & their Caregivers’ workshop has been targeted by the MHLS Continuing Education/ Professional Development Advisory Committee for post-workshop outcome based evaluation surveys (attached\*) sent to all attendees in fall 2014 to measure changes made as a result of attending. Also attached\* is the evaluation form used by the participating libraries in their final report to MHLS - answers to this have developed a database of success stories for us to use in advocacy and future community partnership-building endeavors.

**What increases/decreases would you recommend in budget spending?** For the next year the MHLS budget for the NYS Library’s Family Literacy Library Services grant program will put more towards mini-grants to member libraries, but it is still not enough to meet the need. If the overall funds to the NYS Library’s Family Literacy Library Services grant program were increased there would be more impact statewide in improving family literacy.

**List additional funds used for this project and where funds were obtained. Estimate the in-kind costs incurred by the library and cooperating agencies.**

Additional funds obtained: $5,000 from Ulster County funds for Kids eReading Room digital content. $4,000 from NYS Coordinated Outreach Service Program Aid for 10 additional mini-grants.

In-kind costs incurred by the libraries and cooperating agencies is estimated at a total of $774,422 for the year. This is comprised of $364,400 for room rental (3,644 programs at $100 each); $393,552 library staff time for programming (6 hours of library staff time for each program totals 21,864 hours at $18); $16,470 staff time from libraries and community partners for collaborative planning (15 hours for each of the 27 libraries and 34 community partners totals 915 at $18).

**Statistics:**

1. Number of libraries and/or branches in the system that offered a summer reading program for children and/or teens in 2013? 69
	* Plan to offer in 2014? 69
2. Number of libraries and/or branches in the system that used the CSLP children's slogan for 2013? 64
	* Plan to use the CSLP Children’s slogan for 2014? 64
3. Number of libraries and/or branches in the system that used the CSLP teen slogan for 2013? 38
	* Plan to use the CSLP teen slogan for 2014? 38
4. TOTAL number of children who registered for the summer reading program in 2013: 9,993
5. TOTAL number of teens who registered for the summer reading program in 2013: 1,255
6. Reading totals for 2013:
	* For participants recording by time read:
		+ TOTAL number of children who recorded by minutes read: 2,997
		+ TOTAL minutes read by these children: 2,161,755
		+ TOTAL number of teens who recorded by minutes read: 334
		+ TOTAL minutes read by these teens: 258,835
	* For participants recording by books read:
		+ TOTAL number of children who recorded by books read: 3,309
		+ TOTAL number of books children read: 62,668
		+ TOTAL number of teens who recorded by books read: 647
		+ TOTAL number of books teens read: 5,714
7. Programs: A program is defined as one planned session conducted by a staff member, outside performer or other programmer – it does not include informal visits to the library to report on reading, etc.
	* 1. How many total programs did libraries in the system offer for children during summer 2013? 2,738
		+ Total attendance (including parents/caregivers)? 55,608
	* 2. How many total programs did libraries in the system offer for teens during summer 2013? 906
		+ Total attendance (including parents/caregivers)? 8,219
	* 3. Total of 1 & 2, Programs? 3,644
		+ Total of 1 & 2, Attendance? 63,827
	* How many programs listed in #3 included parents/caregivers? 1,902
		+ Attendance of parents/caregivers? 16,608
	* 5. How many workshops (professional development) were offered by the system from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014? 9
		+ Total attendance? 157

**Budget (actual expenses): total $11,725**

* Purchased Services
	+ Mini-grants to member libraries: $8,225
* Supplies & Materials
	+ Digital titles from OverDrive: $2,675
	+ 60,000 Bookmarks: $825

\*Attachments available upon request