



Summary of Keys to Interactive Parenting Scale (KIPS) Data and Experiences
Collected and Reported by 4 grantee programs of the Portland Children's Levy
June 2011

Background

The Portland Children's Levy was created by Portland, Oregon voters in 2002 and overwhelmingly renewed by the electorate in Fall 2008. The Levy is supported through a five-year property tax projected to generate more than \$12 million annually toward proven programs across the city serving 16,000 children and their families in areas of Early Childhood, After School, Mentoring, Child Abuse Prevention/Intervention and Foster Care. The Levy is annually audited and administrative costs do not exceed 5 percent.

Through its portfolio of Early Childhood grants, the Levy supports early childhood programs ranging from home visiting programs, to early childhood mental health consultation, and from Head Start slots to subsidized high quality childcare for low-income, working families.

Four of the Levy's home visiting programs (listed below), all of which use Parents As Teachers curriculum, agreed in 2006 to receive training in implementing a parent-child interaction assessment tool, the Keys to Interaction Parenting Scale (KIPS). All for programs staff and supervisors completed a two-day training in December 2006 on use of the tool and employing it in their service delivery. In keeping with KIPS fidelity, the staff received certification upon satisfactory completion of the training.

Overview of Programs using KIPS

The four programs began using the KIPS in January 2007. Their typical use of the tool was to perform an "intake" KIPS assessment within the first 3 home visits with newly enrolled families, and then to perform subsequent/follow-up KIPS assessments every 6 months, while a family remained enrolled in services. Two of the programs were home-based Early Head Start models, offering weekly home visits and monthly parent-child socialization groups on a school-year schedule and the other two programs offered monthly to bi-weekly home visits and bi-weekly parent-child socialization groups.

The four programs include:

- Albina Head Start- Early Head Start home-based model
- Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization (IRCO)- Child and Parent Success Program
- Impact NW- Parent Child Development Services (PCDS)
- Neighborhood House- Early Oregon Prekindergarten (modeled on home-based Early Head Start)

Data gathered from programs is reported annually to Children’s Levy staff. Data in this report were compiled by Levy staff from the 4 programs annual reports submitted for the following fiscal/program years: 06-07, 07-08, 08-09, and 09-10. Slight changes to the reporting process affected the way in which some data were collected and reported. Those impacts are noted in the data presented on the following pages.

Some key data that programs did not gather (because it was not required by the Levy) are participation and service completion data. The Levy began requiring that data be collected and reported by programs as of FY09-10, but it was not done for the 3 prior programs years. We cannot say with certainty how long parents participated in the programs, though all of the programs are multi-year and parents could participate as long as their child was age-eligible or income-eligible (in the case of the 2 Early Head Start model programs).

Demographics of Program Participants

Among the 4 programs that used KIPS between January 1, 2007 – June 30, 2010, the demographics of the population served were, on average:

Approximately 300 parents and 500 children served annually. Over 85% of the parents participating in the programs were mothers. Over 70% of participants are people of color, and the largest portion of parents served (41%) are between the ages of 31 – 40. Among children served, over 75% were ages 2 and younger. Just over 75% of parents participating in the programs had incomes at or below the Federal Poverty Level.

Possibly the most unique feature of the population served by the 4 programs is their cultural diversity—over 44% speak a first language other than English or Spanish, and 24% speak Spanish as a primary language. The other languages spoken include several from Africa, East Asia, Eastern Europe and the Middle East. These families are mainly immigrant and refugees families that have settled in the Metro Portland area.

See tables below for more specific demographic data.

Race/Ethnicity of Parents Served

White/ European American	23.7%
African American/ African	22.7%
Asian American/ Asian	16.1%
Native American/ Native Alaskan	1.0%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.9%
Latino/ Hispanic	26.0%
Multiracial/ Multiethnic	3.8%
Other (please specify)	5.1%
Not Given	0.8%

Age of Parent Served

16 - 18	2.7%
19 - 24	20.1%
25 - 30	25.7%

31 - 40	41.1%
41 - 50	8.7%
51+	1.4%
Not Given	0.4%

Age of Children Served

0 - 2	77.3%
3 - 5	22.0%
6 - 8	> 1%

Primary Language Spoken in the Home by Parents Served

English	30.4%
Spanish	24.1%
Other	44.6%
Not Given	0.9%

On average, 25 other languages spoken include: Arabic, Bangla, Bosnian, Burmese, Chaldean, Chinese, Chuukese, Farsi, French, German, Hmong, Karen, Korean, Kurundi, Lao, Micronesian, Nepali, Oromo, Palauan, Romanian, Russian, Samoan, Somali, Swahili, Turkish, Thai, Ukranian, Vietnamese

Socioeconomic Status of Parents Served

At or Below Fed Poverty Level	75.3%
101% - 150% of FPL	14.9%
151% - 200% of FPL	3.4%
201% - 250% of FPL	1.6%
Over 251% of FPL	0.9%
Not Given	3.8%

KIPS Data

There were a total of 608 “intake” or 1st KIPS completed between January 1, 2007 – June 30, 2010. (Total of at least 608 parent-child dyads served in that period)

1082 total KIPS assessments completed in that time period. Includes 1st, 2nd and any subsequent. Approximately one-quarter of the KIPS were done without video due to parents concerns (see “Challenges with KIPS” on the subsequent pages)

Of the 608 first KIPS (intake KIPS) that were completed, scores were reported to the Levy for only 483 of the completed assessments (this discrepancy is due to a reporting policy change made by Levy for FY 09-10 in which programs were not required to report intake scores that year).

Table of scores for 1st KIPS

KIPS assessments in a specific Score Range	Number of KIPS completed	% of KIPS completed
Number of KIPS assessments with a total score between 1 – 2	6	1.2%
Number of KIPS assessments with a total score between 2.1 – 2.9	55	11.4%
Number of KIPS assessments with a total score between 3 - 4	220	45.5%
Number of KIPS assessments with a total score over 4.1	202	41.8%

As noted in the table, just under 90% of KIPS scores were a 3 or higher at the first observation, while approximately 12% were a 2.9 or lower.

There were a total of 396 subsequent (2nd KIPS or other follow-up) KIPS completed between July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2010. Scores from all of the subsequent KIPS assessments were reported because program outcomes were based on looking at percent of parents whose “subsequent KIPS” showed score of 3 or higher. The Levy changed reporting requirements for how scores were reported on subsequent KIPS between FY 08-09 and FY 09-10. Due to the changes, only some data are broken down by scores under 3, between 3 – 4 and over 4. Data reported in FY 09-10 is only reported for scores under 3 and scores 3 and over.

Table of scores for 2nd/subsequent KIPS

KIPS assessments in a specific Score Range	Number of KIPS completed	% of KIPS completed
Number of most recent KIPS that show total score to 2.9 or lower.	19	4.8%
Number of most recent KIPS that show a total score to 3 to 4.	119	31.8%
Number of most recent KIPS that show a total score of 4.1 or higher.	133	33.8%
Number of most recent KIPS that show total score under 3.	5	.04%
Number of most recent KIPS that show total score of 3 or higher.	117	29.5%

As noted in the table above, by the subsequent KIPS assessment, most parents in the four programs were demonstrating scores of 3 or higher.

Themes from Programs’ use of KIPS

Benefits to using KIPS (as reported by Programs)

- Opportunity for parents to self-reflect, see their strengths and identify skills they want to improve
- Giving parents copy of the video afterward so they have keepsakes of their time with their children and their growth together
- Children want to view it with their parent, to see themselves on the video, so it can become a bonding activity for parent-child
- Focusing on specific skills with parents
- Structure and planning tool for home visits

- Tool for staff supervision
- Data backs up what program staff suspected—with support, coaching, guidance, parents learn quickly and improve parent-child interaction.
- “The structured evaluation of the recording prevents staff from becoming too corrective and gives them an opportunity to reinforce positive behaviors.”

Challenges to using KIPS (as reported by Programs)

- Getting families on board, anxiety over being video taped (reasons include cultural appropriateness, fear if undocumented, never used or been exposed to video camera, have criminal history and fear the video could be used in court/child welfare cases)
- Cultural appropriateness for various immigrant & refugee populations and appropriate translation
- Once the observation starts, getting parents to be comfortable and natural (reported that many parents changed their behavior somewhat for first one, but then seemed more relaxed and natural for the second one).
- Staff concerns about video taping families, how to present tool in positive manner and alleviate families feelings of it being intrusive or judgmental
- Staff concerns/fears with video technology use and troubleshooting
- Managing a large family of children and how to keep other children occupied with video is done with parent and child enrolled in program.
- Incorporating the assessment into service delivery such that it is completed on a regular interval with families
- Juggling the video taping/observing with wanting to address issues in the moment, especially if a family asks for help or has questions about something that comes up during the play session.
- Staff turnover and getting new staff up to speed and comfortable with the tool.
- Reviewing the video and scoring it thoughtfully takes up a lot of time.
- “It also was a challenge for some of the Home Visitors to rate and judge the parents in the twelve areas because of the close and secure relationship they had formed with the family.”
- “It is difficult to base parent child interactions on one 20 minute sample and as noted by the group and there are cultural components that have led us to question the usefulness of the results in some cases.”
- “The time it took (20 minutes) was a challenge, along with having siblings home, illnesses, family stress, parents being nervous, the children acting silly or wanting to interact with the Home Visitor while the camera was being used.”

Measuring Program Outcomes

For program outcome goals to be reported to the Levy by the four programs, the programs set goals that 95% of parents would show score of 3 or higher on the most recent and subsequent KIPS assessment. Most programs met that mark, but in hindsight Levy staff believe those goals were too high and likely led to programs not being as thorough or as “honest” in their assessing as they maybe should have been. One program very consistently met a goal of about 85% of

parents showing a score of 3 or higher by the subsequent KIPS, and that goal seemed the most reasonable.

During FY09-10, 2 of the 4 programs (IRCO and Impact NW) opted to stop using KIPS for outcome measurement for many of the reasons highlighted in the challenges sections above. The two remaining Early Head Start programs continue to use KIPS and have adjusted their outcome goals to between 85% to 90% of parents will score at a 3 or higher on a most recent subsequent KIPS.