



## PRE-K 4 SA ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

*Wednesday, December 3, 2014*

8:00 Central (9:00 Eastern)

**Dial-in conference number for Audio:** 866-295-5950; passcode: 4742535

**Goto Meeting:** link sent prior to meeting

---

### ATTENDEES

Kathy Bruck, Pre-K 4 SA  
Lauren Decker, Edvance Research Inc.  
Gay Lamey, Edvance Research Inc.

***Advisory Group Members:***

Don Barfield, Edvance Research Inc.  
Steve Barnett, National Institute for Early Education Research  
Elsa Cardenas-Hagan, Valley Speech Language and Learning Center  
Herb Turner, Analytica Inc.

---

### MEETING HIGHLIGHTS & SUGGESTIONS

1. Herb Turner suggested that Pre-K 4 SA development and use of the Logic Model is important and should be continually revisited and updated as the Pre-K 4 SA program evolves.
2. Steve Barnett expressed concerns about the validity of the GOLD as an outcome measure. He acknowledged the program evaluation team was under the constraint of utilizing the measure selected and administered by the Pre-K 4 SA program as well as not having access to a counterfactual group. The following suggestion emerged from the conversation: For Year 1, Edvance could request the PPVT data from NIEER, on the Pre-K 4 SA children tested in Spring 2014 and look for correlations between GOLD and PPVT by domain. Do they correlate? Do the standard scores on PPVT correspond to GOLD norms for the children? Also, Edvance should consider asking the Pre-K 4 SA Board for additional funding to test Year 2 children at two time points with the PPVT, to be more in alignment with the mid-year and year-end GOLD assessments.
3. Lauren asked the advisory group "How should comparison analyses be conducted for Cohort 1, assuming we can get data sharing agreements with districts, to collect data for both former Pre-K 4 SA students and a comparison sample in kindergarten?"
  - Should we compare to all kindergarten students?
  - Attempt matching strategies (PSM) using demographics only as matching occurring post treatment?

- Other ideas for inclusion of academic variables in post-treatment matching?

The advisory group suggested it would be best to compare Pre-K 4 SA students to students in district run pre-K programs. However, if this data is not available it would be best to compare to all kindergarten students. Steve suggested a regression framework, fixed effects district or school or even classroom (if you can get it). Herb added a clarifier that relevant covariates will be included in models. Also, that it would be important to conduct baseline equivalency and these issues only highlight the importance of finding a way to utilize the lottery.

4. All advisory group members thought it would be important to offer the district analyses on their own pre-K district program compared to the Pre-K 4 SA program as an incentive to agree to sharing data and signing a DSA. This incentive would not come with concern that findings would be shared publically as this information will not be part of any report provided to San Antonio and the DSA would be between Edvance and each individual district.
5. The advisory group also provided suggestions on how to reach out to the control sample through post-cards and emails even if only asking what pre-K experiences were occurring.
6. Steve commented that the CLASS scores are close to the national average for Head Start and suggested Pre-K 4 SA utilize this information specifically on instructional support scores to improve the professional development provided to teachers. Kathy mentioned the mentoring model she plans to use to focus on mentoring and direct coaching techniques to improve instructional supports in the classroom.