



# Descriptive evaluation of the Honoring Fatherhood Program in Denver, Colorado

## Final Descriptive Evaluation Report for the Denver Indian Center, Inc.

September 25, 2020

Prepared by

Jill Iman, Joining Vision and Action

Steve ReVello, Denver Indian Center, Inc.

Recommended Citation:

Iman, J. and ReVello, S. (2020). *Descriptive evaluation of the Honoring Fatherhood Program: Implementation study findings.* For the Office of Family Assistance within the Administration for Children and Families, U. S. Department of Health & Human Services.

Acknowledgements:

The authors of this paper would like to thank the staff at the Denver Indian Center, Inc. for their tireless work in serving our community, as well as the participants in the Honoring Fatherhood Program who contributed their time and feedback through the data included in this report.

Disclosure:

As the local evaluator for this work, JVA was paid by DICI through grant funds to conduct appropriate activities aligned with the evaluation plan. There are no other conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, to disclose.

This publication was prepared under Grant Number 90FK0064-01-00 from the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) within the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U. S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS). The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the policies of HHS, ACF or OFA.

**Abstract:** "A Descriptive Evaluation of the Honoring Fatherhood Program in Denver, Colorado"

In 2015 through 2020, the Denver Indian Center, Inc. (DICI) designed and implemented the Honoring Fatherhood Program (HFP)—a program, eventually administered at two sites in the Denver metro area, that was developed to improve and increase responsible fathering, healthy relationships and positive economic skills, knowledge and behaviors among low-income, American Indian/Alaska Native (Native) fathers. Offering such a program is critical to addressing some of the inequities among Native populations—who have some of the poorest health, mental health and academic outcomes—created in large part through current and historical trauma. Through a combination of workshops and case management, the HFP offered participants an integrated, multipronged approach through weekly (or monthly) sessions utilizing 24/7 Dads and Leading the Next Generation curricula. To document and analyze the implementation of the HFP, DICI partnered with Joining Vision and Action (JVA) to conduct a local descriptive evaluation of the program. In addition to better understanding the challenges and strengths encountered through the project, the process evaluation was designed to address the following four research questions:

- Were all intended intervention components offered and for the expected duration?
- Are relationships guidance specialists (RGS, i.e., facilitators/case managers) prepared to teach the curriculum, and are they maintaining fidelity to the curriculum?
- Is the program perceived as effective and worthwhile to participants? Other stakeholders?
- What specific aspects of the program best support implementation?

Using data collected through focus groups facilitated with completers (n = 65) and non-completers of the program (n = 16), interviews with RGS (n = 14), ad hoc observations and secondary data, the results of the implementation study reveal the following main conclusions:

- Despite adjustments to program curriculum and format over time (in response to federal and participant feedback), the intervention components were largely offered as expected.
- The RGS were assets of the HFP and perhaps could have been better utilized in supporting participants outside of sessions (notwithstanding critical capacity constraints).
- Those that completed the program perceived it to be effective and worthwhile.
- The greatest challenges of the HFP were recruitment and retention, likely driven by barriers related to transportation and the transiency of the target population.
- Participants largely valued the cultural responsiveness lens of the program; however, there was some confusion among both Native and non-Native participants.
- Participants and RGS cited learning from and interacting with others, as well as gaining skills and knowledge relevant to healthy relationships and responsible fatherhood (less so economic security), as core strengths.

Limitations specific to the implementation study outlined in the full report include those related to collection of data, small and self-selected samples, and the inability to examine any relationship between programmatic and implementation adjustments on participant outcomes. Regardless, the results of the process evaluation do highlight key areas of attainment and areas for improvement of the HFP that will be critical for future fatherhood programs focused on administering a culturally responsive program.

# Contents

# Tables

# Descriptive Evaluation of the Honoring Fatherhood Program in Denver, Colorado

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Introduction and study overview

In 2015, the Denver Indian Center, Inc. (DICI) was awarded funding from the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) within the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) through the Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood initiative (HMRF) as a New Pathways for Fathers and Families grantee. The following report provides the findings associated with the descriptive local evaluation process/implementation study conducted by Joining Vision and Action (JVA) over the course of the grant.

**Background.** DICI—founded in 1975 to meet the unique needs of the urban Indian diaspora in the wake of the Relocation Act—developed and implemented the Honoring Fatherhood Program (HFP), which was designed to provide culturally competent, trauma-informed parenting, relationship and economic stability support services. The HFP offered a strength-based and culturally competent approach to supporting American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) fathers as they worked to overcome some of the barriers that have been passed down through historical marginalization, while also supporting each participant to expand future opportunities.

Denver, Colorado, became one of seven cities designated as a relocation center through the Indian Relocation Act of 1956. The act encouraged Native Americans to move off the reservations and into U.S. cities, and it was supposed to provide temporary housing, counseling and guidance in finding a job, permanent housing, and community and social resources (PBS Indian Country). Yet this was a false promise, as many did not receive the support they needed to gain employment or economic stability.

Now, in Denver, more than 200 tribal communities live in the seven-county Denver metropolitan area, and this population comprises more than half of the over 31,000 AI/AN individuals who live in Colorado (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010)—and some of the facts related to AI/AN families and individuals reflect the negative outcomes associated with their historical treatment and marginalization.

Fatherlessness in Native families is widespread. Census figures show that AI/AN children are much more likely to be living in a single-parent household or with grandparents than their non-AI/AN counterparts. For example, over 75% of white children live with married parents, compared with only 53% of AI/AN children, and about 10% of AI/AN children live with their grandparents, which is double the rate for white children (Baker-Demaray, 2012). And as research has demonstrated, children with more involved fathers experience fewer behavioral problems and score higher on reading achievement (Howard, Burke Lefever, Borkowski and Whitman, 2006). As evidence of this, in Colorado in 2019, only 18% of AI/AN students were proficient in math, compared with 45% of white students; and only 29% of AI/AN students were proficient in English language arts, compared with 57% of white students (Colorado Children's Campaign, 2020).

Further, poverty is widespread among AI/AN families. Recent data indicated that 46% of AI/AN children in Denver lived below the poverty level, the highest among all races/ethnicities (Denver Children's Affairs, 2018).

These experiences with fatherlessness and poverty have intersected with other challenges among AI/AN individuals. For example, compared with all other racial groups, Native American adults are more likely to have poorer physical and mental health and to have unmet medical and psychological needs (Barnes, Adams and Powell-Griner, 2010). Additionally, child abuse and neglect are twice as high in AI/AN families as in other races (Horwitz, 2014), and alcoholism among AI/ANs is 7.5 times as common as in the general population (Center for Native Oral Health Research, 2015).

**Program overview.** As outlined above, there is a clear need for the types of supports and services offered through the HFP in the Denver metro area (specifically, the seven-county region of Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Broomfield, Denver, Douglas, Jefferson)—designed to improve fathering, relationship and economic outcomes among 288 AI/AN and other low-income fathers by providing them with an integrated, multipronged approach that supports the relationship between fathers and their children and their spouses, partners or co-parents through responsible parenting education, economic stability support and healthy marriage education. These components were to be provided through a combination of workshops and case management.

**Descriptive evaluation overview.** Understanding the need to document and analyze the implementation of the HFP, DICI partnered with JVA to conduct a local descriptive evaluation of the program. The process evaluation (described in greater detail below) was broadly designed to better understand fidelity (e.g., were all intended intervention components offered during each session?), quality (e.g., are relationship guidance specialists[1] prepared to teach the curriculum? Is the program perceived as effective and worthwhile for participants?), and program components (e.g., what aspects of program design best support implementation?). More broadly, the process study documents how the HFP was implemented and describes both challenges and strengths encountered through the project period, highlighting the way the program was delivered and the pivots made along the way.

**Previous research.** First and foremost, the descriptive evaluation activities were critical to better understanding the ways in which the programmatic inputs, activities and outputs (and their interaction) influenced HFP participation/completion and were perceived by Native fathers. The evaluation was intended to expand the evidence base for a holistic approach to fatherhood that works for the often hard-to-reach and hard-to-serve urban AI/AN population (Yuan, Bartgis, & Demers, 2014).

Although there is extensive research describing the impact and efficacy of the primary curriculum, 24/7 Dad, on fathers (e.g., National Fatherhood Initiative), as well as work describing process components of responsible fatherhood programs (e.g., Zaveri, Baumgartner, Dion & Clary, 2015), there has been a limited focus on specific programs that are designed to target and serve AI/AN fathers through the application of a culturally responsive lens.

This culturally responsive lens meant that beyond having 24/7 Dads as the base curriculum for responsible fatherhood education, the program incorporated elements of Leading the Next Generation—a curriculum developed by the Native Wellness Institute[2]—to provide healthy marriage education, and it

[1] The selected title for case managers and program facilitators

[2] The Leading the Next Generation curriculum was reviewed and field-tested by Native trainers, elders, service providers and communities and is founded in Native culture and teachings, with an emphasis on creating balance of the mind, body and spirit.

offered culturally responsive services and case management. More specifically, this lens incorporated elements taken from research on culturally responsive teaching for American Indian students, such as employing Native facilitators and relationship guidance specialists, incorporating cooperative/shared learning approaches and focusing on building connections between Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing with modern approaches (e.g., Pewewardy and Cahape Hammer, 2003).

The use of a culturally responsive lens was also applied to the local evaluation activities, including the design, implementation and analyses that are included in the following report. Specifically, there is a long history of abusing Native communities through research and evaluation largely because researchers have failed to conduct studies in a collaborative, transparent and respectful manner. Given that history, the evaluation followed several of the guidelines outlined by the Native American Center for Excellence (NACE and LaFrance, 2004), including but not limited to:

- Establishing relationships with the facilitators and project staff
- Getting a clear understanding of the historical trauma
- Relying on DICI staff to gather data and participate in the evaluation activities
- Engaging community members in the design and interpretation of study materials and findings
- Maintaining transparency with HFP staff and participants
- Building in opportunities for storytelling and reflection

**Report outline.** The following report provides a deeper examination of the process evaluation conducted of the HFP through 1) further exploring the intended intervention of the HFP, 2) providing an overview of the key research questions, 3) presenting the study design, including the sample formation, data collection activities and data preparation, 4) reviewing the findings relevant to the implementation of study research questions, and 5) closing with a summary of key takeaways and implications.

## B. Description of the intended intervention

The following section outlines the intended experiences of those receiving the intervention, including intervention components and content, intended implementation (including location/setting, duration and dosage), staffing (including the education and training of staff), and population for intervention focus (please see Appendix A for original logic model).

**Intended components and content.** The HFP is a multicomponent intervention in which participants took part in workshops on responsible fathering, workshops on healthy relationships, a workshop on economic stability, and case management. The content of each of the components included the following (Table 1), all provided with a lens of cultural responsiveness:

1. Workshops on responsible fathering used the 24/7 Dad curriculum and covered the five characteristics of the 24/7 Dad: self-awareness, caring for self, fathering skills, parenting skills and relationship skills. Topics discussed included family history, the meaning of being a man, showing and handling feelings, men's health, communication, the father's role, discipline, child development, getting involved, co-parenting and work.[3]

[3] https://cdn2.hubspot.net/hubfs/135704/Program%20Assets/24-7%20Dad/247-Dad-Evaluation-Lewin-Bizan-06102015.pdf; additionally, of note, the initial core curriculum used in the program to address responsible fathering was Fatherhood is Sacred, which was disallowed in 2017, and the program was modified. Thus, the first three (continued)

2. Workshops on healthy relationships used the Leading the Next Generation (LNG) curriculum, which provides relationship education on healthy relationships and Native wellness, communication skills, conflict resolution and creating desired relationships.
3. The workshop on economic stability topics included a speaker from a local credit union.
4. Case management included ongoing interactions with DICI relationship guidance specialists (RGS; i.e., facilitators and case managers) through workshops and ad hoc throughout the program. These interactions are intended to provide participants with resources and referrals and also allow the participants to develop an individualized success plan, which encourages participants to identify concrete goals related to fathering, relationships and economics.

**Intended implementation and staffing.** The first six cohorts were composed of 16 weeks of workshop participation, with sessions occurring once a week for two hours per session. Additionally, Cohorts 2 through 7 included the option of a monthly Saturday workshop, in which two 4-hour sessions (i.e., eight hours of potential content) occurred once a month for four months. Beginning in Cohort 7, through Cohort 10 (the last cohort included in the analyses in this report), the program was modified to be an eight-week workshop, with sessions occurring once a week for two hours per session. This change occurred because of consistent feedback from participants that 16 weeks was too long, cumbersome and limited abilities to complete the program successfully.

As outlined in Footnote 3, because of concerns with the core curriculum inclusion of concepts related to Native spirituality, there was a change from Fatherhood is Sacred (FIS) as the core curriculum to 24/7 Dad after Cohort 3. The included content is essentially the same, covering similar basic topics (e.g., self-awareness, caring for self, fathering skills, parenting skills and relationship skills), but the difference is the lens through which that information is delivered. FIS approaches the content from the moral imperative and incorporates elements of spirituality (i.e., a framework that resonates with the target population), whereas 24/7 Dad does not include this lens.

The transition from a 16- to an eight-week program did not result in a change in the amount ("dosage") of delivered content. The shortened program assigned homework and made more efficient use of sessions to ensure all material was covered.

Additionally, the first seven cohorts occurred at DICI in Denver County, whereas Cohorts 8–10 were facilitated at the Adams County Human Services Center (about 18 miles north of DICI); thus the HFP occurred at two sites over the course of the program. The RGS delivered the intervention. RGS were trained in the 24/7 Dad curriculum via webinar and the LNG curriculum in person prior to delivering services; no ongoing training occurred (Table 2).

**Target population.** The full intervention (all components of the intervention) targeted lower-income (defined as those below the federal poverty line) AI/AN fathers living in the seven-county Denver metro region. However, participation included other caretakers (e.g., grandparents, mothers) and non-Native participants that met the income thresholds and lived in the target region.

cohorts of participants received somewhat different content (i.e., greater focus on Native culture), although they received supplemental materials from 24/7 Dad curriculum. In 2018, the curriculum was adjusted to incorporate all topics from 24/7 Dad.

**Table 1. Description of intended intervention components and target populations**

| Component | Curriculum and content | Dosage and schedule | Delivery | Target population |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responsible fathering workshops* | 24/7 Dad curriculum (family history, the meaning of being a man, showing and handling feelings, men's health, communication, the father's role, discipline, child development, getting involved, co-parenting and work) | Cohorts 1–6: 16 weeks of workshop participation, with sessions occurring once a week for two hours per session (with option of once-per-month session including eight sessions for four hours)<br>Cohorts 7–10: Eight weeks of workshop participation, with sessions occurring once a week for two hours per session | Cohorts 1–7: Group lessons provided at DICI by two trained facilitators in every session<br>Cohorts 8–10: Group lessons provided at Adams County Department of Human Services by two trained facilitators | Lower-income AI/AN fathers |
| Healthy relationships workshops* | Leading the Next Generation curriculum (healthy relationships and Native wellness, communication skills, conflict resolution and creating desired relationships) | Cohorts 1–6: 16 weeks of workshop participation, with sessions occurring once a week for two hours per session (with option of once-per-month session including eight sessions for four hours)<br>Cohorts 7–10: Eight weeks of workshop participation, with sessions occurring once a week for two hours per session | Cohorts 1–7: Group lessons provided at DICI by two trained facilitators in every session<br>Cohorts 8–10: Group lessons provided at Adams County Department of Human Services by two trained facilitators | Lower-income AI/AN fathers |
| Economic stability workshop | Credit union speaker (what is credit, how to improve, loans, interest rates, checking accounts) | One session during each cohort (i.e., two-hour session) | Workshop is provided by the speaker | Lower-income AI/AN fathers |
| Case management | Resources and referrals, individualized success plans | Ad hoc throughout workshop cycle (those that completed the HFP had on average 27.3 encounters [range: 7 to 125]; those that did not complete had on average 10.6 encounters [range: 0 to 30]) | Relationship guidance specialist | Lower-income AI/AN fathers |

*Full 24/7 Dad curriculum and full LNG curriculum are delivered except in cases of content overlap (e.g., parenting partner relationship and discipline), in which case 24/7 Dad is used.

**Table 2. Staff training and development to support intervention components**

| Component | Education and initial training of staff | Ongoing training of staff |
|---|---|---|
| Responsible fathering workshops | Facilitators are male and female and received four hours of initial training on the 24/7 Dad curriculum. | Facilitators receive ongoing support and clarification as needed (i.e., if they have questions they are able to connect with curriculum developers). |
| Healthy relationships workshops | Facilitators are male and female and received three days of initial training on the Leading the Next Generation curriculum. | Facilitators receive ongoing support as needed (i.e., if they have questions they are able to connect with curriculum developers). |

| Component | Education and initial training of staff | Ongoing training of staff |
|---|---|---|
| Economic stability workshop | Speaker is a representative from an accredited credit union. | N/A |
| Case management | Relationship guidance specialists are male and female and are informally trained internally by DICI as part of onboarding process (specific hours depend on credentials of staff; primarily delivered through weekly Continuous Quality Improvement meetings) | Weekly Continuous Quality Improvement meetings |

# II. PROCESS/IMPLEMENTATION STUDY

The following section outlines the research questions, key components of the study design and findings/analysis approach from the process study.

## A. Research questions

The primary research questions of the process study centered on three implementation elements: 1) fidelity (i.e., the extent to which the HFP adhered to the intervention, specifically in terms of exposure), 2) quality (i.e., the perceived quality of the RGS and the program) and 3) program components (i.e., the role of program elements in supporting participant engagement and outcomes; Table 3).

**Table 3. Research questions for each implementation element**

| Implementation element | Research question |
|---|---|
| Fidelity | • Were all intended intervention components offered and for the expected duration? |
| Quality | • Are relationship guidance specialists prepared to teach the curriculum, and are they maintaining fidelity to the curriculum? Is the program perceived as effective and worthwhile to participants? Other stakeholders? |
| Program components | • What specific aspects of the program best support implementation and outcome achievement (i.e., financial incentives, transportation support, childcare, food, case management/encounters, facilitator interactions and quality)? |

## B. Study design

The following section outlines critical elements of the implementation study design, including the sample, data sources and measures.

### 1. Sample formation

The following section details the study eligibility criteria and the samples that were used in answering the process/implementation study questions. Specifically, as will be outlined in greater detail below (Section B2: Data collection), the key samples important to answering the research questions included:

- Focus groups conducted after each of the 10 cohorts with completers, as well as four groups with non-completers
- Semiformal interviews with HFP staff

- Internal tracking (e.g., RGS completion of curricula training, hours of programming, nFORM data)
- Ad hoc observations of three sessions
- Conversations that occurred during six community input group meetings

**Focus group eligibility criteria.** The participants in the focus groups provided consent during the enrollment process (i.e., first day of the program) and were reminded of the purpose of focus group conversations, as well as guidelines (i.e., anonymous and confidential), prior to each group. The final sample to answer the relevant process research questions included both program completers (i.e., those that completed at least 80% of the HFP) and non-completers (i.e., those that completed less than 80% of the HFP).

**Focus group sample formation.** One focus group for HFP completers was facilitated at the end of each of the 10 cohorts,[4] and one focus group for HFP non-completers was facilitated at the end of each of the first four cohorts (Table 4 and Table 5 for sample demographic information). The only requirement for participation in the completer groups was that participants had successfully finished the HFP by completing at least 80% of the program, whereas those having not completed at least 80% were invited to participate in the non-completer group. After Cohort 4, completion rates were significantly higher among participants, and having a non-completer group was deemed unreliable and ineffective because of the limited potential sample size. Focus group participants received a meal and a grocery gift card incentive, and childcare was provided.

**Table 4. Focus group participation rates (where C = completers and NC = non-completers)**

| Cohort | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C (n) | 8 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 67 |
| NC (n) | 3 | 2 | 7 | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 16 |

[4] No one participated in the Cohort 9 focus group.

**Table 5. Characteristics of participants in process study**

| Characteristic | Focus group participants (data missing for Cohorts 1 and 5) | Full sample (all participants that completed the post-program survey) |
|---|---|---|
| Age | 1.4% ages 18–20, 1.4% ages 21–24, 12.9% ages 25–34, 37.1% ages 35–44, 31.4% ages 45–54, 10.0% ages 55–64, 4.3% 65 years or older (n = 69; missing = 1) | 3.0% ages 18–20, 2.0% ages 21–24, 26.0% ages 25–34, 35.0% ages 35–44, 23.0% ages 45–54, 8.0% ages 55–64, 2.0% 65 years or older (n = 100; missing n = 7) |
| Female % | 47.1% (33/70) | 35.0% (35/100; missing n = 7) |
| Native American % | 72.9% (51/70) | 82.6% (57/69; including those identifying ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino and race as Native American: 66.4% or 71/107) |
| Hispanic % (identified as race for focus group participants and as ethnicity for full sample) | 8.6% (6/70) | 21.8% (22/101; missing n = 6) |
| Non-Hispanic White % | 7.1% (5/70) | 8.7% (6/69; including those identifying ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino and race as white: 8.4% or 9/107) |
| Non-Hispanic Black % | 8.6% (6/70) | 8.7% (6/69; including those identifying ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino and race as Black: 10.3% or 11/107) |
| Non-Hispanic Asian % | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown Race/Missing % | 2.9% (2/70) | 5.6% (6/107) |
| Married or Partnered % | 31.3% (21/67; missing n = 3) | 32.3% (30/93; missing n = 14) |
| Single % (includes separated, divorced, widowed, never married) | 68.7% (46/67; missing n = 3) | 67.7% (63/93; missing n = 14) |
| Sample size | 70 (83 included in focus group analysis in report; see note below) | 107 |

Source: nFORM

Note: Demographic data on focus group participants was not collected as part of the protocol; however, it was possible to identify demographic information of the majority of focus group participants (70/83 or 84.3%) by cross-referencing signatures for receipt of incentives; this information was missing for Cohort 1 and Cohort 5 focus group participants. As a point of reference, demographic information is also shared for the full sample of participants that successfully completed the program.

**Interview eligibility criteria and sample formation.** Semistructured one-on-one phone interviews were conducted with HFP relationship guidance specialists (RGS) during the first three calendar years of the project period (Table 6; over all three years, nine different individuals participated. One individual participated all three years; one participated in Years 1 and 2; and two participated in Years 2 and 3). Topics of discussion included program perceptions of fidelity, strengths and areas of improvement of the HFP.

**Table 6. RGS number of interviews**

| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (number of interviews) | 5* | 4 | 5 | 14 |

*Includes one board member, closely affiliated with the HFP planning period

## 2. Data collection

The data sources for the process evaluation include focus groups with completers and non-completers, interviews with facilitators, nFORM data and session observations (Table 7).

**Table 7. Data for addressing the research questions**

| Implementation element | Research question | Data source | Timing/frequency of data collection | Party responsible for data collection |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fidelity | Were all intended intervention components offered and for the expected duration? | Workshop sessions in nFORM | All sessions delivered | Facilitators |
| Quality | Are relationship guidance specialists prepared to teach the curriculum, and are they maintaining fidelity to the curriculum? | Focus groups, interviews, observations | Focus groups conducted after each cohort, interviews conducted annually, observations conducted ad hoc | Study staff |
| Quality | Is the program perceived as effective and worthwhile to participants? Other stakeholders? | Focus groups, interviews, observations, survey response rates | Focus groups conducted after each cohort, interviews conducted annually, observations conducted ad hoc, surveys conducted pre- and post-program | Study staff, facilitators |
| Program components | What aspects of the program design best support implementation and outcome achievement? | Focus groups, interviews | Focus groups conducted after each cohort, interviews conducted annually | Study staff |

## 3. Data preparation and measures

Generally, objective data (i.e., secondary data) were examined as raw numbers or percentages, whereas qualitative data collected through interviews, focus groups and observations was analyzed using a thematic content approach (e.g., themes within data are identified and recorded for frequency and relevancy).

The strategy for focus group analysis used Braun & Clarke's (2006) six-step approach and relied on Microsoft Excel for initial code generation (Bree and Gallagher, 2016), subsequently adapted to key themes. Two coders examined the notes taken during the focus groups, and inter-rater reliability was established based off thematic categorization percent agreement until agreement reached 90% (see Appendix B). The specific approach included the following guidelines:

- **Prevalence**: Codes counted in terms of the frequency with which different themes were articulated (or concrete, self-contained thought) in response to (and within) a specific question
- **Inductive code generation**: The identified themes are strongly linked to the data themselves (Patton, 1990), meaning the themes are not driven by evaluator's theoretical interests, but rather coding is done without trying to fit data into pre-existing frames
- **Semantic approach**: The themes were identified within the explicit or surface meaning of the data

Of note, the full set of data was considered to be the unit of analysis (i.e., the collective voice of the group *dialogue* as opposed to each individual voice). Focus group data were not analyzed based on the number of individual participants that mentioned a given code, but rather the discrete units of conversation that occurred during focus group dialogue. More specifically, notetakers did not assign comments to individual participants, instead capturing the back-and- forth conversation that occurred, as facilitated by the moderator to ensure all voices and dissenting opinions were included.[5] Put differently, the focus group results will be discussed in terms of "*coded feedback,*" or the frequency of times a specific code appears in the dialogue (i.e., the unit of analysis is what was said in the discussion, as opposed to individual- or group-level attributions; see Appendix B). Specifically, the following terms are used throughout the report:

- **Coded feedback:** Individual units of self-contained dialogues not necessarily attributable to an individual, but reflecting the percentage of each code out of the total number of codes generated to analyze the dialogue of the focus group discussion for a given question
- **Identified codes:** The average frequency of each code (i.e., total number of times a given code was identified across both coders, divided by two)

Interview data were analyzed using thematic analysis, and observational data were analyzed by identifying recurring conceptual themes based on frequency of theme. See Table 8 for measures and Appendix C for data collection instruments referenced in this report.

**Table 8. Measures for addressing the research questions**

| Implementation element | Research question | Measures |
|---|---|---|
| Fidelity | Were all intended intervention components offered during each session and for the expected duration? | • Total number of sessions delivered, intervention components per session (total number of topics covered as percentage of intended topics to be covered) and average session duration (calculated as the average minutes per session) during each session |

[5] As an example of this, if Participant A responded to a question first, followed by comments from Participants B and C, and then contributed again, attributions to Participant A at Time 1 and Time 2 cannot be discerned from notes; thus each comment from Participants A (2), B (1) and C (1), were analyzed for potential codes and themes.

| Implementation element | Research question | Measures |
|---|---|---|
| Quality | Are relationship guidance specialists prepared to teach the curriculum, and are they maintaining fidelity to the curriculum? | • Reported confidence and comfort with curricula and evaluation (themes that emerge from annual interview and focus group data in response to understanding of roles and responsibilities, reported challenges, experiences with the curricula and training, ability to implement to fidelity)<br>• Facilitators complete curricula trainings (percentage of facilitators adequately completing the required training) |
| Quality | Is the program perceived as effective and worthwhile to participants? Other stakeholders? | • Percentage of participants reporting being satisfied and reporting feeling benefitted by program<br>• Participants report value of HFP activities (e.g., themes that emerge from participant focus groups in response to rated value of program aspects, such as relationship guidance specialists, workforce development activities, incentives, etc.)<br>• Participants who do not complete the program perceive the program as worthwhile (themes that emerge from participant focus groups in response to perceived value of the program, challenges, interest in participating again, descriptions of program to family/friends)<br>• HFP waiting list of interested participants<br>• Participant completion rate (percentage of those enrolled that complete 80% of program and the post-program survey)<br>• Community input group perceptions of value and participation (themes that emerge from community input meetings regarding perceived value of HFP and feedback on design/delivery) |
| Program components | What aspects of the program design best support implementation and outcome achievement? | • Participants and facilitator perceptions of effectiveness (themes that emerge from participant focus groups and staff interviews regarding importance of services, needed supports, the ability to accomplish goals, greatest strengths, areas for improvement) |

## C. Findings and analysis approach

The key takeaways from the process analyses (see Table 9) are that the curriculum was administered to fidelity; the RGS were invaluable to participant experience (and perhaps underutilized); the program was perceived as effective by those who completed the program, yet recruitment and retention were consistent challenges; and the supports (e.g., meals, childcare, incentives) were important program components but not necessarily as valuable as the opportunities to interact and learn from other participants and the RGS.

**Table 9. Implementation study findings summary**

| Research question | Data summary |
|---|---|
| **Fidelity**: Were all intended intervention components offered during each session and for the expected duration? | All anticipated sessions and intervention components based on planned curriculum were offered. |
| **Quality**: Are relationship guidance specialists prepared to teach the curriculum, and are they maintaining fidelity to the curriculum? | HFP participants tended to value interactions with RGS, finding them to be helpful and knowledgeable; however, participants may have benefitted from more systematic/regular interactions. |
| | RGS understood the importance and felt prepared to deliver the curriculum to fidelity; however, without economic stability/well-being being explicit in the curriculum, it felt like that component was lacking a bit (as also reflected by participants' feedback).<br>Similar to participants, RGS expressed an interest in increasing frequency and supports offered through one-on-one interactions. |
| | 80% of RGS received adequate training. |
| **Quality**: Is the program perceived as effective and worthwhile to participants? Other stakeholders? | Resoundingly, the program was perceived as effective and worthwhile to participants; in fact, all responding participants indicated a desire to be involved in the future.<br>Only non-completers provided negative feedback regarding their perceptions of, and satisfaction with, the program (i.e., described the program using negative words). |
| | Community stakeholders perceived the value of the program, particularly during the planning stages, and expressed an interest in seeing it succeed. |
| | Recruitment was a key challenge of the HFP, and despite positive feedback from participants, there was never sufficient interest (or awareness) to warrant a waitlist. |
| | Retention was a key challenge of the HFP. |
| **Program components:** What aspects of the program design best support implementation and outcome achievement? | Assets of the program most frequently identified by participants included the opportunity to interact and have conversations with both other participants and RGS, the chance to gain skills and knowledge relevant to healthy relationships and responsible fatherhood, and the program supports (e.g., meals, childcare, incentives). |
| | The cultural responsiveness of the program was largely identified as a positive for participants; however, roughly one in four responding focus group participants identified confusion over the mix of Native and non-Native participants. |
| | The greatest challenge for participants was transportation. |
| | RGS identified similar programmatic strengths and challenges as participants, reflecting their close connection. |
| | Participants were inconsistent in staying present and on task, but engagement was particularly high when participants were interacting with others and sharing personal examples. |

The following sections provide a high-level summary of findings related to each of the four research questions, followed by more detailed analyses from each of the data sources.

# III. FINDINGS

## 1. Were all intended intervention components offered during each session and for the expected duration?

*a. Key findings*

To explore this research question, secondary data collected on program implementation were reviewed. Specifically:

1. Total number of sessions delivered
2. Intervention components per session (i.e., total number of topics covered as percentage of intended topics to be covered)
3. Average session duration (i.e., average minutes per session)

Results (Table 10), suggest that across the full HFP (Cohorts 1 through 10), intervention components were offered as expected. This is true regardless of duration of the HFP (16- or eight-week program) because of adjustments made to program delivery such as including more curricula content per session and assigning homework.[6]

**Table 10. Secondary data collected to assess fidelity**

| Data point | Data output | Data interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Total number of sessions delivered (tracked through internal DICI tracking) | • 16 sessions for Cohorts 1–6<br>• Eight sessions for Cohorts 7–10<br>• Total of 128 sessions for 10 cohorts | All anticipated sessions were delivered across program period; reduction of the HFP from 16-week to eight-week program was achieved by covering two doses of curriculum per session (and by assigning homework) |
| Intervention components per session (i.e., total number of topics covered as percentage of intended topics to be covered; tracked through internal DICI tracking) | 100% | All intended topics were covered during each session |
| Average session duration (i.e., average minutes per session; tracked through internal DICI tracking) | • Two-hour sessions for all Tuesday evening participants<br>• Four-hour sessions for all Saturday participants | Sessions lasted the full time allocated |

[6] Of note, completion of homework was only assessed anecdotally, with RGS asserting that all participants were regularly doing the supplemental assignments; that said, there may have been potential differences between 16-week and eight-week HFP participants to the extent that interest and absorption of content offered through homework was not as robust.

**2. Are relationship guidance specialists prepared to teach the curriculum, and are they maintaining fidelity to the curriculum?**

*a. Key findings*

To answer this question, data collected from secondary data, interviews, focus groups and ad hoc observations were examined. In sum, these data reveal that 80% (four of five) RGS received all required trainings, and all RGS maintained fidelity to the curriculum through adherence to the content—specifically 24/7 Dad, of which 100% of the curriculum was incorporated (50% of LNG was included as a result of areas of content overlap). The RGS were a critical asset of the program in terms of participant engagement and infusing elements of Native cultural relevancy.

In fact, given the positive sentiments and perceived value of the RGS interactions, it is likely that benefit could have been gained through more deliberate and scheduled interactions. Nevertheless, anecdotal feedback from participants and reported challenges with "making the time" for the HFP suggests that it would not work to have these interactions in person, but rather through alternative methods.

**Secondary data findings.** Data were collected on the percentage of RGS adequately completing the required trainings, as well as key data points on program implementation. Of note, 80% (four of five) of all RGS received the 24/7 Dad training via webinar and LNG training in person.

As has been identified previously, FIS was the core curriculum for the first few cohorts (with supplemental material from 24/7 Dad and LNG). At the point when FIS was excluded, 100% of 24/7 Dad and 50% of LNG were used. Additionally, Cohorts 1 through 6 covered one dose of content per session for 16 weeks (except for Saturday sessions, which covered four doses of content per session for four weeks), and Cohorts 7 through 10 covered two doses of content per session for eight weeks.[7]

**Interview findings.** Those participating in the interviews responded to a series of questions focusing on four topical areas to assess the extent to which the RGS felt prepared to teach the curriculum and maintain fidelity:

1. Experiences teaching the curricula, including perceptions of training and ability to deliver to fidelity
2. Feedback on the curricula (following the exclusion of FIS)
3. Extent to which the three areas of focus (responsible parenting, healthy relationships and economic well-being) were covered
4. Experiences as an RGS

RGS feedback in response to **experiences with the curricula, including training,** reveals a few consistent themes. Regarding the curricula, all RGS in Year 1 and 60% (three of five) in Year 3 note a specific emphasis on maintaining fidelity with the curricula,[8] including reviewing and following the trainer manual. Additionally, an important component of the HFP was adding content to provide participants exposure to some culturally relevant concepts (e.g., through stories, explanation of history), particularly after Year 1 and the exclusion of FIS as the core curriculum (with all interviewees in Years 2 and 3 noting the value of "supplemental" material). Regarding the transition from FIS to 24/7 Dad, three of four RGS noted that some participants had difficulty with it—particularly because there were both

[7] Additional content covered during each weekly session through faster review and assignment of homework.
[8] Question was not specifically posed during Year 2 interviews with focus instead being on transition of curriculum to exclude FIS.

women and men participating in the groups at the time, and 24/7 Dad was "highly directed toward males."

> *"Yes, it was presented the way it was supposed to be presented; we all went through the training; we all had a good sense on how to deliver it; that was done to fidelity. The challenge on that piece was to make it culturally specific. To strike that balance is hard, and we did the best that we could." — Year 1 RGS*

When asked, all RGS provided information regarding curricula training consistent with prescribed approaches: FIS in person, 24/7 Dad through webinar and LNG in person. Receiving the 24/7 Dad training via webinar was noted as a weakness. Beyond the first two facilitators, subsequent RGS also noted the value of watching the original two facilitate as a form of training.

After the exclusion of FIS, RGS were asked to share what they **liked and did not like about the curricula**—important because attitudes have been shown to have an effect on fidelity (e.g., Beets, Flay, Vuchinich, Acock, Li & Allred, 2008). As noted previously, three of four RGS interviewed in Year 2 cited a challenge with 24/7 Dad resonating with female participants, but they also mentioned that this transition allowed them to focus more on targeting male participants. Additionally, there was a clear preference among facilitators for LNG, instead of 24/7 Dad, largely because 24/7 Dad felt "generic" and "not that great" (specifically mentioned by three of four RGS in Year 2).

In response to the extent to which RGS felt they were able to **address the three areas of focus** adequately (i.e., responsible parenting, healthy relationships, economic well-being), the majority of interviewees felt most confident that the relationship and parenting components were well covered (mentioned in seven of 10 interviews that included this question over three years).

> *"For sure the parenting and the relationships; I think we did a good job and hopefully got across the message of children, and their role as parents and their behavior as people. So I think we're strong in those two areas. Economic stability I think the way the program is set up, is that it is too early to make an assessment, other than knowing where they are at and identifying goals and where they want to go. You don't know what you're going to get in terms of participants coming in (very diverse group), the economic stability is a long-term process ..."— RGS Year 1*

In contrast to parenting and relationships, the economic component was identified as a piece that was not always explicitly or obviously incorporated. Over time, the RGS recognized that it was indirectly addressed through the curricula and conversations around identifying how parenting and relationships intersect with economic stability; however, RGS felt like participants received the most explicit and helpful information from the guest speakers that were brought in to specifically address economic components (i.e., credit, budgeting).

RGS additionally noted the immense need to maintain some flexibility in approach, while still maintaining fidelity (cited in half of interviews responding to this question; six of 12), because each cohort and each participant was unique in their life circumstances. The shared belief was that the curricula will only get you so far in reaching participants and having the message resonate, so it was critical to tailor them where feasible (e.g., through individual conversations, group work and discussion, cultural perspective).

> *"I believe in fidelity. We try to go off the curriculum outline, but as we get to talking with participants, we try to tailor to the participants based on (their) situation." — RGS Year 3*

Finally, in response to a question regarding **experiences as an RGS**, feedback from interviewees centered on the following themes:

- A need to improve the frequency and focus of one-on-one encounters (although multiple RGS noted that some of the best interactions happened spontaneously and/or immediately prior to sessions, e.g., during the meals; mentioned eight times across 12 interviews)
- The value of group settings for increasing comfort (mentioned four times across 12 interviews)
- The value of grounding the approach to the HFP in "making choices" and focusing on educating participants that they have choices (mentioned three times across 12 interviews)

> *"(I) probably wouldn't change anything other than being a bit more formal with face-to-face interactions. I did a lot of communication with them by phone or text; phone was less reliable ... I'm more effective face-to-face and enjoy that more, which I try to do as much as (I) could at dinnertime." — RGS Year 2*

**Focus group findings.** To address whether or not RGS were prepared to teach the curriculum and whether they were maintaining fidelity to the curriculum, three items from the focus groups were examined. Participants' perceptions are critical to understanding fidelity because experiences with intervention delivery and receipt, particularly on engagement with RGS, can help inform assessment of the extent to which program components may have resonated. Specifically, focus group participants provided feedback on:

1. Reported frequency and type of RGS interactions
2. Perceived value of the RGS
3. Feedback on whether they would change anything related to RGS interactions

Using the dialogue as the unit of analysis (i.e., what was said in the conversation, "coded feedback" based on discrete items of feedback, through interpersonal exchange), overall, when asked about **frequency and types of RGS interactions**, feedback from completers and non-completers reveals that most often, participants reported engaging in person, once a week, with RGS either only at the HFP sessions or before or after the sessions. Specifically, across the 38 codes that were assigned to the 21 discrete items of feedback among completers, 31.6% (n = 12) were coded as such. Among non-completers, this type and frequency of RGS interaction was also the most common (75%, or three of four codes assigned across two discrete items of feedback). Themes used to describe these interactions highlighted the RGS' perceived helpfulness and knowledge (each coded an average of three times, or 8%), and participants were appreciative of the concrete supports that were provided (e.g., work boots; coded an average of four times, or 10.5%). A few participants noted they met more frequently with RGS, but the meetings were not regular.

When participants were asked to describe the **perceived value of the RGS**, the most common answers highlighted that participants felt comfortable interacting with the RGS and that they were very accessible/available (coded nine and eight times, respectively, across the 38.5 codes that were assigned to the 35 discrete items of feedback, or 23.4% and 20.8%).

> *"I got to be free, and there was no judging me."*— Cohort 8 participant

Participants also provided feedback revealing an appreciation of the RGS' knowledge (coded five times, or 13%) and the perspectives they could offer on Native culture, history and traditions (coded 4.5 times, or 11.7%).

> *"I appreciated their knowledge from experience. How they were able to talk about how Native Americans did parenting back in the day ... the knowledge from elders passed down."* — Cohort 7 participant

In response to the question on **suggested changes to their RGS interactions**, completers most often noted that they had no suggestions or that everything was positive (coded five times across 9.5 codes that were assigned to 14 discrete items, or 52.6%). Of those that recommended a change (coded 4.5 times, or 47.4%), feedback indicated a desire for spending more time (such as engaging more often and/or in different settings) and learning more about the Native perspective.

> *"I think it would be good if we had a day where everybody goes and does something that is outside of this and relevant to Native culture. Shows you how to interact and go do something."* — Cohort 10 participant

**Observations findings.** Across the three ad hoc observations, the following components relevant to session implantation (i.e., fidelity) were rated from not evident (0) to very evident (3):

- A review of the previous week's workshop topic
- A review of the goals and objectives for the current workshop
- Content (i.e., teachings, activities, discussions) reflects the curriculum topic for the workshop
- Content (i.e., teaching, activities, discussions) aligns with cultural values of DICI and the HFP

As outlined in Table 11, the content, both in terms of being on topic and aligning with cultural values, was consistently evident, suggesting fidelity to these elements was maintained. There was greater variability in the extent to which a review of the goals and objectives occurred, which is less about maintaining fidelity to the curriculum and more about best practices in adult learning.

**Table 11. Observational ratings of components of quality**

| | Rating Time 1 | Rating Time 2 | Rating Time 3 | Relevant notes (summarized over time) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A review of the previous week's workshop topic | 3 | 3 | 2 | RGS reviewed, but participants did not always identify concepts through recall |
| A review of the goals and objectives for the current workshop | 3 | 1 | 2 | RGS reviewed inconsistently (i.e., specific to workshop, only specific to full HFP, not clearly summarized) |
| Content (i.e., teachings, activities, discussions) reflects the curriculum topic for the workshop | 3 | 3 | 3 | High-quality conversations, facilitation and activities |
| Content (i.e., teachings, activities, discussions) aligns with cultural values of DICI and the HFP | 3 | 3 | 3 | Skilled facilitation and incorporation of cultural elements, made content relevant regardless of race/ethnicity of participants |

### 3. Is the program perceived as effective and worthwhile to participants? Other stakeholders?

*a. Key findings*

To answer this question, data collected from focus groups and stakeholder input groups, as well as secondary data, were examined. In sum, these data demonstrate that overwhelmingly, participants perceived the program to be effective and were able to identify strengths and overall program elements that were aligned with program goals (e.g., reportedly valuing the opportunities to engage with others, learn about parenting, enhance relationships, improve communication skills, etc.) Further, all participants responding through focus groups (100%) indicated that their expectations had been either met or exceeded, and all (100%) reported some level of interest in either direct future involvement with the HFP or continuing to support the program in some other manner. Additionally, less than 4% of responding focus group participants described the program using negative terms—all were non-completers.

Conversely, secondary data reveal that despite the largely positive feedback provided by program participants (particularly completers), recruitment and retention were consistently challenging for the HFP. Specifically, there was never a need for a waitlist; the average number of clients in any given session was six (despite an anticipated cohort size of 36; see Appendix A), and the completion rate (as determined by percentage of participants completing both an entrance and an exit survey) was only 52.7%.

**Focus group findings.** To address the extent to which participants perceived the program as effective and worthwhile, 10 specific questions from the focus group guide were examined; specifically:

1. The extent to which participants reported getting what they expected from the HFP
2. Reports of what participants liked learning about
3. Areas participants wished they had more time to discuss
4. What they had passed on to their children
5. Their interest in future involvement
6. How they would describe the experience to others
7. The program components that were not helpful
8. The extent to which their goals felt attainable
9. Overall satisfaction with the HFP
10. The extent to which participants felt benefitted by their participation in the HFP

In general, 100% of completers reported that they **got what they expected from the HFP,** with all responses from the nine discrete items that were coded indicating either that 1) their expectations had been exceeded (47.1%, or four of 8.5 identified codes), 2) they definitely got something out of the program (41.2%, or 3.5 of 8.5 identified codes), or 3) their expectations had been met (11.8%, or one of 8.5 identified codes). No participants that shared during the focus group in response to this question reported that their expectations had not been met.

> *"At first I thought I was here for the money, to get ahead a little bit. Then I started thinking that this is knowledge for my future to do good on my own."* — Cohort 4 participant

In response to **areas that participants enjoyed learning about**, provided feedback (across nine discrete items) reveals that participants most enjoyed learning about two of the three core components of the HFP:

relationship/partnering skills (25%, or 3.5 of 14 identified codes) and parenting skills (21.4%, or three of 14 identified codes). Learning about listening and communication skills (17.9%, or 2.5 of 14 identified codes) and culture/historical trauma (14.3%, or 2 of 14 identified codes) were mentioned more than once. Feedback from participants on what they **wish they had more time to discuss** (across 16 items of discrete feedback) reveals the most common areas to be:

- Economic/work-related skills (24.4%, or five of 20.5 identified codes)
- Legal issues (24.4%, or five of 20.5 identified codes)
- Parenting skills (22%, or 4.5 of 20.5 identified codes)

Additionally, 17.1% of the provided feedback (3.5 of 20.5 identified codes) indicated that participants could not think of anything specifically that they wish they had more time to discuss and/or said the HFP was good as is.

As an additional assessment of perceived value of the program, focus group participants were asked to reflect on what they thought **they might pass on to their children**. Most commonly mentioned across the 19 items of discrete feedback was the lesson of the importance of being teachable and making the right choices (31.4%, or eight of 25.5 identified codes). And, when asked to share their interest in **future involvement with the HFP**, across 24 items of discrete feedback, all responding participants noted some level of interest, for example, through retaking all or some of the program (16.9%, or five of 29.5 identified codes) or helping out with outreach and recruitment (10.2%, or three of 29.5 identified codes). This was true regardless of completion status.

> *"Yes, all throughout my life the programs I was in was because I had to do it. This one I wasn't forced to do it. I feel like they are all doing this to help us out, and I want to give back."* — Cohort 10 participant

Focus group participants were also asked to share how they would **describe the program** to someone else, as a means to assess overall perceptions of the HFP. Responses shared across the 73 items of discrete feedback indicate largely positive experiences. Specifically, only four items of feedback were coded as negative, with participants either reporting general negative perceptions or being confused on the focus of the program (each 1.9%, or two of 106 identified codes). Importantly, this feedback was only provided by non-completers. The rest of the feedback provided in response to this question revealed positive experiences, with the following themes merging most frequently:

- Gaining skills, informational, helpful (17.5%, or 18.5 of 106 identified codes)
- Valuing the opportunity to learn from others in a comfortable, supportive environment (16%, or 17 of 106 identified codes)
- Improving relationship with children, changing parenting style (14.2%, or 15 of 106 identified codes)
- General positive attitudes (13.7%, or 14.5 of 106 identified codes)
- Gaining an understanding of Native culture, history and traditions (11.8%, or 12.5 of 106 identified codes)

> *"I just want to say that the teachers here, they have a heart, and it was good to remember* where my roots are and things. It helps a lot." — *Cohort 4 participant*

Regarding focus group participant reports of **unhelpful aspects of the HFP**, the most frequent response (across the 25 discrete items of feedback) was that everything was good (19.6%, or five of 25.5 identified

codes). When identifying specific areas for improvement, participants noted the need to improve transportation supports (15.6%, or four of 25.5 identified codes) and challenges related to having both males and females participating in the sessions (11.8%, or three of 25.5 identified codes). Of note, the feedback regarding males/females all came from the fourth cohort, which had the greatest number of female participants.

Focus group participants were also asked to reflect on whether or not their **goals felt more attainable** after completion of the HFP. Of the 11 items of discrete feedback, almost half of the coded responses suggested that goals generally felt more attainable (48%, or six of 12.5 identified codes), and all but one (8%, or one of 12.5 identified codes) of the remaining items of feedback identified specific goals that felt more attainable (e.g., career, parenting, communication).

When asked how they would rate their **level of satisfaction**, the responses (27 discrete items of feedback) revealed the vast majority of people were highly satisfied, responding in one of the following three ways:

- Generally rating the HFP positively (39.6%, or 10.5 of 26.5 identified codes)
- Giving the HFP a "10" (34%, or nine of 26.5 identified codes)
- Giving the HFP a rating between 8.5 and 9.5 (15.1%, or four of 26.5 identified codes)

This left only 11.3% (three of 26.5 identified codes) of the feedback providing an 8.5 or lower rating.

Participants were asked to share what they perceived to be the **most beneficial aspects** of the program. Of those that responded, across 21 discrete items of feedback, the most frequently mentioned area was parenting knowledge and skills (34.5%, or 10 of 29 identified codes), followed by general knowledge gains (15.5% or 4.5 of 29 identified codes). Additionally, among those that responded, there were no negative responses.

Finally, four non-completers were asked to indicate if they anticipated completing the HFP, and all indicated that they would like to in the future or that they thought that they might, particularly if they could overcome challenges related to transportation and work schedules.

**Stakeholder input group findings.** To further offer a qualitative assessment of perceived worthiness of the HFP among stakeholders, community input participants were asked to reflect on the value of the program and offer feedback on its design and delivery. Across the six input groups that were facilitated, community members and leaders articulated the need for such a program yet shared concerns related to recruitment and retention. Additionally, the size of this group also fluctuated over time, with only four community members participating in the final meeting—suggesting that interest (or perceived value of these meetings) was waning. However, the group size was substantial during the first several meetings (i.e., 15–22 participants) when the design of the tools and the descriptive evaluation approach were reviewed, so community members were able to offer substantial input that was eventually incorporated. The group also expressed dismay and frustration after the announcement that FIS would no longer be used, with feedback from community members indicating beliefs that the program would ultimately be most effective if able to use that curriculum.

**Secondary data findings.** As additional proxy measures of perceived quality, secondary data points were reviewed; specifically the HFP waiting list of interested participants and participant completion rate. These data reveal the following:

- No formal waitlist was ever generated or used (recruitment was a consistent challenge of the HFP)

- The average number of clients in any given workshop session was six (well below the anticipated size of 36)
- The completion rate was 52.1% (50 of 96 enrolled participants completed the HFP based on post-survey completion)

Taken together with feedback provided through focus groups and interviews, the data suggest that attracting and retaining the target audience was an ongoing challenge. Later efforts around marketing (e.g., the development of a bus campaign) and outreach (e.g., strengthening of partnerships with county departments for referrals) did not take hold until after collection of the data and were then interrupted by COVID-19, thus limiting understanding of the impacts that these types of efforts may have had on recruitment. Additionally, the program targets a highly transient population, and many participants did not complete it. Despite a completion rate lower than expected overall (52.7% based on post-survey completion), this improved over time, likely because of the transition from a 16- to an eight-week program—specifically, Cohorts 1–6 (i.e., 16-week program) had a completion rate of 50% (or 79 of 158 participants), whereas Cohorts 7–10 had a completion rate of 62.2% (or 28 of 45 participants).

### 4. What aspects of the program design best support implementation and outcome achievement?

*a. Key findings*

To identify aspects of program design that best support implementation and outcome achievement, data collected from participants through focus groups and from RGS through interviews and observations were analyzed. In summary, focus group participants shared that the activities and opportunities to interact with other participants were perceived to be an important component provided by the curriculum and the HFP, as was the opportunity to learn specifically about relationships and fatherhood (with more than 40% of coded feedback including these strengths). The meals provided in advance of the session, the on-site childcare and the incentives were critical additions appreciated by participants, and they ultimately supported program participation, whereas the greatest barrier was transportation (noted by almost one in four discrete items of feedback from focus group participants). Additionally, the feel of the physical space seemed to matter to participants, particularly among those participating at the Adams County government building, which felt less inviting and more intimidating to participants (as noted in 100% of focus group feedback provided by Adams County participants).

Thematic review of interview feedback from RGS reveals high levels of agreement between program staff and participants in terms of valuable components and strengths (i.e., interactions with others, group setting, interactions with RGS) as well as challenges and areas for improvement (i.e., transportation and recruitment). These similarities suggest strong relationships and shared understandings of the experiences with the HFP.

**Focus group findings.** To explore perceptions and feedback related to program components that support implementation and outcome achievement, responses to 11 questions were examined; specifically, focus group participants were asked to share their feedback on the following:

1. The curriculum
2. The cultural appropriateness of the program
3. The extent to which participants believed the three domains were covered (i.e., fatherhood, relationships, economic well-being)

4. The overall format of the HFP
5. Challenges related to the format of the HFP
6. The meal and childcare offerings
7. Other activities that could have been beneficial
8. Other supports/resources that could have been beneficial
9. Perceptions of DICI
10. Overall strengths of the program
11. Overall improvements to the program

Asked to provide **feedback about the curriculum**, participants generally had positive feedback across the 43 discrete items, with only 9.9% of coded feedback (or 6.5 of 65.5 identified codes) providing negative feedback. The themes that participants touched on most frequently were:

- Finding the materials fun and interactive, and appreciating the opportunity to learn from others (16.8%, or 11 of 65.5 identified codes)
- Finding the information to be helpful and practical (13.7%, or nine of 65.5 identified codes)
- Enjoying specifically learning about one of the three domains:
  - Relationships and getting along with parenting partners (12.2%, or eight of 65.5 identified codes)
  - Parenting (9.9%, or 6.5 of 65.5 identified codes)
  - And to a lesser degree, economics (4.6%, or three of 65.5 identified codes)
- Valuing the opportunity to learn about Native traditions, culture and history (7.6%, or five of 65.5 identified codes)

Because of the specific focus of the HFP on providing a culturally responsive program to Native fathers, perspectives on **cultural appropriateness** were assessed. Responses provided across the 29 items of discrete feedback were a bit mixed. Over half of coded responses revealed positive themes that suggested participants felt welcomed, such that 15.8% (or 4.5 of 28.5 identified codes) indicated an appreciation for the Native perspective and a piqued interest in learning more; 24.6% (or seven of 28.5 identified codes) indicated that the program was applicable to non-Natives too and offered new perspectives; and 14% (or four of 28.5 identified codes) generally found the HFP to be good and respectful.

Meanwhile, 22.8% (or 6.5 of 28.5 identified codes) noted that they were confused, either because of the inclusion of non-Native participants or because they were unsure if they were able to be a part of the program if identifying as non-Native. Because demographics of focus group participants were not recorded, nor assigned based on specific statements, it is difficult to make assumptions about whether the latter sentiment was coming from Native or non-Native participants. With about a quarter of participants indicating some confusion, it is clear that there are marketing, recruitment and onboarding implications; however, the majority of participants (whether Native or non-Native) reported largely positive feedback related to the cultural appropriateness.

> *"The classes were not all necessarily culturally driven, but some were. People who were not Native had no idea about that kind of material. It really bothered me that the class was opened to Natives and non-Natives. Seeing all these different people in there made*

> *me reconsider, because I'm old school ... Clarify that it is not only for Natives." —* Cohort 2 participant

Focus group participants were asked to share the extent to which they understood and were aware of **the three domains of the program** (across 14 discrete items of feedback provided). The most common answer among participants suggested that they were aware (58.1%, or nine of 15.5 identified codes). Among those that were not aware, the most common response was related to a lack of awareness of the economic component (29%, or 4.5 of 15.5 identified codes).

In terms of the **overall format** of the HFP, the most frequent response among participants that offered feedback (18 discrete items) was that they would prefer a different time or day because of competing obligations (i.e., work; 40%, or seven of 17.5 identified codes). Regarding **specific challenges** related to the format, responding focus group participants (14 discrete items) most often noted challenges related to transportation and/or location of the program (46.7%, or 7 of 15 identified codes). Importantly, 26.7% (or four of 15 identified codes) specifically mentioned that there were no challenges.

> *"It was really hard to get to the program (had to take two buses and light rail) ... Transportation to get to the program is hard and during rush hour." —* Cohort 1 participant

Feedback on the **provided meal and childcare** also offers an understanding of how program supports were perceived. When asked, almost half of responding participants (across 21 discrete items) noted that the supports were of good quality and/or beneficial, particularly:

- The meals (20%, or 5.5 of 27.5 identified codes)
- The transportation supports (i.e., bus passes, van rides; 16.4%, or 4.5 of 27.5 identified codes)
- The incentives (10.9%, or three of 27.5 identified codes)
- The childcare (9.1%, or 2.5 of 27.5 identified codes)

Challenges with age-appropriate activities for older children (10.9%, or three of 27.5 identified codes), requests for more incentives (10.9%, or three of 27.5 identified codes), and increased flexibility to make up classes (7.3%, or two of 27.5 identified codes) were mentioned among those providing less positive feedback

When asked to share **other activities** that may have been beneficial, adding movies/ documentaries (18.2%, or two of 11 identified codes) and increasing group work opportunities (13.6%, or 1.5 of 11 identified codes) were mentioned across the 11 items of discrete feedback. Similarly, participants were asked to share **other supports** that could have been helpful. Across the 11 items of discrete feedback, the most frequently mentioned were transportation supports (23.8%, or 2.5 of 10.5 identified codes), nutrition education (19.1%, or two of 10.5 identified codes), additional gift cards (19.1%, or two of 10.5 identified codes), and supports specific for non-Natives since they could not access the workforce supports already offered by DICI under separate funding (19.1%, or two of 10.5 identified codes).

> *"Not being Native, I couldn't do much besides the program. They didn't allow me to come to other programs." —* Cohort 3 participant

Focus group participants were also asked to reflect on how it **felt coming into DICI and the Adams County Human Services Center**. In reference to DICI, feeling welcomed, comfortable and safe was mentioned most often among the 41 items of discrete feedback (31%, or 15.5 of 50 identified codes). A

smaller number of respondents noted that it felt cold or mentioned feeling surprised by the presence of women in a fatherhood program (each 10%, or five of 50 identified codes). Regarding Adams County participants, all feedback that was provided regarding the space was negative (e.g., noting the sterility of the space, the armed guard at the entrance, etc.).

Finally, when asked to share **strengths** (30 items of discrete feedback) and **areas for improvement** (49 items of discrete feedback), the following areas emerged most frequently:

- Strengths
  - The opportunity to interact and talk with others who may have similar or different experiences (31.3%, or 10 of 32 identified codes)
  - The interactions with the RGS (23.4%, or 7.5 of 32 identified codes)
  - The content and knowledge gained (18.8%, or six of 32 identified codes)
- Areas for improvement
  - Increased opportunities to engage with children (17%, or 8.5 of 50 identified codes)

    *"They could have a session special for kids and parents, to build relationships, to learn what's important for the kids in a relationships and why, what is different for them, what's their experience."* — Cohort 3 participant
  - Increased frequency or duration of program because of a desire to learn more (16%, or eight of 50 identified codes)
  - Enhanced outreach, recruitment and marketing to increase cohort size (14%, or seven of 50 identified codes)

**Interview findings.** Those participating in the interviews responded to a series of questions focusing on five topical areas to assess the extent to which the RGS perceived the program and program components to be effective in supporting implementation and outcome achievement:

1. Valuable aspects for participants
2. Additional resources and service needs
3. The cultural responsiveness of the program
4. Strengths
5. Areas for growth

In response to beliefs about the most **valuable aspect of the HFP for participants**, interviewees largely echoed the participants in consistently noting that the opportunity to learn with and from their peers in a safe space is critical (mentioned in nine of 12 responses). Additionally, the program offers hope and gives participants the opportunity to pause, reflect and make a plan for the future (i.e., make choices; mentioned in seven of 12 responses).

> *"I would have to say just the opportunity to interact as individuals; just the opportunity to express themselves without any kind of reservation, without any kind of consternation occurring ... Know that it is a safe space ..."* — RGS Year 1

> *"Being able to interact with peers and facilitators; being able to interact in a group setting; have more of a chance to hear different perspectives, talk through things; have*

> *more interactions around topics; if you're not in a group, you don't always get those different perspectives."* — RGS Year 3

When asked about **additional resources and services** they believed would be important to provide to participants, interviewee responses aligned with those of participants, suggesting a shared understanding between RGS and participants. Specifically, RGS noted the need for transportation, legal, housing and workforce supports, and offerings more aligned with the specific ages of the children that were present during the sessions. Additionally, over time, RGS continued to mention a desire to "do more" (e.g., individual plans), but not having the capacity.

RGS were further asked if they felt they were implementing a **culturally responsive program**. Year 1 responses reflected frustrations with needing to abandon the use of FIS as the core curriculum because of disagreements about spirituality (mentioned in four of four Year 1 interviews; i.e., perceiving it to be either similar or distinct from religion).

> *"We were good until we stopped FIS; once that happened, I think that really changed our ability to deliver culturally specific services ... At least limited our ability."* — RGS Year 1

Beyond the first year, interviewees noted their ability to infuse culture in meaningful ways that were beneficial to all participants, regardless of whether they identified as Native or not.

Finally, in response to **programmatic strengths and areas for improvement**, the RGS commonly mentioned:

- Strengths
  - Facilitation skills and engagement with participants (i.e., the ability to facilitate effectively and have positive interactions with participants)
  - Ability to work as a small team (i.e., recognition that people need to wear multiple hats and be willing to fill many roles)
  - Filling a gap in services (i.e., offering a needed service to Native fathers and the broader community)
- Areas for improvement
  - Addressing transportation challenges of participants
  - Communication and relationship with the federal government (although this was noted as an area of achievement in Year 3)
  - Recruitment and retention (as identified above, recruitment and retention remained a consistent challenge over the course of the HFP, and the RGS recognized this)

**Observations findings.** Across the three ad hoc observations, the following components relevant to participant engagement/program were rated from not evident (0) to very evident (3), based on domains of participant engagement—specifically connected to understanding the extent to which program components may have been contributing to achievement of desired programmatic outcomes:

- Participants sharing personal examples
- Participants actively engaging
- Participants positively interacting with facilitators

- Participants positively interacting with other participants

As outlined in Table 12, participants were consistent in their desire to share personal examples, engage with facilitators and interact with/learn from others. The greatest variability in program components was related to participant consistent engagement during the sessions. Of note, however, with only three observations (noted in limitations section below), findings (i.e., differences in ratings) over time were likely more a reflection of the actual participants in each cohort that was observed, as opposed to programming components that may have differed between observations.

**Table 12. Observational ratings of components of program**

| | Rating Time 1 | Rating Time 2 | Rating Time 3 | Relevant notes (summarized over time) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participants share personal examples about what is going on in own lives | 3 | 3 | 3 | Participants eager to share personal experiences relevant to topic |
| Participants are actively engaged (e.g., stay present and on task) | 3 | 2 | 1 | Participant engagement fluctuated; identified disruptions included side conversations, use of cell phones, children entering room |
| Participants positively interact with facilitators | 3 | 3 | 2 | Generally, participants were respectful of facilitators; occasional disruptions as identified above |
| Participants positively interact with other participants | 3 | 3 | 2 | Participants seemed to respect each other and actively engage; occasional disruptions as identified above |

# IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of the analyses revealed several key findings about the fidelity, quality and importance of program components of the HFP. In addition, the work revealed limitations and important factors to consider in the interpretation of study findings.

**Key findings.** Relating specifically to the four research questions, there are several key findings that provide insights into the delivery and implementation of a fatherhood program designed to specifically target, and resonate with, Native fathers. Specifically:

- **Fidelity:** Despite early disagreements with core curriculum (i.e., FIS vs. 24/7 Dad), necessary modifications were made along the way to ensure fidelity to the selected core curriculum. The transition away from FIS was a frustrating experience for program staff, community members and participants, yet the HFP ultimately found ways of incorporating cultural elements through stories, conversations and the sharing of histories and experiences (both at the individual level and for broader Native communities). It should be noted that both RGS and the participants often noted these interactions and opportunities to learn as some of the most beneficial components of the program.
    - ***Takeaways:*** Given a history of mistrust and mistreatment, programs seeking to support and serve Native populations may be more effective through the deliberate incorporation of cultural components relevant to shared history. If not feasible through the curriculum, the addition of ancillary elements may be included. Future research more specifically examining the "impact" of such cultural elements will be critical for expanding current understanding.
- **Quality:** The strength of the relationship between RGS and participants was consistently viewed as an asset of the HFP. In fact, greater benefits to participants may have been possible through increasing more systematic and deliberate interactions.
    - ***Takeaways:*** The relationships and supports provided through participant and program staff engagement are fundamental to program success, and finding opportunities to strengthen those connections and provide additional resources and supports to participants has the potential to enhance participant experience and program quality.
- **Quality:** The HFP was valued and perceived as worthwhile for the participants that successfully completed the program. Completers reported areas of growth, specifically related to understanding the value of "choices" (what was most often communicated to children), improving their parenting styles and understanding how to enhance relationships with parenting partners. Participants desired additional supports around economic well-being, also recognized as an area somewhat lacking by RGS. The greatest challenges for the HFP were recruitment and retention:
    - Recruitment was a challenge both in terms of ensuring that the target population of Native males was reached and in simply attracting a high number of participants.
        - Retention was a challenge because the 1) program was long (either 16 or eight weeks), 2) the population was not captive (i.e., they were there by choice), 3) the target population has significant barriers to overcome (e.g., transportation barriers, irregular work schedules) and 4) the target population tends to be transient.
            - ***Takeaways:*** Strengthening relationships with referral services (e.g., departments of human and social services, programs serving similar populations), increasing "word of

mouth" practices and exploring alternative marketing strategies further (e.g., public transportation, radio advertising) will likely improve recruitment. Continuing with the condensed program, offering more opportunities for session participation (i.e., multiple times a week, different locations) and building RGS case management supports with participants will likely improve retention.

- **Program components:** There were several program components (both central to programming and ancillary) that were important to perceived effectiveness and overall quality of experience:
  - Opportunities to engage with other participants and RGS
  - The meals, transportation supports, incentives and childcare
  - Opportunities to gain knowledge
  - Feelings of being welcomed to the physical space of programming
  - Opportunities to gain cultural perspectives (particularly for Native fathers, although there was some confusion from Native participants in terms of the inclusion of non-Native participants and from non-Native participants in terms of the focus of the program)
    - ***Takeaways:*** Future programming could potentially be best served by sustaining identified strengths and finding opportunities to enhance them (e.g., by offering more transportation supports; increasing opportunities for participants to recognize, and put into practice, all the knowledge gained; and explicitly talking about what Native history and experiences might be, where/how Native perspectives were formed and ways they are still relevant, and who may be able to benefit from this understanding).

  Additionally, the following were identified as programming areas for improvement:
  - Opportunities to have interactions with children
  - Additional transportation supports
  - Increased variety of activities
  - Increased variety in times/days of programming
    - ***Takeaways:*** Future programming could potentially be served by improving upon the above areas (e.g., by incorporating child interactions into the program or through creation of opportunities outside of the session; offering gas vouchers instead of bus passes, since cars are the most common form of transportation; exploring different activities such as movies, podcasts and bonding experiences; and increasing frequency of programming).

**Analytical context and limitations.** In addition to analyses on the four research questions outlined above, a review of the HFP and evaluation activities and adjustments over time reveals those that contributed to successes and those that potentially detracted from program goals. Regardless, the following activities and adjustments provide important context through which to interpret the implementation study research question findings.

- Activities and adjustments contributing to successes
  - **Co-creation and implementation of evaluation plan, tools and methods**: The evaluation plan, tools and methods were created in close collaboration among evaluator, program staff and community stakeholders, making evaluation activities more aligned with program and community

goals. To the extent possible, keeping the evaluation lead (a white female) external from evaluation activities likely improved participant engagement and participation. As a result of historical mistrust between Native communities and research entities, including the federal government, it was critical to 1) reassure participants that all data collected are owned/under control of DICI, 2) have RGS administer pre- and post-participation surveys, and 3) take time at the outset of each focus group to clarify evaluator affiliation and purpose of groups.

- **Modification of evaluation plan:** Evaluation and program staff had ongoing and consistent communication across the program period. This allowed for adaptations to the evaluation plan and tools to ensure alignment with the HFP.
- **Responsiveness of HFP to participant needs:** From adjusting the layout of the physical space (e.g., from rows to a circle) to offering a monthly (vs. weekly) class, the RGS and the HFP were responsive to participant requests—empowering participants to have a voice and seeing feedback reflected in concrete actions.
    - ***Takeaways:*** Having a strong, collaborative relationship between evaluator and program is critical to better understanding program successes and areas for improvement, as well as creating a shared understanding of why evaluation questions are important (i.e., not just to check the box or to understand the value of the program). Related, being able to pivot the evaluation activities and learn alongside the program supports mutual success. Finally, creating an environment that allows for (and supports) participant feedback is a meaningful way to enhance participant experience and engagement.

- Activities and adjustments detracting from program goals
    - **Removal of FIS as core curriculum and limits on language**: Midway through Cohort 1, the HFP was informed that it could no longer use the selected core curriculum, FIS. This change required program staff to adjust and redesign the program and contributed to miscommunications between federal program staff and DICI staff (that were subsequently remedied). Additionally, in Year 2, the modified curriculum needed to be updated again following disagreements about the concepts and use of "spirituality" vs. "religion"—the former of which resonates deeply with Native cultures and is distinct from "religion" but was not viewed as such by the federal government.
    - **High number of females participating in early cohorts**: Particularly in early cohorts in which there were a fair number of female participants, there was some confusion about the audience of the HFP—with males reporting that they had anticipated being able to interact with more fathers. Through adjustments made to recruiting approaches, the HFP evolved to reach its goal of 70% male participation.
    - **Limitations on ability to analyze outcome data collected through evaluation activities because of sample-size constraints:**[9] The HFP and local outcome evaluation study did not reach its target sample size of 288 participants, so the outcome evaluation study was abandoned. However, data were collected from 195 participants through the pre-program survey and 107 participants through the post-program survey—a significant amount of data, given the dearth of

[9] The original evaluation plan was to include both an outcomes and a process study; during Year 5, it was clear that intended sample (n = 288) would not be achieved. Upon recommendation from Mathematica and ACF, the data collected through the outcomes study are not included in this report.

data collected by and on behalf of Natives. It will, unfortunately, not be analyzed and used for the purposes of federal review of local evaluation findings.

- ***Takeaways:*** There is still tension and misunderstanding between traditional Native teachings and American interpretation of those teachings, which resulted in challenges in program implementation. Having constructive conversations and increasing awareness on both sides (i.e., recognizing those differences and the sources of those differences) to allow for cultural responsiveness will be fundamental for future programming targeting Native populations. Understanding the desired outcome achievement/progress of the program (as opposed to process evaluation questions) was limited because of high female participation and limited sample size. Continuing to build the knowledge base and answer outcome evaluation questions will be possible with additional participants in the future (e.g., what was the change in fathering knowledge and attitudes over time among program participants? How did perceived relationship quality with parenting partners change over time among program participants?).

Limitations specific to the implementation study include three primary limits. First, related to the collection of focus group data, the evaluation relied on notes taken instead of recording/transcription, and demographic data (e.g., gender) were not assigned to individual participants and their feedback, so it is not possible to make individual-level attributions to comments, which led to the need to rely on dialogue as the unit of analysis (as opposed to individual- or group-level feedback). Second, the evaluation included small and self-selected samples (specifically, focus groups, observations); and third, because of the small sample size of the outcome evaluation, there is an inability to examine any relationship between programmatic and implementation adjustments on participant outcomes (to be available under separate cover).

**Conclusion.** In sum, the data gathered through this implementation suggest the following recommendations for future programming intended to serve Native fathers through a culturally responsive approach:

- Aligned with program requirements, identify opportunities to incorporate Native perspectives, teachings and history, while also allowing all participants to reflect on ways those are relevant to them
- Seek to develop deliberate and meaningful relationships with program staff, and implement methods to ensure consistent outreach and supports (beyond program sessions and immediate needs related to program attendance)
- Create multiple recruitment strategies to target a relatively small and harder-to-reach population that meets potential participants where they are and gives potential participants a “reason” to participate fully
- Expand program offerings so that participants have more opportunities to fulfill program requirements (e.g., multiple sessions a week, in different locations)
- Incorporate a range of activities, for participants as well as those that engage their children, both within the confines of the program and outside of the program
- Actively request participant feedback throughout programming, and implement changes (as appropriate) to further empower participants

Overall, the results included in this report highlight the areas of attainment and the areas for improvement of the HFP. By identifying the programmatic and implementation factors that seem to influence participant experiences and perceptions, programs desiring to administer a culturally responsive fatherhood program are better equipped to do so.

# V. REFERENCES


Baker-Demaray, T. (2012). *Real warriors: Native fatherhood and family.* National Resource Center on Native American Aging.

Barnes, P. M., Adams, P. F., & Powell-Griner, E. (2010). Health characteristics of the American Indian or Alaska Native adult population: United States, 2004–2008. *National Health Statistics Reports, No. 20*. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

Beets, M. W., Flay, B. R., Vuchinich, S., Acock, A. C., Li, K., & Allred, C. (2008). School climate and teachers' beliefs and attitudes associated with implementation of the positive action program: A diffusion of innovations model. *Prevention Science: The Official Journal of the Society for Prevention Research, 9(*4), 264-275.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3,* 77–101.

Bree, R., & Gallagher, G. (2016). Using Microsoft Excel to code and thematically analyze qualitative data: A simple, cost-effective approach. *The All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 8,* 2811–28114.

Center for Native Oral Health Research. (2015). *Oral health demographics of the American Indian population*. Retrieved from http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/PublicHealth/research/centers/CAIANH/cnohr/Pages/AIANDemographics.aspx

Colorado Children's Campaign. (2020). *Kids count in Colorado*. Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Denver Children's Affairs. (2018). *The status of Denver's children: A community resource.* Retrieved from https://www.denvergov.org/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/713/documents/data-resources/StatusOfDenversChildren_2018.pdf

Horwitz, S. (2014, March 9). *The hard lives and high suicide rate of Native American children on reservations.* The Washington Post.

Howard, K. S., Burke Lefever, J. E., Borkowski, J. G., & Whitman , T. L. (2006). Fathers' influence in the lives of children with adolescent mothers. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*, 468– 476.

LaFrance, J. (2004). Culturally competent evaluation in Indian County. *In Search of Cultural Competence in Evaluation.* Retrieved from https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/CCevalinidancountry.pdf

National Fatherhood Initiative. *The father factor: Two new evaluations add to 24/7 Dad's Efficacy.* Retrieved from https://www.fatherhood.org/fatherhood/two-new-evaluations-add-to-24/7-dads-efficacy

Native American Center for Excellence Substance Abuse Prevention. Retrieved from https://www.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/nace-steps-conducting-research-evaluation-native-communities.pdf

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

PBS Indian Country Diaries. *The Urban Relocation Program*. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/indiancountry/history/relocate.html

Pewewardy, C., & Cahape Hammer, P. (2003). Culturally responsive teaching for American Indian students. *ERIC Digest.* Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED482325.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *2010 Population by race and Hispanic origin: Colorado counties – Total Population.* Retrieved from http://dola.colorado.gov/dlg/demog/2010censusdata.html

Yuan, N. P., Martgis, J., & Demers, D. (2014). Promoting ethical research with American Indian and Alaska Native people living in urban areas. *American Journal of Public Health, 104,* 2085–2091.

Zaveri, H., Baumgartner, S., Dion, R., & Clary, L. (September 2015). Parents and children together: Design and implementation of responsible fatherhood programs. *Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.* Retrieved from https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/pact_initial_rf_implementation_report_9_11_15_508b.pdf

# VI. APPENDICES

## A. Logic model for program (Original)

| ***GOAL:*** Strengthen responsible parenting, improve economic stability and increase healthy relationships among AI/AN fathers. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ***TARGET POPULATION:*** Low-income AI/AN and other minority fathers in the metro Denver area. | | | |
| ***ASSUMPTIONS:*** The majority of fathers served will be AI/AN, but there will also be a mix of fathers from other races/ethnicities, therefore, the program will be culturally appropriate but not culturally exclusive. | | | |
| ***Inputs*** | ***Activities*** | ***Outputs*** | ***Outcomes*** |
| ▪ DICI staff<br>▪ Honoring Fatherhood staff<br>▪ Evaluator—JVA Consulting<br>▪ 24/7 Dad curriculum and training<br>▪ Fatherhood is Sacred curriculum and training<br>▪ Leading the Next Generation curriculum and training<br>▪ Computer lab equipped to support ACASI and nFORM data collection and evaluation activities<br>▪ Supportive services funds<br>▪ The Butler Institute<br>▪ Dr. Ross Davis | **1. Responsible Parenting:**<br>▪ 24/7 Dad<br>▪ Fatherhood is Sacred<br>**2. Economic Stability:**<br>▪ DICI Native Workforce program<br>**3. Healthy Marriage**<br>▪ Leading the Next Generation<br>**Case Management/ Supportive Services:**<br>▪ One to one case management<br>**Domestic Violence, Child Welfare and Trauma-Informed practice:**<br>▪ Butler Institute training and technical assistance | ▪ 12 weeks of 24/7 Dad at 2 hours/week<br>▪ 8 weeks of Leading the Next Generation at 1 hour/week<br>▪ 5-8 Fatherhood is Sacred supplemental modules<br>▪ 36 fathers trained per cohort<br>▪ 8 cohorts trained<br>▪ **288 fathers trained over 5 years** | ▪ 85% of participants will self-report an increase in conflict resolution, communication, and healthy relationship knowledge and skills as measured by LNG pre- and post-participation surveys<br>▪ 85% of participants will self-report an increase in fatherhood knowledge and skills at program completion as measured by the National Fatherhood Initiative's knowledge and skills scale.<br>▪ 85% of participants will self-report an increase in participant's belief in the working relationship with their child's other parent at program completion as measured by the Parenting Alliance Inventory.[1]<br>▪ 85% of participants will self-report an increase in father/child engagement as measured by the Inventory of Father Involvement.[1]<br>▪ 85% of participants will self-report an increase in confidence in personal/familial financial management skills on pre- and post-participation surveys.<br>▪ 100% of participants will receive the SCALE and complete an Individualized Employment Plan (IEP) with a case manager to develop a clear plan for skill building and employment.<br>▪ 90% of participants will be employed without subsidy at the close of program participation. |

## B. Process / Implementation analysis

To analyze the focus group data, notes taken during each session were compiled and broken into discrete items of feedback according to the question each item was associated with in the notes. After this, codes were generated and, along with the notes, were shared with two coders. The coders independently coded each focus group question with the corresponding generated codes, such that items of feedback could receive multiple codes. This occurred until 90% inter-rater agreement was established. The tables below present the inter-rater reliability for each question that was analyzed (calculated as the number of agreed upon codes divided by total codes generated by each coder), the individual codes, the average frequency of each code (i.e., total number of times code identified across both coders, divided by two), and the percentage of each code out of the total number of codes generated.

**Quality (Research Question #2):** Are relationship guidance specialists prepared to teach the curriculum, and are they maintaining fidelity to the curriculum? (3 items)

| FG Measure | Codes (code average frequency) | % coded (total) |
|---|---|---|
| Frequency of interactions[a] | • Small group only/Every week/At the center/In person (13.5) | 32.1% |
| | • 2X a week (2.5) | 6% |
| | • Any time, 24/7 (2) | 4.8% |
| | • One-on-one meetings (1.5) | 3.6% |
| | • Not assigned (1.5) | 3.6% |
| | • Calls (3.5) | 8.3% |
| | • Text (1) | 2.4% |
| | • Email (2) | 4.8% |
| | • Helpful (4.5) | 10.7% |
| | • Knowledgeable (3) | 7.1% |
| | • Honest (1) | 2.4% |
| | • Caring (2) | 4.8% |
| | • Concrete supports (4) | 9.5% |
| Perceived value of RGS[b] | • Goal setting (2) | 5.2% |
| | • Role models (1.5) | 3.9% |
| | • Accessible/Available (8) | 20.8% |
| | • Concrete skills (1) | 2.6% |
| | • Comfortable/No judgment (9) | 23.4% |
| | • Knowledgeable (5) | 13% |
| | • Concrete supports (3) | 3.9% |
| | • Shared experiences (2.5) | 6.5% |
| | • Caring (4.5) | 11.7% |
| | • Native experience (2) | 5.2% |
| Change anything | • More time (1) | 10.5% |
| | • No change (2) | 21.1% |
| | • Different support (3.5) | 36.8% |

| FG Measure | Codes (code average frequency) | % coded (total) |
|---|---|---|
| | • All good (3) | 31.6% |

[a] Inter- rater reliability 77/84 (91.7%)

[b] Inter- rater reliability 73/77 (94.8%)

[c] Inter- rater reliability 18/19 (94.7%)

**Quality (Research Question #3):** Is the program perceived as effective and worthwhile to participants? Other stakeholders? (10 items)

| FG Measure | Codes (code average frequency) | % coded (total) |
|---|---|---|
| Got what expected[a] | • Yes (1) | 11.8% |
| | • No (0) | 0% |
| | • Exceeded (4) | 47.1% |
| | • Not sure (0) | 0% |
| | • Got something (3.5) | 41.2% |
| Like learning[b] | • Parenting skills (3) | 21.4% |
| | • Relationship/partner skills (3.5) | 25% |
| | • Health, mental health (1) | 7.1% |
| | • Culture/Historical trauma (2) | 14.3% |
| | • Listening/communication/conflict skills (2.5) | 17.9% |
| | • Economic/work-related skills (1) | 7.1% |
| | • General skills (to be better, responsible) (1) | 7.1% |
| More time to discuss[c] | • Parenting skills (not communication) (4.5) | 22% |
| | • Relationship/partner skills (not communication) (1) | 2.4% |
| | • Own health, mental health knowledge (0) | 0% |
| | • Culture/Historical trauma (0) | 0% |
| | • Listening/communication/conflict skills (0) | 0% |
| | • Economic/work-related skills (5) | 24.4% |
| | • Grandparenting skills (1) | 2.4% |
| | • Different gender perspective/Including women/Mothering skills (3) | 14.6% |
| | • Legal issues (5) | 24.4% |
| | • Concrete/practical skills and knowledge (first aid, nutrition) (2) | 9.8% |
| | • Nothing/No ideas/All good as is (3.5) | 17.1% |
| Passed on to children[d] | • Parenting skills (not communication) (1) | 2% |
| | • Own health, mental health knowledge (0) | 0% |
| | • Culture/Historical trauma/Story telling (2.5) | 9.8% |
| | • Listening/communication/conflict skills (3) | 11.8% |
| | • Economic/work-related skills (2.5) | 9.8% |
| | • Responsibility (1.5) | 5.9% |
| | • Respect/value for what have (3) | 11.8% |
| | • Role model (3) | 11.8% |
| | • Make right choices/Value Learning/Be teachable (8) | 31.4% |
| | • Stability/Spending time (2) | 7.8% |
| | • Relationship skills (1) | 2% |
| Future involvement[e] | • Generally interested/Any way/Yes (7) | 23.7% |
| | • Retake program/Participate again in some classes (5) | 16.9% |
| | • Version 2 (3) | 10.2% |

| FG Measure | Codes (code average frequency) | % coded (total) |
|---|---|---|
| | • Fatherhood is Sacred/Traditional piece (2) | 6.8% |
| | • Outreach/Engagement/Recruitment (general) (3) | 10.2% |
| | • Reach younger ages (0) | 0% |
| | • Bring/invite/include/tell family and friends (3) | 10.2% |
| | • General follow-up (2.5) | 8.5% |
| | • Other opportunities/Ongoing connection (4) | 13.6% |
| Describe experience[f] | • Recommend/Positive overall (good class) (14.5) | 13.7% |
| | • Understanding of culture and history, traditions, Native perspective, generations (12.5) | 11.8% |
| | • Differences okay/Learning from others/Sense of community/No judgment/Comfortable/Supportive (17) | 16% |
| | • Growth/Informational/Gain skills and resources/Helpful or valuable information (18.5) | 17.5% |
| | • Good structure or format/Interactive (5) | 4.7% |
| | • Improve relationship with partner/Impact on relationship (5) | 4.7% |
| | • Improve relationship with children/Impact on kids/parenting (15) | 14.2% |
| | • Choices/Self-reflection/Empowering (10.5) | 9.9% |
| | • Good instructors (4) | 3.8% |
| | • Confused on focus (fatherhood, Native) (2) | 1.9% |
| | • Negative (general) (2) | 1.9% |
| Unhelpful aspects[g] | • Nothing/Everything good (5) | 19.6% |
| | • Reading/not discussing/Individual work (1.5) | 5.9% |
| | • Not in depth enough/Wanting more/Version 2 (2) | 7.8% |
| | • Positive feedback (global)/Unrelated to question (1) | 3.9% |
| | • Improve childcare/meal/incentives (0) | 0% |
| | • Improve transportation supports (4) | 13.6% |
| | • More economics (1) | 3.9% |
| | • More mental health supports (2) | 7.8% |
| | • Repetitive (1) | 3.9% |
| | • Format (3) | 11.8% |

| FG Measure | Codes (code average frequency) | % coded (total) |
|---|---|---|
| | • Limited outreach/Unknown (2) | 7.8% |
| | • Male vs. female perspective (being mean, talking down) (3) | 11.8% |
| Goals attainable[h] | • Yes (generally) (6) | 48% |
| | • No/Not really (1) | 8% |
| | • Career/economic goals (3.5) | 28% |
| | • Parenting goals (1) | 8% |
| | • Relationship goals (0) | 0% |
| | • Anger management/Communication skills (1) | 8% |
| Satisfaction[i] | • 10 (9) | 34% |
| | • 8.5 to 9.5 (or high mix) (4) | 15.1% |
| | • Less than 8.5 (3) | 11.3% |
| | • Yes/Good/Informative (10.5) | 39.6% |
| Beneficial aspects[j] | • Parenting knowledge/skills (not communication) (10) | 34.5% |
| | • Partner/relationship knowledge/skills (not communication) (2.5) | 8.6% |
| | • Work/career knowledge/skills (.5) | 1.7% |
| | • Economic knowledge/skills (1) | 3.4% |
| | • Incentives (0) | 0% |
| | • Communication/Listening (3) | 10.3% |
| | • Culture/Traditions (1.5) | 5.2% |
| | • General knowledge/improvements/Learning from others/Better human (4.5) | 15.5% |
| | • Outside, external resources (1.5) | 5.2% |
| | • Time/Finding balance (2.5) | 8.6% |
| | • Patience (2) | 6.9% |

[a] Inter- rater reliability 16/17 (94.1%)

[b] Inter- rater reliability 26/28 (92.9%)

[c] Inter- rater reliability 38/41 (92.7%)

[d] Inter- rater reliability 48/51 (94.1%)

[e] Inter- rater reliability 56/59 (94.9%)

[f] Inter- rater reliability 190/212 (89.6%)

[g] Inter- rater reliability 50/51 (98%)

[h] Inter- rater reliability 22/25 (88%)[10]

[i] Inter- rater reliability 52/53 (98.1%)

[j] Inter- rater reliability 53/58 (91.4%)

[10] Given the relatively low number of items to code, this threshold of inter-rater agreement (88%) was deemed acceptable

**Program Components (Research Question #4):** What aspects of program design best support implementation and outcome achievement? (11 items)

| FG Measure | Codes (code average frequency) | % coded (total) |
|---|---|---|
| Curriculum feedback[a] | • Fatherhood is Sacred, traditions, Native, culture, history, trauma (5) | 7.6% |
| | • Comfortable, safe space (4.5) | 6.9% |
| | • Practical, easy to understand, applicable, helpful, informational, eye-opening (9) | 13.7% |
| | • Generally good, positive, change nothing (.5) | .8% |
| | • Incentives, resources (3) | 4.6% |
| | • Fun, interactive, good materials, learn from others, good activities, different perspectives (11) | 16.8% |
| | • Learned communication skills, how to fight (4) | 6.1% |
| | • Learned about economics (3) | 4.6% |
| | • Learned about relationships (8) | 12.2% |
| | • Learned about parenting (6.5) | 9.9% |
| | • RGS positive (2.5) | 3.8% |
| | • Too fast (1) | 1.5% |
| | • Reluctant to share/Uncomfortable (3) | 4.6% |
| | • Negative (other), missing topics, missing opportunities to interact, change format (2.5) | 3.8% |
| | • Confusion over men/women, focus on fatherhood (2) | 3.1% |
| Cultural appropriateness[b] | • Yes to Native, sparked interest to learn more, helpful to learn about history/trauma (4.5) | 15.8% |
| | • No, confused at non-Native participants, not relevant, confusing name (6.5) | 22.8% |
| | • Yes to non-Native too, new perspectives (7) | 24.6% |
| | • More cultural support needed (2.5) | 8.8% |
| | • Good, respectful (4) | 14% |
| | • Disrespectful (2) | 7% |
| | • Aligned with how raised (1) | 3.5% |
| | • Role of women (1) | 3.5% |
| 3 domains[c] | • All covered, yes, aware of 3 domains (9) | 58.1% |
| | • Increase economics, unaware (4.5) | 29% |
| | • Not aware (1) | 6.5% |
| | • Increase healthy relationships, unaware (0) | 0% |
| | • Increase parenting, unaware (1) | 6.5% |
| Format overall[d] | • Later/Different time, different day, competing obligations (7) | 40% |
| | • Meals/childcare/transportation good (3) | 17.1% |
| | • Improve meals/childcare (0) | 0% |
| | • More focus on parenting (1) | 5.7% |
| | • Other activities (2) | 11.4% |
| | • More time to reflect (1) | 5.7% |
| | • Transportation challenging (1) | 5.7% |
| | • Nothing change, good (2.5) | 14.3% |

| FG Measure | Codes (code average frequency) | % coded (total) |
|---|---|---|
| Challenges to format[e] | • Later time/different time, different day (2) | 13.3% |
| | • Transportation/location challenges (7) | 46.7% |
| | • Reminders (1) | 6.7% |
| | • Nothing (4) | 26.7% |
| | • Options were helpful (1) | 6.7% |
| Meal/childcare[f] | • Childcare good (2.5) | 9.1% |
| | • Hard with older children, include children (3) | 10.9% |
| | • Meals good (5.5) | 20% |
| | • Incentives good (3) | 10.9% |
| | • Different/more incentives (3) | 10.9% |
| | • Outside activities (1) | 3.6% |
| | • Offer different classes for different ages (1) | 3.6% |
| | • Childcare lacking (1) | 3.6% |
| | • Format good (1) | 3.6% |
| | • Transportation supports helpful (4.5) | 16.4% |
| | • Increase flexibility, make up classes (2) | 7.3% |
| Other activities[g] | • Group work/Different people/Learning from others/Interactions (1.5) | 13.6% |
| | • Drawing, visualizations (1) | 9.1% |
| | • Budgeting (1) | 9.1% |
| | • Movies (2) | 18.2% |
| | • Child engagement, activities (1) | 9.1% |
| | • Guest speakers (1) | 9.1% |
| | • No ideas (2) | 18.2% |
| | • Other topics (1.5) | 13.6% |
| Other supports[h] | • Nothing (1) | 9.5% |
| | • Non-Native supports (2) | 19.1% |
| | • Workforce (1) | 9.5% |
| | • Nutrition (2) | 19.1% |
| | • Transportation (2.5) | 23.8% |
| | • Gift cards, incentives (2) | 19.1% |
| DICI perceptions[i] | • Clean (1) | 2% |
| | • Welcomed/Comfortable/Like home/Safe (15.5) | 31% |
| | • Underutilized, more opportunities at DICI (3) | 6% |
| | • Less positive, cold, sad, standoffish (5) | 10% |
| | • Challenges accessing (1) | 2% |
| | • Positive (general), able to learn (3.5) | 7% |
| | • Okay/All right (1) | 2% |
| | • Compassionate/Caring (1) | 2% |
| | • Surprised by women, preference for males only (5) | 10% |
| | • History of coming to DICI, many years (5.5) | 11% |
| | • Access, use of other resources and services (4.5) | 9% |

| FG Measure | Codes (code average frequency) | % coded (total) |
|---|---|---|
| | • Adams positive (0) | 0% |
| | • Adams negative (4) | 8% |
| Strengths[j] | • RGS interactions (7.5) | 23.4% |
| | • Classes/Presentation/Content/Tools/Knowledge (6) | 18.8% |
| | • Safe space, no judgment (2) | 6.3% |
| | • Interactions with others, ability to talk with others (10) | 31.3% |
| | • Incentives (1) | 3.1% |
| | • Supports for children (2) | 6.3% |
| | • Connection to Native culture, understanding of history (2.5) | 7.8% |
| | • Financial portion (1) | 3.1% |
| Improvements[k] | • Fatherhood is Sacred (FIS) missing (0) | 0% |
| | • Broaden scope beyond “fatherhood”; change the name (3.5) | 7% |
| | • Outreach, recruitment, marketing (7) | 14% |
| | • More interaction, activities (3.5) | 7% |
| | • More incentives (3.5) | 7% |
| | • Interactions, activities outside of class (0) | 0% |
| | • Transportation supports (1) | 2% |
| | • More content/examples, more time, increase frequency (8) | 16% |
| | • More child engagement, youth programs (8.5) | 17% |
| | • More time on finances (.5) | 1% |
| | • More time on parenting (4) | 8% |
| | • Location change/Time change (1.5) | 3% |
| | • Electronic versions of materials (1) | 2% |
| | • Improve space (1) | 2% |
| | • Change nothing, positive feedback (5) | 10% |
| | • More resources, services (e.g., legal) (2) | 4% |

[a] Inter- rater reliability 118/131 (90.1%)
[b] Inter- rater reliability 51/57 (89.5%)
[c] Inter- rater reliability 29/31 (93.5%)
[d] Inter- rater reliability 32/35 (91.4%)
[e] Inter- rater reliability 27/30 (90%)
[f] Inter- rater reliability 52/55 (94.5%)
[g] Inter- rater reliability 20/22 (90.9%)
[h] Inter- rater reliability 20/21 (95.2%)
[i] Inter- rater reliability 92/100 (92%)
[j] Inter- rater reliability 58/64 (90.6%)
[k] Inter- rater reliability 90/100 (90%)

## C. Data collection instruments

The following includes the data collection tools referenced utilized in the process/ implementation study: focus group script, interview script and observation protocol.

# Denver Indian Center, Honoring Fatherhood Program: Focus Group Methodology and Script

### Methodology

JVA takes a participatory approach to focus group facilitation in order to solicit honest answers and ensure that participants know their voice is needed and valued. This method is rooted in the belief that the deepest understanding of data lies within the participants themselves. To share the importance of their open and honest thoughts, participants will be frequently reminded that their input is important in understanding their experiences as the first cohort of the Honoring Fatherhood Program (HFP), as well as the perceived value of participation and potential areas for future improvements of the program. JVA's style of participation also requires a level of flexibility to adjust to participants' backgrounds and insights.

### Protocol

One 1.5-hour focus group will be conducted at the Denver Indian Center, Inc. (DICI) with HFP participants who successfully completed the program as part of Cohort 5. Recruitment will be conducted via direct outreach from the relationship guidance specialists. Participants will be thanked for their participation with an honorarium of a $50 grocery gift card provided by JVA; additionally, childcare and a meal will be provided.

### Goals

The main goal of these groups is to gather feedback from participants on their experiences with the program and perceived areas of strength and areas for improvement of the HFP. As outlined in the federal evaluation plan, these groups will focus on assessing:

- Experiences with the curricula and other HFP activities
- Perceived effectiveness and value of participation
- Program satisfaction
- Potential areas for improvement

## Focus Group Script

*Boxes or borders and italics are used in the script below to indicate facilitator directions or guidelines, which are not to be read aloud by the facilitator during the session. Facilitator is expected to use simple language that can be understood by everyone, thus avoiding jargon.*

### 1. Welcome

*The following section aims to ensure participants have the necessary background information about the purpose of this focus group and the opportunity to understand their desire to participate and give consent. Note: Facilitators establish a welcoming and friendly environment by greeting all participants as they come in and inviting them to help themselves to dinner.*

Hello, and thank you for participating in this conversation. My name is _____, and this is _____, who will be taking notes throughout our discussion. We work at Joining Vision and Action, a Denver-based planning and research firm working with the Denver Indian Center to facilitate discussions regarding your experiences with the Honoring Fatherhood Program. We've been working with the Denver Indian Center for three years now.

**The information you share today is confidential,** meaning we won't attach your name to any of your quotes or ideas that you share. All of your feedback will be combined into a larger report that will inform future planning of the HFP—no personally identifying information will be shared outside of this conversation. There are no wrong answers. I simply want to know what you think and why.

Our discussion today should last an hour and a half. Thank you for your time and feedback. Do you have any questions for me before we get started?

### **2.** Group introduction

*The following section aims to ensure participants feel at ease and get an opportunity to break the ice.*

Let's introduce ourselves to the group by sharing your name, hometown and your favorite thing about being a parent/caregiver.

### *3.* Experiences with HFP

The following section aims to understand what HFP participants (both regular and non-regular attendees) felt about their experiences and interactions.

I'd first like to talk about your experiences with the HFP generally, and more specifically about certain aspects of the program.

1. Based on your experiences with the HFP, how would you describe your overall experience to a friend or family member?

2. **For completers only:** Let's talk specifically about some of the specific aspects of the program.
    a. Starting with the curriculum that you used (i.e., the lessons and material that you covered), what did you like about it? What did you not like about it?
        i. Did you feel like it was culturally appropriate to you, including how you are raising your child(ren) and your relationship with your child(ren)'s other parent? In other words, did you feel like the materials and lessons were in line with your values and your beliefs about parenting and relationships?
        ii. Were there any aspects about the materials and lessons that you did not find helpful? Which ones?
    b. Let's now talk about your relationship guidance specialist.
        i. How frequently did you interact?
        ii. What was the most valuable aspect of those interactions? What did you enjoy the most?
        iii. Do you wish anything was different about how you interacted with your relationship guidance specialist?
        iv. Did you attend individual (one-on-one) meetings? What was that experience like?

3. What other activities, resources or supports would have been helpful to you?

4. Among many other things, the goal of the HFP was to provide education on 1) responsible parenting, 2) healthy relationships and 3) economic well-being.
    a. **For completers only:** Do you feel like you learned things relevant to all three areas? Please explain.
        i. What did you most enjoy learning about?
        ii. What do you wish you had learned about or had more time to discuss?
        iii. What things have you passed on to your children/grandchildren?
        iv. Since beginning the HFP, do your economic and career goals feel more attainable? Why or why not?

5. Thinking about other aspects of the program, how did you feel about the format (once a week, every week in the evenings)?
    a. Did you experience challenges related to when/how the program was offered?
    b. Did you enjoy the meal? The childcare? Was there anything else the HFP and the work relatives could have done differently or provided to help make it easier for you to attend?

## **4.** Perceptions of HFP

*This section aims to gain additional feedback on greatest perceived value/benefit of the HFP, as well as feedback on areas of strength and areas for improvement.*

6. Thinking about your overall experience with the HFP, how satisfied would you say you are with the program?

7. **<u>For completers only</u>:** What aspect do you think provided you with the greatest benefit? What aspect do you think provided your family with the greatest benefit?
    a. If you had to sum up the value of participating in the HFP, how would you describe it? **(Ask participants to write this down/draw and share)**

8. What do you think could be improved upon to make the HFP better or more effective for future participants?

9. Have you noticed any changes in your peers/cohort members since you first started?
    a. What types of changes? Please describe and provide some examples.

## 5. Engagement and Future Communication

*This section aims to discover the interest participants have in staying involved with DIC and the HFP beyond their cohort.*

10. Talk to me a little bit about your feelings coming to the Denver Indian Center? How would you describe you feel when you walk in the door?
    a. Does it feel like a safe space?
    b. Do you feel welcomed here?

11. Would you like to continue to be involved in the HFP in the future? In what ways? With whom?
    a. How would you like to be communicated with about future HFP or DICI events (e.g., social media, phone calls from relationship guidance specialists, email)?

## *Closing*

12. Do you have any other comments or feedback related to your experience with the HFP that you think would be helpful for us or the work relatives to know?

**Thank you very much for your time and contributions today!** We'll be using this information to inform the future work of the HFP. Your feedback is incredibly valuable and will ensure that the HFP continues to meet the needs of participants and families in our community.

# Denver Indian Center, Honoring Fatherhood Program: Work Relatives Interview Methodology and Script

## Methodology

In order to elicit honest opinions from interviewees, the informality of the interviews will be key. JVA will stress that the interview is an informal discussion in order to prevent concern over a need to prepare. The interview itself will be semi-structured, with the same questions asked to each interviewee, while maintaining an emphasis on flexibility, allowing for adjustments based on different perspectives and enabling the interviewer to draw out items that are of particular interest to certain respondents based on their expertise.

### B. Protocol

Interviews will be no longer than 30 minutes and will occur over the phone.

## Goals

As outlined in the federal evaluation plan, these interviews will focus on assessing:

- Experiences with the curricula and other HFP activities
- Perceived effectiveness and value of participation
- Program satisfaction
- Potential areas for improvement

# Focus Group Script

### *a) Introduction*

- Hello and thank you for your time. The goal of today is to get your feedback on experiences with the first HFP cohort and gather your ideas on areas of strength and areas for improvement.
- The information you share today is confidential. I will combine the responses from our discussion into the larger report that will inform future planning and programming. There are no right or wrong answers. This is just an important part of our evaluation as we simply want to know what you think and why. Our discussion today will last no longer than 30 minutes.
- I have you on speakerphone, as I am going to be taking notes on my computer as you speak. Can you hear me OK?
- Do you have any questions before we get started?

### *b) Interview questions*

#### (1) Experiences

1. To begin, please tell me about your role with the HFP. How would you describe your position and responsibilities?
2. Let's talk about your overall experiences with the first year of the grant.
    a. Overall (aside from programming), what do you think went well?
    b. What do you think was difficult? How did you navigate/manage these challenges?
3. I want to get your feedback on some of the specific aspects of the HFP.
    a. First, tell me about the experience with the **curricula**. Do you feel like you received adequate training and that you were able to deliver the training to fidelity?
        i. What did you like about the three curricula that had been selected? What did you not like?
        ii. What do you anticipate will change or what should be changed in the future?
    b. [**For Steve and Rick only**] How was your experience as a relationship guidance specialist? Did you feel like you had the opportunity to interact with participants in the way that you would have liked? What would you change about those interactions/your role in the future?
    c. Do you feel like you were able to adequately and appropriately train the participants in the three areas for focus (responsible parenting, healthy relationships and economic well-being)?
        i. Were all areas of equal focus in the program?
        ii. What do you think was the most valuable aspect for the participants? Please elaborate.
    d. Based on your experiences with the first HFP cohort, are there additional resources and services that you believe will be important to provide participants with or to implement through programming in the future? What?

4. Do you feel like the HFP was able to accomplish its goal of implementing a culturally responsive program? Why or why not? What could change in the future?

#### (2) Perceptions

5. Overall, what would you say are the greatest benefits of participating in the HFP?
6. What do you believe to be the HFP's greatest areas of strength?
7. What do you believe to be the HFP's areas for future growth, change or improvement?
    a. What will you do differently next time?
8. Is there anything else you would like me to know or that would be beneficial to the evaluation of the HFP?

**Thank you very much for your time!** Your feedback and perspectives have been very valuable. If you have any other thoughts that come to mind after we get off the phone, please feel free to contact me at any time.

# HFP: Global Workshop Observational Tool

**Date:** **Workshop Topic:**

**Observer:**

**Facilitator(s):**

**# of Participants:** **Time Start:** **Time End:**

Please indicate the extent to which the following were evident during the observed session.

| | Not Evident (0) | Somewhat Evident (1) | Evident (2) | Very Evident (3) | Additional notes: |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Session Implementation** | | | | | |
| 1. A review of the previous week's workshop topic | | | | | |
| 2. A review of the goals and objectives for the current workshop | | | | | |
| 3. Content (i.e., teachings, activities, discussions) reflects the curriculum topic for the workshop | | | | | |
| 4. Content (i.e., teachings, activities, discussions) aligns with cultural values of DICI and HFP | | | | | |
| **Participant Engagement** | | | | | |
| 1. Participants share personal examples about what is going on in own lives | | | | | |
| 2. Participants are actively engaged (e.g., stay present and on task) | | | | | |
| 3. Participants positively interact with facilitators | | | | | |
| 4. Participants positively interact with other participants | | | | | |
| 5. Participants share take-away comments about workshop material | | | | | |
| 6. Participants share suggestions for ways to improve the workshop | | | | | |