Descriptive Evaluation of Growing Responsible Fathers Through Support and Education in Northeast Florida – Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E.

Final Descriptive Evaluation Report for Northeast Florida Healthy Start Coalition

October 28, 2020

Prepared by

Jeffry A. Will, Ph.D., University of North Florida

Tracy A. Milligan, University of North Florida

Recommended Citation:

Will, J. A., & Milligan, T. A. (2020). Descriptive evaluation of Growing Responsible Fathers Through Support and Education in Northeast Florida – Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E.

Acknowledgements:

First and foremost, we would like to acknowledge the fathers who participated in the program and research and express our sincere gratitude for their participation. The Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. staff also deserve recognition for their instrumental work in collecting program and evaluation data. Finally, we would like to thank our University of North Florida (UNF) staff and student research assistants for their valuable work with this evaluation.

Disclosure:

Jeffry Will and Tracy Milligan declare that they have no conflict of interest, financial or otherwise.

This publication was prepared under Grant Number 90FM0074-04-00 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.

Structured Abstract: "A Descriptive Evaluation of Growing Responsible Fathers Through Support and Education in Northeast Florida"

The Growing Responsible Fathers Through Support and Education (referred to in this report as the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program) was deployed as a comprehensive program to educate on and support father involvement and mitigate barriers faced by many fathers in the Northeast Florida region. Program participants were offered four main components: responsible fatherhood workshop series, self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshop series, individualized workforce development services, and other case management services to address individuals' needs. The intervention was intended for community and incarcerated fathers.

This descriptive evaluation included both a process and outcomes study component. The process study aimed to describe the program implementation, identify relevant program changes, and assess the satisfaction and perceptions of the participants. The outcomes study set out to determine whether community participants completing the program gained knowledge in responsible fatherhood, co-parenting skills, and financial literacy, and increased self-efficacy in paying child support and engagement with their children. The process study utilized enrollment, workshop attendance and service contact data to answer the research questions and included 332 incarcerated and 213 community fathers who enrolled during the study timeframe. In addition, perceptions of satisfaction were obtained from 124 of the community fathers. One hundred four clients completed a local pre- and post-test evaluation survey for the outcomes study.

Overall, Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. was implemented during the research time frame as intended and well received by community participants. The program faced some challenges providing the self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshop series and retaining fathers for the duration of the required workshops. These types of challenges are not new to social service programs but reemphasize the importance of strong partnerships and finding solutions to participant retention. There were no significant changes in program participants' self-efficacy in paying child support or engagement with their children. There was a significant correlation between fathers' engagement and Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) scores. The ACEs measure challenging childhood experiences such as abuse and neglect, which are associated with adult outcomes. Fatherhood program participants with higher ACE scores had a significant increase in engagement mean scores at post-test. The ACE score interaction with engagement warrants further exploration and supports the importance of a trauma informed approach for program policies and procedures. Understanding the extent of childhood trauma and the association between trauma and engagement found in this study underscores the need for programs to focus and build upon participants' resiliency and protective factors. Limitations to the outcomes study included post-test attrition and item non-response, introducing potential bias into the results. This study was also limited and unable to examine the outcomes of the incarcerated population the program served for two main reasons. First, the unique structure of the program delivery in the corrections facilities did not allow for successful follow up on data collection efforts, thus response rates were low. In addition, after experiencing two adverse events, the UNF IRB ended the local evaluation efforts for the incarcerated population.

Contents

Tables

Descriptive Evaluation of Growing Responsible Fathers Through Support and Education in Northeast Florida – Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Introduction and study overview

An engaged, nurturing father has a significant impact on his child's life. Multiple studies have found a positive relationship between a father's involvement with his child and various areas of his child's well-being including academic, social, psychological, and behavioral (Adamsons & Johnson, 2013; Jeynes, 2015). For at-risk children, a father can act as a protective factor (Hayward et al., 2018). For example, Baker et al. (2018) found that a fathers' warmth and cognitive stimulation can alleviate the negative relationship between family poverty and a preschooler's reading scores.

There are a number of barriers that impede fathers from being fully engaged with their children. For instance, positive parenting and involvement can be particularly challenging for non-residential fathers due to limited contact compared to residential fathers (Castillo et al., 2010). Additionally, Waller and Swisher (2006) found that unmarried fathers who faced personal obstacles such as incarceration and substance abuse, and perpetrated physical abuse against the mother experienced negative impacts on their involvement with their children. Low self-esteem has also been found to be a predictor of reduced father involvement (Hayward-Everson et al., 2018).

Fathers in the area of study, Northeast Florida, are not immune to the challenges of being involved in their children's lives. Like other areas across the nation, many children in Northeast Florida live in single-mother households. In fact, more than one out of four (27.2 percent) families with children under 18 in the region are headed by a female with no husband present and 38.2 percent of those households live below the poverty level (US Census Bureau, 2019). Men in the community also experience issues regarding domestic violence and substance abuse. Rolling rates of domestic violence offenses for 2016 to 2018 ranged from 328.2 to as high as 751.2 per 100,000 in the Northeast Florida counties (Florida Department of Health, 2020b). While these rates do not represent all male offenders, perpetrators are predominately male. Duval County, the most populous county in the area, was among the top ten counties in Florida with domestic violence offenses by percentage of population in 2018 (Florida Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2019). In 2016, the percentage of adult men who reported that they engage in heavy or binge drinking varied from 12.5 to 27.8 percent in the region's counties (Florida Department of Health, 2020a).

The Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program was deployed as a comprehensive program to educate on and support father involvement and mitigate barriers faced by many fathers in the Northeast Florida region. Program participants were offered four main components: responsible fatherhood workshop series, self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshop series, individualized workforce development services (including partner-provided job readiness trainings, such as resume writing, interview skills, etc. as well as support for finding and sustaining employment), and other case management services to address individuals' needs. Due to restrictions on the incarcerated population, the workforce development and case management services available to incarcerated fathers were more limited than those available to community fathers. The responsible fatherhood and financial literacy workshops were primarily group-based. The intervention was intended for community and incarcerated fathers of all ages, marital statuses, and socio-economic statuses. Community workshops were implemented at the main program offices in Jacksonville, and at community locations in the surrounding counties. Interventions for incarcerated fathers were held at local correctional facilities in Jacksonville and surrounding counties.

Early into the grant, the staff received feedback from participants that the original name inferred those that attended the program were not "responsible fathers." To address their concerns, the program was re-branded as "Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E.," an acronym for parental responsibility inspiring dads everywhere. This is the name that the program is known by locally.

This descriptive evaluation included both a process and outcomes study component to better understand the program as well as possible outcomes of program participants. The process study aimed to describe the program implementation, identify relevant program changes, and assess the satisfaction and perceptions of the participants. Previous fatherhood program evaluations have found increases in father engagement, both for fatherhood initiatives more generally (e.g. Henry et al., 2020) as well as those more closely designed along the lines of Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. (e.g. Avellar et al., 2018). The outcomes study examined here set out to determine whether community participants completing Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. increased their engagement with their children. Additional outcomes examined for this study included knowledge in responsible fatherhood, co-parenting skills, and financial literacy, and self-efficacy in paying child support.

The research questions, study design, and findings and analysis approach for the process and implementation study are presented first in this report. The findings discussed in this section will provide important context for the outcomes study findings outlined in Section III. Next, the research questions, study design, and findings of the outcomes study are presented. The report will culminate with a discussion and conclusions section of the entire descriptive evaluation. Details related to the evaluation can be found under the Appendix.

B. Description of the intended intervention

The Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program was a multi-component intervention in which fathers were intended to receive four main components: responsible fatherhood workshop series, self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshop series, individualized workforce development services

(including partner job readiness trainings, such as resume writing, interview skills, etc. as well as support for finding and sustaining employment), and other needed case management services to address the "social determinants of health" – That is, the factors apart from medical care that influence and shape community health. Case management services addressed issues including child support navigation, employment, food, housing, transportation, education, physical and mental health service navigation, intimate partner violence/domestic violence, childcare, as well as others.

Two separate National Fatherhood Initiative curricula were utilized for the responsible fatherhood workshop series: 24/7 Dad (community fathers) and InsideOut Dad (incarcerated fathers). Both curricula cover topics such as family history, communication skills, fathers' roles, discipline, co-parenting, men's health, children's growth, and handling feelings. 24/7 Dad also covers balancing work and family and ways to get involved with their children while InsideOut Dad goes over a fathering plan for incarcerated fathers. The self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshop series utilized United Way of Northeast Florida's (United Way) curriculum, RealSense. The curriculum covers budgets, growing savings, and improving credit. The workforce development services were individualized based on the participants' needs and participants were referred to job training programs and job-finding resources, as needed. Case managers provided referrals according to the participants' needs. Due to restrictions on the incarcerated population, the workforce development and case management services available to incarcerated fathers were more limited than those available to community fathers.

The planned dosage for each of the responsible fatherhood workshop series curriculum, 24/7 Dad and InsideOut Dad, was 24 hours total. The dosage was divided into 12 sessions of two hours each. For the community fathers, the 24/7 Dad workshops were offered twice a week for six weeks (normal track) and daily Monday through Thursday for three weeks (accelerated track). Fathers were able to choose a track based on their availability and to move between tracks if their daily schedule changed. InsideOut Dad for the incarcerated fathers was provided once a week for 12 weeks. The planned dosage of the financial literacy workshop series was six hours total and was implemented during the timeframe of the fatherhood workshop series described above. The financial literacy workshops were provided two hours per week for three weeks during the normal track and two hours three times during the first week of the accelerated track. Incarcerated fathers were intended to receive financial literacy one hour a week for six weeks during the 12 weeks of InsideOut Dad. Workforce development classes offered by the Jacksonville Urban League and Catholic Charities during the fatherhood workshop series timeframe described above were an option for participating community fathers, while other fathers seeking employment or better employment were referred directly to these partners for additional services as needed. Case management was provided to fathers while they attended the fatherhood and financial literacy workshop series and up to about one year once they completed the workshop series. Incarcerated fathers received limited case management compared to community fathers due to service restrictions placed by the criminal justice facilities. While community fathers were provided information and referrals to partner agencies, incarcerated

participants were limited to information about services that would be available upon their release.

The responsible fatherhood and self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshops were primarily group-based. The community workshops were held at the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E.'s office, community centers, libraries, and agency partners' sites. The workshops for the incarcerated fathers were conducted within the jail and detention facilities. The responsible fatherhood group-based workshops were facilitated by Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E.'s program staff while the financial literacy workshop was facilitated by United Way staff or volunteers. One facilitator was present at each workshop. The community participants had the option to complete the financial literacy workshop online rather than in a group setting. Case management services were provided by the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E.'s case managers at their office or within the jail and detention facilities for incarcerated participants.

The intervention targeted two populations: community and incarcerated fathers. The community fathers received the 24/7 Dad curriculum, the self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshops, workforce development, and case management. The intervention was intended for fathers of all ages, marital statuses, and socio-economic statuses. The community fathers were referred from other community programs and Family Courts. Court referrals were generally situations where, when ordered by a judge to participate in a program, clients chose the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program over other options. The incarcerated fathers received the InsideOut Dad curriculum, financial literacy workshops, access to information on workforce development, and one to two case management interactions. The intervention was intended for adult fathers located in jails, re-entry, and detention centers. For this descriptive evaluation, however, only the community fathers population were used for the outcomes study analysis. As stated above, after experiencing adverse events within the incarcerated settings, the UNF Institutional Review Board (IRB) withdrew permission to conduct the local evaluation with the incarcerated population. Table I.1 provides an overview of the intended invention components, curricula and content, dosage and schedule, delivery, and targeted population.

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

Component	Curriculum and content	Dosage and schedule	Delivery	Target Population
Responsible fatherhood workshops	24/7 Dad: Understanding partner's perspectives; avoiding destructive conflict; and communicating effectively	24 hours, with 2-hour sessions occurring twice a week, or 2-hour sessions occurring four times a week	Group sessions provided at the intervention's facilities by one trained program facilitator in every session	Community fathers
Responsible fatherhood workshops	InsideOut Dad: Understanding partner's perspectives; avoiding destructive conflict; and communicating effectively	24 hours, with 2-hour sessions occurring once a week	Group sessions provided at the jails and detention centers by one trained program facilitator in every session	Incarcerated fathers
Financial Literacy workshops	Real Sense: Budgeting, growing savings, and improving credit	6 hours, with one hour each week for six weeks or two hours three times a week or two hours per week for three weeks.	Workshops are provided by one program facilitator; online option for community fathers	Community and incarcerated fathers
Workforce Development and Case management	Information, assistance, and referrals for individualized workforce development services (includes partner-provided job readiness trainings, such as resume writing, interview skills, etc. as well as support for finding and sustaining employment), and other needed case management services, such as child support navigation services, employment, food, housing, transportation, education, physical and mental health service navigation services, Intimate Partner Violence/Domestic Violence education and services, and child care	Varies depending on individuals' needs	Communication from case manager via text, email, phone, and/or face-to-face contact	Community and incarcerated fathers

Facilitators for the responsible fatherhood and economic stability workshops were male and female and held at least a bachelor's degree or at least four (4) years of professional experience in community services and/or counseling with high risk populations in the non-profit sector. Facilitators received two (2) days of certification initial training for 24/7 Dad and/or InsideOut Dad from the curriculum developers. They received quarterly refresher training through curriculum developer webinars and monthly scheduled staff trainings. For the economic stability workshops, facilitators received four (4) hours of initial training from a Certified Financial Institution (CFI) and two (2) hours of refresher training from the CFI quarterly. Information related to the education and training of program staff is provided in Table I.2.

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

Component	Education and initial training of staff	Ongoing training of staff
Responsible fatherhood workshops	Facilitators were male and female and held at least a bachelor's degree or at least four years of professional experience and received one day of certification initial training for each curriculum (24/7 Dad and InsideOut Dad) from curriculum developers.	Facilitators received quarterly refresher training through curriculum developer webinars (two hours per curriculum), and monthly scheduled staff trainings.
Financial Literacy workshops	Facilitators were male and female and held at least a bachelor's degree or at least four years of professional experience and received four hours of initial training from Certified Financial Institution (CFI).	Facilitators received two hours of refresher training from the CFI quarterly.

II. PROCESS/IMPLEMENTATION STUDY

This descriptive evaluation included a process and implementation study as well as an outcomes study component. This section focuses on the process/implementation component of the evaluation. As a descriptive process and implementation study, the primary goal was to describe the program implementation, relevant program changes that may have affected the program enrollment and outcome numbers and the satisfaction and perceptions of the participants. The research questions, study design, and findings for the process and implementation study are presented in this section. The findings discussed in this section will provide important context for the outcomes study findings outlined in Section III.

A. Research questions

The process/implementation study explored aspects related to program engagement, dosage, fidelity, and quality. The research questions for this component of the evaluation were:

1. To what extent did the program meet its process objective to provide workshops and case management to 1,350 fathers?
   a. How many fathers were enrolled?
   b. How many enrolled fathers engaged in a first service?
2. To what extent did participants in the program complete 75 percent of the required workshops?
   a. How many enrolled fathers engaged in at least 75 percent of the required workshop hours?
   b. What demographic, social, socioeconomic characteristics appear to influence workshop and case management participation?
3. Were all intended intervention components offered and for the expected duration? What were the unplanned adaptations to key intervention components?
4. Do participants in the program report satisfaction with the overall program and the program services they received?

B. Study design

1. Sample formation

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of North Florida (UNF), Jacksonville Florida approved the study plan and data collection process on April 14, 2016. The local evaluation team also received IRB approval for including incarcerated participants from the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Human Research Protections on May 2, 2016. Supplemental reviews were also conducted and approved by the UNF IRB: March 21, 2017, October 20, 2017, March 31, 2018, March 28, 2019, July 18, 2019, and April 1, 2020. In April 2019, after learning of two (2) adverse events with incarcerated participants, the UNF IRB suspended all local evaluation data collection and analysis of data obtained in those facilities. As

a result, while administrative and attendance data from nFORM is included in this analysis, all analyses of local survey data include only community participants.

For research questions one (1) through three (3) of the process/implementation evaluation, the sample includes all male participants (community and incarcerated) who completed the enrollment process into the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program and had an enrollment date in nFORM. nFORM was the database used by all Administration for Children and Families (ACF) Responsible Fatherhood grantees to record and store administrative as well as survey data. This study utilized the administrative data for the process and outcomes components. While the program began implementation in June 2016, the research sample is limited to community and incarcerated participants who enrolled beginning April 1, 2018. Prior to this date, the program was not providing the entire series of the responsible fatherhood curricula and the workshop attendance data does not accurately reflect actual attendance. Limiting the sample to this enrollment period provides a more accurate picture of the program as it was intended to be implemented. In order to allow enough time for participants to complete the program, the incarcerated sample includes individuals who enrolled up until December 6, 2019 and the community sample includes those who enrolled up until February 11, 2020 for those who attended normal community workshop series and March 1, 2020 for those who attended accelerated community workshop series. The sample formation for process/implementation research question four (4) includes enrolled adult male community participants (April 1, 2018 to February 11, 2020 or March 1, 2020) who consented to the local evaluation research and completed a local post-test survey and/or participated in a focus group.

At program intake all potential participants were provided information on the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program, explained the benefits and expectations of the program, and the overall program goals. Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. intake personnel then explained the research component of the program to adult program participants and provided the written Consent for Research form and explained the goals and informed consent components of the research. There were no incentives offered for participating in the local evaluation. Participants who consented to being part of the local evaluation research component then signed the consent form and were provided a copy for their records. If a participant wished to not be part of the research study, and did not sign the consent, that participant did not complete local evaluation surveys. Local evaluation staff ensured all local evaluation survey data analyzed was from consented participants.

While the program was open to youth community fathers, all incarcerated and community participants enrolled into the program during the sampling frame period were adults 18 years old or older. The majority of enrolled participants for both incarcerated and community were between the ages of 25 and 44. While the program targeted fathers, females were permitted to enroll if they desired. Only males enrolled during the research time frame. The incarcerated and community participants varied in terms of race. The incarcerated fathers were predominantly non-Hispanic white males (56.8 percent) while the majority of community participants were non-Hispanic black males (65.3 percent). Sixty-one percent of incarcerated participants were married or claimed to be in a relationship. Just over half of their community counterparts had the same relationship status. Seventy percent incarcerated and 78.5 percent community participants had

obtained a high school diploma or GED equivalent. Seventy percent of incarcerated participants were unemployed compared to 60.6 percent of the community fathers. Less than one out of five community participants (18.8 percent) were employed full-time when they enrolled into the program (see Table II.1 for demographics).

The enrolled community participants who consented and completed a local post-test were quite similar to the overall enrolled community participants in terms of age, race/ethnicity, relationship status, education, and employment (see Table II.1). The only demographics recorded about the community focus group members were sex and race. The focus group participants consisted of 15 black and two (2) white males.

Table II.1. Characteristics of participants in implementation/process study

Characteristic	nFORM enrolled incarcerated participants	nFORM enrolled community participants	Local post-test survey community participants
Age (%)			
18 – 24 years	13.9	9.1	8.2
25 – 34 years	39.7	42.1	38.5
35 – 44 years	31.2	34.0	36.1
45 and older	15.1	14.8	17.2
Race/ethnicity (%)			
Hispanic	5.6	4.2	4.5
Non-Hispanic White	56.8	25.8	22.3
Non-Hispanic Black	29.7	65.3	68.8
Non-Hispanic Other	7.9	4.7	4.5
Married/partnered (%)	60.9	55.2	56.5
Biological/adopted Children Under 21 (mean/std. dev.)	2.0/1.9	2.7/2.4	2.7/2.6
Live w/at least one child all or most of the time (%)	51.3	50.6	55.2
Has high school diploma/GED (%)	70.3	78.5	78.0
Employment Status (%)			
Not employed	69.7	60.6	62.8
Employed full-time	20.1	18.8	19.0
Income Past 30 Days (%)			
Less than $500	77.0	70.3	68.5
$500 or more	23.0	29.7	31.5
Sample size	**332**	**213**	**124**

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey

Notes: Includes participants enrolled on or after April 1, 2018 until December 6, 2019 for incarcerated participants, until February 11, 2020 for community participants who attended normal community workshop series, and March 1, 2020 for community participants who attended accelerated community workshop series.

The details of the sample formation for the outcomes study are presented in Section III of this report. The same enrollment period was used for the outcomes study as the process/implementation study outlined above. The only eligibility criteria for the local evaluation research was that individuals be adult males. All enrolled adult males were provided an opportunity to participate in the local evaluation. There was no purposive sampling. Therefore, the outcomes study sample includes enrolled community participants who consented to the local research and completed the local pre- and post-test evaluation surveys.

2. Data collection

Data for the process/implementation study came from a variety of sources. One of the primary sources of data for this evaluation is the nFORM database. nFORM data, including enrollment date, workshop sessions and attendance, individual service contacts, and Applicant Characteristics survey data, were used to answer research questions one (1) and two (2). This data was collected by intervention staff. The nFORM Applicant Characteristics survey was collected during each individual's enrollment and the enrollment date was generated in nFORM once the participant completed the survey and intervention staff entered the participant's service assignment. The workshop attendance and individual service contacts were collected at all sessions delivered. The program evaluation relied upon nFORM workshop sessions data, 6-month and annual progress reports, and evaluation staff notes to understand program implementation and address research question three (3). nFORM workshop sessions data was collected by intervention staff for all sessions delivered and progress reports were written by the program director bi-annually. Evaluation staff regularly attended program staff meetings and collected notes. Finally, research question four (4) regarding participant satisfaction was answered with local post-test survey and focus group data from community participants. The local evaluation post-test survey was collected by intervention staff after participants completed their final workshop. Post-test surveys assessed client's self-efficacy, engagement, and program satisfaction. If a participant indicated that he was no longer going to attend the workshops, program staff attempted to administer the local evaluation survey even if the participant had not completed all required workshops. Three (3) focus groups were conducted by evaluation staff over the course of the analysis period with community participants in order to obtain more qualitative reflections of the program. Refer to Table II.2 for the data sources used for each process and implementation research question.

Table II.2. Data used to address process/implementation research questions

Implementation element	Research question	Data source	Timing/frequency of data collection	Party responsible for data collection
Engagement	To what extent did the program meet its process objective to provide workshops and case management to 1,350 fathers?	Enrollment, workshop session attendance, and individual contact data in nFORM	All enrollments; all sessions delivered;	Intervention staff
Dosage	To what extent did participants in the program complete 75% of the required workshops?	Workshop session attendance in nFORM Applicant Characteristics survey	All Sessions Delivered	Intervention staff
Fidelity	Were all intended intervention components offered and for the expected duration?	Workshop sessions in nFORM; Evaluation staff notes; 6-month progress report; annual progress report	Ad hoc; bi-annually	Intervention staff; Evaluation staff; program director
Fidelity	What were the unplanned adaptations to key intervention components?	Evaluation staff notes; 6-month progress report; annual progress report	Ad hoc; bi-annually	Evaluation staff; program director
Quality	Do participants in the program report satisfaction with the overall program and the program services they received?	Local Evaluation post survey; Focus groups	Immediately after completion of last workshop; Ad hoc	Intervention staff; Evaluation staff

3. Data preparation and measures

As outlined in Table II.3, a variety of measures were examined for the process/implementation study. The statistical package SPSS was used for all analyses in this investigation. The engagement measures examined included the nFORM database counts on number of clients enrolled for each population: incarcerated and community. A percentage was calculated dividing the actual number enrolled by the target enrollment for the sampling frame period for each population. Engagement in first service was measured by the percentage of enrolled participants who attended at least one (1) workshop or received at least one (1) service contact. All service contacts collected in nFORM were included in the analyses regardless of contact method and issue addressed.

The dosage measure included the percentage of enrolled participants who completed at least 75 percent of the required workshop hours. A comparison of baseline characteristics between those who completed at least 75 percent of the required workshops and those who did not for each population (community and incarcerated) was also conducted.

Fidelity measures included information from the nFORM database, including the total number of session series delivered and the percentage of completed sessions. This data was analyzed for all

required workshops and the populations served. Additional fidelity measures included notations of program adaptations in evaluation staff notes and bi-annual program progress reports.

Satisfaction levels were measured by the percentage of participants who strongly agreed or agreed to statements regarding their satisfaction with the program which were included in the local evaluation post-test survey and through results from periodic focus groups with community participants. Content analysis was conducted with the qualitative data from the focus groups. One evaluation staff member was responsible for coding (inductive) and identifying themes within the data.

Table II.3. Measures used to address process/implementation research questions

Implementation element	Research question	Measures
Participation	To what extent did the program meet its process objective to provide workshops and case management to 1,350 fathers?	• Total number of participants (incarcerated and community) enrolled in Fatherhood Pride as indicated in nFORM data • Percentage of target enrollment • Percentage of participants who engaged in first service
Dosage	To what extent did participants in the program complete 75% of the required workshops?	• Percentage of participants attending 75% of required sessions as indicated in nFORM.
Fidelity	Were all intended intervention components offered and for the expected duration?	• Total number of series delivered during timeframes • Percent series completely delivered
Fidelity	What were the unplanned adaptations to key intervention components?	• List of unplanned adaptations, such as change in timing of sessions, and components eliminated from the program
Quality	Do participants in the program report satisfaction with the overall program and the program services they received?	• Percentage of respondents who agree with satisfaction questions.

C. Findings and analysis approach

Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. was predominately implemented during the research time frame as intended and overall community participants reported being satisfied with the program. The intervention nearly achieved its enrollment goals and succeeded in engaging nearly all enrolled participants in a first service during the study period. The intervention retained more than half of the enrolled community and incarcerated participants for at least 75 percent of the 30 required workshop hours. All intended intervention components were offered and a great majority of them were offered for the expected duration. There were some unplanned adaptations to key

intervention components during the earlier part of the research time frame, primarily related to the self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshops.

1. **To what extent did the program meet its process objective to provide workshops and case management to 1,350 fathers?**
   - How many fathers were enrolled?
   - How many enrolled fathers engaged in a first service?

a. Key findings

The intervention originally proposed to enroll 150 participants the first fiscal year and 300 participants a fiscal year for the remaining four (4) years; 150 of each the incarcerated and the community father populations. In all, Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. enrolled 538 community and 627 incarcerated fathers, as well as 23 women up until the end of the research sample frame. This represents approximately 90 percent of the program's initial target and Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. was on track to meet their goal.

In Spring 2018, the program was reorganized, and the actual research sample frame included in the analysis below, was reduced to include only those clients enrolled after April 2018. The sampling frame periods were estimated to be 20 months for the incarcerated and 23 months for the community fathers. The target enrollments for the time period therefore calculated to 250 incarcerated and 287 community participants. Over the study period, the intervention enrolled 332 incarcerated fathers, 32.8 percent over its target enrollment, and 213 community participants, 74.2 percent of its goal. Of the incarcerated population, 95.8 percent engaged in a first service compared to 99.5 percent of the community population. Engagement in first service was measured by the percentage of enrolled participants who attended at least one (1) workshop or received at least one (1) service contact. All service contacts collected in nFORM were included in the analyses regardless of contact method and issue addressed.

2. **To what extent did participants in the program complete 75 percent of the required workshops?**
   - How many enrolled fathers engaged in at least 75 percent of the required workshop hours?
   - What demographic, social, socioeconomic characteristics appear to influence workshop and case management participation?

a. Key findings

The intervention was successful in retaining more than half of the enrolled community and incarcerated participants for at least 75 percent of the 30 required workshop hours. Fifty-two percent of enrolled incarcerated fathers completed at least 75 percent of the required workshop hours and 62.0 percent of community participants completed 75 percent or more of the hours.

The intervention included two (2) required workshop series for participants; a responsible fatherhood curriculum and a self-sufficiency/financial literacy curriculum. Both responsible fatherhood curricula, the InsideOut Dad series for incarcerated fathers and the 24/7 Dad series

for community fathers, were 24 hours each. The financial literacy included six (6) hours of curricula culminating in 30 hours of required workshop hours. Anyone attending more than 22 hours of the required workshop hours according to their population assignment was considered to have completed at least 75 percent of the workshops and was included in the analyses.

As seen in Table II.4, the incarcerated fathers who attended less than 75 percent of the required workshop hours were fairly similar in demographic characteristics to those who completed at least 75 percent. The two (2) groups of incarcerated men differed significantly in terms of race/ethnicity, employment status, and income. Eight percent of those who completed less than 75 percent were Hispanic compared to only 3.7 percent of those who attended 75 percent or more. Additionally, non-Hispanic blacks represented a smaller proportion of those who did not complete at least 75 percent (23.0 percent) than those who did (35.4 percent). Incarcerated men who completed at least 75 percent of the required workshop hours were more likely to be unemployed (76.2 percent) and earn less than $500 the previous month (82.4 percent) than those who did not attend as many hours (62.3 percent and 70.7 percent respectively).

Community fathers who completed less than 75 percent of the required workshop hours somewhat reflected the demographic characteristics of those who attended 75 percent or more. Significant differences included age and income. Community participants who completed less than 75 percent of the hours tended to be slightly younger than the community fathers who attended more than 75 percent of the workshop hours. Contrary to their incarcerated counterparts, community fathers who attended at least 75 percent of the hours were less likely to earn below $500 the previous month (65.0 percent) than those who did not (78.7 percent).

Table II.4. Workshop completion and participant characteristics

Characteristic	Incarcerated participants who completed at least 75% of the required workshop hours	Incarcerated participants who completed less than 75% of the required workshop hours (p-value)	Community participants who completed at least 75% of the required workshop hours	Community participants who completed less than 75% of the required workshop hours (p-value)
Age (%)		(0.70)		(0.09)*
18 – 24 years	13.4	14.6	10.1	7.5
25 – 34 years	37.2	42.4	39.5	46.3
35 – 44 years	33.7	28.5	31.0	38.8
45 and older	15.7	14.6	19.4	7.5
Race/ethnicity (%)[a]		(0.06)*		(0.60)
Hispanic	3.7	7.9	4.2	4.3
Non-Hispanic White	54.3	59.7	25.0	27.1
Non-Hispanic Black	35.4	23.0	66.7	62.9
Non-Hispanic Other	6.7	9.4	4.2	5.7
Married/partnered (%)	58.6	63.6 (0.38)	56.7	52.7 (0.59)
Biological/adopted Children Under 21 (mean/std. dev.)	2.0/2.2	2.0/1.5 (0.28)	2.62.6	2.82.0 (0.12)
Live w/at least one child all or most of the time (%)	50.4	52.3 (0.79)	52.0	48.5 (0.66)
Has high school diploma/GED (%)	72.0	68.4 (0.48)	81.9	73.1 (0.14)
Employment Status (%)		(0.02)**		(0.77)
Not employed	76.2	62.3	58.9	63.3
Employed full-time	16.9	23.8	20.2	16.5
Income Past 30 Days (%)		(0.02)**		(0.04)**
Less than $500	82.4	70.7	65.0	78.7
$500 or more	17.6	29.3	35.0	21.3
Sample size	**174**	**158**	**132**	**81**

* Significantly different at the .10 level, two-tailed test.

** Significantly different at the .05 level, two-tailed test.

Notes: p-values are included in parentheses. Categorical data was compared between each of the incarcerated and community groups of participants using chi-square. Significance is indicated in the row of the corresponding variable.

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey

[a]: ethnicity/race compared between non-Hispanic black and all others among community participants due to low cell values

3. Were all intended intervention components offered and for the expected duration? What were the unplanned adaptations to key intervention components?

a. Key findings

All intended intervention components were offered and a great majority of them were offered for the expected duration during the research time frame. During the research time frame, Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. offered 68 24/7 Dad workshop series and 40 self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshop series for community participants. Thirty-six InsideOut Dad workshop series and 36 financial literacy workshop series were offered for incarcerated fathers. Overall, 88.9 percent of the workshop series were offered for the expected duration. There were a few unplanned adaptations to key intervention components during the study time frame, primarily related to the self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshops and early in the research time frame.

Workshop sessions data entered into nFORM by Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. staff were examined for each workshop series offered during the research time frame. Series were simply totaled per workshop, track, and population served. The number of sessions completed and cancelled per series was also tallied to determine the extent to which the program was successfully implemented as designed and on time. In addition to planned series, the program offered make-up sessions to allow fathers to attend sessions they had missed. These make-up series were not included in the analyses.

During the research time frame, Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. offered 68 series of 24/7 Dad workshops for community fathers. Three-fourths of these series were offered in Duval County; 25 normal track and 26 accelerated. The remaining series were provided in outlying counties of the service area, which were less likely to be completed. Overall, 86.8 percent of the 24/7 Dad workshop series were offered in their entirety, while 29.4 percent of the series in the outlying counties had at least one cancelled class.

Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. offered 40 self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshop series to community fathers. A vast majority (92.5 percent) of the series provided all of the classes. All but three (3) series were offered in Duval County. As discussed in response to the second part of this research question below, there were some challenges implementing the financial literacy workshop series early in the grant period. These challenges were not fully remedied during the study time frame and appear to be reflected in these numbers. Given the intended implementation of offering financial literacy during the 24/7 Dad series, one would expect there to be an equal number of series for each of the workshops. However, there are only 58.8 percent as many financial literacy series as 24/7 Dad workshop series. It is important to note that community participants had an online option to complete the financial literacy workshop.

While most of the community workshop series were offered in Duval County, InsideOut Dad and financial literacy for incarcerated fathers were provided more often in the surrounding counties. Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. offered a total of 36 InsideOut Dad workshop series; 15 in Duval County and 21 in outlying counties. Overall, 83.3 percent of the InsideOut Dad series were completed without any cancelled classes.

Thirty-six financial literacy workshop series were offered to incarcerated fathers during the research time period; 13 in Duval County and 23 in outlying counties. These workshop series were completed 94.4 percent of the time. Although there were an equal number of InsideOut Dad and financial literacy series offered to incarcerated fathers, they were not similarly distributed among the counties. For instance, there were 15 InsideOut series in Duval, but only 13 financial literacy series.

For the second part of this research question, local evaluation staff examined 6-month and annual progress reports written by the program director, and evaluation staff notes for notations of any changes related to key components of the program.

One of the unplanned adaptations to the financial literacy workshops entailed the curriculum. The original self-sufficiency/financial literacy curriculum proposed was United Way's RealSense. However, there were obstacles early in the grant delivering the workshop to the Fatherhood participants. In particular, establishing formal partnerships for program referrals and lining up the appropriate financial literacy programs. As a result, after some delay the program partnered with BBVA Compass bank who facilitated financial literacy workshops for the community program participants. This curriculum was taught until October 2018, during the research time frame. During the Summer of 2018, Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. successfully partnered with United Way to offer the RealSense curriculum to community and incarcerated program participants as intended. These RealSense workshops began June 2018 and continued throughout the remainder of the program. While online RealSense workshops were an intended option for the self-sufficiency/financial literacy component of the program, the option was not available for community participants until December 2018. Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. staff were certified in the RealSense curriculum in November 2018 in order to facilitate workshops, if needed.

In August 2018, a full-time workshop facilitator was hired to facilitate workshops primarily for Duval County community participants. Prior to this, Fatherhood staff served dual roles as workshop facilitators and case managers. By hiring a full-time facilitator, the other staff were able to devote more time to case management. This arrangement required open communication and collaboration between the facilitator and case managers to best serve the program participants and track their progress.

Finally, the program was forced to adapt due to the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020. Face-to-face classes ended March 19th. The program quickly responded by offering online 24/7 Dad and financial literacy classes to the community participants via GoToMeeting March 23rd.

4. Do participants in the program report satisfaction with the overall program and the program services they received?

a. Key findings

Virtually all the community participants who completed a local post-test survey (N= 124) during the sample time frame reported satisfaction with the intervention overall as well as various components of the intervention. Ninety-nine percent of the fathers who responded agreed that

they were satisfied with the 24/7 Dad workshops and their individual contacts with their case manager helped keep them moving toward their goals. Ninety-eight percent agreed that they were satisfied with the intervention overall. All of the responding community participants claimed to be pleased with their progress in the program and would recommend the program to other fathers. Community focus group participants spoke favorably about the program, facilitators, and case managers.

In the local evaluation post-test survey, community participants were given a series of statements related to the program and asked how much they agreed to each. A Likert scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree was used. The analyses included any consented community participant enrolled during the research time frame who completed a post-test survey regardless of the number of workshop hours they attended.

Focus group discussions focused on the experiences and perceptions of the community participants. Throughout the community focus groups most of the men described the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. workshops as a support group where they experienced camaraderie and a "brotherhood." The men explained they were learning not just from the workshop facilitators, but from one another. One father explained, "[it is] a safe place for vulnerability." Another focus group participant stated,

[the workshops] act as an outlet for the men emotionally and verbally. Allows for venting, talking to others in similar situations, and sharing stories with other men who have different experiences that they may run into. It provides a non-threatening, non-judgmental environment, contrasting that of a court room.

Approximately half of the participants shared their thoughts of the workshop facilitators and used terms like "good teacher and listener," "supportive," "non-judgmental," "wonderful," and "relatable." One father explained, "He's not all about the book per se. He uses real life examples and learning and coordinating with the material." The focus group participants discussed how helpful the facilitators were with a variety of issues including communication skills, disciplining children, workforce development, finances, and child support.

About half of the focus group participants shared that the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. case managers had helped them, particularly in terms of navigating the child support system and workforce development. One father explained that he was backed up with child support for two (2) years and facing jail time, but his case manager presented progress from his participation in the program and he was spared time in jail. Another instance was shared where a program member was unaware of an upcoming court appearance, but his case manager informed him of the date and potentially saved him from missing the date and subsequent consequences. Approximately one-third of the focus group members used words such as "genuine," "attentive," and "helpful" when describing the case managers. One father said, "[they're] always there for you. Attentive. Goes above and beyond." A couple of the men explained that the case managers worked collaboratively for solutions and provided members with referrals for services the program did not provide.

III. OUTCOMES STUDY

In addition to a process evaluation, this descriptive evaluation included an outcomes study component. The outcome study set out to determine whether community participants gained knowledge in responsible fatherhood, co-parenting skills, and financial literacy, self-efficacy in paying child support, and increased engagement with their children. The following section outlines the research questions, study design, findings and analysis approach of the outcomes study.

A. Research questions

Primary Research Questions include:

1. Increased knowledge gain
   - Do community participants who complete the program increase knowledge gains in financial literacy, co-parenting skills, and responsible fatherhood/family relationships after participating in program as measured by pre- post-test measures adapted from curriculum?
2. Increased self-efficacy
   - Do community participants who complete the program increase self-efficacy to pay for child support after participating in program as measured by pre- post-test?
3. Increased engagement
   - Do community participants who complete the program increase self-reported engagement with their children after participating in program as measured by pre- post-test?

B. Study design

1. Sample formation

The Institutional Review Board at the University of North Florida, Jacksonville Florida approved the study plan and data collection process on April 14, 2016. The local evaluation team also received IRB approval for including incarcerated participants from the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Human Research Protections on May 2, 2016. Supplemental reviews were also conducted and approved by the UNF IRB: March 21, 2017, October 20, 2017, March 31, 2018, March 28, 2019, July 18, 2019, and April 1, 2020. In April 2019, after learning of two adverse events with incarcerated participants, the UNF IRB suspended all local evaluation data collection in those facilities. As a result, all analyses of local survey data include only community participants.

The same enrollment period was used for the outcomes study as the process/implementation study outlined above - April 1, 2018 through February 11, 2020 for those who attended normal community workshops series and through March 1, 2020 for those who attended accelerated community workshop series. The only eligibility criteria for the local evaluation research was that individuals be adult males. All adult males who enrolled into the program were provided an opportunity to participate in the local evaluation. There was no purposive sampling. Therefore,

the outcomes study sample includes enrolled community participants who consented to the local research.

At program intake all potential participants were provided information on the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program, explained the benefits and expectations of the program, and the overall program goals. Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. intake personnel then explained the research component of the program to adult program participants and provided the written Consent for Research form and explained the goals informed consent components of the research. There were no incentives offered for participating in the local evaluation. Participants who consented to being part of the research then signed the consent form and were provided a copy for their records. If a participant wished to not be part of the research study, and did not sign the consent, that participant did not complete local evaluation surveys. Local evaluation staff ensured all local evaluation survey data analyzed was from consented participants.

2. Data collection

Data for these analyses was based on two (2) primary sources: local evaluation pre- and post-test surveys developed by research team members assessing gains in knowledge, self-efficacy, and engagement and the nFORM Applicant Characteristics survey for demographic data. The nFORM system was the database used by all Responsible Fatherhood grantees to record and store administrative as well as survey data. The local evaluation instrument also included the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) survey taken by participants at pre-test.

The local evaluation surveys and nFORM Applicant Characteristics survey were administered by the intervention staff and were available for participants to complete online or via paper. The nFORM Applicant Characteristics survey was administered at program intake. The local evaluation pre-test survey was administered at or prior to the first workshop attended by the participant while the local evaluation post-test survey was completed after the final workshop. If a participant indicated that he was no longer going to attend the workshops, program staff attempted to administer the local evaluation post-test survey even if the participant had not completed all required workshops (see Table III.1 for an overview of data collection).

Table III.1. Sources of data used to address outcomes study research questions

Data source	Timing of data collection	Mode of data collection	Start and end date of data collection
Community Intervention participants	Prior to or at the first workshop	In-person online or paper nFORM Applicant Characteristics	April 2018 through February 2020
Community Intervention participants	Prior to or at the first workshop	In-person online or paper local evaluation pre-test survey	April 2018 through February 2020
Community Intervention participants	After completing the last workshop	In-person online or paper local evaluation post-test survey	May 2018 through March 2020

3. Analytic sample, outcomes, and descriptive statistics

While the eligibility criteria to be included in the local evaluation research was broad, not all of local survey data collected was analyzed. To best answer the outcome research questions, an analytic sample was constructed and is described below in this section of the report. Also outlined in this section are the outcome measures and the characteristics of the analytic sample.

It was determined that the analytic sample for the outcome analyses would include all consented community program participants enrolled in the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program who attended at least 75 percent of required workshop hours (either the normal track or the accelerated track). The 75 percent participation threshold was determined based on two (2) considerations. First, given the socio-economic and employment obstacles facing the intervention's target population, expecting perfect attendance at the program sessions was determined to be an extraordinarily high bar for participants. Thus, allowing for some flexibility seemed to be reasonable. Second, program and evaluation staff believed that the 75 percent attendance threshold would be enough dosage for the knowledge, self-efficacy, and engagement measures of the program. The analytic sample for each of the outcome research questions also only includes consented community participants who completed both a local evaluation pre- and post-test survey. The final criteria for eligibility in the analytic sample was that participants had to have at least three (3) outcome measures at pre-test. The final analytic sample resulted in 104 adult community fathers.

Respondents who answered at least 80 percent of the items in a scale at baseline were included in the analyses. All others were excluded from the individual outcome analyses. Zeroes were imputed for missing data with at least 80 percent of a knowledge scale (fatherhood, co-parenting, and financial literacy). Zeroes were selected because the responses were coded as zero (0) for incorrect responses or one (1) for correct answers. Like a quiz, an unanswered response would result in an incorrect answer. Means were imputed for missing items for those who had at answered at least 80 percent of the self-efficacy in paying child support or engagement with youngest child scale. Again, this imputation was only conducted with the scales at baseline. Given the target populations and the unique nature of this program group, imputing missing data techniques were not used for any other data variables.

Attrition was a concern for the outcome evaluation research from the beginning and efforts were made to minimize attrition throughout data collection, particularly during the study time frame period. The intervention staff and evaluation team worked with the Evaluation Team Technical Assistance Liaison and Family Program Specialist to improve data collection by program staff and collect post-test surveys for as many participants as possible. This team included the program representative from The Department of Health and Human Services and a technical specialist from the Mathematica corporation. In addition to closely monitoring participants' progress and survey response rates, intervention staff revisited files to assess whether information had been entered, conducted additional follow-ups with participants who had not completed surveys and received additional staff training on the data collection procedures. Despite these efforts some attrition still occurred. Indeed, the attrition rate from program enrollment to the post-test survey was 51.2 percent (see Table III.2). Attrition occurred for a variety of reasons including participants not meeting the analytic sample criteria. Participants also dropped out of the program without completing a post-test survey and failed to return despite efforts to bring them back. Some attrition occurred because the facilitator was unaware the individual was completing their final workshop and subsequently was not provided the opportunity to complete the post-test survey. Additionally, the accelerated track was less than 28 days, the minimum time allotted between the nFORM Entrance and Exit surveys. In order to make it less confusing for intervention staff, the local evaluation post-test survey was to be taken when the nFORM Exit survey was completed. Sometimes staff were unable to contact and/or convince participants to return to complete the post-test surveys. Attrition analyses are located in Appendix B.

Table III.2. Outcomes study analytic sample

Number of individuals	Number of individuals
Enrolled in the program	213
Completed a baseline survey	121
Completed post-program survey (accounts for item non-response and any other analysis restrictions)	104
Attrition rate (%)	51.2

Source: nFORM enrollment, local evaluation pre- and post-test surveys

Notes: The number of individuals who completed a baseline survey includes everyone who completed at least 75 percent of the required workshop hours and had at least three (3) outcome measures.

As seen in Table III.3, the analytic sample was similar to the overall enrolled community fathers except they were slightly older. The analytic sample fathers were predominately non-Hispanic black (70.4 percent) and the between the ages of 25 and 44 (71.6 percent). A majority of the fathers were married or partnered (57.7 percent) with an average of 2.8 biological or adopted children under 21. Just over half of the analytics sample (54.9 percent) lived with at least one child most or all of the time. Approximately eight out of ten of the fathers had earned at least a high school diploma or GED equivalent. Sixty-one percent of the men were unemployed and nearly two-thirds had earned less than $500 the previous 30 days.

Overall, the fathers in the program, although scoring low on what they knew about fatherhood appeared to fall in the mid-range score area on skill measures and self-efficacy. Fathers of the analytic sample scored fairly low on the fatherhood knowledge scale at pre-test with an average of 1.9 on a scale of zero (0) to six (6). Conversely, the men scored relatively higher on the co-parenting and financial literacy scales at 3.6 (0 to 6) and 4.3 (0 to 5) respectively. The average self-efficacy to pay child support score was 360.1 (0 to 600) at baseline for the analytic sample. The men averaged 13.8 on the engagement scale (0 to 24) at baseline.

The attrition analyses (see Appendix B) indicate that the demographic characteristics were not significantly different between the outcomes study analytic sample and those who did not complete a local evaluation post-test survey. The only significant difference found in the baseline characteristics occurred between the financial management knowledge scores. The study experienced relatively high attrition. However, tests of difference in baseline characteristics between the enrolled sample and the sample with complete post-test data showed few statistically significant differences. This suggests the study results may generalize to the enrolled sample.

Table III.3. Characteristics of participants in the outcomes study at baseline

Characteristic	Average at baseline
Age (%)	
18 – 24 years	8.8
25 – 34 years	40.2
35 – 44 years	31.4
45 and older	19.6
Race/ethnicity (%)	
Hispanic	4.1
Non-Hispanic White	21.4
Non-Hispanic Black	70.4
Non-Hispanic Other	4.1
Married/partnered (%)	57.7
Biological / adopted Children Under 21 (mean/std. dev.)	2.8/2.8
Live w/ at least one child all or most of the time (%)	54.9
Has high school diploma/GED (%)	79.2
Employment Status (%)	
Not employed	61.4
Employed full-time	19.8
Income Past 30 Days (%)	
Less than $500	65.2
$500 or more	34.8
Has child support orders/arrearages (%)	62.6
ACE Score (mean/std. dev.)	2.7/2.7

Characteristic	Average at baseline
Knowledge in fatherhood (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 6)	1.9/1.2
Knowledge in co-parenting (mean (std. dev.)) (range: 0 to 6)	3.6/1.1
Knowledge in financial literacy (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 5)	4.3/0.8
Self-efficacy paying child support (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 600)	360.1/185.6
Engagement with youngest child (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 24)	13.8/9.3
Sample size	104

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics survey and local evaluation pre-test survey

Notes: Higher scores for the knowledge, self-efficacy, and engagement scales equate to higher levels of understanding and/or success within the related construct.

The outcome measure for knowledge in responsible fatherhood was a scale constructed from six (6) questions based on the fatherhood curriculum. The six (6) questions came from the 24/7 Dad (3rd Edition) AM Fathering Survey which includes 22 About Fathering questions. The questions selected for the scale included multiple choice and true/false questions. For example, one question was "Two good ways to talk with my children are: tell them to focus on the goal and listen to their mom, tell them to focus on what they learn and listen to their mom, don't give them a bad label and tell them to listen to their teachers, honor what they want and don't give them a bad label, or I'm not sure." The scale was a sum of the number of correctly answered questions resulting in a scale of zero (0) to six (6) for the pre- and post-test surveys.

The outcome measure for knowledge in co-parenting skills was also constructed with six (6) different questions based on the fatherhood curriculum. Two (2) were multiple choice questions selected from the About Fathering section of the 24/7 Dad (3rd Edition) AM Fathering Survey and the other four (4) questions were written by the local evaluation team. The four (4) questions were Likert-style questions (strongly agree to strongly disagree) focused on communication. One such question was "To communicate well, you should use statements that begin with "I" when expressing yourself." The scale was a sum of the number of correctly answered questions for each survey (0 to 6).

The outcome measure for knowledge in financial literacy was a scale created with five (5) true/false questions written by the local evaluation team based on the financial literacy curriculum. Questions included, "One way to build credit is to pay your bills on time" and "You will not pay more than the original amount charged to your credit card as long as you pay the minimum payment required." The scale was a sum of the number of correctly answered questions ranging from zero (0) to five (5) for the pre- and post-test surveys.

The outcome measure for self-efficacy of paying child support was constructed with six (6) scenarios related to paying child support. These scenarios were constructed by the evaluation team based on research identifying barriers to paying child support. All of the scenarios began

with “I can pay child support even if” and examples included “I don’t think it is a fair amount” and “I have not seen my children in a while.” The scale (0 to 600) was calculated from the total of six (6) scores ranging from zero (0) to 100 participants assigned to the scenarios (see Appendix C for scales in the local post-test survey).

The outcome measure for engagement with their youngest child was a scale created with a set of six (6) questions of how often the participants engaged in particular activities with their youngest child. These questions were selected and adapted from all 4 (four) versions of the Fatherhood Research and Practice Network (FRPN) Father Engagement Scale (Dyer et al., 2015) that has been validated with fathers representative of those who attend fatherhood programs in the US. Each of the FRPN Father Engagement Scale versions focuses upon engagement activities for a specific age group. The evaluation team decided to ask about engagement with the father’s youngest child in order to simplify the set of questions. Knowing that the ages of the youngest child would vary, the questions were selected and adapted to be suitable for any age of the child. All of the questions began with “How often have you in the last month” and activity examples included “fed or had a meal with your youngest child” and “watched over or cared for your youngest child when other adults were not around.” Each of these questions were coded on a scale of zero (Never) to four (Every day) as directed by FRPN’s scoring guide and then added for a total score (0 to 24).

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted for each of the measures described above using SPSS. A Cronbach alpha of 0.70 or higher was required for each measure to establish reliability. As seen in Table III.4, the Cronbach alphas ranged from zero to 0.30 for all of the knowledge scales (fatherhood, co-parenting, and financial literacy). The Cronbach alphas did not meet the 0.70 criteria even after adjusting scale items. Therefore, these research questions were not included in any further analyses. Possible explanations for these low results are presented in the Discussion and Conclusions section of this report. The Cronbach alphas for the self-efficacy of paying child support and engagement with their youngest child were acceptable at 0.90 or higher.

Table III.4. Outcome measures used to answer the outcomes study research questions

Outcome name	Description of the outcome measure	Source of the measure	Timing of measure
Knowledge in fatherhood[1]	A scale (value range 0 to 6) calculated from the number of correctly answered questions out of 6 questions measuring fatherhood knowledge (Questions 1 – 6) **Cronbach's alpha:** 0.23	Local evaluation pre-test survey	Prior to or at the first workshop
Knowledge in fatherhood	A scale (value range 0 to 6) calculated from the number of correctly answered questions out of 6 questions measuring fatherhood knowledge (Questions 1 – 6) **Cronbach's alpha:** 0.00	Local evaluation post-test survey	Immediately after completion of last workshop
Knowledge in co-parenting	A scale (value range 0 to 6) calculated from the number of correctly answered questions out of 6 questions measuring co-parenting knowledge (Questions 7 – 9) **Cronbach's alpha:** 0.16	Local evaluation pre-test survey	Prior to or at the first workshop
Knowledge in co-parenting	A scale (value range 0 to 6) calculated from the number of correctly answered questions out of 6 questions measuring co-parenting knowledge (Questions 7 – 9) **Cronbach's alpha:** 0.03	Local evaluation post-test survey	Immediately after completion of last workshop
Knowledge in financial literacy	A scale (value range 0 to 5) calculated from the number of correctly answered questions out of 5 questions measuring financial literacy (Question 14) **Cronbach's alpha:** 0.30	Local evaluation pre-test survey	Prior to or at the first workshop
Knowledge in financial literacy	A scale (value range 0 to 5) calculated from the number of correctly answered questions out of 5 questions measuring financial literacy (Question 16) **Cronbach's alpha:** 0.28	Local evaluation post-test survey	Immediately after completion of last workshop
Self-efficacy paying child support	A scale (value range from 0 to 600) calculated from the total of six scores assigned by respondents to six self-efficacy statements (Question 31). **Cronbach's alpha:** 0.90	Local evaluation pre-test survey	Prior to or at the first workshop
Self-efficacy paying child support	A scale (value range from 0 to 600) calculated from the total of six scores assigned by respondents to six self-efficacy statements (Question 32) **Cronbach's alpha:** 0.93	Local evaluation post-test survey	Immediately after completion of last workshop
Engagement with youngest child	A scale (value range from 0 to 24) calculated from the total of six scores assigned by respondents to six engagement statements (Question 10) **Cronbach's alpha:** 0.97	Local evaluation pre-test survey	Prior to or at the first workshop
Engagement with youngest child	A scale (value range from 0 to 24) calculated from the total of six scores assigned by respondents to six engagement statements (Question 10) **Cronbach's alpha:** 0.98	Local evaluation post-test survey	Immediately after completion of last workshop

C. Findings and analysis approach

The knowledge scales did not meet the acceptable threshold for reliability for this group of community participants. Therefore, analyses were not conducted to determine if community

[1] Scale item questions for the knowledge, self-efficacy, and engagement scales can be found in Appendix C

participants gained knowledge in these three domains after completing the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program. Additionally, there were no significant findings regarding self-efficacy in paying child support. While there was not an overall significant difference in fathers' engagement with their children between the surveys, participants with higher ACE scores had a significant increase in engagement mean scores at post-test.

1. Do community participants who complete the program increase knowledge gains in financial literacy, co-parenting skills, and responsible fatherhood/family relationships after participating in program as measured by pre- post-test measures adapted from curriculum?

a. Key findings

Not applicable due to low Cronbach alphas

2. Do community participants who complete the program increase self-efficacy to pay for child support after participating in program as measured by pre- post-test?

a. Key findings

Community participants did not increase their self-efficacy to pay for child support after participating in the program as measured by the local evaluation pre- and post-test surveys. The overall mean decreased by 8.35 points between the pre- and post-test survey, but the decrease was not statistically significant (see Table III.5). No significant patterns were found.

The outcome measures were analyzed with a one-way repeated measures ANOVA to determine if there was a difference in the mean self-efficacy scores between the local evaluation pre- and post-test surveys. The means were not statistically significant. Mixed ANOVAs were run to determine if any interactions between time and groups were significant, particularly between those who reported having child support orders or arrearages on the local evaluation pre-test survey and those who did not. There were no statistically significant interactions (0.05 or 0.10 level) when examining child support orders/arrearages, ACE, race, employment, or education.

Table III.5. Changes in outcome measures from baseline to follow-up

Outcome	Sample size	Mean outcome at baseline	Mean outcome at post-test	Difference in means	p-value of the difference
Self-efficacy paying child support (range: 0 to 600)	79	372.41	364.06	-8.35	0.74

Source: Local evaluation pre- and post-test surveys

Notes: Sample size is less than 104 due to item non-response.

3. Do community participants who complete the program increase self-reported engagement with their children after participating in program as measured by pre-post-test?

a. Key findings

Overall, community participants did not increase their self-reported engagement with their youngest child after participating in the program as measured by the local evaluation pre- and post-test surveys. The overall mean was virtually unchanged between the pre- and post-test surveys. The means decreased by 0.02 points, but the decrease was not statistically significant. Participants with high ACE scores increased their engagement scores between the two surveys.

The mean scores of engagement with youngest child were analyzed with a one-way repeated measures ANOVA to determine if there was a significant difference in the means between the local evaluation pre- and post-test surveys. As seen in Table III.6, the means were not statistically significant at the 0.05 or 0.10 level. Mixed ANOVAs were run to determine if any interactions were significant between time and groups. There were no statistically significant interactions when examining race, employment, or education. However, ACE score was found to have a significant interaction with time, $F(1, 85) = 4.6$, $p = 0.04$. Simple associations were analyzed for the ACE score groups and found that while the mean engagement scores were not significantly different between surveys for participants with low ACE scores, the engagement means were significantly higher at post-test than pre-test for fathers with high ACE scores. Pre- and post-test engagement means were significantly higher (at the 0.05 and 0.10 levels respectively) among the fathers with low ACE scores than those with high ACE scores. Participants with low ACE scores had a mean engagement score of 15.92 at pre-test and 15.19 at post-test. Mean engagement scores for fathers with high ACE scores were 8.38 at pre-test and 11.04 at post, a significant increase of 2.66, $F(1, 24) = 3.5$, $p = 0.07$. Thus, in general, participants with low ACE scores showed little change in engagement with their youngest child after participation in the program, whereas those with high ACE scores, while not matching engagement levels of the low ACE score group, showed significantly higher levels of engagement with their youngest child.

Table III.6. Changes in outcome measures from baseline to follow-up

Outcome	Sample size	Mean outcome at baseline	Mean outcome at post-test	Difference in means	p-value of the difference
Engagement with youngest child (range: 0 to 24)	92	13.93	13.91	-0.02	0.98
Low ACE score (less than 4)	62	15.92	15.19	-0.73	0.38
High ACE score (4 and over)	25	8.38	11.04	2.66	0.07*

*Significantly different at the .10 level, one-tailed test.

Source: Local evaluation pre- and post-test surveys

Notes: ACE sample sizes are less than 92 due to item non-response.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Overall findings of this study suggest Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. was implemented during the research time frame as intended and well received by community participants. The intervention nearly achieved its enrollment goals and succeeded in engaging nearly all enrolled participants in a first service during the study period. Enrollment of incarcerated fathers exceeded the target during the study period while community enrollment fell short of the population goal. This result may be partially explained by the processes and restrictions of the incarcerated facilities. Despite conversations between program and incarcerated facilities staff, workshop facilitators had little to no control in some of the facilities as to who was invited and/or came to the workshops. This lack of control potentially resulted in larger enrollment numbers but included men who were not well fitted for the program. For example, some men were enrolled and then transferred to another facility or released too soon to complete the program according to program staff. This in turn may have contributed to a smaller percentage of incarcerated fathers receiving 75 percent or more of the required workshop hours than the community fathers. On the other hand, recruitment for community fathers was contingent upon collaboration with the family courts and other community partners, and the program experienced inconsistent and lower referral numbers than anticipated. However, community fathers who enrolled in the program were more likely to complete the requisite hours.

Although findings suggest Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. was successfully implemented, the program faced some challenges implementing the self-sufficiency/financial literacy workshop series and retaining fathers for the duration of the required workshops. These challenges are not new to social service programs but reemphasize the importance of strong partnerships and finding solutions to participant retention. Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. was quick to offer required workshops online when COVID-19 caused face-to-face workshops to cease. While these online workshops provided an alternative for fathers to complete the program, this format may not foster the camaraderie the men discussed in the focus groups.

The knowledge scales (fatherhood, co-parenting, and financial literacy) created for this outcomes study did not meet the acceptable threshold for reliability for this group of community participants. These scales had five (5) to six (6) items, which may not have been enough questions to capture each construct. For example, the fatherhood knowledge questions came from a larger set of questions and were selected based on the session topics that were delivered at the beginning of the grant period before all sessions were offered to participants. Additionally, there was a subset of questions within the knowledge of co-parenting skills scale related to communication which would indicate that the low reliability may have been due to multiple constructs within the scale; however, the Cronbach's alpha remained low when including only those questions. Due to the unacceptable Cronbach's alphas analyses was not conducted to determine if community participants gained knowledge in these three domains after completing the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program.

There were no significant changes in self-efficacy in paying child support after program participation. While this scale was deemed reliable, there may be unknown variables that could

alter the results. For example, it is possible that not all fathers relate to the question items. Less than two-thirds of the fathers reported to have child support orders or arrearages on the local evaluation pre-test survey. Although the outcome study results did not find a significant difference in self-efficacy means between those with and without child support order/arrearages, the sample size was relatively small. Significant differences found between those who completed a post-test and/or self-efficacy scales and those who did not may have also affected the results. For example, those missing a self-efficacy scale had significantly higher income than those who did not. It stands to reason that those earning more income would be more likely to have higher levels of self-efficacy than those with lower income. If the data were more complete, the results may have been different. Future research may examine the possible effects of gaining or improving employment during the program on self-efficacy of paying child support.

There was not an overall significant difference in fathers' engagement with their children between the surveys. One possible explanation to the overall results lie in the timing of the pre- and post-test surveys. The original outcomes study aimed at measuring engagement with children as both a short-term and an intermediate outcome measured at a six-month follow-up after workshop completion. Unfortunately, the response rate for the local follow-up surveys was insufficient for data analyses even after implementing a $25 gift card incentive. Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. community participants could complete the required workshops within as little as three (3) to six (6) weeks, giving little time for fathers to change their levels of involvement with their children. While there was not an overall significant difference in fathers' engagement, participants with higher ACE scores had a significant increase in engagement mean scores at post-test. The ACE score interaction with engagement warrants further exploration and supports the importance of a trauma informed approach for program policies and procedures. Understanding the extent of childhood trauma also underscores the need for programs to focus and build upon participants' resiliency and protective factors.

Additional limitations to the outcomes study included post-test attrition, introducing potential bias into the results. This study was also limited and unable to examine the outcomes of the incarcerated population the program served after adverse events led to the cessation of that analyses.

Overall, the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program was implemented with fidelity and reached a large number of incarcerated and community fathers in Northeast Florida during the research time frame. After initial implementation approaches were updated, the program was able to successfully recruit new clients, and reduce attrition during the research time frame through increased staff engagement. While the outcomes study found no significant changes in self-efficacy for paying child support and minimal change in engagement with their children, fathers in the program appeared to be quite receptive of the materials presented, and the goals of the program. Indeed, the program was well-received by the community participants. Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. participants reported being overwhelmingly satisfied with the program and the program created a camaraderie for the fathers participating in the workshops. Although long-term "fatherhood" behaviors are not within the scope of the research on the Fatherhood P.R.I.D.E. program, such levels of satisfaction and camaraderie bode well for how future

programs may be implemented, and how improved fatherhood outcomes could improve communities in need.

V. REFERENCES

Adamsons, K. & Johnson, S. K. (2013). An updated and expanded meta-analysis of nonresident fathering and child well-being. *Journal of Family Psychology, 27*(4), 589-599. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033786

Anda, R. F., Felitti, V. J, Bremner, J. D., Walker, J. D., Whitfield, C., Perry, B. D., Dube, S. R., & Giles, W. H. (2006). The enduring effects of abuse and related adverse experiences in childhood: A convergence of evidence from neurobiology and epidemiology. *European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience, 256*, 174-186. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00406-005-0624-4

Avellar, S., Covington, R., Moore, Q., Patnaik, A., & Wu, A. (2018, June). Parents and Children Together: Effects of Four Responsible Fatherhood Programs for Low-income Fathers. https://www.mathematica.org/our-publications-and-findings/publications/parents-and-children-together-effects-of-four-responsible-fatherhood-programs-for-low-income-fathers

Baker, C. E., Kainz, K. L., & Reynolds, E. R. (2018). Family poverty, family processes and children's preschool achievement: Understanding the unique role of fathers. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 27*, 1242-1251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0947-6

Castillo, J., Welch, G., & Sarver, C. (2010). Fathering: The Relationship Between Fathers' Residence, Fathers' Sociodemographic Characteristics, and Father Involvement. *Maternal & Child Health Journal, 15*, 1342-1349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-010-0684-6

Dyer, J., Kaufman, R., Cabrera, N., Fagan, J., & Pearson, J. (2015, November). FRPN Research Measure: Father's Engagement (English and Spanish versions available). *Fatherhood Research and Practice Network*. https://www.frpn.org/asset/frpn-research-measure-fathers-engagement-english-and-spanish-versions-available

Florida Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (2019). Leading Florida Higher, Lifting Survivors Upward: Florida's Commitment to Ending Domestic Violence and Saving Lives. https://www.myflfamilies.com/service-programs/domestic-violence/docs/2019%20Annual%20%20Report.pdf

Florida Department of Health. (2020a). Florida Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. Adults who engage in heavy or binge drinking. http://www.flhealthcharts.com/charts/Brfss/DataViewer.aspx?bid=10&cid=2

Florida Department of Health. (2020b). Florida Department of Law Enforcement. Total Domestic Violence Offenses. http://www.flhealthcharts.com/charts/OtherIndicators/NonVitalIndNoGrpDataViewer.aspx?cid=0312

Hayward-Everson, R. A., Honegger, L., Glazebrook, A., Rabeno, S., & Yim, K. (2018). Predictors of father involvement in a sample of low-income men enrolled in a responsible fatherhood program. *Social Work Research, 42*(2), 84-94. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svy004

Henry, J. B., Julion, W. A., Bounds, D. T., & Sumo, J. (2020). Fatherhood matters: An integrative review of fatherhood intervention research. *The Journal of School Nursing, 36*(1), 19-32. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059840519873380

Jeynes, W. H. (2015). A meta-analysis: The relationship between father involvement and student academic achievement. *Urban Education, 50*(4), 387-423. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085914525789

US Census Bureau. (2019). *Selected Social Characteristics, 2014 – 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates*. https://data.census.gov/cedsci/

Waller, M. R. & Swisher, R. (2006). Father's risk factors in fragile families: Implications for "healthy" relationships and father involvement. *Social Problems, 53*(3), 392-420. https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2006.53.3.392

VI. APPENDICES

A. Outcomes Study Data Cleaning and preparation

The local evaluation pre- and post-test surveys of consented community participants were merged into one SPSS file with the nFORM ID as a key variable. Knowledge scale items were recoded to identify correct and incorrect responses. Mean imputation was conducted for missing data on pre-test scales with at least 80 percent data response. Scales with more than 20 percent missing data were excluded from analyses. A total variable was computed for each outcome measure scale. The ACE scores were computed into a total variable and then recoded into "high" and "low" with scores of zero (0) to three (3) categorized as low and scores of four (4) or higher categorized as high. Adapted by myriad social intervention programs across the country, the ACE tries to assess the cumulative impact of childhood experiences including abuse, neglect and other adverse events on a person's adult social conditions (Anda et al., 2006). High ACE scores indicate potential adverse adult situations. An analytic sample variable was created based on the criteria (enrollment dates, attended at least 75 percent of required workshop hours, completed a pre- and post-test survey, and had at least three (3) outcome measures at pre-test). This variable was used to select cases during outcome measures and attrition analyses.

The nFORM data files used for the outcomes study included nFORM client information, session attendance, and the Applicant Characteristics survey responses. The total number of session hours for each workshop series for community fathers (24/7 Dad and financial literacy) were calculated per participant in Access from the nFORM session attendance file. These calculated variables were saved as SPSS files and merged with the client information and Applicant Characteristics files using nFORM ID as the key variable into one (1) file. A variable for total workshop hours was calculated in SPSS by adding the hours of 24/7 and financial literacy together. The age categories were collapsed into fewer categories. The race and ethnicity variables were cleaned according to information specified by the participants who selected "Other." For instance, if someone only selected "Other" and specified "White Hispanic," then this person was recoded to white and Hispanic. Race and ethnicity was then recoded into one variable with categories of Hispanic any race, non-Hispanic black, non-Hispanic white, and non-Hispanic other. Non-Hispanic other included non-Hispanic American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, other, and those who selected multiple races. Additional recoded variables included marital/relationship status, live with children all or most of the time, current grade/highest degree, and employment. Marital and partner status were combined and recoded into the categories of married/partnered and single. Those who were married, engaged, romantically involved, or in a relationship were considered married or partnered while participants who claimed to have no partner were coded as single. The variable about the number of biological/adopted children who the father lives with all or most of the time was recoded into a yes/no variable. Those who responded zero (0) were coded as no and those with at least one (1) child was coded as yes. Current grade and highest degree were combined and recoded into a high school diploma or high school General Education Development (GED) variable. Those whose current grade was less than college and those who claimed to have earned

no degree or diploma were recoded as not having a high school diploma or GED. Those who were currently in college and those who had selected GED or higher category were recoded as having earned a high school diploma/GED. The employment variables were recoded into one variable with full-time, part-time/temporary (included part-time, varied hours, and temporary), and not employed as categories. Income was recoded into less than $500 and $500 or more. Some of these variables were recoded into a smaller number of categories for the attrition analyses due to low cell numbers in the Chi-Square analyses. These are noted in the related tables. This nFORM SPSS data file was merged with the local evaluation surveys file using nFORM ID as the key variable. The data variables used for the outcomes study were not repeated across data sources; therefore, inconsistent data was not a concern.

Preliminary analyses were run to test appropriate assumptions related to each statistical test. Outliers were found among the differences in self-efficacy scores and in the pre- and post-test self-efficacy scores among those without a high school diploma or GED equivalent. The outliers were not removed as the five (5) percent trimmed mean was not much different from the overall mean and to prevent further attrition. No other outliers were found in the data analyzed. Many of the variables analyzed were not normally distributed using the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality and those that were had a relatively small number of cases. ANOVA is considered robust for larger samples that fail to meet the assumption of normality. All of the mixed ANOVAs fulfilled the assumption homogeneity of covariance matrices and the repeated measures ANOVAs fulfilled the assumption of homogeneity of variances according to the Levene's test.

B. Attrition analyses and tables

Analyses were conducted to compare the characteristics of those who were included in the outcomes study analytic sample and those who did not complete a local evaluation post-test survey. As seen in Table B.1, the demographics were not significantly different between the two groups. The only significant difference found in the baseline characteristics occurred between the financial management knowledge scores. While the difference between the mean scores was only 0.2, the analytic sample had a significantly higher mean than those who did not complete a post-test survey. The study experienced relatively high attrition. However, tests of difference in baseline characteristics between the enrolled sample and the sample with complete post-test data showed few statistically significant differences. This suggests the study results may generalize to the enrolled sample.

Table B.1. Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who did not complete post-test survey data collection, for individuals after final workshop

Baseline measure	With post-test survey	Without post-test survey	Difference (p-value of difference)
Age (%)			(0.30)
18 – 24 years	8.8	9.3	-.05
25 – 34 years	40.2	43.9	-3.7
35 – 44 years	31.4	36.4	-5.0
45 and older	19.6	10.3	9.3
Race/ethnicity (%)			(0.12)[a]
Hispanic	4.1	4.3	-0.2
Non-Hispanic White	21.4	30.4	-9.0
Non-Hispanic Black	70.4	59.8	10.6
Non-Hispanic Other	4.1	5.4	-1.3
Married/partnered (%)	57.7	52.6	5.1 (0.47)
Biological/adopted Children Under 21 (mean/std. dev.)	2.8/2.8	2.6/2.0	0.2 (0.93)
Live w/at least one child all or most of the time (%)	54.9	46.5	8.4 (0.28)
Has high school diploma/ GED (%)	79.2	77.9	1.3 (0.82)
Employment Status (%)			(0.79)
Not employed	61.4	59.8	1.6
Employed full-time	19.8	17.8	2.0
Income Past 30 Days (%)			(0.14)
Less than $500	65.2	75.0	-9.8
$500 or more	34.8	25.0	9.8
Has child support orders/arrearages (%)	62.6	67.5	-4.9 (0.50)
ACE Score (mean/std. dev.)	2.7/2.7	2.8/2.5	-0.1 (0.52)
Knowledge in fatherhood (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 6)	1.9/1.2	2.0/1.1	-0.1 (0.77)
Knowledge in co-parenting (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 6)	3.6/1.1	3.5/1.1	0.1 (0.66)
Knowledge in financial literacy (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 5)	4.3/0.8	4.1/0.8	0.2 (0.04)**
Self-efficacy paying child support (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 600)	360.1/185.6	359.5/198.0	0.6 (0.96)

Baseline measure	With post-test survey	Without post-test survey	Difference (p-value of difference)
Engagement with youngest child (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 24)	13.8/9.3	13.3/9.6	0.5 (0.61)
Sample size	**104**	**109**	**n.a.**

n.a. = not applicable.

* Significantly different at the .10 level, two-tailed test.

** Significantly different at the .05 level, two-tailed test.

Notes: p-values are included in parentheses. The analytic sample includes enrolled community participants during the research time frame who attended at least 75% of the required workshops, had at least three (3) outcome measures at pre-test, and completed a post-test survey. Those in the without post-test survey data column includes community participants enrolled during the research time frame who did not complete a post-test and/or meet the sample criteria. Chi-square was conducted for categorical data and significance is indicated in the row of the corresponding variable.

[a]ethnicity/race compared between non-Hispanic black and all others due to low cell values

Further attrition analyses were conducted for item non-response for the self-efficacy in paying for child support and engagement with youngest child outcome measures among the analytic sample. Income, ACE, and baseline self-efficacy scores were significantly different between those in the analytic sample who had a self-efficacy score at post-test and those who did not. Income was significantly lower for those with a self-efficacy outcome score than those without. ACE and baseline self-efficacy scores were significantly higher for those with self-efficacy outcome data at post-test than those who did not. As to be expected, the percentage of those with child support orders or arrearages was significantly more among those with self-efficacy scores than those missing one or both scores. This would indicate that those without child support orders/arrearages chose not to answer these questions as they could not relate to them (see Table B.2).

Table B.2. Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who did not complete self-efficacy for paying child support outcome measure, for individuals after final workshop

Baseline measure	With outcome data	Without outcome data	Difference (p-value of difference)
Age (%)			(0.30)[a]
18 – 24 years	7.8	12.0	-4.2
25 – 34 years	44.2	28.0	16.2
35 – 44 years	32.5	28.0	4.5
45 and older	15.6	32.0	-16.4
Race/ethnicity (%)			
Hispanic	5.3	0.0	5.3 (0.92)[b]
Non-Hispanic White	20.0	26.1	-6.1
Non-Hispanic Black	70.7	69.6	1.1
Non-Hispanic Other	4.0	4.3	-0.3
Married/partnered (%)	58.9	54.2	4.7 (0.68)
Biological / adopted Children Under 21 (mean/std. dev.)	2.9/3.0	2.3/2.0	0.6 (0.41)
Live w/at least one child all or most of the time (%)	53.1	61.1	-8.0 (0.55)
Has high school diploma or GED (%)	77.9	83.3	-5.4 (0.78)
Employment Status (%)			
Not employed	62.3	58.3	4.0 (0.73)[c]
Employed full-time	16.9	29.2	-12.3
Income Past 30 Days (%)			(0.04)**
Less than $500	71.0	47.8	23.2
$500 or more	29.0	52.2	-23.2
Has child support orders /arrearages (%)	67.5	45.5	22.0 (0.06)*
ACE Score (mean/std. dev.)	3.0/ 2.9	1.6/1.6	1.4 (0.05)*
Knowledge in fatherhood (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 6)	2.0/1.3	1.8/1.0	0.2 (0.65)
Knowledge in co-parenting (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 6)	3.7/1.2	3.4/1.0	0.3 (0.22)
Knowledge in financial literacy (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 5)	4.3/0.8	4.5/0.8	-0.2 (0.11)
Self-efficacy paying child support (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 600)	372.4/182.2	220.6/178.5	151.8 (0.04)**

Baseline measure	With outcome data	Without outcome data	Difference (p-value of difference)
Engagement with youngest child (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 24)	13.8/9.3	14.1/9.5	-0.3 (0.89)
Sample size	79	25	n.a.

n.a. = not applicable.

* Significantly different at the .10 level, two-tailed test.

** Significantly different at the .05 level, two-tailed test.

Notes: p-values are included in parentheses. The with outcome data includes those in the analytic who had a self-efficacy for paying child support score at post-test. Chi-square was conducted for categorical data and significance is indicated in the row of the corresponding variable.

[a] age compared between under 18 to 34 categories and 35 to over 65 or older due to low cell values.

[b] ethnicity/race compared between non-Hispanic black and all others due to low cell values

[c] employment compared between unemployed and those employed due to low cell values.

Finally, attrition analyses found that the average number of own children to be the only baseline characteristic significantly different between those in the analytic sample with engagement with youngest child outcome data at post-test and those without. As seen in Table B.3, participants with an engagement outcome score at post-test had a significantly higher average number of children than those who were missing an engagement score at post-test.

Table B.3. Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who did not complete engagement with youngest child outcome measure, for individuals after final workshop

Baseline measure	With outcome data	Without outcome data	Difference (p-value of difference)
Age (%)			(0.59)[a]
18 – 24 years	7.8	16.7	-8.9
25 – 34 years	42.2	25.0	17.2
35 – 44 years	30.0	41.7	-11.7
45 and older	20.0	16.7	3.3
Race/ethnicity (%)			(0.10)[b]
Hispanic	3.5	8.3	-4.8
Non-Hispanic White	18.6	41.7	-23.1
Non-Hispanic Black	73.3	50.0	23.3
Non-Hispanic Other	4.7	0.0	4.7
Married/partnered (%)	58.8	50.0	8.0 (0.56)
Biological / adopted Children Under 21 (mean/std. dev.)	2.9/2.9	1.6/1.3	1.3 (0.09)*
Live w/at least one child all or most of the time (%)	55.4	50.0	5.4 (1.0)
Has high school diploma or GED (%)	78.7	83.3	-4.6 (1.0)
Employment Status (%)			
Not employed	61.8	58.3	3.5 (0.82)[c]
Employed full-time	19.1	25.0	-5.9
Income Past 30 Days (%)			(1.0)
Less than $500	65.4	63.6	1.8
$500 or more	34.6	36.4	-1.8
Has child support orders /arrearages (%)	62.6	62.5	0.1 (1.0)
ACE Score (mean/std. dev.)	2.5/2.5	4.1/3.8	-3.4 (0.25)
Knowledge in fatherhood (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 6)	1.9/1.2	1.9/1.1	0.0 (0.79)
Knowledge in co-parenting (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 6)	3.6/1.1	3.4/1.1	0.2 (0.65)
Knowledge in financial literacy (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 5)	4.4/0.8	4.2/0.6	0.2 (0.19)
Self-efficacy paying child support (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 600)	364.9/188.7	313.1/154.2	51.8 (0.32)

Baseline measure	With outcome data	Without outcome data	Difference (p-value of difference)
Engagement with youngest child (mean/std. dev.) (range: 0 to 24)	13.9/9.3	11.0/9.5[d]	2.9 (0.63)
Sample size	92	12	n.a.

n.a. = not applicable.

* Significantly different at the .10 level, two-tailed test.

Notes: p-values are included in parentheses. The with outcome data includes those in the analytic who had an engagement with youngest child score at post-test. Chi-square was conducted for categorical data and significance is indicated in the row of the corresponding variable.

[a] age compared between under 18 to 34 categories and 35 to over 65 or older due to low cell values.

[b] ethnicity/race compared between non-Hispanic black and all others due to low cell values

[c] employment compared between unemployed and those employed due to low cell values.

[d] sample size for engagement at baseline for those missing outcome data at post-test was three (3).

C. Data collection instruments

THIS section NEEDS TO BE DONE BY SURVEYDPA