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History

• The Martin-Aldridge Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Act adopted by Legislature in 1983

• Established the Department of Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention “The Children’s Trust Fund”

35 years of prevention efforts!
Overview

- History and Mission of the Alabama Department of Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention (ADCANP) & Prevent Child Abuse Alabama (PCAA)
- Impact of Abuse - Cost of child maltreatment report
- Prevention of Abuse – community-based programs
Department of Child Abuse & Neglect Prevention

• Community-Based Prevention Programs
• Public Policy Advocacy
• Public Education and Awareness
• Network of Grantees – currently 150 (16 funded through CBCAP)
• Affiliated with National Organizations
  o Prevent Child Abuse America
  o National Alliance of Children’s Trust & Prevent Child Abuse America
Video
Partnership

- Empower grantees to “tell their story” through valid documentation of numbers served and reports of changes due to program participation

- Allow for variation in program delivery models within categories of programs, but assess common objectives centered on **protective factors**
  - aggregation of data allows for analysis of change across programs

- Conduct statistical analyses of reported levels of knowledge, intent, and behaviors before and after program participation
  - Feature user-friendly infographics and descriptions of changes in reports

- Allow grantees and participants to provide example testimonials
Evaluation Methods

- Forms for tracking outreach based on target numbers
  - Reporting forms are utilized for tracking participant #s- these are verifiable, *non-duplicated* #s

- Surveys for assessing participants’ view of change and benefit – due to the program
  - Grantees collect data on surveys given to participants and send to evaluation team for processing and entry
  - Intakes collect demographic information
  - Survey on outcomes are given at conclusion of program to assess retrospective pre-program ratings and post-program ratings
    - Matched data without the task of matching separate pre/post surveys
    - Retrospective pre/post self-reports have been validated as an effective and efficient strategy for assessing perceived change among program participants that is less susceptible to response bias and social desirability than traditional methods of baseline and post-program assessments (Pratt et al., 2000)
Central data collection and management
Target Data Spread Sheet

- Uploaded monthly into each program’s Dropbox folder
- Reported numbers
  - Newly served in program
  - Awareness participants
  - Surveys collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTING MONTH</th>
<th>ADULTS</th>
<th>YOUTH</th>
<th># of Newly Served Participants (This is a NON-DUPLICATED count per month)</th>
<th># of Paired Surveys (Intake + Post) (GOAL: 80% of Target #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** If no new participants were served, PLEASE mark column with a “0” for that month.
Home Visitation / Parent Education Programs

1. My knowledge of community resources where I can receive help is...

BEFORE THIS PROGRAM, I would have said...
TODAY, my answer is...

2. My commitment to using available social services that apply to me is...

BEFORE THIS PROGRAM, I would have said...
TODAY, my answer is...

3. My knowledge of children’s development at different ages is...

BEFORE THIS PROGRAM, I would have said...
TODAY, my answer is...

4. My knowledge of what parenting responses are best to use when my child is not behaving is...

BEFORE THIS PROGRAM, I would have said...
TODAY, my answer is...

5. My knowledge of ways to manage stress is...

BEFORE THIS PROGRAM, I would have said...
TODAY, my answer is...

6. My knowledge of ways to manage anger is...

BEFORE THIS PROGRAM, I would have said...
TODAY, my answer is...
Parent Education & Support/ Home Visiting Programs

**Goals center on participant improvement in:**

- **Protective Factor: Parent Resilience**
  - Stress management skills
  - Skills to manage maltreatment risk

- **Protective Factor: Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development**
  - Understanding of various forms of child maltreatment
  - Medical care commitment
  - Positive parenting skills & child development knowledge
  - Positive view of one’s child

- **Protective Factor: Concrete Supports in Times of Need**
  - Knowledge and use of support services

- **Protective Factor: Social Connections**
  - Use of informal support networks

THE ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF
CHILD ABUSE & NEGLECT PREVENTION

THE CHILDREN’S TRUST FUND
SALLYE LONGSHORE, M.S., ED.S., DIRECTOR
The Alabama Department of Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention – The Children’s Trust Fund (ADCANP/CTF) was established in 1983 and is the only state agency explicitly focused on educating our communities about child abuse and neglect. It also is the only state agency actively engaged in providing community-based prevention programs focused on promoting protective factors in families.

Throughout its 35-year history, ADCANP/CTF has provided direct funding support to hundreds of local agencies through a competitive process. These local organizations carry out the important work of building family strengths.

ADCANP/CTF believes in investing upfront to ensure that children in our state grow up in a nurturing and supportive home. Research supports this preventive approach. A 2015 study by the University of Alabama College of Human Environmental Sciences and Center for Business and Economic Research – Calhoun College of Commerce reveals the high costs of intervention. They estimated services associated with child abuse and neglect incidents costs taxpayers $2.3 billion dollars every year. Child maltreatment prevention is, therefore, both a social justice and an economic issue for Alabama.

In this report we highlight the evaluation results of ADCANP/CTF-funded programs’ efforts to promote protective factors among the families and youth served throughout the state during the period of August 2017 – July 2018.

Prevention programs funded by ADCANP/CTF have documented important positive effects for parents and youth in Alabama. Support for these programs serves to enhance protective factors and reduce the significant human and economic cost of child abuse and neglect in our state.


The Five Protective Factors:
The Foundation of the Strengthening Families™ Program

What are the Five Protective Factors?
The Five Protective Factors are the foundation of the Strengthening Families™ approach. Extensive evidence supports this common sense view that when these Protective Factors are present and robust in a family, the likelihood of abuse and neglect diminishes. Research also shows that these are the factors that create healthy environments for the normal development of all children.

Social Connections
Friends, family members, neighbors, and other members of a community provide emotional support and concrete assistance to parents. Social connections help parents build networks of support that serve multiple purposes: they help parents develop and reinforce community norms around child rearing, provide assistance in times of need, and serve as a resource for parenting information or help solving problems. Because isolation is a common risk factor for abuse and neglect, parents who are isolated need support in building positive friendships.

Concrete Support in Times of Need
Parents need access to the types of concrete supports and services that can mitigate the stress of difficult situations, such as a family crisis, a condition such as substance abuse, or stress associated with lack of resources. Building the Protective Factor is about helping to ensure the basic needs of a family, such as food, clothing, and shelter, are met and connecting parents and children to services, especially those that have a stigma associated with them, like domestic violence shelter or substance abuse counseling, in times of crisis.

Information provided by Strengthening Families™, a project of the Center for the Study of Social Policy (www.strengtheningfamilies.net) and the Alabama Department of Early Childhood Education (www.education.ala.gov) and Community Services Administration (www.acf.hhs.gov).
In Project Year 2017-2018, ADCANP/CTF awarded grants from four primary federal and state funding streams to support two statewide initiatives and 153 community-based prevention programs provided by local agencies in Alabama that applied for program grants. Results indicate these funded programs provided multi-session services to 73,014 adults and children. In addition, 247,324 individuals attended community awareness programs/provisional events.

A total of 320,136 Alabama citizens were impacted by ADCANP/CTF-funded programs during the one year period.

In this report we feature evaluation results from the 153 community-based programs funded by Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP), Children First Trust Fund (CFTF), Education Trust Fund (ETF), and Department of Human Resources/Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (DHR/TANF) funds. Research suggests several key activities as useful for the prevention of child maltreatment: raising public awareness, providing education and supports for parents—particularly those facing special challenges (e.g., low resources, special needs children), facilitating positive parent involvement, and promoting youth’s own awareness, knowledge, and skills related to resilience. Therefore, the types of programs ADCANP/CTF funded include:

- Parent Education and Support
- Home Visiting Parent Programs
- Fatherhood Programs
- Respite Care Programs
- Youth School-Based, Non School-Based/After-School, & Mentoring Programs
- Community Awareness Programs

Although each program differs in approach and delivery method, common objectives are shared by programs in each area of specialty. All programs have objectives that center on reducing risk factors for child maltreatment and promoting protective factors outlined at the beginning of this report.

From August 2017 to July 2018, ADCANP/CTF worked with an independent research team in Auburn University’s Human Development and Family Studies Department to conduct a systematic evaluation of its funded programs. All funded agencies invest time and effort in the collection of data from program participants throughout the year, using uniform surveys within each program type. This allows for the aggregation of data within program categories and results in meaningful information regarding the experiences of the average participant in each program area. This systematic empirical assessment of prevention programs throughout the state is one of few such efforts in the U.S.

Survey research methods are utilized and program participants respond to questions regarding their background and demographics, as well as their understanding, knowledge, and skills in many different areas relevant to healthy families and communities. The questionnaire was a validated method of gathering information on baseline and post-program levels of each measure in order to assess change. At program completion, participants report their level of knowledge and skill in specific areas before and after their participation in the program. Previous research has supported the use of this retrospective pre- and post-program evaluation design as efficient and meaningful documentation of participants’ perceptions of benefit from the program and the extent to which specific program objectives have been met. Research indicates this method may be a more accurate strategy for documenting change. Participants tend to answer more honestly when taking a retrospective pre/post as compared to separate pre- and post-program surveys since participants may respond in a more socially desirable way prior to program start. They also tend to have better knowledge on which to assess pre-program levels after they have received information and skills training in the program. (See the authors of this report for more information on this survey research method.)

For analyses, data were aggregated across programs within each program type. Paired sample t-tests were conducted on each measure (some are global; some are multi-item) to identify statistically significant changes from pre-program mean levels to post-program mean levels. Effect sizes for documented changes were calculated using the appropriate formula for paired data.
Participant Numbers & Demographics

Data on numbers of participants in ADCANP/IFIT funded programs were taken from master lists of individuals who spent time in a program. Demographic reports that most participants provided, and from presentation reports that documents the numbers of individuals who participated in community awareness activities provided by grantees in all program areas, including the Community Awareness program area.

Community Awareness 247,124 individuals (youth and adults) participated in a community awareness event or presentation and learned more about prevention of child maltreatment. Helpful information was also provided through media and social media. Approximately 9,712,918 exposures/ impressions were generated. Programs provided multi-session services to adults and children in all 7 congressional districts in Alabama during the one year period.

Adult Demographics

Data on adult demographics come from across the program types: parent education, home visiting, fatherhood, and respite. Parents are racially diverse and predominantly of lower socio-economic status, based on work status, education level, and income reported. Note: adults who participated only in community awareness programs did not provide demographic information.

**Age**
- Average age was 35
- 4% were 18 and younger; 16% were 19-24; 23% were 25-30; 31% were 31-40; and 26% were over 40

**Gender**
- 53% female
- 47% male

**Race & Ethnicity**
- 52% European American
- 43% African American
- 3% Asian American
- 1% Native American
- 3% Identify as some other ethnicity
- Of all participants, 4% identified as Hispanic or Latino

**Work Status**
- For participants (excluding students) over the age of 18:
  - 51% reported not working for pay
  - 14% reported working part-time
  - 35% reported working full-time

**Education Level**
- For participants (excluding students) over the age of 18:
  - 19% reported not completing high school
  - 49% reported completing high school or GED
  - 9% reported completing some college/Associate degree
  - 6% reported obtaining trade/technical school degree
  - 12% reported completing a 4-year college degree
  - 9% reported completing an advanced degree

**Income Level**
- For participants (excluding students) over the age of 18:
  - 55% reported a gross yearly income of less than $10,000 a year
  - 24% reported earning $10,000-$29,999
  - 12% reported earning $30,000-$59,999
  - 5% reported earning more than $60,000 per year
Participant Numbers and Demographics

Youth Demographics

Data on youth demographics come from school-based, non-school based/after school, and mentoring programs and indicate that participants were diverse in age, race, and gender. Note: Youth who participated only in community awareness programs did not provide demographic information.

Grade
• 42% were in grades 3-5
• 58% were in grades 6-12

Gender
• 49% female
• 51% male

Race & Ethnicity
• 43% African American
• 41% European American
• 3% Native American
• 1% Asian American
• 12% selected "other" when asked ethnic background

Of all participants, 9% identified as Hispanic or Latino
58 programs provided parent education/home visiting through hospital visits, group education, and home visits. Goals of home visiting/parent education programs center on participant improvement in:

- stress management skills
- skills to manage maltreatment risk
- understanding various forms of child maltreatment
- medical care commitment
- positive parenting skills and child development knowledge
- knowledge and use of support services
- use of informal support networks

These goals promote several protective factors emphasized by the “Strengthening Families Program”:

**Parent Education & Home Visiting Programs Demographics**

Parents in Parent Education classes and Home Visiting programs are racially diverse and predominantly of lower socio-economic status, based on work status, education level, and income reported. Participants are predominantly women.

**Age**
- 8% were 18 and younger; 19% were 19-24; 26% were 25-30; 23% were 31-40; and 19% were over 40

**Gender**
- 85% female
- 15% male

**Race & Ethnicity**
- 56% European American
- 40% African American
- 1% Asian American
- 1% Native American
- 2% identify as some other ethnicity
- Of all participants, 5% identified as Hispanic or Latino

**Work Status**
- Parents (excluding students) over the age of 18:
  - 51% reported not working for pay
  - 13% reported working part-time
  - 36% reported working full-time

**Education Level**
- Parents (excluding students) over the age of 18:
  - 18% reported not completing high school
  - 55% reported completing high school or GED
  - 9% reported completing some college/Associate degree
  - 7% reported obtaining trade/technical school degree
  - 6% reported completing a 4-year college degree
  - 3% reported completing an advanced degree

**Income Level**
- Parents (excluding students) over the age of 18:
  - 51% reported a gross yearly income of less than $16,000 a year.
  - 29% reported earning $16,000-$29,999
  - 15% reported earning $30,000-$59,999
  - 5% reported earning more than $60,000 per year
Parent Education & Support/ Home Visiting Programs

**Goals center on participant improvement in:**

- **Protective Factor: Parent Resilience**
  - Stress management skills
  - Skills to manage maltreatment risk

- **Protective Factor: Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development**
  - Understanding of various forms of child maltreatment
  - Medical care commitment
  - Positive parenting skills & child development knowledge
  - Positive view of one’s child

- **Protective Factor: Concrete Supports in Times of Need**
  - Knowledge and use of support services

- **Protective Factor: Social Connections**
  - Use of informal support networks
A sample of Parenting participants (n=3,566) responded to an assessment of 7 goals. Analyses of measures (some using multi-items; Cronbach’s a ranges from .78 - .91) using paired sample t-tests revealed statistically significant (p<.001) improvements for participants, on average, in ALL targeted areas. The effect sizes ranged from .68 - 1.32. The average magnitude of the effect sizes for these improvements was 1.04 and can be considered large i.e. .22 small effect, .60 moderate effect, .75 large effect.

**Table 1.** Paired Sample T-test for mean change over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Factor: Parent Resilience</th>
<th>Pre-Test M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Post-Test M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management Skills</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2553</td>
<td>-67.83***</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills to Manage Maltreatment Risk</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3693</td>
<td>-60.71***</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Factor: Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development</th>
<th>Pre-Test M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Post-Test M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Various Forms of Child Maltreatment</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3546</td>
<td>-58.94***</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care Commitment</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3509</td>
<td>-37.21***</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Skills &amp; Child Development Knowledge</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3552</td>
<td>-71.35***</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Factor: Concrete Support in Times of Need &amp; Social Connections</th>
<th>Pre-Test M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Post-Test M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of &amp; Use of Support Services</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3560</td>
<td>-72.61***</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Factor: Social Connections</th>
<th>Pre-Test M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Post-Test M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Informal Supportive Networks</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3526</td>
<td>-61.83***</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001; Cohen’s d reported in absolute values.
### Key Changes

We also examined the number of participants who showed improvement and found the majority rated themselves as improved in each area assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Factor:</th>
<th>% who changed in the desired direction</th>
<th>% who didn't change in the desired direction or maintained pre-program level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management Skills</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills to Manage Maintenance Risk</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of Parenting &amp; Child Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Various Forms of Child Maltreatment</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care Commitment</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Skills &amp; Child Development Knowledge</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concrete Support in Times of Need</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of &amp; Use of Support Services</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Connections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Informal Supportive Networks</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The HIPPY Program was one of the best educational opportunities for my son. The program provided great creative curriculum. My son always wanted to do more of it. The monthly meetings gave the parents and children a platform to connect with each other along with amazing activities and gifts. So glad we found it."

"My Parent Educator has been amazing. She taught me many different factors on parenting styles, ways to cope with stress, learning activities to try with my child, and much more."

"It opened my mind and showed me new ways to respond to my kids."

"Small wonders helped me and my family to get the help my son needed, from helping us get the appointments with the doctors, to coming to the school meetings with us and asked some questions that I did not think about asking and sincerely cared about my child. I would highly recommend this group to a friend or relative."

~ Home Visiting Program Participants

"Thank you so much for being there for me when I call! I have called several times and each time you calm me down and help me work through my issues. I am dealing with at the time. The information you sent me the last time I called was also very helpful. I am thankful I have the PAL line I can call."

~ A mom who calls often. PAL: Parenting Assistance Line

"I am a better mom because now I know there's a difference between teaching and punishment. Punishment doesn't teach new behaviors. I've learned to communicate and to talk with my children."

"Special Deliveries is a great program. It helps women, young and old who may need help with issues they have with their children. It has helped me with my anger issues I had within myself. I am a great mom and loving it!"

"Most days as a parent with my child feels like joy and a struggle. Having a child with a disability can be overwhelming. This group has taught me to take one step at time and to appreciate all that is right with my child and to celebrate each accomplishment. I will now approach each situation thinking about all that is able with my child and not what view him as his disability, I can now see my child beyond his disability."

~ Parent Education Program Participants
Respite Care Programs

Demographics

Parents in Respite Care programs are racially diverse and predominantly of lower socio-economic status, based on work status, education level, and income reported. Participants are predominantly women.

Age
- 48% were 25-30
- 25-40: 42% were 25-40; 43% were over 40

Gender
- 93% female
- 7% male

Race & Ethnicity
- 59% European American
- 37% African American
- 16% Asian American
- 1% Native American
- 4% identify as some other ethnicity
- Of all participants, 3% identified as Hispanic or Latino

Work Status
Parents in Respite Care programs (excluding students) over the age of 18:
- 55% reported not working for pay
- 19% reported working part-time
- 27% reported working full-time

Education Level
Parents in Respite Care programs (excluding students) over the age of 18:
- 12% reported completing high school
- 36% reported completing high school or GED
- 14% reported completing some college/Associate degree
- 8% reported obtaining trade/technical school degree
- 22% reported completing a 4-year college degree
- 12% reported completing an advanced degree

Income Level
Parents in Respite Care programs (excluding students) over the age of 18:
- 51% reported a gross yearly income of less than $10,000 a year
- 35% reported earning $10,000-$29,999
- 20% reported earning $30,000-$59,999
- 11% reported earning more than $60,000 per year

7 programs provided respite care services and parent information for parents of children with special needs. Goals of respite programs center on participant improvement in:
- stress level
- positive view of child
- knowledge and use of support services
- use of informal supportive social networks

These goals promote several protective factors emphasized by the “Strengthening Families Program™”
Respite Programs

- **Goals center on participant improvement in:**
  - **Protective Factor: Parent Resilience**
    - Stress level
  - **Protective Factor: Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development**
    - Positive view of child
  - **Protective Factor: Concrete Supports in Times of Need**
    - Knowledge and use of support services
  - **Protective Factor: Social Connections**
    - Use of informal supportive social networks
A sample of Respite Care program participants (n=334) responded to an assessment of 4 goals. Analyses of measures (some using multi-items; Chronbach’s α ranges from .82 - .87) using paired sample t-tests revealed statistically significant (p<.001) improvements for participants, on average, in ALL targeted areas. The effect sizes ranged from .71-1.03. The average magnitude of the effect sizes for these improvements was .89 and can be considered large (i.e. .25 small effect, .50 moderate effect, .75 large effect).

Table 2. Paired Sample T-test for mean change over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Factor: Parent Resilience</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress Level</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>18.37***</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive View of Child</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>-12.27***</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of &amp; Use of Support Services</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>-16.45***</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Informal Supportive Networks</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>-15.85***</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001. Cohen’s d reported in above table.

Key Changes

We also examined the number of participants who showed improvement and found the majority rated themselves as improved in each area assessed.

**Protective Factor: Parent Resilience**
- Stress Level
  - 84% improved
  - 16% did not change

**Protective Factor: Knowledge of Parenting & Child Development**
- Positive View of Child
  - 72% improved
  - 28% did not change

**Protective Factor: Concrete Support in Times of Need**
- Knowledge of & Use of Support Services
  - 86% improved
  - 14% did not change

**Protective Factor: Social Connections**
- Use of Informal Supportive Networks
  - 74% improved
  - 26% did not change

“This service has helped strengthen my relationship with my husband. It has also helped reduce the daily stress of caring for a child with special needs.”

“I was able to attend a marriage enrichment seminar due to financial support from Hearts Respite. My husband and family are so grateful!”

- Respite Care Program Participant
DHR/TANF (Alabama Department of Human Resources and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) provided funding for 21 Fatherhood programs: Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) funded 1 additional program; and the Children First Trust Fund (CFTF) provided funding for an additional 7 programs. Fatherhood programs provide case management and classes. They focus on enhancing employability through education and job skills training. They also provide educational information on child development and positive parenting strategies and emphasize the value of positive involvement with children and child support obligation compliance. Mothers are invited to participate in classes as well.

Goals of fatherhood programs are:
- positive relationship skills
- enhanced coparenting quality
- dating abuse prevention skills
- cooperation with child support enforcement (CSE) & commitment to pay child support
- greater work and education commitment
- greater use of support services
- positive parenting skills
- enhanced parent involvement & relationship quality with child
- enhanced child adjustment

*These goals promote several protective factors emphasized by the "Strengthening Families Program".*

---

Fatherhood Program Demographics

Parents who participated in Fatherhood programs are racially diverse and predominantly of lower socio-economic status, based on work status, education level, and income reported. Participants were predominantly men.

**Age**
- Parents in Fatherhood programs had an average age of 35.
  - 16% were 18 and younger; 13% were 19-24; 25% were 25-30; 37% were 31-40; and 21% were over 40

**Gender**
- 20% female
- 80% male

**Race & Ethnicity**
- 50% African American
- 44% European American
- 2% Native American
- 4% identify as some other ethnicity
- Of all participants, 3% identified as Hispanic or Latino

**Work Status**
Parents in Fatherhood programs (excluding students) over the age of 18:
- 65% not working for pay
- 6% reported working part-time
- 27% reported working full-time

**Education Level**
Parents in Fatherhood programs (excluding students) over the age of 18:
- 29% reported not completing high school
- 53% reported completing high school or GED
- 4% reported completing some college/Associate degree
- 10% reported obtaining trade/technical school degree
- 4% reported completing a 4-year college degree
- 3% reported completing an advanced degree

**Income Level**
Parents in Fatherhood programs (excluding students) over the age of 18:
- 76% reported a gross yearly income of less than $10,000 a year.
- 12% reported earning $10,000-$29,999
- 13% reported earning $30,000-$59,999
- 1% reported earning more than $60,000 per year
Fatherhood Programs

Goals of fatherhood programs are:

• Protective Factor: Social Connections
  • Commitment to relationship stability
  • Conflict management skills
  • Communication Skills
  • Dating abuse prevention skills

• Protective Factor: Concrete Supports in Times of Need
  • Hopeful about future
  • Financial responsibility
  • Economic stability
  • Commitment to pay full child support
Fatherhood Programs (cont’d)

Goals of fatherhood programs are:

- Protective Factor: Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development
  - Parent Child Relationship Quality

- Protective Factor: Social and Emotional Competence of Children
  - Child academic adjustment
Key Changes

We also examined the number of participants who showed improvement and found the majority rated themselves as improved in each area assessed.

Protective Factor: Social Connections

- Commitment to Relationship Stability: 65% improved, 35% did not
- Conflict Management Skills: 80% improved, 20% did not
- Communication Skills: 82% improved, 18% did not
- Coparenting Conflict: 57% improved, 43% did not
- Dating Abuse Prevention Skills: 82% improved, 18% did not

Protective Factor: Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development

- Positive Parenting Behavior: 66% improved, 34% did not
- Parent Involvement: 58% improved, 42% did not
- Parent Child Relationship Quality: 64% improved, 36% did not

Protective Factor: Social and Emotional Competence of Children

- Child Academic Adjustment: 52% improved, 48% did not

"The Fatherhood class has been very fulfilling and has taught me even though I have made mistakes I can still be a good dad and person. I can be productive and a good role model for my children."

"Without Fatherhood, I don’t know where I would be today. I learned about the importance of being a father, and I secured 2 jobs, a high school diploma, and entered the Welding program at Wallace Community College."

"I just wanted to THANK YOU FROM THE BOTTOM OF MY HEART FOR U BELIEVING IN ME, and Helping me with This case, I know without you in my corner this case would Not have moved so fast!!! Thank you for taking the time from your day to help me bring my babies home!!!! Thank you sooooooooo much! [followed by several emoji]

—Fatherhood Program Participants
Fatherhood Challenges

Fathers rated a list of areas on the level of challenge using a scale of 1-4, with 1 indicating no challenge and 4 indicating a major challenge. Analyses using paired sample t-tests revealed statistically significant (p < .05) changes in several key challenge areas. All but one of these were significant improvements (i.e., the area is significantly less of a challenge, on average, following program participation). Fatherhood participants reported a significant increase, on average, for their level of challenge for managing anger; the effect size was very small (d = .09). The effect sizes for improvements ranged from .05-.13. The average magnitude of the effect sizes for these improvements was .09 and is considered small (i.e., .25 small effect, .50 moderate effect, .75 large effect).

Table 3.2 Paired Sample T-test for mean change over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fatherhood Challenges</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen's d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Having a Steady Place to Live</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>3.22*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>3.22**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Support</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>2.32*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>2.95**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough Money</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>3.00**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>2.46*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .05, *p < .01, **p < .001, Cohen's d reported in absolute values.

Challenges areas that did not show significant change: unemployment, incarceration, problems with the law, physical health problems, violent toward partner, abusing children, overcrowded home, repairs to home, bills, living situation, foster care, living too far from child, working too many hours, protective order, keeping a job, family court, court support, mom's new partner, trouble with child's mother, trouble with child's mother's family and immigration.
Income and Job Status

**Income at Baseline**
- Less than $10,000: 26%
- More than $10,000: 74%

**Income at One Year Follow-Up**
- Less than $10,000: 50%
- More than $10,000: 50%

**Job Status at Baseline**
- Full Time: 64%
- Part Time: 27%
- Not Working for Pay: 9%

**Job Status at One Year Follow-up**
- Full Time: 39%
- Part Time: 52%
- Not Working for Pay: 9%
Follow-Up Study with non-incarcerated fathers

Social Connections

- Commitment to Relationship: Baseline 5.12, Post 5.55, 6 Month 5.93, 1 Year 5.97
- Conflict Management Skills: Baseline 4.97, Post 5.98, 6 Month 5.98, 1 Year 5.97
- Communication Skills: Baseline 5.6, Post 6.39, 6 Month 6.25, 1 Year 6.45
- Dating Abuse Prevention Skills: Baseline 5.71, Post 6.48, 6 Month 6.23, 1 Year 6.35
- Coparenting Conflict: Baseline 3.42, Post 3.2, 6 Month 2.63, 1 Year 2.91

Statistically significant growth over 1-year:
- Commitment to Relationship
- Conflict Management Skills
- Communication Skills
- Dating Abuse Prevention Skills

Statistically significant decreases over 1-year:
- Coparenting Conflict
Follow-Up Study with non-incarcerated fathers

Concrete Supports in Times of Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>6 Month</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful for Future</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Responsibility</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Stability</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation with Child</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Pay</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically significant growth over 6-months

Statistically significant growth over 1-year

Statistically significant growth over 6-months

Statistically significant growth over 1-year

Follow-Up Study with non-incarcerated fathers
Follow-Up Study with non-incarcerated fathers

Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development & Social & Emotional Competence of Children

- Statistically significant growth over 6-months
- Statistically significant growth over 1-year
- Statistically significant growth over 1-year
- Statistically significant growth over 1-year

Baseline | Post | 6 Month | 1 Year
---|---|---|---
Parent Involvement | 6.06 | 6.58 | 6.32 | 6.49
Parent Child Relationship Quality | 5.79 | 6.23 | 6.08 | 6.27
Positive Parenting Behaviors | 5.67 | 6.24 | 6.31 | 6.38
Child Academic Adjustment | 6.0 | 6.34 | 6.43 | 6.67
Program Quality

Class Setting
- Satisfied: 86%
- Unsatisfied: 14%

Facilitator Effectiveness/Quality
- Satisfied: 88%
- Unsatisfied: 12%

“Alliance” with Facilitator
- Satisfied: 87%
- Unsatisfied: 13%
Youth Programs
3rd - 5th Grade
Demographics

Data on youth demographics from school-based, non-school-based, after-school, and mentoring programs offered to children in 3rd - 5th grade indicate that participants were diverse in race, and gender. Note: Youth who participated only in community awareness programs did not provide demographic information.

Gender
- 50% male
- 50% female

Race & Ethnicity
- 43% African American
- 41% European American
- 3% Native American
- 1% Asian American
- 12% selected "other" when asked ethnic background

- Of all 3rd - 5th grade participants, 9% identified as Hispanic or Latino

Program objectives for youth in 3rd-5th grade center on:
- social skill development
- improved abuse awareness
- self confidence
- emotion identification and regulation
- enhanced assertiveness
- cooperative behavior
Youth Programs: School-based, Non School-based/After School, and Mentoring

**Goals for 3rd – 5th grade:**

- Protective Factor: Social & Emotional Competence of Children
  - Social skill development
  - Improved abuse awareness
  - Self confidence
  - Emotion identification & regulation
  - Enhanced assertiveness
  - Cooperative behavior
A sample of 3rd – 5th grade participants (n=5,247) responded to an assessment of 6 goals. Analyses of measures (some using multi-items; Cronbach’s α ranges from .65 – .66) using paired sample t-tests revealed statistically significant (p<.001) improvements for participants, on average, in all targeted areas. The effect sizes ranged from .49 – .97. The average magnitude of the effect sizes for these improvements is .75 and can be considered large (i.e. .25 small effect, .50 moderate effect, .75 large effect).

**Table 4. Paired Sample T-test for mean change over time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective Factor: Social and Emotional Competence of Children</th>
<th>Pre-Test M</th>
<th>Pre-Test SD</th>
<th>Post-Test M</th>
<th>Post-Test SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen's d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5033</td>
<td>-34.38***</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse Awareness</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4974</td>
<td>-46.45***</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>4949</td>
<td>-41.96***</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Identification &amp; Regulation</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>5150</td>
<td>-65.41***</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>5076</td>
<td>-68.44***</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Behavior</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>5120</td>
<td>-54.93***</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < 0.001. Cohen’s d report in rough values.

**Key Changes**

We also examined the number of participants who showed improvement and found the majority rated themselves as improved in each area assessed.

**Protective Factor: Social and Emotional Competence of Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse Awareness</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Identification &amp; Regulation</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Behavior</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“To my after school teacher- Thank you for making me better at BAMA Kids. Thank you.”**

-Youth Program Participant
Youth in 3rd-12th grade around the state were served through 46 programs that included a variety of school-based, non-school based/after school, and mentoring programs. These programs varied in their emphasis, but all were focused on reducing risks for children and enhancing their well-being by promoting the protective factor: social and emotional competence of children.

Program objectives for youth in 6th-12th grades center on:
- emotion knowledge
- self confidence
- social competence
- commitment to avoid risky & delinquent behavior
- cooperative behavior
- abuse awareness & resourcefulness

Youth Programs
6th - 12th Grade
Demographics

Data on youth demographics from school-based, non-school based/after school, and mentoring programs offered to students in 6th - 12th grade indicate that participants were diverse in age, race, and gender. Note: Youth who participated in community awareness programs did not provide demographic information.

Gender
- 48% female
- 52% male

Race & Ethnicity
- 49% African American
- 39% European American
- 2% Native American
- 1% Asian American
- 9% selected “other” when asked ethnic background
- Of all participants, 8% identified as Hispanic or Latino
Youth Programs: School-based, Non School-based/After School, and Mentoring

- Goals for 6th – 12th grade:
  - Protective Factor: Social & Emotional Competence of Children
    - Emotion knowledge
    - Self confidence
    - Social Competence
    - Commitment to avoid risky & delinquent behavior
    - Cooperative behavior
    - Abuse Awareness & Resourcefulness
A sample of 6th - 12th grade participants (n=5,820) responded to an assessment of 6 goals. Analyses of measures (some using multi-items; Chronbach’s α ranges from .66 - .69) using paired sample t-tests revealed statistically significant (p < .001) improvements for participants, on average, in ALL targeted areas. The effect sizes ranged from .54 -.81. The average magnitude of the effect sizes for these improvements was .65 and can be considered moderate to large (i.e. .25 small effect, .50 moderate effect, .75 large effect).

Table 5. Paired Sample T-test for mean change over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Post-Test M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social and Emotional Competence of Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Knowledge</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>5650</td>
<td>-50.61***</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>5934</td>
<td>-40.26***</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Competence</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>5743</td>
<td>-57.29***</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Avoid Delinquent &amp; Risky Behavior</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>5737</td>
<td>-40.56***</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Behavior</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>5643</td>
<td>-42.75***</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse Awareness &amp; Resourcefulness</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>5717</td>
<td>-60.11***</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .001, Cohen’s d = measure of effect size.

Key Changes

We also examined the number of participants who showed improvement and found the majority rated themselves as improved in each area assessed.

**Protective Factor:**
**Social and Emotional Competence of Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emotion Knowledge</th>
<th>Self Confidence</th>
<th>Social Competence</th>
<th>Commitment to Avoid Delinquent &amp; Risky Behavior</th>
<th>Cooperative Behavior</th>
<th>Abuse Awareness &amp; Resourcefulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% who changed in the desired direction</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who didn’t change in the desired direction or maintained pre-program level</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protective Factor:**
**Social and Emotional Competence of Children**
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“The Central Alabama Regional Child Advocacy Center assists our district each year with the mandatory reporter training. Their experiences, knowledge, and partnership provide us with the resources we need to ensure that every child has an advocate in the school and community.”

- Mandatory Reporter Training Participant

There were 15 programs funded to specifically conduct Community Awareness activities. These programs provided information to professionals and community members on child abuse and neglect in an effort to raise awareness and increase 1) the likelihood of reporting suspected child abuse and neglect and 2) the use of services provided for child abuse and neglect situations.

Additionally, many of the Youth, Parent Education and Home Visitor, Respite, and Fatherhood programs also made efforts to raise community awareness about child abuse and neglect and documented their efforts.

Due to the large numbers attending community awareness programs, individual surveys were not administered to these participants. Staff tracked the number of face to face encounters and reported these to the evaluation team monthly and quarterly:

- Community awareness programs/presentations directly served a total of 247,124 individuals.

Staff also tracked exposures to other community awareness efforts implemented within communities through various media outlets, such as billboards, radio and newspaper ads, agency websites, and social media (Facebook, Instagram, and Snapchat).

- 9,712,918 exposures/impressions were documented.
Summary and Implications

ADCANP-funded programs:

• Prevention programs in Alabama are diverse and far-reaching: Home Visiting/Parent Education, Respite, Fatherhood; Youth mentoring; School-based Youth Development; Community Awareness

• Broad, successful outreach serves a diverse population

• Participants in ALL program types reported significant improvements in key outcome areas related to protective factors for children using the Strengthening Families framework

• The value of investing in some form of effectiveness evaluation for all programs; sustained effects for some
Summary and Implications

- Program evaluation can be conducted across programs that vary in design, but are similar in outcome goals.
- Basic outreach numbers and outcome data can be collected efficiently and effectively using an evaluation team to minimize labor burden on program staff.
- Buy-in from community agencies and participants is critical for quality data; use an empowerment approach.
- Turning results into easy-to-understand brief reports are key to informing stakeholders of the value of the programs.
- Both quantitative and qualitative (testimonials) help “tell the story” of program experiences
For more information:

ADCANP website:
www.ctf.alabama.gov

CTF Evaluation:
ctfeval@auburn.edu