

KISRA FATHERHOOD PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT: YEAR 1

Prepared by:

**Jolan Rivera, PhD
Center for Community Economic Development
Manchester NH**

INTRODUCTION

This report is an evaluation of the first year of implementation of Kanawha Institute for Social Research and Action's (KISRA) Fatherhood Program.

The report is based on information gathered from the Program inception date to July 2007 when data was last gathered. Information was gathered mainly through the following:

1. a survey of 57 participants who completed the questionnaire (part of intake form) as of July 2007,
2. a couple of focus group discussions with a number of participants and their spouses/partners, and
3. interviews with Program staff.

Program activities in Year 1 involved marketing of the Program, participant recruitment and selection, and provision of training. As of July 2007, most participants were still undergoing training, while a few have begun on-the-job training. Because of this, the report is not able to discuss the attainment of Program Outcomes, i.e., [1] improvement in the participants' ability to undertake responsible parenting, and [2] improvement in the participants' ability to acquire and maintain gainful employment. It is too early to expect these changes to occur, given that none of the participants have fully completed all activities.

Given this, the report focuses its discussion on the participants' and their spouses'/partners' thoughts and opinions regarding the implementation of the Program, as well as their expectations in terms of achieving the goals they set for themselves when they joined the Program. This is validated by the thoughts and opinions of Program staff. The report will also provide information on the backgrounds, parenting- and employment-related issues and concerns, and needs and goals of the participants when they entered the Program. These serve as baseline data of the participants, thereby allowing KISRA to determine the extent to which Program Outcomes are attained when the participants complete the Program.

RESULTS OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

SECTION A: Participants' Program Awareness And Entry

Introduction: This section discusses the participants' and their spouses'/partners' thoughts regarding their awareness of the Program prior to their participation. It also discusses their suggestions on how to improve the marketing of the Program. Likewise, this section discusses the initial expectations and difficulties encountered by the participants and their spouses/partners during their entry into the Program. After presenting the findings, the evaluator will provide his comments and recommendations at the end of the section.

Findings A.1. On the Question: How did you learn about the Fatherhood Program?

Program Participants:

- Workforce WV
- Relative
- Word-of-Mouth
- Pastor's wife
- Hooping for Health event in Huntington

Participants' Spouses/Partners:

- (For the most part,) word-of-mouth (e.g., neighbors, off the street).
- Church
- Health Fair
- Welfare office.

Findings A.2. On the Question: What are other/better ways of raising awareness about the Program?

Program Participants:

- Radio commercials (e.g. 98.7 FM)
- Television commercials
- Word-of-mouth
- Huntington Work Release Center

Participants' Spouses/Partners:

- Radio 98.7 The Beat
- Newspaper
- The Mall
- Prison & jail

- Churches

Findings A.3. On the Question: What barriers or challenges did you encounter in joining the Program?

Program Participants:

- None
- Work schedule
- Childcare

Participants' Spouses/Partners:

- Mothers may not join due to the name of program.
- People don't know about the program.
- People don't know how much help they can get from this program.
- This program is not like any other program.
- People are afraid of child support they may have a warrant.

Findings A.4. On the Question: What expectations do you have regarding your spouse's participation in the Program (relationship with child/children, relationship with spouse and/or other adult family members, child support, better parenting, employment, income, and the like)?

Participants' Spouses/Partners:

- Parenting skills
- Newborn training
- Mentors
- Positive male influence
- Behavior/self-discipline
- Home ownership
- Employability skills
- Most clients should meet their goals unless they are lazy

Findings A.5. On the Question: What made you decide to join the Program?

Program Participants:

- Healthy for me
- They help me
- May be in prison if not in the program
- Want to learn parenting
- For job readiness
- To learn about cover letters and resumes
- Gained self respect

- Wants to learn to be a better dad early (has young child)

EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Program has achieved partial success in raising awareness about the Program, as shown by the fact that information has reached some of its intended audience in a variety of ways; some directly, others through word-of-mouth. However, there still is a lot that can be done, given that less than half of the targeted number participants for Year 1 have been met. As suggested by the participants, the Program should undertake both direct and indirect measures to increase awareness about the Program. Direct measures could include the mass media (radio, TV, newspapers), job- and other related fairs that are usually frequented by potential participants, and visits to soon-to-be-released incarcerated people. Indirect ways of improving awareness could be done through linkages with government and nonprofit agencies that are currently working with potential participants (e.g., the court system, Welfare Department, homeless shelters, and the like).

The Program should seriously consider the participants themselves as a very effective recruitment strategy. However, it has to make sure that the participants have a very good understanding of the Program in order to avoid over-promising or providing incorrect information. This can be done by making sure that the participants are properly oriented and are provided with Program-related materials that are self-explanatory and contain contact information of Program staff.

The Program should also provide focus not only on the means of improving awareness, but also on the message itself. Initial misconceptions about the Program that were raised by the participants must be explicitly addressed (e.g., that the Program is exclusively for fathers; that it is connected with CPS; and the like). At the same time, the Program's marketing efforts should highlight what the participants consider to be attractive about the Program (e.g., acquisition of fatherhood and employment skills, staff and implementation flexibility, financial incentives, OJT, and the like).

SECTION B: Program Implementation And Enhancement

Introduction: This section discusses the participants' (and their spouses'/partners') thoughts regarding their (and their spouses'/partners') experience with the Program, to date. Specifically, it talks about what the participants liked or disliked about certain elements of the Program (e.g.,

administration, venue, schedule, training content and instruction, job placement, OJT, incentives/benefits). It also provides insights on what the participants (and spouses/partners) think are ways to improve the Program's implementation. After presenting the findings, the evaluator will provide his comments and recommendations at the end of the section.

Findings B.1. On the Question: What do/did you like about the Program (administration, venue, schedule, training content and instruction, job placement, OJT, incentives/benefits)?

Program Participants:

- Administration – They help you get there; other programs don't care that you are there.
- Schedule – Hard (Charleston); prefer earlier because of childcare
- Training content – Good
- Incentives – Good; Not a lot of people offer; Would come even without check; good/helpful; real helpful especially when you have children
- Benefits – Help you out; show you how to be a better dad

Findings B.2. On the Question: How can KISRA further enhance the aspects that you like about the Program (administration, venue, schedule, training content and instruction, job placement, OJT, incentives/benefits)?

Program Participants:

- Wondered why mothers were not included so that they can learn together because it would be good for mothers to be involved. Later saw mothers in the program
- Need better computers (Charleston); Should upgrade from Windows 98
- Good computer training; one-on-one help
- Guest speakers – diapering (hands on stuff); mock baby; speakers from different fields based on the interest of the group; speakers from companies that hire people with criminal records.
- Time management
- Have participants give out fliers door-to-door – tell people about program components; start off with incentives; ask them "Hey, you want to get paid to be a better parent"

Findings B.3. On the Question: What do/did you not like about the Program (administration, venue, schedule, training content and instruction, job placement, OJT, incentives/benefits)?

Program Participants:

- Participants expecting more than they want to put it.
- Schedule at Charleston
- People not taking advantage of opportunities, which may hurt other participants.

Findings B.4. On the Question: How can KISRA appropriately deal with the aspects that you do not like about the Program (administration, venue, schedule, training content and instruction, job placement, OJT, incentives/benefits)?

Program Participants:

- Discuss with the entire group
- Talks with staff
- Focus groups – once or twice per month
- Open communication
- Survey participants
- Doing good job
- Know people in the program
- No problems
- Computer upgrades

Findings B.5. On the Question: What barriers or challenges did you encounter (or are currently encountering while participating in the Program)?

Program Participants:

- Childcare
- Charleston site needs bigger classroom
- More locations in Huntington

Participants' Spouses/Partners:

- "Baby-Momma" drama
- Lazy/lack of motivation
- Stress
- Felony charges

Findings B.6. On the Question: Are you on your way to meeting your goals and expectations in relation to the Program? Why/why not?

Program Participants:

- One person wants to be a police officer and is currently working on getting his criminal record expunged. Another participant was

encouraging and pointed out that there are officers on the St. Albans police force that had records.

- Another participant sees a psychologist and is on his way to meeting his goal. He said he speaks to the Huntington Program Specialist more than he speaks to the psychologist.
- Another participant wants to be a better parent and to learn about discipline and giving children praise.
- Other goals – being a better parent; attending college and becoming a better parent

Findings B.7. On the Question: Which expectations are being met, to date (relationship with child/children, relationship with spouse and/or other adult family members, child support, better parenting, employment, income, and the like)?

Participants' Spouses/Partners:

- I have seen a change within 2 weeks
- He was depressed
- Happier/we live in a shelter so sometimes that is hard to do
- Doesn't cry about finding a job
- Now looking forward to the baby coming
- He comes because he has to
- He's becoming a better parent

Findings B.8. On the Question: Which expectations are not being met, to date (relationship with child/children, relationship with spouse and/or other adult family members, child support, better parenting, employment, income, and the like)?

Participants' Spouses/Partners:

- I haven't seen a change

Findings B.9. On the Question: How can KISRA support your spouse in meeting these expectations?

Participants' Spouses/Partners:

- More family events
- More awareness of all KISRA
- Have testimonials of fathers in the program

Findings B.10. On the Question: Are there other comments or matters related to the Fatherhood Program that you want to discuss?

Program Participants:

- Indoor/on-site child care
- Instructors have faith in the participants
- Participating with children at some times. Bring children in to apply what was taught.
- Wants to learn how to teach child skills like reading.
- Program is helpful
- Get good tips
- They pay you
- Schedule hard when working
- Night classes should be considered (e.g. 6:00 pm – 9:30 pm)
- Good support services
- Wouldn't mind participating in the focus group again
- More focus groups to give feedback on what is right and what is wrong
- Site should have signs directing participants to the exact location of the focus group
- Get all participants together
- Appreciation day for administrators
- Keep instructors; they take extra step

EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The results of both focus group discussions are very promising when it comes to the potential of the Program to meet its goals and objectives.

First and foremost, the participants expressed their overall satisfaction with most elements of the Program. This sentiment is affirmed by their spouses/partners. The participants are very encouraged by the financial incentives provided to them. This is particularly true, given that most of the participants are economically underprivileged, e.g., living in a homeless shelter; have not had a job for an extended period of time; does not have the skills demanded by the job market; saddled by overdue child support, and the like. It therefore makes sense that the Program provides financial incentives after the completion of each training module, rather than at the end of all modules. However, it is recommended that the Program provides certificates of completion after each completed training. This could be a way for the Program to avoid violating stipulations of the funding agency regarding training-related incentives.

The discussions also reveal the high expectations that the participants and their spouses/partners have regarding their ability to land a regular and well-paying job after their participation in the Program. It

is therefore extremely important that the Program makes extra efforts to ensure that appropriate jobs are indeed available to the participants. This means that the Program should put a lot of effort in expanding its network and linkages with employers. Strategies could include personal visits to employers to explain the nature and purpose of the Program (i.e., expected outcomes, outputs, activities, strategies, and the like). Employers should also be invited to attend some of the training sessions, either as observers, and/or as resource persons. If possible, these linkages have to be formalized via memorandums of agreement in order to “lock in” jobs for the participants. Needless to say, the Program should ensure that the participants are acquiring the necessary and appropriate skills in order to be good employees and managers of their households’ finances. This can only be validated if pre- and post-tests are religiously administered and documented. Given that computer skills are almost always required in any job, the Program should make sure that the participants have ready access to qualified trainers and updated software. Otherwise, they might be acquiring outdated computers skills that are no longer demanded by the job market.

The participants and their spouses/partners expressed their satisfaction with the parenting skills learned from the Program, to date. In order to maintain this, the Program should heed the recommendations of participants for specific/special parenting-related workshops (e.g., infant care, academic mentoring, parental advising) and family-oriented activities (e.g., more frequent family get-together social and sports events and affairs, home visits, trips to ballgames, and the like). These activities could also create a sense of community among the participants, thereby improving the chances of completion due to positive peer pressure.

Certain specific issues need to be addressed. One is the scheduling concern in Charleston. Related to this is the possibility of offering evening classes. Another is the need for childcare. Also, the Program should continue providing legal support in terms of accompanying participants to court, providing referrals, and dealing with some of the participants’ previous criminal records vis-à-vis employment.

The participants should also be oriented on the other services provided by KISRA, other than the Program. Examples include KISRA’s Individual Development Accounts Program, after-school and summer sessions for children, and the like. This would further boost the trust and confidence of the participants on the Program because they feel that they have a partner in their pursuit for success in life.

The participants and their spouses/partners seemed to be very interested and upfront in sharing their thoughts and suggestions during the focus group discussions. The Program should capitalize on this enthusiasm by conducting more frequent feedback sessions, perhaps on a quarterly basis. These sessions do not only provide needed feedback; equally important, they provide the participants with a sense of ownership of the change process.

Last but certainly not the least, the not-so-secret weapon of the Program is its dedicated and qualified Staff, and the able support provided by KISRA’s administration. It is certainly encouraging to listen to the participants and their spouses/partners share their admiration, trust and respect for their trainers. It goes without saying that the Staff should continue providing the high-quality service to the participants. In return, any additional support that KISRA can provide to the Program Staff will surely go a long way in further enhancing their ability to be excellent partners to the participants.

SURVEY RESULTS (Baseline Data)

SECTION C: Basic Background Information

This section discusses basic participant information, i.e., gender, age, how they learned about the Program, and language and training-related accessibility issues.

Gender. Of the 57 survey participants, a vast majority of them are male (54 participants of 95 percent). Only 5 percent of the participants are female.

Age. The average age of the participants is 35 years old, ranging from 19 to 64 years old. A plurality (42 percent) is between 25 and 34 years old. Below is a summary of age groups.

Age (grouped)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	19-24	9	15.5	15.8	15.8
	25-34	24	41.4	42.1	57.9
	35-44	16	27.6	28.1	86.0
	45-54	6	10.3	10.5	96.5
	55-64	2	3.4	3.5	100.0
	Total	57	98.3	100.0	

Missing System	1	1.7		
Total	58	100.0		

Ethnicity. A slight majority (54 percent) of the participants are African-American or Black, while 43 percent are Caucasian or White. Less than 4 percent are of another ethnicity.

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	24	41.4	42.9	42.9
	Black	30	51.7	53.6	96.4
	Other	2	3.4	3.6	100.0
	Total	56	96.6	100.0	
Missing	No answer	1	1.7		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	2	3.4		
Total		58	100.0		

Dominant Language. English is the dominant language of almost all participants (98 percent). Not surprisingly, a vast majority claim to not have trouble reading or writing in English (93 and 95 percent, respectively).

Assistive Devices. Only 3 of the 57 (5 percent) survey participants say that they use an assistive device, although none of them volunteered to identify the device they are using.

Transportation to the Program. About one-fourth (26 percent) of the participants have their own vehicle to use in order to attend Program activities, while 13 percent say that they will share a ride. The rest (61 percent) will rely on either public transportation or other means (walk, hitch a ride, and the like).

Transportation to Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Own vehicle	14	24.1	25.9	25.9
	Share ride	7	12.1	13.0	38.9
	Public transportation	19	32.8	35.2	74.1
	Other	14	24.1	25.9	100.0
	Total	54	93.1	100.0	
Missing	No answer	3	5.2		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	4	6.9		
Total		58	100.0		

It is worth noting that only about two-thirds (66 percent) of the participants have a driver's license.

Have driver's license?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	36	62.1	65.5	65.5
	Yes	19	32.8	34.5	100.0
	Total	55	94.8	100.0	
Missing	No answer	2	3.4		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	3	5.2		
Total		58	100.0		

Given the information on the two tables above, it is not surprising that majority of the participants (55 percent) say that they need transportation assistance to attend the Program.

Need transportation assistance to attend program?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	20	34.5	45.5	45.5
	Yes	24	41.4	54.5	100.0
	Total	44	75.9	100.0	
Missing	No answer	10	17.2		
	System	4	6.9		
	Total	14	24.1		
Total		58	100.0		

How Participants Learned About the Program. When asked to name the various ways they learned about the Program, one-third of the participants said that they heard about it from someone who was already participating in the Program. About 30 percent learned about it from KISRA Staff/Board members, while about one-fifth read the posters and placards that describe the Program. Some 32 percent learned about it through other ways, e.g., family member, friend, Church member, newspaper, local agency, internet, and the like.

How Participants Learned About Program	Frequency	Percentage
Someone currently in Program	19	33.3
Others (family member, friend, Church member, newspaper, local agency, internet)	18	31.6

KISRA Board/Staff	17	29.8
Posters/placards	12	21.1
Court	3	5.3
Someone participating in another program	2	3.5

Multiple-response question

SECTION D: Education

This section discusses education-related information, i.e., current education status, educational attainment, and interest in schooling.

Education Status. Only 9 percent of participants are currently in school, which is not surprising, given the group's age composition.

Currently attending school?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	50	86.2	90.9	90.9
	Yes	5	8.6	9.1	100.0
	Total	55	94.8	100.0	
Missing	No answer	1	1.7		
	System	2	3.4		
	Total	3	5.2		
Total		58	100.0		

Of those who are currently not in school, a vast majority of them (87 percent) are interested in furthering their education.

Interested in furthering education?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	7	12.1	13.2	13.2
	Yes	46	79.3	86.8	100.0
	Total	53	91.4	100.0	
Missing	No answer	4	6.9		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	5	8.6		
Total		58	100.0		

Education Attainment. The average number of years of schooling is around 11 years, ranging from 0 years to 18 years of schooling. Majority (65 percent) of

the participants have between 9 and 12 years of schooling. Below is a summary of number of years of schooling.

Years of Schooling (Grouped)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	1.7	2.0	2.0
	1-5	2	3.4	3.9	5.9
	6-8	2	3.4	3.9	9.8
	9-12	33	56.9	64.7	74.5
	13-16	12	20.7	23.5	98.0
	17 and up	1	1.7	2.0	100.0
	Total	51	87.9	100.0	
Missing	No answer	5	8.6		
	System	2	3.4		
	Total	7	12.1		
Total		58	100.0		

Majority (67 percent) of the participants have either a GED or high school diploma as their highest educational attainment. While 15 percent have at least some college education, a significant number (19 percent) do not have a GED or high school diploma.

Highest Degree Earned

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No GED/HS diploma	10	17.2	18.5	18.5
	GED	18	31.0	33.3	51.9
	High school diploma	18	31.0	33.3	85.2
	Technical/AA degree	3	5.2	5.6	90.7
	College degree or higher	5	8.6	9.3	100.0
	Total	54	93.1	100.0	
Missing	No answer	3	5.2		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	4	6.9		
Total		58	100.0		

About half of the participants (52 percent) have some vocational training or technical education. The types of training received include welding, electronics, computers, HVAC, car repair, forklift operation, and the like.

SECTION D: Family and Parenting

Current Marital Status. A slight majority (53 percent) of the participants are never married, while about 17 percent are legally married and currently living with their spouse.

Current Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Legally married & living with spouse	9	15.5	16.4	16.4
	Separated	5	8.6	9.1	25.5
	Divorced	12	20.7	21.8	47.3
	Never married	29	50.0	52.7	100.0
	Total	55	94.8	100.0	
Missing	No answer	2	3.4		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	3	5.2		
Total		58	100.0		

Living Arrangements. The participants have varied types of living arrangement. While about 30 percent live with their spouse or partner, almost one-fourth (23 percent) live alone. Only 11 percent live with their own children. A significant 16 percent live in a halfway house, shelter or re-entry program housing.

Persons Participants Regularly Live With	Frequency	Percentage
No one/live alone	13	23.2
Wife	7	12.5
Girlfriend/boyfriend	10	17.9
Own child(ren)	6	10.7
Spouse/partner's children	5	8.9
One or both parents	7	12.5
Sibling(s)	2	3.6
Other relatives	3	5.4
Friends	2	3.6
Halfway house/shelter	2	3.6
Re-entry program housing	7	12.5

Multiple-response question

A significant 14 percent of the participants were homeless or lived in a shelter in the past six months.

Homeless/lived in shelter in past 6 months?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Valid	No	48	82.8	85.7	85.7
	Yes	8	13.8	14.3	100.0
	Total	56	96.6	100.0	
Missing	No answer	1	1.7		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	2	3.4		
Total		58	100.0		

The average number of adults living with the participants is between 1 and 2 persons, ranging from zero to five. Below is a tabulation of the number of adults that the participants have regularly lived with.

Number of adults regularly living in household

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	8.6	10.4	10.4
	1	13	22.4	27.1	37.5
	2	24	41.4	50.0	87.5
	3	5	8.6	10.4	97.9
	5	1	1.7	2.1	100.0
	Total	48	82.8	100.0	
Missing	no answer	9	15.5		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	10	17.2		
Total		58	100.0		

The average number of children living with the participants is between 0 and 1 child, ranging from zero to six. Below is a tabulation of the number of adults that the participants have regularly lived with.

Number of children regularly living in household

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	32	55.2	60.4	60.4
	1	10	17.2	18.9	79.2
	2	7	12.1	13.2	92.5
	3	2	3.4	3.8	96.2
	4	1	1.7	1.9	98.1
	6	1	1.7	1.9	100.0
	Total	53	91.4	100.0	
Missing	no answer	4	6.9		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	5	8.6		
Total		58	100.0		

The average number of adults and children combined living with the participants is between 2 and 3 persons, ranging from zero to eight. Below is a tabulation of the number of adults and children that the participants have regularly lived with.

Total number regularly living in household

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	5.2	6.5	6.5
	1	8	13.8	17.4	23.9
	2	12	20.7	26.1	50.0
	3	11	19.0	23.9	73.9
	4	9	15.5	19.6	93.5
	5	1	1.7	2.2	95.7
	6	1	1.7	2.2	97.8
	8	1	1.7	2.2	100.0
	Total	46	79.3	100.0	
	Missing	no answer	11	19.0	
System		1	1.7		
Total		12	20.7		
Total		58	100.0		

The average number of children aged 18 years or older that the participants have is between 0 and 1 child, ranging from zero to eight. Below is a tabulation of the number of adult children that the participants have.

Number of children 18 years or older

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	45	77.6	80.4	80.4
	1	5	8.6	8.9	89.3
	2	2	3.4	3.6	92.9
	4	3	5.2	5.4	98.2
	6	1	1.7	1.8	100.0
	Total	56	96.6	100.0	
	Missing	no answer	1	1.7	
System		1	1.7		
Total		2	3.4		
Total		58	100.0		

The average number of children aged below 18 years that the participants have is two children, ranging from zero to seven. Below is a tabulation of the number of children under 18 years of age that the participants have.

Number of children younger than 18 years

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	8.6	8.9	8.9
	1	19	32.8	33.9	42.9
	2	20	34.5	35.7	78.6
	3	5	8.6	8.9	87.5
	4	1	1.7	1.8	89.3
	5	3	5.2	5.4	94.6
	6	2	3.4	3.6	98.2
	7	1	1.7	1.8	100.0
	Total	56	96.6	100.0	
Missing	no answer	1	1.7		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	2	3.4		
Total		58	100.0		

The average number of children aged below 18 years that the participants have but do not live with them is between 1 and 2 children. Below is a tabulation of the number of children under 18 years of age that the participants have but do not live with.

Number of children younger than 18 years not living with participant

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	11	19.0	19.6	19.6
	1	24	41.4	42.9	62.5
	2	12	20.7	21.4	83.9
	3	1	1.7	1.8	85.7
	4	2	3.4	3.6	89.3
	5	3	5.2	5.4	94.6
	6	1	1.7	1.8	96.4
	8	1	1.7	1.8	98.2
	9	1	1.7	1.8	100.0
	Total	56	96.6	100.0	
Missing	no answer	1	1.7		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	2	3.4		
Total		58	100.0		

Child Support and Custody.

About 58 percent of the participants say that they have a child support order from the court or a child support agency.

Child support order from court or child support agency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	23	39.7	41.8	41.8
	Yes	32	55.2	58.2	100.0
	Total	55	94.8	100.0	
Missing	No answer	2	3.4		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	3	5.2		
Total		58	100.0		

On average, the participants have one child support order, ranging from zero to as much as five. Below is a tabulation of the number of child support orders that the participants have.

Number of child support orders (according to participant)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	15	25.9	31.3	31.3
	1	23	39.7	47.9	79.2
	2	6	10.3	12.5	91.7
	3	1	1.7	2.1	93.8
	4	2	3.4	4.2	97.9
	5	1	1.7	2.1	100.0
	Total	48	82.8	100.0	
Missing	no answer	8	13.8		
	System	2	3.4		
	Total	10	17.2		
Total		58	100.0		

According to the participants, the average monthly child support amount is \$163.42. The amounts range from zero to \$783. Below is a tabulation of the monthly child support amounts that need to be paid by the participants.

Amount of Child Support Payment (grouped)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	\$0.00	13	22.4	31.0	31.0
	\$1 - \$99	4	6.9	9.5	40.5
	\$100 - \$199	9	15.5	21.4	61.9
	\$200 - \$299	9	15.5	21.4	83.3
	\$300 - \$399	4	6.9	9.5	92.9
	\$400 and up	3	5.2	7.1	100.0
	Total	42	72.4	100.0	

Missing	No answer	12	20.7		
	System	4	6.9		
	Total	16	27.6		
Total		58	100.0		

The amount of back due child support payments that the participants have incurred vary from zero to as much as \$30,000. The average back due child support payment is \$5,863.50. Below is a distribution of the said amounts.

Amount of Back Due Child Support Payments (grouped)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	\$0	15	25.9	39.5	39.5
	\$1 - \$999	5	8.6	13.2	52.6
	\$1,000 - \$9,999	8	13.8	21.1	73.7
	\$10,000 - \$19,999	5	8.6	13.2	86.8
	\$20,000 and up	5	8.6	13.2	100.0
	Total	38	65.5	100.0	
Missing	No answer	14	24.1		
	System	6	10.3		
	Total	20	34.5		
Total		58	100.0		

About half of the participants say that there is a court decision on the legal custody of their child (or one of their children) of whom they do not have custody. The others either do not have a decision (34 percent) or do not know (15 percent).

Child 1: Court decision on legal custody of child?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	18	31.0	34.0	34.0
	Yes	27	46.6	50.9	84.9
	Don't know	8	13.8	15.1	100.0
	Total	53	91.4	100.0	
Missing	No answer	3	5.2		
	System	2	3.4		
	Total	5	8.6		
Total		58	100.0		

A large majority (84 percent) of the participants say that their name is in the birth certificate of their child (or one of their children) of whom they do not have custody.

Child 1: Participant's name in birth certificate or established paternity?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	8	13.8	14.5	14.5
	Yes	46	79.3	83.6	98.2
	Don't know	1	1.7	1.8	100.0
	Total	55	94.8	100.0	
Missing	No answer	2	3.4		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	3	5.2		
Total		58	100.0		

According to 64 percent the participants, the child (or one of their children) of whom they do not have custody is covered by a child support order.

Child 1: Covered by child support order?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	17	29.3	30.4	30.4
	Yes	36	62.1	64.3	94.6
	Don't know	2	3.4	3.6	98.2
	6	1	1.7	1.8	100.0
	Total	56	96.6	100.0	
Missing	No answer	1	1.7		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	2	3.4		
Total		58	100.0		

However, only 36 percent have a court order allowing them to spend time with the child.

Child 1: Court order allowing time spent with child?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	36	62.1	64.3	64.3
	Yes	20	34.5	35.7	100.0
	Total	56	96.6	100.0	
Missing	No answer	1	1.7		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	2	3.4		
Total		58	100.0		

In fact, around 9 percent of the participants have court-order contact restriction, e.g., no overnights, supervised visits only, and the like.

Child 1: Court-ordered contact restrictions?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	49	84.5	90.7	90.7
	Yes	5	8.6	9.3	100.0
	Total	54	93.1	100.0	
Missing	No answer	2	3.4		
	System	2	3.4		
	Total	4	6.9		
Total		58	100.0		

Parenting. One measure of the participants' parenting behavior is the amount of contact they have with their children. Majority (63 percent) of the participants say that they saw their child (or one of their children) of whom they do not have custody the same day of, or less than a week before, the interview.

Child 1: Length of time since last saw child

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2	3.4	3.8	3.8
	Less than a week	31	53.4	59.6	63.5
	One week to less than one month	5	8.6	9.6	73.1
	Between one to less than six months	3	5.2	5.8	78.8
	One year or more	11	19.0	21.2	100.0
	Total	52	89.7	100.0	
Missing	No answer	3	5.2		
	System	3	5.2		
	Total	6	10.3		
Total		58	100.0		

Almost half of them (48 percent) claim to have been seeing their child about once a week or more in the last 12 months. However, one-fifth of them have never seen their child in the last 12 months.

Child 1: Frequency of seeing child in last 12 months

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	1.7	1.9	1.9
	Several times a week	21	36.2	38.9	40.7

	About once a week	4	6.9	7.4	48.1
	One to three times a month	9	15.5	16.7	64.8
	Several times a year	6	10.3	11.1	75.9
	About once a year	2	3.4	3.7	79.6
	Not at all	11	19.0	20.4	100.0
	Total	54	93.1	100.0	
Missing	No answer	3	5.2		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	4	6.9		
Total		58	100.0		

There is dissatisfaction among participants regarding the amount of time they have been spending with their child (or one of their children) of whom they do not have custody. Almost half (46 percent) are very dissatisfied, and another 11 percent are somewhat satisfied. On a positive note, almost one-fourth of them (23 percent) say that they are very satisfied with the amount of time they have been spending with their child.

Child 1: How satisfied with amount of time spent with child?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very dissatisfied	26	44.8	46.4	46.4
	Somewhat dissatisfied	6	10.3	10.7	57.1
	Somewhat satisfied	11	19.0	19.6	76.8
	Very satisfied	13	22.4	23.2	100.0
	Total	56	96.6	100.0	
Missing	No answer	1	1.7		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	2	3.4		
Total		58	100.0		

Given the number of participants with limited contact with their child (or one of their children) of whom they do not have custody, it is not surprising that around 41 percent do not have any influence in making decisions about the child in the last 12 months.

Child 1: Amount of influence in making major decisions about child in last 12 months

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No influence	22	37.9	40.7	40.7
	Some influence	13	22.4	24.1	64.8
	A great deal of influence	19	32.8	35.2	100.0
	Total	54	93.1	100.0	
Missing	No answer	3	5.2		

System	1	1.7	
Total	4	6.9	
Total	58	100.0	

This could be partly explained by the participants' claim that about 37 percent of them have a somewhat hostile, very hostile or no relationship at all with their child's other parent. On a more positive note, some 32 percent of the participants claim to have a very friendly relationship with the child's other parent.

Child 1: Overall assessment of relationship with child's other parent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No relationship	12	20.7	22.2	22.2
	Very hostile	4	6.9	7.4	29.6
	Somewhat hostile	4	6.9	7.4	37.0
	Neutral	4	6.9	7.4	44.4
	Somewhat friendly	13	22.4	24.1	68.5
	Very friendly	17	29.3	31.5	100.0
	Total	54	93.1	100.0	
Missing	No answer	3	5.2		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	4	6.9		
Total		58	100.0		

About 56 percent of the participants say that the child's other parent want them (the participant) to have a relationship with their child.

Child 1: Other parent wants participant to have relationship with child?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unsure	5	8.6	9.1	9.1
	No	13	22.4	23.6	32.7
	Somewhat	5	8.6	9.1	41.8
	Definitely	31	53.4	56.4	98.2
	5	1	1.7	1.8	100.0
	Total	55	94.8	100.0	
Missing	No answer	2	3.4		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	3	5.2		
Total		58	100.0		

Aside from the child support payments made, the participants claim to also provide other forms of child support. The most common forms are purchase of clothes and other major items (52 percent) and money directly given to the child or other parent (51 percent). Below is a distribution of the different forms of child support provided by the participants.

Forms of Child Support	Frequency	Percentage
Money directly to child/parent	28	50.9
Car payments, purchase, etc	6	10.9
Purchase of clothes, other major items	28	51.9
Payment of medical bills	7	12.7
Mortgage/loan payments	5	9.1
Buying diapers	8	14.5
Others	4	7.3

Multiple-response question

SECTION E: Employment and Income

Employment History and Status. In order to provide financial support to their children, the participants need a regular source of income. A vast majority (95 percent) of the participants have been employed either currently or in the past.

Ever been employed?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	3	5.2	5.5	5.5
	Yes	52	89.7	94.5	100.0
	Total	55	94.8	100.0	
Missing	No answer	2	3.4		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	3	5.2		
Total		58	100.0		

Most of them (94 percent) actually had a full-time job.

Ever been employed fulltime?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	3	5.2	5.7	5.7
	Yes	50	86.2	94.3	100.0
	Total	53	91.4	100.0	
Missing	No answer	4	6.9		

System	1	1.7	
Total	5	8.6	
Total	58	100.0	

On average, the longest time the participants held a fulltime job is 4 years, ranging from zero to as much as 16 years. Below is a distribution of the the longest time the participants held a fulltime job.

Longest ever worked fulltime for one employer (years)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	8.6	12.2	12.2
	1	7	12.1	17.1	29.3
	2	3	5.2	7.3	36.6
	3	6	10.3	14.6	51.2
	4	4	6.9	9.8	61.0
	5	4	6.9	9.8	70.7
	6	4	6.9	9.8	80.5
	8	3	5.2	7.3	87.8
	9	3	5.2	7.3	95.1
	10	1	1.7	2.4	97.6
	16	1	1.7	2.4	100.0
	Total	41	70.7	100.0	
Missing	No answer	16	27.6		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	17	29.3		
Total		58	100.0		

When asked to describe their employment in the past 12 months, about 40 percent of the participants claim to have a fulltime employment. On the other hand, almost one-fourth of them (23 percent) did not work.

Employment in past 12 months (best description)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Employed fulltime	21	36.2	40.4	40.4
	Employed parttime	8	13.8	15.4	55.8
	Employed on temporary basis/pick-up/occasional jobs	11	19.0	21.2	76.9
	Did not work	12	20.7	23.1	100.0
	Total	52	89.7	100.0	
Missing	No answer	5	8.6		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	6	10.3		

Total	58	100.0	
-------	----	-------	--

The average number of months that the participants worked full-time in the past 12 months is around six months. However, when asked about their employment status during their entry into the Program, one-third of the participants (36 percent) said that they did not have a job.

Currently employed?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	35	60.3	63.6	63.6
	Yes	20	34.5	36.4	100.0
	Total	55	94.8	100.0	
Missing	No answer	2	3.4		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	3	5.2		
Total		58	100.0		

Twenty-three of the 35 unemployed participants said that, on average, they have been unemployed for the last 12 to 13 months.

Only three participants currently have more than one job.

More than one job?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	35	60.3	92.1	92.1
	Yes	3	5.2	7.9	100.0
	Total	38	65.5	100.0	
Missing	Not applicable	2	3.4		
	No answer	16	27.6		
	System	2	3.4		
	Total	20	34.5		
Total		58	100.0		

A large percentage of the participants (86 percent) were looking for a job during their entry to the Program.

Currently looking for a job?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	7	12.1	13.7	13.7
	Yes	44	75.9	86.3	100.0

	Total	51	87.9	100.0
Missing	No answer	6	10.3	
	System	1	1.7	
	Total	7	12.1	
Total		58	100.0	

According to the participants, majority of them (78 percent) started working in their current job less than two years ago. Only around 5 percent of them had their job for 10 years or more.

Year started current/most recent job

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2	3.4	5.4	5.4
	1996	1	1.7	2.7	8.1
	1997	1	1.7	2.7	10.8
	2002	1	1.7	2.7	13.5
	2004	1	1.7	2.7	16.2
	2005	2	3.4	5.4	21.6
	2006	9	15.5	24.3	45.9
	2007	20	34.5	54.1	100.0
	Total	37	63.8	100.0	
Missing	No answer	20	34.5		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	21	36.2		
Total		58	100.0		

Only three participants say that they are self-employed.

Self-employed?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	46	79.3	93.9	93.9
	Yes	3	5.2	6.1	100.0
	Total	49	84.5	100.0	
Missing	No answer	7	12.1		
	System	2	3.4		
	Total	9	15.5		
Total		58	100.0		

The average number of hours of work per week for the participants is between 35 to 36 hours. This is true only for those who work and volunteered to provide information (45 participants).

Income and Benefits. The average hourly wage of participants who work and volunteered to provide information (46 participants) is \$7.38, ranging from as low as \$2.13 per hour to \$15 per hour.

Non-wage source of income for participants in the last 12 months are enumerated below. The most common source is food stamps.

Non-Wage Sources in Last 12 Months	Frequency	Percentage
TANF	1	1.8
State/Local General Assistance (GA)	6	10.9
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	1	1.8
Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI)	2	3.6
Food Stamps	19	35.2
Unemployment Insurance (UI)	4	7.3
Worker's Compensation	1	1.8
Veterans Administration (VA) Benefits	1	1.9
Others	1	1.9

Multiple-response question

Given their employment status and wage rates, it is not surprising that a large majority (73 percent) of the participants say that their usual wages do not very well cover, or not cover at all, their financial needs. Only 2 percent say that their usual wages cover their needs very well.

Usual wage cover financial needs?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	19	32.8	36.5	36.5
	Not very well	19	32.8	36.5	73.1
	Fairly well	13	22.4	25.0	98.1
	Very well	1	1.7	1.9	100.0
	Total	52	89.7	100.0	
Missing	No answer	5	8.6		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	6	10.3		
Total		58	100.0		

Majority (65 percent) of the participants do not have paid vacation, paid sick leave and medical coverage benefits.

Job Benefits	Frequency	Percentage
Paid Vacation	15	31.3
Paid Sick Leave	12	25.0

Medical Coverage	13	27.1
None of the three	31	64.6

Multiple-response question

SECTION F: Legal, Mental and Medical History and Status

A significant percentage of participants have legal, mental and medical histories. More than half of them (59 percent) had been convicted of a misdemeanor, while almost half (47 percent) were convicted of a felony, or is in an alcohol/drug abuse treatment program (45 percent). Below is a detailed list of legal, mental and medical history and status of the participants.

Legal, Mental and Medical History and Status	Frequency	Percentage
Convicted of a misdemeanor	32	59.3
Convicted of a felony	25	47.2
Convicted of a violent crime	5	9.4
Convicted of spousal or child abuse	1	1.9
In an alcohol/drug abuse treatment program	24	45.3
Arrested for DUI/DWI	7	13.5
Ever been imprisoned for non-child support-related offense?	21	38.9
Currently on probation?	14	25.5
Currently on parole?	4	7.8
Currently have pending charges?	4	7.1
Currently undergoing substance abuse treatment?	12	22.2
Currently undergoing mental health-related treatment?	4	7.1
Currently undergoing medical health-related treatment?	5	9.6

Multiple-response question

SECTION F: General Needs

Majority of participants expressed the need for some or a lot of help in a number of areas. It must be noted that only 46 of the 57 survey participants filled out this part of the questionnaire.

The most pressing needs include [1] finding a better-paying job (91 percent), [2] additional job-related training (89 percent), and [3] parenting skills (78.3 percent). Below is a distribution of the needs expressed by the participants.

General Needs: Need some or a lot of help in ...	Frequency	Percentage
Getting to see child(ren) more often	21	45.7
Parenting skills/being a better parent	36	78.3
Improving relationship with other parent	23	50.0
Child support payments or debt	32	69.6
Anger management	11	23.9
Substance abuse treatment/counseling	7	15.2
Mental health-related treatment/counseling	5	10.9
Finding a job	36	78.3
Finding a better-paying job	42	91.3
Additional job-related training	41	89.1
Garnering high school diploma or GED	5	11.4

Multiple-response question

SECTION G: Program Participation

Based on their list of needs, the participants identified a number of Program components that they agreed to participate and complete in order to meet their needs. It must be noted that only 46 of the 57 survey participants filled out this part of the questionnaire.

Almost all participants (91 percent) agreed to participate in training workshops on responsible fatherhood. The same is true regarding training workshops on employable skills (89 percent).

Program-related Goals	Frequency	Percentage
Participation in training workshops on responsible fatherhood	42	91.3
Participation in training workshops on employable skills	41	89.1
Participation in GED program	8	17.8
Participation in on-the-job training/job placement	39	84.8

Multiple-response question

The participants signified their interest to participate in the Program in one of the training sites enumerated below:

Preferred training venue

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Charleston	16	27.6	35.6	35.6
	Dunbar	11	19.0	24.4	60.0
	Huntington	18	31.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	45	77.6	100.0	
Missing	No answer	12	20.7		
	System	1	1.7		
	Total	13	22.4		
Total		58	100.0		

EVALUATOR’S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Information gathered through the survey (embedded in participants’ intake forms) strongly point to the fact that the participants need the Program. Indeed, KISRA did an excellent job in identifying and enjoining participation from community members who need responsible parenthood training because majority of the participants do not have regular contact with their children, and have major issues with their children’s other parent. Part of the reason is the inability of most of the participants to provide financial support to their children which, in turn, is due to their inability to either maintain or find a well-paying and/or stable job. Thus, they need the employment-related training and job placement elements of the Program. To facilitate this, some of the participants need to get their GEDs.

With the availability of this baseline information, it would be interesting to find out how the participants’ parenting and employment skills and behavior change (hopefully for the better) upon their completion of the Program. Are more participants having more frequent and regular contact with their children? Is their relationship with their children’s other parent improving? Are the participants learning new or enhancing existing job-related skills? Do these changes manifest in the job placement aspect of the Program? Are they able to secure and maintain regular employment? Does this translate to their ability to pay child support? On the Program implementation process, are more community members learning about the Program? Are there more novel ways of informing the public? Will more women participate in the Program?

In order to answer these questions, KISRA should continue, if not further improve, the timely and complete information from the

participants. It is a tedious undertaking, but it is the only way to come up with data that will inform the attainment of Program Outcomes.

Lastly, it is important to reiterate the fact that majority of the participants are vulnerable to legal, mental and medical issues. Thus, KISRA should continue its laudable effort in treating participants as human beings. Testimonies from the focus group discussions strongly point to the fact that participants want to be treated this way, especially since they have had negative experiences in the past with other community members, organizations, and society, as a whole.