



ACHIEVING THE FULL POTENTIAL OF REENTRY AND FATHERS' COURTS

March 31, 2010

**Jane Macoubrie, Ph.D
Senior Court Consultant
Court Consulting Services**

**Daniel J. Hall, Vice President
Court Consulting Services
707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2900
Denver, Colorado 80202**

ACHIEVING THE FULL POTENTIAL OF REENTRY AND FATHERS' COURTS

Introduction

Beginning in the late 1980s and early 1990s, a fathering movement emerged in social and community services organizations. That movement focused on fathers' nurturing roles in families, recognizing that parenting is a learned skill. Where the courts have become engaged in this, the focus has been on non-custodial fathers and child support (sometimes involving criminal non-support charges),¹ and problem-solving that helps individuals to better support and engage with their non-custodial children. Reentry courts then emerged in the 1990's, and also focus on problem solving for individuals who about 50% of the time are fathers of minor children, while about 70% of fathers with significant child support arrears also have a criminal background.

For several reasons, fathers' and reentry courts appear to be converging trends. The first is that they both serve individuals who face significant barriers to employment, are unemployed or underemployed, are usually poorly educated, frequently have a criminal background, and may also have physical or emotional illnesses, literacy issues, substance abuse problems, or multiple-partner fertility.² All of these characteristics make these fathers' supporting themselves and families difficult, especially if the mother(s) and father are not in the same household. Reentry and fathering court populations overlap significantly, since ninety-three (93%) percent of reentry ex-prisoners are male, about 50% of these are fathers of minor children, and about 70% of fathers with significant child support arrears have a criminal background. In one study, 3/4ths of those with high child support arrears had incomes under \$10,000 per year, and 11% of non-custodial parents (NCPs) owed 54% of all child support arrears.³

Second, evaluations of fathering court and reentry court programs have also separately converged on a key finding, that addressing the root causes of employment problems is critical to this population, rising above sanctions (such as jail time) as critical to success. Employment-

¹ Thirty-six states have felony non-child-support statutes, although a great many do not pursue these charges. Sussman, Scott & Corey Mather (no date given). Center on Fathers, Families, and Public Policy (2003). Madison, Wisconsin. <http://www.cffpporg/publications/pdfs/crimstat.pdf>

² Sorensen, Elaine, Carolyn O'Brien, and Ronald B. Mincy (2009). Strengthening Families Through Stronger Fathers Initiative: Lessons From the First Year of the Evaluation. New York: The Urban Institute, for the New York Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance.

³ Sorensen, Elaine, Liliana Sousa, & Simon Schaner (2007). Assessing Child Support Arrears in Nine Large States and the Nation. The Urban Institute, for the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement.

based problem-solving approaches are central to transitioning these individuals to a different life, and are equally applicable to resolving child support and reentry issues. While some reports find mixed results for the effect of employment programs on recidivism and other outcomes,⁴ the present overview suggests it is not whether an employment exists that it is important, but that *how* the employment program operates, or its practices, are critical to success.

Third, the shared potential of both social and fiscal outcomes, when employment programs work well, is the reason to consider these converging trends. Not only is there the potential to change the lives of parents and children, that is, but to return more dollars to the system that these programs cost. Texas pilot fathers' courts report a return of \$4 in child support for every dollar spent. Alabama's fathering courts return \$2 in child support for every \$1 spent to operate them,⁵ and because new dollars are not required to run these programs, there is little new cost to those gains. Why these results are so different is not yet clear; existing evaluations do not provide clues about either employment efficacy or other factors.

After discussion of the current state of the field, the rest of the report summarizes what is known about best practices in the problem-solving processes of these programs, and the known links to outcomes. Where possible, the report shows the actual results that are being realized. The article ends with a best practices checklist that emerging and start-up programs/courts may find helpful. A key finding of the present report is that the potential cost effectiveness of fathering and reentry courts or programs may be significant.

State of the field. Before going further, the current ways that courts are involved in these programs should be described, since there is far more going on than initially meets the eye. Whether in fact courts have to be involved in fathers programs, and the courts' role, is also considered below.

First, how are courts currently involved? Simply counting fathers' problem-solving courts is not as simple as might be imagined. Some states have programs that are not called courts, but that share all other features of fathering courts. Some states have courts that are not centered in the courts, although courts are quite central to programs, practitioners say, even when fathering and reentry programs are not based in the courts. And although there are many

⁴ e.g., Office of Child Support Enforcement (2006). *Incarceration, Reentry, and Child Support Issues: National and State Research Overview*. Washington, D.C: Center for Policy Research, for the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children and Families.

⁵ Dollars returned figures were obtained from personal communication with the Alabama Department of Child Abuse and Neglect and Texas Office of Attorney General.

social-service based programs for fathers,⁶ this report focuses on just those that can reasonably be called courts.

The first Fathers' or Fathering Court began in 1997, in Jackson County, Missouri. This court also has a strong link to The National Center for Fathering,⁷ which developed a fathering curriculum used by this court. Jackson County's defendants are facing criminal-level sanctions for non-payment of child support, and so participation in fathering court programs is an alternative to incarceration. A second fathering court is the "Pay or Appear" program in Lee County, Florida (Ft. Meyers), and a third, the problem solving father's court effort in Wake County (Raleigh), North Carolina. The District of Columbia Superior Court's Fathering Reentry Court is a new entry to the field, was established in late 2008, and serves a reentry population with child support issues. This hybrid Fathering Reentry Court is the first of its kind, although others are in planning and will emerge in 2009 and 2010. In addition to fathering courts, there are said to be more than 356 social-service based rather than court-related fathers' and reentry programs⁸.

More interesting is that Alabama has 21 'fathering courts' that are not court based, that have significant judicial involvement, and that share every other feature of problem-solving courts except their managers' location. Alabama's program has been in place for 10 years and is managed by the Children's Trust Fund through contracts with local non-profits. New York State has five new pilot fathering projects established in 2007. Of these, one is court based and uses the problem-solving court model, but is not called a fathering court. Connecticut has had a problem-solving effort involving child support magistrates, but does not call it a fathering court. Beginning in 2010, however, Connecticut will have a new fathering reentry problem-solving court including magistrates with new authority to order participation. Philadelphia and Newark are also establishing fatherhood reentry programs that include mentoring, parenting, and job-related services. These programs are based in the respective mayor's offices, but have significant involvement of courts.

In Texas, 5 pilot fathering court projects began in 2005, and as of 2009 there are 25 fathering courts involving 100 counties. The Texas courts are based in the Office of Attorney

⁶ See Office of Child Support Enforcement (2009). Noncustodial Parents: Summaries of Research, Grants, and Practices. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children and Families.

⁷ Fathers.com

⁸ Jeffries, John and Suzanne Manghraj, Serving Incarcerated and Ex-Offender Fathers and Their Families: A Review of the Field. (2001). Vera Institute of Justice, report for the U.S. Department of Justice and The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

General, Office of Child Support, but involve close cooperation with child support courts. Georgia's state wide problem-solving program for underemployed fathers is different yet. Georgia's program, based in their 36 technical colleges, has a strong training/education component, but voluntary judicial involvement.

Counting all the programs/courts just reviewed (and excluding Georgia), there are 81 existing courts or closely court-integrated fathers' programs. Although there are few court-based fathering courts as the courts would normally count them, then, this review shows there is substantial activity from which to learn. Some of these non-court based programs are courts in all but name, including that judges mandate participation and/or threaten/ invoke criminal sanctions. The successful strategies of all these existing programs can point the way for those who are interested, whether or not all programs are court based. Evaluations of their processes and outcomes are available and valuable in understanding how programs such as these can reach their full potential. Particularly interesting are best practices that relate to courts not wishing to or not able to use criminal charge sanctions.

Must courts be central? Courts and judicial orders are central to reentry programs, for fathers or otherwise. Judicial orders in fathering courts are considered essential by some, to mandate participation and thus improve the chances a recalcitrant father will initially participate. Courts are also necessary to mitigate child support arrears that are de-incentives to improve the situation, and courts (rather than individual judges') leadership and commitment to the problem-solving process is very important. But as the successful existing programs demonstrate, courts do not necessarily need to be the center of program administration or management to fulfill their essential role. Courts are integral to these programs, in other words, even if administration and day-to-day management is elsewhere.

Additionally, the scale of the social problem makes court involvement compelling, given the argument that courts are central to success. In the U.S. this year alone, 700,000 ex-offenders will be released, with heavy concentrations in urban areas. Nearly 40,000 will reenter in Philadelphia alone, for example, and in the state prisons in general, 93% of inmates are male, and half of this population are fathers of minor children. The sheer size of the returning population threatens to overwhelm communities with problems if the needs of this population is not addressed, hence the growing involvement of mayor's offices in trying to address the situation.

The wave of reentry ex-offenders is a new challenge, and the opportunity to help communities, individuals, and families, lies in the fathers' employment. Fathers' employment is also key to resolving non-support of minor children, whether dads are reentry or not. A viable

income is a requirement for substantive support of non-custodial children. In one study, child support payments accounted for 30% of income for families below poverty guidelines, and 15% of income for families between 100-200% of poverty.⁹ Simply having an employment is no guarantee that good outcomes will be realized, however, as one evaluation found only 33-45% of participants actually received the primary intended services: job readiness training, work skills enhancement, and job search assistance.¹⁰

Best Practices

Problem solving courts or court related programs can be informed by all the activity that currently exists, and the review above shows courts' centrality to effective processes. Process and in some cases outcome evaluations have been performed on some programs, and will be helpful to understanding program successes, or to planning and refining implementation as new programs develop. Best practices can also be informed by the literature on reentry courts and problem-solving courts in general,¹¹ especially since the populations served by fathering and reentry courts are quite similar.

In the remainder of this report, the focus is on best practices, and especially, on those factors that are most associated with successful program/participant outcomes. Best practices for fathering or reentry problem-solving programs should be seen as *variables*, or factors that vary to affect successes/outcomes. Higher or lower outcomes, then, are explained by the productivity of program practices, generally, although child support dollars returned also depends on the fathers' inherent earning ability and local employment sufficiency.

For fathering courts, best practices are more relevant rather than benchmarks. Benchmarks are measurable and specific, and a benchmark is not flexible in application in a specific location. All sites studied had had to adopt program strategies unique to the legal, political, and community context in which they operate in Lindquist *et al's* study of Harlem's

⁹ Sorensen, Elaine, Liliana Sousa, & Simon Schaner (2007). Assessing Child Support Arrears in Nine Large States and the Nation. The Urban Institute, for the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement.

¹⁰ Fraker, T., D. Levy, I. Perez-Johnson, A. Hershey, D. Nightingale, R. Olsen, and R. Stapulonis (2004). The National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Grants Program: Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

¹¹ Monchick, Randy, Anna Scheyett, and Jane Pfeifer. Drug Court Case Management: Role, Function, and Utility. (2006). Monograph Series 7, National Drug Court Institute. Casey, Pamela, David Rottman, & Chantal Bromage. Problem-solving justice toolkit. (2007) Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts. Heck, Carey & Meredith H. Tanner, Evaluating Drug Courts: A model for process evaluation. (2004). Drug Court Review, 5, 2, pp51-81. Marlowe, Douglas B., David S. Festinger, & Patricia A. Lee. The judge is a key component of drug court. (2004). Drug Court Review, 4, 3, pp1-34. Carey, Shannon, Michael Finigan, and Kimberly Pukstas. Exploring the Key Components of Drug Courts: A Comparative Study of 18 Adult Drug Courts on Practices, Outcomes, and Costs. (2008). NPC Research, for the National Institute of Justice.

reentry courts,¹² so application of best practices to any court necessarily takes context into account.

The following review of best practices follows the general outline of the core components of re-entry courts described by Lindquist, *et al.* The final section discusses outcomes that are known to date. Appendix A provides a checklist of the best practices that are discussed below.

Best Practice Areas:

Recruitment, Intake, Needs Assessment and Planning
Oversight
Management of Support Services
Case Management
Information Management
Sanctions & Incentives

Participant Recruitment, Intake, Assessment and Planning

The first step in re-entry and all problem-solving courts is intake, assessment, and planning. For re-entry courts, the literature suggests that pre-release recruitment and planning is ideal, but that it is hard to achieve, and that target populations are those that courts can actually access. Recruitment is different for reentry and fathering courts, so although some problems and solutions are similar, the two types of courts will be discussed separately.

Recruitment in reentry courts. Assessment and planning prior to release helps reentry participants move quickly into housing, medical care, and employment services, which increases chance of success.¹³ Pre-release recruitment and planning has proven, however, to be difficult for most of the courts described in published evaluations. Evaluations of re-entry courts frequently report that initial assumptions about the target population must often be revisited as programs are implemented. Often there are administrative obstacles, such as rules of the parole board, legal constrictions, or structural or geographical problems in recruiting, all of which can make the expected clientele not available. For reentry courts, the target clientele necessarily becomes the clientele that is accessible, and the characteristics of this new target population can affect program structures and operations. In Harlem, for example, parole rules mean that the Re-Entry Court deals with the most difficult clients, often with 5-6 prior convictions and little preparation for employment, since work-release programs absorb other populations prior to release and local rules do not allow work release participants into re-entry court.

¹² Lindquist, Christine, Jennifer Hardison, and Pamela Lattimore, P. Re-Entry Courts Process Evaluation (Phase 1). (2003). Final Report, National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C.

¹³ Farole, Donald J., Jr. The Harlem Parole Reentry Court Evaluation: Implementation and Preliminary Impacts. (2003). Center for Court Innovation, New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services and Bureau of Justice Assistance.

In most re-entry courts, then, the intake structure seems to evolve as the courts learn how to work most successfully with the accessible clients. The nature of the population then affects program operations.

Recruitment by fathering courts. Whereas reentry court participation is mandated by court order, this is not always the case with fathering courts. Evaluations of fathering court programs also report quite significant problems recruiting voluntary fathers, as well as retaining either mandated or voluntary participants. Resistance to participation (magnified for reentry fathers) is said to stem from mistrust of the child support system, no awareness that orders can be modified or negotiated, the pressures of needing immediate employment or income (especially for reentry fathers), a possible stigma associated with men's participation in a social service program, and multiple child support orders reducing the individual's incentive to work.¹⁴

Voluntary participation in fathering court programs is typically low, some evaluations report, and these evaluations often suggest that volunteer programs may need to identify the population that is most motivated and likely to benefit from the program, and promote extensively.¹⁵ An alternative is promotion through strategically selected partner agencies and employment centers; examples of this are discussed in the employment section.

Mandatory participation via judicial orders is effective in initiating participation, although this has its limits, as well. In Texas, when judges began to mandate participation or jail, 82% of those ordered did so, compared to 0% of the comparison group.¹⁶ A North Carolina fathers court experimented with jail sentences versus electronic monitoring and found the evidence favors electronic monitoring in improving child support collections.¹⁷

In New York, one court-based fathering problem-solving program uses judicial orders to recruit, but does not enforce the jail threat. Of those referred to the program, about 37% decline to participate within a few hours of leaving the courtroom. Whether the latter has to do with program design or just participant reluctance is not addressed in the evaluation. Those declining participation may feel they have been paths to employment, or are initially better educated and skilled, or may want more immediate results than can be provided by program's design.

¹⁴ Sorensen, Elaine, Carolyn O'Brien, and Ronald B. Mincy (2009). *Strengthening Families Through Stronger Fathers Initiative: Lessons From the First Year of the Evaluation*. New York: The Urban Institute, for the New York Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance. Schroeder, Daniel, and Nicholas Doughty (2009). *Texas Non-Custodial Parent Choices: Program Impact Analysis*. Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin.

¹⁵ Schroeder, Daniel, Christopher King, Esmerelda Garcia, Sarah Looney Oldmixon, & Andy David (2005). *Evaluating the Non-Custodial Parent Choices Program in Texas: Literature Review, Early Implementation Results, and Preliminary Impact Analysis Plan*. Austin, TX: Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin.

¹⁶ Schroeder & Doughty, op cit.

¹⁷ Zingraff, R., S. Lopez, and J. McCoy (2009). Evidence Favors Electronic Monitoring for Improvements in Child Support Collections. 21 *Journal of Offender Monitoring*, 5.

Successful recruitment strategies that have been reported in evaluations and interviews included: family court sessions are attended by the recruiter, so that referrals can move to engagement immediately; the program is promoted and referrals encouraged from community organizations and all possible court centers; and appropriate fathers are recruited in employment centers by informed personnel. It seems possible that multiple sources of recruitment, such as from employment centers, may heighten the successes of voluntary versus mandatory, court-ordered participation. The literature review below also suggests an alternative incentive: that recruitment and retention of voluntary participants is predicated on the efficacy of employment and other services.

Some of those involved with fathering courts believe mandatory and enforced participation is an essential tool at least initially, that some participants will not see the value unless they are first forced to participate. For some jurisdictions, however, criminal sanctions are not an available or desirable tool of enforcement. For the latter courts, program efficacy and speed of engagement then becomes a central ingredient in throughput of fathers served, which in turn affects child support collected and cost effectiveness.

Intake and needs assessment. Intake should occur as quickly as possible after participants are identified, and include immediate work opportunities, which are one ingredient in effective programs.¹⁸ Offenders without jobs are not likely to have many immediate resources, and the speed with which employment proceeds is critical. Several programs use paid transitional, subsidized jobs as one strategy for those with very low skills, but immediate help finding work for those with higher skills should also be a priority. This suggests that needs assessment should address sending individuals down the most efficient job-related track. Strategies to achieve both short and long term goals should proceed on parallel tracks.

To proceed quickly, needs assessment should accurately understand a participant's specific needs and preferences. Assessment tools will vary widely from program to program, by clientele, and best practices in this area would be relative to the specific population served and available services. Self assessment of needs is also seen by some as a tool for engagement (defined below), as participants contribute to actively directing and managing their own processes. The discussion further below will also suggest that intake should involve early engagement strategies, and should be followed as instantly as is practical by quick steps from entry to active participation.

¹⁸ Griswold, E. and J. Pearson (2005). Turning Offenders Into Responsible Parents and Child Support Payers. 43 *Family Court Review*, 358.

Engagement. Engagement is a term designating another aspect of successful programs, and that should begin in the pre-release or entry phase. *Engagement* means that an individual internalizes the goals and strategies, rather than their superficial response to the program requirements. Programs/courts can improve engagement by a variety of strategies. Farole describes, for example, that participants can be drawn into the assessment and planning process, helped to explore information, ponder alternatives, and to play an active role in development of their case plan. Similarly, behavioral contracts can build on those plans, be used to build clarity about expectations and responsibility, and can include the schedule of graduated sanctions as well as incentives.¹⁹ Engagement strategies build participant commitment, as opposed to mandated participation.

One fathering curriculum, that used by the Jackson County, Missouri courts, appears to serve as an engagement and internally motivating device in various ways. One engagement tool used in this curriculum is experiential learning exercises, such as encouraging participants to describe their own ideal father; this is then discussed with the group. This type of activity helps participants perceive their own needs, and through this, their children's needs, to "get it" internally, and to see their responsibilities differently.²⁰ More on this will be described later, in the section on fathering curriculum.

For courts/programs with voluntary participants, engagement to stimulate internal motivation and hope may be an important ingredient in success, especially in recruiting/retaining larger numbers of participants.

Active Oversight

Early oversight. The Reentry Court model stresses that active oversight begins with court appearances as immediately as possible after release from prison. Managing the key, early transition phase is crucial.²¹ In the Harlem Re-Entry Court, for example, Farole noted that participants make an initial appearance before the judge the same day (usually within a few hours) of release, and the court may even request release to coincide with the weekly hearing schedule. For fathering courts' non-reentry participants, early oversight would mean immediate involvement in program activities, and a quick return to court oversight and case management.

Phases of oversight. While Lindquists' sequential process description did not include planned program phases, reviewing outcomes suggests this is an important part of success.

¹⁹ E.g., Harlem Re-Entry Courts.

²⁰ "Helping me understand why we are paying." Team efforts to "keep better goals in front of me." Personal conversation with program participants in one court and with The National Center for Fathering leader Peter Spokes.

²¹ Office of Child Support Enforcement (2006), op cit.

Farole²² describes the Harlem reentry court's oversight process, for example, as an initial 6 month program, with 3 stages approximately 60 days in length. In the first 60 days, parolees appear before the judge every other week, and report to parole officers weekly. In the second 60 days, participants see the judge monthly, and the parole officer bi-monthly. In the final phase of the first six months, the 3rd 60 day period, Harlem participants see the parole office and judge both monthly. Phase advancement in Harlem is on a case by case basis, based on progress. There is also an 12 additional months of follow up. Farole reports that days in the initial "six months" phase ranged from 143 to 540 days, as each phase can be extended by 30 days and repeatedly so at the court's discretion.

It is outcomes that make these phases significant. Recidivism and retention in a program both seem to be affected by the phasing of program designs. Farole found, for example, that 100% of participants were successful in avoiding re-incarceration from months 1 through 4 (through 120 days, or the end of the second 60 day period). About 5% relapsed between months 4 and 6; and another 20% relapsed between 180-365 days (p70). Oversight processes differ in these phases, as just discussed. While there are no existing best practices for this aspect of oversight, the effect of oversight phasing should be considered in court planning and in impact evaluations. In some courts, there are no fixed phases; the judge handles oversight frequency on a case by case basis, rewarding progress with loosened oversight or holding participants as close to court oversight as seems necessary.

Another example of program phasing is a fathering court that directs participants through a sequential, linear process ending in (rather than beginning with) employment assistance. Participants first go to an orientation meeting, then move to parenting and soft skills training, and on completion of both, receive employment placement services. Attrition is a problem throughout. By contrast, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation study found that getting a job and getting one quickly is the key to a better life for ex-offenders.²³

Judicial interaction. Oversight processes can also be understood to include the nature of interactions in court appearances, and the drug and reentry court experience suggests that the nature of a judge's interaction with participants in court has a direct effect on success. Some of the relevant characteristics of successful judge-participant interaction noted by Farole are that direct interaction between the judge and participant should constitute the majority of the time in

²² Farole, Donald J., Jr. The Harlem Parole Reentry Court Evaluation: Implementation and Preliminary Impacts. (2003). Center for Court Innovation, New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services and Bureau of Justice Assistance

²³ Greenwald, Richard, and Howard Husock (11.24.09). Prisoner Reentry: Creating a System That Works. Manhattan Institute: <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/miarticle.htm?id=5645>

hearings, and that the judge engages in interaction behaviors that convey to participants that the judge cares about their progress.

Examples.... “The administrative law judge engaged in direct conversation (100% of the hearings) and made eye contact (94%) with participants. In addition, in 55% of the hearings, the judge engaged in physical contact (most often a handshake, occasionally with a pat on the back) with the parolee after the hearing concluded. While the judge acknowledges program compliance and issues supportive messages, it is important to note that she is stern and demanding when necessary. The judge clearly communicates to program participants her expectation that they comply with all conditions of their treatment and supervision plan and that non-compliance will not be tolerated.” (Farole, p45)

This type of interaction serves a support and relational function, then, and affects participants’ willingness to continue a long-term and difficult process.

Team oversight. The importance of a team approach to oversight is another factor stressed frequently by evaluations of re-entry and other problem-solving courts. This means not only oversight of the judge, but by the supervision officer, case manager, and service delivery personnel. In the Harlem court, ‘micro’ team case conference meetings are held weekly -- case manager, employment leader, parole officers, the judge, and court staff -- just prior to court hearings. Participants know their behavior is discussed and shared among the team, and that it is unlikely their behavior will go unnoticed. Regular ‘macro’ inter-agency leadership team meetings are also held, for problem-solving and planning purposes, as well as to re-commit partnering agencies and cement their continued involvement.

Partner agency commitment. The overall commitment of a court and partnering agencies, rather than just the enthusiasm of a particular judge, is an important ingredient in court success. One Fathering Court judge described her personal learning curve as the program was developed, and then the marked shift in processes when another judge took over. The Jackson County, Missouri Fathering Court describes its eleven-year history as deeply rooted in a committed circle of agencies, and reports that the involvement of several different judges over time has not significantly affected the program. Such experiences are not surprising; in all organizations, ongoing programs can only be sustained by commitment and leadership from the top levels, or in this case, the array of interrelated agencies.

Management of Support Services

Leveraging needed services. The array of support resources marshaled by a court are clearly a core component of re-entry courts, and of fathering courts, since both encounter individuals with employment, education, mental health, medical care, transportation, and other

needs that impede their ability to support themselves and their children. Reducing attrition by attention to program design, day to day practices, and rapid service delivery are all important.

Programs will need to assess and develop local employment and training mechanisms. Case management personnel should be intimately familiar with services available to participants, so that quick response to needs is possible, and so that the most appropriate service referrals are made. Data collected should include when and whether services are actually received, and the effectiveness of services at achieving their intent.

The speed of action and a program/court's ability to creatively leverage all available services is critical, and each court location will have different circumstances and opportunities. An individual in need of transportation assistance to keep commitments to a new job needs that assistance quickly, and delays probably lead to a predictable end. Program designs affect the speed and efficacy of employment services, and this in turn will affect retention and the number served. An excellent example of creative leverage is provided by one Alabama fathering court, discussed further below.

Employment & training services. Employment services and training are particularly key for re-entry and fathering courts, since this population so often has poor education, few job skills, and limited knowledge about job hunting. Depending on the geographic location of a Re-Entry or Fathering Court, employment can be a challenging service dimension. Matching participants with the available job market may be one obstacle, which may mean in turn that training for better jobs become essential, and that leveraging training and workforce agency resources is necessary. Sorensen *et al* reports that fatherhood initiatives have not always had the best track record in obtaining employment for fathers, in part because some employment service providers have a poor track record of serving underemployed men (p14).²⁴

A conversation with one Alabama court/program shows the potential of thinking creatively and creating no-cost leveraged services. There, the project director personally makes direct contacts to sell potential new employers on participants' motivation. Employers agree to receive referrals from a for-profit staffing firm, to pay the normal, modest fee for screening and referral. The for-profit staffing firm then provides skill evaluation for all, and refers participants to any appropriate employers, whether recruited by the program manager or not. Using a for-profit service reduces program costs associated with employment services, and expands the pool of potential employers. This Alabama respondent also reported recruiting large employers, such as

²⁴ Sorensen, Elaine, Carolyn O'Brien, and Ronald B. Mincy (2009). Strengthening Families Through Stronger Fathers Initiative: Lessons From the First Year of the Evaluation. New York: The Urban Institute, for the New York Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance.

a local hospital, which has further contributed to this program's ability to successfully serve high numbers of participants at low cost.

Another creative example is a fathering pilot program that established a relationship with a high-volume, one-stop employment/services center. The center was able to refer and help serve eligible participants, rather than program referrals being only through court orders. This recruitment/employment service strategy allows this site to serve 4 times the number of participants than had been the original goal. Thus, their cost effectiveness may also be significantly enhanced.

Social support networks. Farole points out that informal social controls have been found to have a more direct effect on offender behavior than formal social controls.²⁵ The most successful reentry courts help build social support networks for participants, and these are critical to long-term success. Some refer to this as developing 'concentric circles' of connection, forming a social network that connects and reinforces ex-offenders ongoing re-entry into a community of non-offenders. One judge we spoke with also stressed the importance of encouraging custodial parents to see a new or renewed involvement by re-entry fathers as a positive, and to see that as "not just about the money, but about the children's needs." This seems to require both programmatic elements that increase motivation of the custodial parent to facilitate the re-entry father's engagement with his child/children, and requires commitment of court leadership to such an approach, rather than a focus on collecting child support.

Fathering curriculum. Most re-entry courts do not directly focus on fathering. And while fathering courts do have fathering/parenting programs, the best practices that should be associated these curricula have not been described. While this is the case, the published evaluations do suggest certain factors that might be important.

First, the content of fathering curriculums or courses should be considered. Jefferies *et al's* description of services to incarcerated and ex-offender parents shows that content may vary considerably.²⁶ Jefferies' also noted that none of the parenting programs studied were specifically designed for men who had been incarcerated. Thus, issues such as parenting at a distance, or handling difficulties with a non-spouse custodial parent (p.45) may only be addressed informally, rather than in a developed curriculum. Alabama's fathering courts do use

²⁵ Farole, Donald J., Jr. The Harlem Parole Reentry Court Evaluation: Implementation and Preliminary Impacts. (2003). Center for Court Innovation, New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services and Bureau of Justice Assistance.

²⁶ Jeffries, John and Suzanne Manghraj, Serving Incarcerated and Ex-Offender Fathers and Their Families: A Review of the Field. (2001). Vera Institute of Justice, report for the U.S. Department of Justice and The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

a fathering curriculum, and evaluations report excellent results in participants learning key aspects of fathering/parenting.

Second, the delivery mechanisms for fathering may both be important. The ‘Quenching the Father Thirst’ fathering curriculum,²⁷ for example, developed by The National Center on Fathering and used by several fathering courts, is based throughout on experiential learning exercises. Proponents of this curriculum believe it engages and motivates participants internally. This belief is in line with teaching theory that stresses experiential learning, or using activities that go beyond conceptual level or fact learning. By participation in experiential exercises, learning becomes internalized and part of the individual's experience. It seems likely that high quality experiential learning opportunities could be an important best practice in fathering programs, since internalization rather than memorization or fact-level learning is wanted.

Additionally, Texas’ 25 fathering courts do not have a fathering curriculum. The Texas respondent said they are now developed a curriculum tailored to their participants, but said they believe their success in achieving continued father engagement is due to employment and income. Income, in this view, acts as its own motivator by creating a sense of contributing, softening resistance against/from the custodial parent, and increasing fathering activity. Without a fathering curriculum, then, Texas’ success hinges on the strength of its employment/training effort.

To some extent, of course, whether this is important depends on program goals. And whether employment without fathering engagement is sufficient to maintain longer term objectives is not known. No comparative studies or analyses have been done at this time. Were such studies to be undertaken, the level of income programs are able to achieve for participants may then be a factor in whether fathering programs or income are better motivators for participants. Higher incomes probably are also significantly affected by the availability of training, such as in Georgia, where the fathering program is based in the technical college system. The content and delivery mechanisms of fathering programs would certainly also be a factor.

The National Center on Fathers and Families at the University of Pennsylvania’s Fathering Indicators Framework (FIF)²⁸ may also be relevant as best practices for fathering

²⁷ Williams, George (2007). *Quenching the Father Thirst: Developing a Dad*. Kansas City, KS: the National Center for Fathering. www.fathers.com

²⁸ Gadsen, Vivian, Jay Fagan, Aisha Ray, and James Earl Davis. *The Fathering Indicators Framework: A Tool for Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis*. University of Pennsylvania: National Center on Fathers and Families. Also see Rodriguez, James (2008). *Practitioners Effective Fatherhood Services Scale*. Fathers’ and Families’ Coalition of America. <http://www.azffc.org>.

curricula develop. The FIF is an instrument that could be considered a tool for benchmarking fathering classes. The instrument measures fathering behavior in six dimensions: father presence, care giving, nurturing child social competence and achievement, cooperative parenting, healthy living, and material and financial contributions. The FIF would need to be evaluated for its fit as a Fathering Court benchmark device, especially with regards to ex-offenders, but it does suggest potential best practice areas that fathering programs should address. At the same time, curricula must be flexibly adapted by instructors to the local population.

Case Management

Case management, while a subset of support service management, is such a key component of all problem-solving courts that it deserves close attention. In Lindquist's description of re-entry court core components, case management falls under the "management of support services," but here, it is treated separately so that best practices can be fully discussed.

Relevant service delivery. Case management involves focusing on the holistic needs of clients, from basics such as food and shelter, emotional and medical needs, employment, education, and connection with others in the community. An in-depth review of case management (Monchick, *et al.*)²⁹ suggests models of case management share a core group of key functions: assessment, planning, linking, monitoring, and advocacy. Clients are linked to relevant and effective services; all service efforts are monitored, connected, and synchronized; and pertinent information that is gathered during assessment and monitoring is provided to the entire court and service team in real time.

"Without competent case management, a ... program would lack the assurance that quality services are being provided, that needed services are accessible, and that participants are in fact complying, progressing, and being appropriately rewarded or sanctioned. As emphasized previously, case management – by facilitating communication, coordination, and navigation – is the "glue" that binds together the pieces, standardizes the process, and explicitly documents participants' progress..." (Monchick *et al*, p3)

In the traditional social services model, one individual case manager is the 'hub' for services and monitoring, and in social services-based re-entry programs, may also deliver counseling or may be the probation officer. In the drug court model described by Monchick *et al*,

²⁹ Monchick, Randy, Anna Scheyett, and Jane Pfeifer. Drug Court Case Management: Role, Function, and Utility. (2006). Monograph Series 7, National Drug Court Institute.

the case manager is the key player in tracking and monitoring, disseminating information to others, and in conveying participant information to the judge.

The distributed or team model for case management can be successful as well, and allows for sharing case management responsibilities across several agencies. While the case manager's role is clearly important, taking a team approach requires other team members to collaborate across different perspectives. For many, this is a non-traditional role. In Farole's reporting, the Harlem Re-Entry Court found that parole officers' expectations and agency rules made it especially difficult for them to participate in a collaborative team-focused manner. Likewise, team approaches require designating roles and responsibilities that may be outside the experience of the team players. A concerted effort to develop policies and standards, and to offer direct training in collaborative processes, could pay off in helping the team members function well together.

Information Management

Another important part of case management is the information regularly captured and used by the team to track progress and make decisions. Evaluations of re-entry courts rarely discuss this. Monchick's review of drug courts suggests, however, that re-entry and fathering re-entry case files should reveal the following types of informative documents or their equivalent:

Best Practice Data Elements

- Intake information
- Signed releases and waivers
- Confidentiality agreements
- Screening and eligibility forms and results
- Clinical and other risk assessments
- Treatment/attendance/progress reports (to monitor outpatient, residential, and other performance)
- Participant tracking forms (to document participation in ancillary service activities and compliance with required or recommended referrals)
- Case progress reports
- Drug test result logs
- Summary of court sessions to include description of sanctions, incentives, or conditions
- Individual case manager status reports
- Home visit reports
- Mid-term reports
- Discharge summaries
- Exit interviews at graduation

Additionally, unless this information is easily accessible by all members of the case management team, the speed and effectiveness of case management may be at risk.

Evaluating the efficacy of program services also requires having standard service delivery information available for all participants throughout their involvement. Rarely have extant evaluations examined the processes for or quality of services to participants from outside providers (such as drug treatment, employment, housing efficacy, etc.), but this seems to be next step, given the importance of these in engaging and retaining participants, and to cost effectiveness.

Sanctions & Incentives

The processes used for both sanctions and incentives converge to produce the best results, but in ways that might be unexpected. Some practitioners urge the importance of a sanction such as judge mandated and enforced participation, for example. Their support for this is that the most reluctant participants can be helped only after they are engaged in the programs and the value of the problem-solving aspect is revealed.

The value of the problem-solving program, which is an incentive, then becomes the motivator even if the participant is initially motivated by sanctions. Engagement should also be further emphasized, this suggests, since engagement means that participants become internally motivated to participate. Sanctions such as jail time are also limited because they fail to address the root causes of non-compliance, including low employment status.³⁰ The most effective motivator, that is, is problem-solving efficacy. Effective problem-solving, incentives, and engagement are thus likely to provide a sound, replicable basis for program successes.

This is good news for purely voluntary programs, which must rely on services and incentives. The New York city reentry program called CEO finds that early and consistent incentives that help participants work and stay committed to work (transportation fare cards, coupons for grocery items, etc., bonuses for consistent work) are a quite effective retention tool, especially for the lowest income most-difficult-to-employ group.³¹ Incentives in use in reentry courts also include early phase advancement, restrictions lifted, giving travel passes, permission to get driver's license, return home, return to work, or curfew eased. Employment is so central to

³⁰ Schroeder, Daniel, Christopher King, Esmerelda Garcia, Sarah Looney Oldmixon, & Andy David (2005). Evaluating the Non-Custodial Parent *Choices* Program in Texas: Literature Review, Early Implementation Results, and Preliminary Impact Analysis Plan. Austin, TX: Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin.

³¹ Bryant, Jennifer, Alana Gunn, & Stephanie Henthorn (2007). Using Incentives to Promote Employment Retention for Formerly Incarcerated Individuals. August 2007 Report, Center for Employment Opportunities.

fathering and reentry courts, however, that transportation for employment is probably better seen as an essential service, rather than as a motivator.

Where sanctions are needed and possible, reentry and purely fathering courts also have different tools available. Examples of sanctions used by reentry courts are enhanced supervision: enhanced curfew, lockdown in residential facility, electronic monitoring, enhanced reporting to parole officer, enhanced reporting to judge.³² Where fathers are facing criminal non-support charges, the threat of jail time is a significant sanction that can be avoided by participation. Enhanced treatment can be seen as both an incentive and a sanction. Sanctions that can be used by voluntary programs include judicial admonishment, phase extension, suspension of other incentives (such as employment assistance), mandatory anger management program attendance, or “read to your children one hour this week.”³³

Outcomes & Goals

As was stated earlier, it is helpful to consider best practices as variables, factors whose presence/absence or strength can explain outcomes. Some outcomes have already been discussed in this report already, but the outcomes of most interest here are those where evaluations have measured outcomes in relation to particular process factors. These are the 1) New York fathering program (new, court based), 2) the five Texas pilot fathering courts (non court based), 3) Alabama’s 21 fathering courts (non court based), 4) Oregon’s reentry and 5) New York’s reentry courts, and 6) the Jackson County, Missouri fathering court.

Appendix B shows which outcomes have been measured by the six programs. It is quite interesting to see what is not measured, but that probably should be. And because it is likely to be of interest to many but is so infrequently discussed, cost effectiveness (an outcome) will be covered first.

Cost Effectiveness

Cost per participant. First, the New York report is the only evaluation to measure cost per participant (CPP). Most other evaluations do not report costs at all. But while CPP is an interesting measure, it may not be a particularly *good* measure of cost effectiveness. One problem is that in New York’s case, the programs counted their costs differently, so even within this one state, cost per participant is not a useful measure of program success. Different jurisdictions around the country will also have varying economic and target population

³² Close, Daniel, Melissa Aubin, and Kevin Alltucker. The District of Oregon Re-entry Court: Evaluation, Policy Recommendations, and Replication Strategies. (2008). United States District Court, District of Oregon.

³³ This is a cross-cutting sanction and motivator that was suggested by one experienced fathering court judge.

conditions affecting cost per participant. Small courts will probably never match the cost effectiveness of large courts, as well.

Participant numbers are also problematic in CPP: The evaluations reviewed measure 'participants' as all those referred to the program, others as those currently enrolled at time of evaluation. And clearly, the efficacy of employment programs affects numbers of participants retained and served. Some courts/programs operate with criminal sanctions, while others are purely voluntary; some courts recruit from many sources, others draw only from court ordered, mandated participation. For all these reasons, CPP is interesting to know, but problematic as a measure outcome of program success, and especially problematic as a comparative measure between courts.

Increases in child support. Dollars of child support received from participants are another potential measure of cost effectiveness, and significant increases in child support have been clearly demonstrated by all programs reporting this outcome (Texas, Missouri, Alabama, and New York). But again, total dollars of child support received depend partly on the wage potential of the court's population, or not only on program efficacy. The sheer dollar amount returned, or even returned per participant, is thus not an easy, across-the-board effectiveness measure.

The Jackson County, Missouri fathering court, for example, like Texas, follows the criminal sanctions model and has collected over \$2 million in child support across 8 years, compared to nearly zero from those participants in previous years. Texas' evaluation of 10 courts (5 pilot and 5 expansion) found an increase in collections of about \$10 million over four years, or \$10 million over and above what participants had been contributing prior to the *Choices* program/courts. Texas' participants paid more child support as opposed to the comparison group, although they also earned about 1/3rd less. The Texas evaluation also found a modest correlation at all sites between payment of child support and court ordered jail sanctions, although other results suggest this may not be as important as it first might seem.

Alabama reports (personal communication) that child support received is about 200% of costs, so their state-wide program more than pays for itself on that measure alone. This measure of cost effectiveness could be the best measure for evaluations to use, since it incorporates not only the important outcome of dollars received, but the equally important outcome of dollars spent, and the dollars spent achieving other outcomes such as employment.

System costs savings. Dollars saved across the criminal justice, courts, and social service system would also be a good measure of cost effectiveness. While some evaluations have estimated this, Texas has actually measured their fathering courts' effect on specific families' receipt of TANF funds, the amount of unemployment benefits fathers received post-

participation (indicating ongoing employment in the first place), food stamps received, and more, versus a comparison group. Texas' evaluation found very little difference in TANF or food stamp benefits received by the participants or comparison groups' families; even though participants paid more child support, they also earned less overall, as well. The lack of clear savings in other programs may, then, have to do with the lower levels of family income and employability, rather than to failings of the program. Other evaluations have made estimates of jail costs avoided when employment goals are achieved, but these are estimates rather than measures.

Program Efficacy.

Employment. Given that research has already demonstrated how central employment is to reentry and fathering court individuals, it is surprising that evaluations have rarely addressed the adequacy of employment or employment-related incentives. The results that are available are inadequate for significant conclusions, but are nevertheless interesting.

New York's evaluator measured the numbers who obtained employment through program offices, and those who retained employment at 90 and 180 days. The numbers are a little difficult to interpret with certainty, since for two sites, the numbers retaining jobs at 90 days are greater than the numbers entering employment. Assuming this is due to some coming into the programs being already employed or having found their own employment, and using the numbers employed at 90 days and 180 days, retention varied dramatically, from 10% still employed at 180 days, to 70% of those employed at 90 days, still employed at 180 days. It should not be assumed but certainly should be questioned whether the employment programs at these two sites are comparable in processes, are equally effective, or whether there is some other explanation for this wide variation in results.

Texas' results are interesting as well. Texas found for example, that sites with the greatest impact on earnings were sites perceived to have the best workforce services. The percent of time participants were employed was also correlated with ease of access to and availability of employment services. Their Adequate and Available Workforce Service measure is a first in evaluations of these programs, and their finding lends some credibility to the idea that quality of employment services is a critical variable. Texas also found participants were 21% more likely to be employed even 2-4 years after program participation, but that this statistic is likely to be lower if unemployment is higher.

Incentives. First, the efficacy of employment incentives as related to outcomes has, surprisingly, been measured for only one program, the CEO program in New York. That is, while

incentives are widely discussed as a best practice, only one evaluation has actually looked for a measure of incentives' effect on outcomes.

The particular incentives used by the CEO program have a positive effect on program participation long term, they found. The CEO evaluation report suggests that the incentives achieve their results by affecting engagement or internal commitment, and by providing motivation and support to the lowest-paid employment group. The cost of incentives may be minimal compared to employment gains, system savings, and child support gains, although measurements like this have not been made as yet.

Sanctions. Interestingly, the Texas evaluation found a reasonably high correlation between payment of child support and jail sanctions, but the Texas evaluators also found that the percent of time a participant was employed was *not* related to jail sanction: jail sanctions increased child support, but not employment. Jail sentences were also *negatively* correlated with program participation. Thus, as jail certainty went up, program participation went down. This might be both because individuals are incarcerated, and because a program that incarcerates readily may be de-motivating, as the Texas evaluator notes.

In general, then, it seems important to understand the factors influencing success as a whole: employment and useful incentives may far outweigh jail sanctions as a driver of participation and long term success.

Participation and retention. Participation is a function of recruitment, first, and delivery of needed services, second. Obtaining participation through court orders has an effect on initial participation, and on child support, as demonstrated by the evaluations in Texas, Alabama, and Missouri.³⁴ The Missouri court does not currently report employment-related statistics, so it is difficult to know whether jail sentences/threats or employment are more effective, but Texas' experience suggests employment is the trump card.

Keeping participants involved must surely be a contributor to eventual overall outcomes. Retention rates at program milestones were measured by three programs, but the adequacy of employment services was investigated in only one evaluation.

The New York evaluation reported significantly increased employment throughputs (numbers receiving employment services) as due to local practices at some sites, and these higher throughputs (more participants recruited, retained, and employed) would seem to be

³⁴ Watters, Annette Jones, Rebecca Odom, Carl Ferguson, Milla Boschung, and Sally Edwards (2007). The Cost of Child Abuse versus Child Abuse Prevention: Alabama's Experience. Birmingham: Center for Business and Economic Research, University of Alabama, for The Alabama Children's Trust Fund. Schroeder, Daniel, and Nicholas Doughty (2009). Texas Non-Custodial Parent *Choices*: Program Impact Analysis. Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin. For Missouri's experience, see http://support.fathers.com/site/DocServer/Fathering_court_poster_2006.pdf?docID=2781

important outcomes for more programs/courts to measure. The New York evaluation measured the number of participants who entered employment and who retained their jobs at 90 and 180 days. One site reported 56% of enrollees had entered employment, and that 5% of those enrollees were still employed at 180 days. As the evaluation states, this may have to do with the program's losing touch with participants, but noted that even so, this is problematic, since retention and other outcomes can only be measured for participants who *are* still in touch.

In New York, certain employment-related incentives already discussed were also related to continued program participation, or retention. That the lowest income group was most affected is also notable.

Fathering curricula outcomes. Of the programs that have a required fathering curricula, only Alabama has conducted pre- and post-tests on fathering-related measures. Alabama's results are encouraging, with very positive results on a large number of measures, ranging from knowledge of how to respond to children's needs, knowledge of positive parenting, and knowledge of nurturing behaviors. Behavioral measures also showed very positive results (participating more in children's lives, etc.) Fathers' comments in interviews also speak of a strong impact of the program on their outlook and knowledge, and this may come not only from the curriculum itself, but from interactive learning while using their new knowledge. Of course, as stated earlier, employment versus fathering curricula effectiveness has yet to be measured.

Summary and Conclusion

While there are relatively few fathering reentry courts as named by the courts, this report makes clear that there are many more programs similar in their problem-solving approach and in integral judicial involvement. The existing literature and published evaluation reports are helpful in establishing some best practices, and suggesting how processes used may affect the most desirable outcomes. Courts that wish to be involved in these programs, or sponsor problem-solving fathers courts, can use this report as a guide to known best practices, which are summarized in the checklist in Appendix A.

Evaluations are not yet measuring all that could be investigated to discover the efficacy of expected best practices, and to establish clearer links between practices and outcomes. In particular, the efficacy of services provided is an obvious practical concern, and few evaluations have investigated this as yet.

The potential of problem-solving fathers' programs to address the underlying causes of non-child-support, low employment and low commitment, and the key role courts play in these programs, is suggested by this review. That some fathering courts are successful in returning

child support dollars far beyond costs is very encouraging. Some of the lessons learned from active practitioners also show how leverage, or using existing or no-cost program partners, can make a big difference both in cost and participant outcomes.

Finally, courts that wish to become involved in fathering courts may benefit by the Manhattan Institute's review of potential funding sources for employment and training programs. Their list of funding sources is included as Appendix C.

Bibliography

- Aldrich, L., A. Arnold, and M. Haab (2009). *Helping Children by Helping Parents: A Problem Solving Approach to Child Support*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation.
- Bryant, J., A. Gunn, and S. Henthorn (2007). *Using Incentives to Promote Employment Retention for Formerly Incarcerated Individuals*. New York, NY: Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO).
- Carey, S., M. Finigan, and K. Pukstas (2008). *Exploring the Key Components of Drug Courts: A Comparative Study of 18 Adult Drug Courts on Practices, Outcomes, and Costs*. Portland, OR: NPC Research, for the National Institute of Justice.
- Casey, P., D. Rottman, and C. Bromage (2007) *Problem-solving justice toolkit*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts.
- Sussman, S. and C. Mather (2003). *Center on Fathers, Families, and Public Policy*. Madison, WI: <http://www.cffpporg/publications/pdfs/crimstat.pdf>
- Close, D., M. Aubin, and K. Alltucker (2008). *The District of Oregon Re-entry Court: Evaluation, Policy Recommendations, and Replication Strategies*. Portland, OR: United States District Court, District of Oregon.
- Department of Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention (2008). *PY 2006-2007 End of Year Evaluation*. Montgomery, AL: The Alabama Children's Trust Fund, pp17-22.
- Farole, D.J., Jr. (2003). *The Harlem Parole Reentry Court Evaluation: Implementation and Preliminary Impacts*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation, New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services and Bureau of Justice Assistance.
- Fraker, T., D. Levy, I. Perez-Johnson, A. Hershey, D. Nightingale, R. Olsen, and R. Stapulonis (2004). *The National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Grants Program: Final Report*. Washington, D.C.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- Gadsen, V., J. Fagan, A. Ray, and J. E. Davis (2002). *The Fathering Indicators Framework: A Tool for Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania: National Center on Fathers and Families.
- Greenwald, R., and H. Husock (2009). *Prisoner Reentry: Creating a System That Works*. New York, NY: Manhattan Institute: <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/miarticle.htm?id=5645>
- Griswold, E. and J. Pearson (2005). *Turning Offenders Into Responsible Parents and Child Support Payers*. 43 *Family Court Review*, 358.
- Heck, C. & M. H. Tanner (2004). *Evaluating Drug Courts: A model for process evaluation*. *Drug Court Review*, 5, 2, pp51-81.
- Jeffries, J. and S. Manghraj (2001). *Serving Incarcerated and Ex-Offender Fathers and Their Families: A Review of the Field*. Washington, D.C.: Vera Institute of Justice, report for the U.S. Department of Justice and The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

- Lindquist, C., J. Hardison, and P. Lattimore, P. (2003). Re-Entry Courts Process Evaluation (Phase 1). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Marlowe, D. B., D. S. Festinger, and P. A. Lee (2004). The judge is a key component of drug court. *Drug Court Review*, 4, 3, pp1-34.
- Monchick, R., A. Scheyett, and J. Pfeifer (2006). Drug Court Case Management: Role, Function, and Utility. Alexandria, VA: National Drug Court Institute, Monograph Series 7.
- Office of Child Support Enforcement (2006). Incarceration, Reentry, and Child Support Issues: National and State Research Overview. Washington, D.C: Center for Policy Research, for the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children and Families.
- Office of Child Support Enforcement (2009). Noncustodial Parents: Summaries of Research, Grants, and Practices. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children and Families.
- Rodriguez, J. (2008). Practitioners Effective Fatherhood Services Scale. Phoenix, AZ: Fathers and Families Coalition of American.
- Roehl, J., and K. Guertin (2000). A Self Evaluation Manual and Case Management System for Adult Drug Courts. Tallahassee, FL: Justice Research Center.
- Schroeder, D., and N. Doughty (2009). Texas Non-Custodial Parent *Choices*: Program Impact Analysis. Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs.
- Schroeder, D., C. King, E. Garcia, S. L. Oldmixon, and A. David (2005). Evaluating the Non-Custodial Parent *Choices* Program in Texas: Literature Review, Early Implementation Results, and Preliminary Impact Analysis Plan. Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs.
- Sorensen, E., C. O'Brien, and R. B. Mincy (2009). Strengthening Families Through Stronger Fathers Initiative: Lessons From the First Year of the Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, for the New York Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance.
- Sorensen, E., L. Sousa, and S. Schaner (2007). Assessing Child Support Arrears in Nine Large States and the Nation. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, for the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement.
- Watters, A. J., R. Odom, C. Ferguson, M. Boschung, and S. Edwards (2007). The Cost of Child Abuse versus Child Abuse Prevention: Alabama's Experience. Tuscaloosa, AL: Center for Business and Economic Research, University of Alabama, for The Alabama Children's Trust Fund.
- Williams, G. (2007). Quenching the Father Thirst: Developing a Dad. Kansas City, KS: the National Center for Fathering. www.fathers.com
- Zingraff, R., S. Lopez, and J. McCoy (2009). Evidence Favors Electronic Monitoring for Improvements in Child Support Collections. 21 *Journal of Offender Monitoring*, pp5-9.
-

APPENDIX A

Best Practices Checklist				
Best Practice Area	Specific Practices to Consider	Already doing well	Needs action plan	Not appropriate/relevant
Interagency collaboration	Establish MOUs etc. with all relevant agency heads; create mechanisms to reinforce lasting commitment to engagement and action.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participant Recruitment, Intake, Assessment, and Case Planning	Clearly describe the target population and linked recruitment selection processes, revising as implementation proceeds.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Address built-in resistance strategies that thwart initial recruitment of fathers. Cultivate readiness and motivation through early interventions designed to build engagement and motivation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Use appropriate baseline assessment tools, risk screening tools, and/or self assessment tools.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	All interrelated staff empower the case manager and synchronize planning efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Services and supports are relevant and meaningful to individual participants.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Active Oversight	Participants witness others' appearances and are publically rewarded for successes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reassessment of participants' challenges and strengths is on-going.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Individual responsibility and public safety are balanced; neither is sacrificed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Specified court oversight includes the intensity of oversight during case progression, the duration, method for transitioning from phase-to-phase, and effectiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Relevant, linked program leaders interact to facilitate commitment, information sharing, and program delivery (problem-solving).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Commitment to goals and strategies from the interrelated agencies, to sustain the program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Management of Support Services	Identification of needed resources, including job training programs, private employers, faith institution programs, counseling or other mental health services, family members, housing services, transportation, and community organizations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Assessment of requirements for access to services, and assistance with ways to overcome obstacles to receiving services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Employment and training services are developed using a variety of strategies appropriate to the court's location.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Case manager knows and aligns philosophies, practices, costs, locations of services with participants, so that linkages can be quick, efficient and effective.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Developing social support networks is considered an objective.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Case manager knows and aligns philosophies, practices, costs, locations of services with participants, so that linkages can be quick, efficient and effective.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Quality reviews occur to ensure that services are meeting participant needs, and that a communication loop exists between participant and provider.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	While the ideal content of fathering classes is not yet been well defined, teaching theory suggests the importance of specific content and an effective experiential learning component through which participants internalize ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Processes are established for meaningful contact with children.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Processes are established to encourage custodial parents to work productive with fathers/parents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Case Management	Clearinghouse individual coordinates and oversees plans and services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Case manager evaluates behavior and advocates for rewards/sanctions as appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Regular meetings with participants enhance proficiency, compliance, progress, self esteem.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Judge and supervision officers empower case managers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Service delivery is monitored, coordinated, and evaluated.			
	Guidelines identify <i>what</i> information is critical including both positive and negative events, <i>to whom</i> it must be conveyed, and <i>when</i> it should be conveyed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	All staff monitor early warning signs of relapse or psychosocial crisis, and promptly intervene via 'motivational interviewing' and crisis management skills.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Supervision and law enforcement officers observe and report participant behavior in the community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information Management	All best practice data elements are regularly collected and available for shared access.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sanctions and Incentives	Response is swift, predictable, and consistent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Sanctions are related to magnitude of event and individual's history and plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Program efficacy in supporting rapid & sufficient employment should be understood as the central incentive for participation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Milestones are recognized and rewarded, in a public forum. Public forum for rewards is desirable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX C

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND SERVICES

The Manhattan Institute recently reviewed what cities are doing to foster re-entry programs, in recognition of the wave of prisoners returning and needing employment assistance in order to stay out of prison.³⁵ Their review also details the funding sources that can be tapped to fund re-entry job training, and these sources could also be relevant to funding employment and training programs for non-re-entry fathering courts/programs, since their participants' employment needs are similar:

Workforce Investment Act (WIA)
Serious and Violent Re-entry Initiative
Community Development Block Grant (GDBG)
Food Stamp Education and Training (FSET)
Funds for Basic Vocational Rehabilitation
Social service Block Grants
Perkins Vocational and Technical Educational Act
Workplace and Community Transition
Life Skills for State and Local Prisoners Program
Literacy Program for Prisoners
Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency
Program (ROSS) Hope VI
Empowerment Zones, Enterprise
Communities (ECs) Renewal Communities (RCs)
Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)
Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals (JOLI)
Operation Weed and Seed

³⁵ Greenwald, Richard, and Howard Husock (11.24.09). Prisoner Re-entry: Creating a System That Works. Manhattan Institute: <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/miarticle.htm?id=5645>

APPENDIX B:
OUTCOME VARIABLES MEASURED IN EVALUATIONS TO DATE

Variable Measured	TX FC/ FP	MO FC	AL FC/ FP	NY FC or FP	OR RE	NY RE CEO	NC FC
GENERAL							
Numbers of participants served*	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Statistical relationship of some process variables to outcomes	■		■	■	■	■	■
FISCAL OUTCOMES							
Child support paid	■	■	■	■			■
Cost savings estimate	■						
Family TANF support post-participation	■						
Unemployment benefits received	■						
Cost per participant per site**				■			
Cost vs child support dollars returned	■		■	■			
NON-FINANCIAL OUTCOMES							
Recidivism	■			■		■	
Effect of electronic monitoring v. jail sanction							■
Self vs. program job placement						■	
Adequate & available workforce services (staffing, immediacy & adjacency)	■						
Efficacy of continued employment incentives						■	
Long term employment	■			■	■	■	
Individual degree of program participation	■				■	■	
Retention rates at milestones	■			■		■	
Self-report Pre-Post Tests							
Commitment to future child support			■				
Commitment to training, education, and job advancement			■				
Knowledge of community support services			■				
Parental efficacy			■				
Parental involvement			■			■	
Beliefs about father responsibilities			■				
*Participants served as an outcome, rather than an input, was measured in all evaluations. Participants recruited is an input, that is, but unfortunately, those recruited are frequently far fewer than those actually served **Cost per site includes partnering agency pass-through costs for some sites, but not for others.							
KEY. In column headings, FC = fathering court, RE = reentry court, FP = fathers program not court based.							

Appendix C
FUNDING RESOURCES

The funding sources listed below were identified by the Manhattan Institute in its review of what cities are doing to foster reentry programs. Their review details these funding sources as ones that can be tapped to fund reentry jobs training, and since underemployed fathers also have significant employment needs, these sources could also be relevant to funding non-reentry fathering courts/programs:

Workforce Investment Act (WIA)
Serious and Violent Reentry Initiative
Community Development Block Grant (GDBG)
Food Stamp Education and Training (FSET)
Funds for Basic Vocational Rehabilitation
Social service Block Grants
Perkins Vocational and Technical Educational Act
Workplace and Community Transition
Life Skills for State and Local Prisoners Program
Literacy Program for Prisoners
Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency
Program (ROSS) Hope VI
Empowerment Zones, Enterprise
Communities (ECs) Renewal Communities (RCs)
Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)
Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals (JOLI)
Operation Weed and Seed