



Integrating and Sustaining Father Involvement

Copyright Notice

Copyright © 2016 National Family Preservation Network. All rights reserved.

Published by:

National Family Preservation Network

Priscilla Martens, Executive Director

3971 N. 1400 E.

Buhl, ID 83316

888-498-9047

director@nfpn.org

Integrating and Sustaining Father Involvement

Introduction

In 2001 the National Family Preservation Network (NFPN) published the *Fatherhood Training Curriculum*, the first-of-its-kind training for practitioners. NFPN has continued to publish resources on father involvement and this is now the 7th publication. It summarizes NFPN's 15 years of observations and review of research findings, and culminates in the urgent call to integrate and sustain father involvement in programs, policies, and practice.

Over the past two decades, father involvement has appeared, built momentum, peaked, and is currently stalled. There has been little new research or findings published within the past 5 years on father involvement, especially in the field of child welfare. The void has been quickly filled with other priorities and initiatives.

Almost everyone agrees that father involvement is important but delving deeper reveals this is a theory that is not integrated into practice. Why is it so urgent to do that? The answer is in the story that follows.

A Tale of Two Children

Meet Tony and Kylie. We're going to look in on them at various stages of their lives ranging from birth to age 26:

Tony (infancy): Following birth, Tony goes home with his mom and dad. He is breastfed and grows quickly. By the age of one, tests show that Tony has advanced cognitive skills. He shows no fear and learns quickly. His mom says that Tony's dad is a good father. Tony enjoys nightly wrestling with his dad.

Kylie (infancy): Following birth, Kylie goes home with her mom. Kylie's mom and dad dated for a few months prior to the pregnancy. Kylie's dad moved out of town before Kylie was born. He has never had contact with Kylie and does not pay child support. Kylie's mom is depressed following the birth. She bottle-feeds Kylie who cries a lot and seems distressed and anxious. By the age of one, Kylie has been to the emergency room several times for injuries related to falls and burns.

Tony (elementary school): Tony loves school and earns mostly "A" grades. He is a self-starter and behaves well. He has many friends.

Kylie (elementary school): Kylie misses a lot of school due to asthma attacks and dislikes school when she is there. She has low self-esteem, is impulsive, and frequently misbehaves. She earns mostly “C” grades along with a few “D” grades. She has few friends.

Tony (high school): Tony takes advanced placement classes. He enjoys playing sports and is well-liked. By his junior year, Tony is trying to decide which college he would like to attend.

Kylie (high school): Kylie is a year behind, having flunked fourth grade. She is aggressive and has had several suspensions for fighting. Kylie steals her mom’s prescription drug that her mom takes for depression. Kylie enjoys partying with her friends and frequently skips school with them. By her junior year, Kylie is pregnant and drops out of school.

Tony (age 26): Tony has graduated from college at the top of his class. He has a good-paying job in finance. He has many friends and enjoys recreational sports. Tony volunteers as a Big Brother once a week. Tony is engaged to be married and plans to buy a house within a year.

Kylie (age 26): Kylie lives with her mom who helps care for Kylie’s now 10-year old daughter. Kylie struggles with low self-esteem. She has held a series of fast-food restaurant jobs but clashes frequently with other employees and her boss. Kylie has just learned that she is pregnant. She plans to marry the father, a high-school dropout, who works at a fast-food restaurant.

Do you know what factor is most highly associated with the good outcomes for Tony and the poor outcomes for Kylie? It’s the presence or absence of a father. Allen & Daly (2007) compiled a research summary with over 250 citations of the effects of father involvement, including documentation for every statement in the tale of Tony and Kylie. This research is part of a large body of evidence on the importance of a father to his child.

If father involvement is so critical to a child, what effect do practitioners have on father involvement?

The Effect of Practitioners on Father Involvement

With the literature on father involvement focused primarily on father presence or absence, there is a dearth of literature as to how and the extent to which practitioners influence father involvement. One of the most comprehensive studies

of practitioners was conducted through interviews with child welfare caseworkers (Malm, Murray, & Geen, 2006). Over 1,200 caseworkers in four states were interviewed regarding the non-resident fathers of children in foster care. Here are some of the actions that the caseworkers took and the percentage of fathers reached:

<i>Caseworker Action</i>	<i>% of Fathers</i>
Identified father	88%
Located father	52%
Had at least one contact with father	55%
Informed father of case plan	94%
Arranged father/child visit	55%
Offered services to father	59%

In addition, there were some findings on how training impacted the actions of caseworkers: 70% of caseworkers received training on father involvement. Trained workers were more likely than untrained to report having located fathers, sharing the case plan, asking for financial assistance, considering placement with the father, and the father asking for child to be placed with him. However, if the father was identified more than 30 days following case opening, he was unlikely to be contacted.

In another study (English, D. J., Brummel, S., & Martens, P., 2009) involving child welfare caseworkers working with fathers, about two-thirds of the dependent children were in foster care. The following were the actions taken by these caseworkers and the percentage of fathers reached:

<i>Caseworker Action</i>	<i>% of Fathers</i>
Identified father	90%
Located father	63%
Invited father to participate in case plan	37%
Invited extended father's family to participate in case plan	36%

All of the caseworkers received training at the beginning of the project. Here are the findings: Training and a focus on father involvement may be associated with actual changes in practice. When fathers are located and identified as a resource, there are incremental increases over time in fathers' involvement in case planning

and the fathers' extended family involvement in case planning. This involvement frequently peaks at or before the sixth month of the dependency case. Thus, it is critical to identify and involve fathers early in the dependency process. There is also some indication that social workers' initial motivation and efforts to involve fathers may decrease over a period of time and require reinforcement through ongoing training and agency emphasis.

In a report (Martens, 2011) on meeting Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) standards, one state-contracted agency in Kansas demonstrated how it addressed and achieved improvements in father involvement. Services to and involvement with fathers was an area of deficiency in the second round of CFSR reviews in Kansas conducted in 2007. The state child welfare agency developed a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) with one strategy listed as “improved engagement with fathers in case planning and worker contact practices.” A contracted provider agency decided to implement best practice in this area. Workers received training on father involvement. On a quarterly basis the agency had 100 case files reviewed. Here are the results with averages across three regions of the service area:

<i>Caseworker Action</i>	<i>First Quarter 2009 (% of cases)</i>	<i>Second Quarter 2010 (% of cases)</i>
Assessed father's needs	39%	67%
Provided services to father	48%	96%
Involved father in case planning	43%	55%
Visited with father	42%	67%

The increase in caseworker actions to engage and assist fathers was phenomenal over the 15 months of tracking.

These three studies all involved families in the child welfare system. However, it is not possible to make direct comparisons of caseworkers' actions to involve fathers across these studies because there are too many variables. But here are some commonalities in findings:

- Agencies can influence best practice in father involvement by motivating and training workers.

- Caseworkers who received training on father involvement demonstrated increased ability to engage and involve fathers in their children’s lives.
- The caseworkers’ actions early on are critical as to whether or not the father will be engaged (two of three studies).

What other studies are available to inform the field? To address that question, we need to take a closer look at one of the main drivers of father involvement, the federal government. Let’s begin with funding.

The Federal Role in Father Involvement—Funding

The federal government first authorized specific funding for fatherhood in 2006 when \$50 million was allocated for responsible fatherhood grants. This funding was extended annually through FY 2011. In 2012 Congress enacted the Responsible Fatherhood Program and the Healthy Marriage Program and allocated \$150 million with \$75 million for each program. The annual appropriation remains in effect. In 2015, 39 grants were awarded to Responsible Fatherhood programs.

Fatherhood programs frequently include parenting education, relationship skills (including conflict resolution), child support, mentoring, and job training opportunities (Solomon-Fears, 2015). The following are two examples of programs that received Responsible Fatherhood funding in 2015:

- The Nez Perce Tribe in Idaho received almost \$600,000 in a five-year grant and was the only American Indian tribe to receive funding this year. The centerpiece for use of the funds is a curriculum that teaches healthy gender roles, sexuality, communication, and conflict resolution to adults and youth.
- The University of Georgia received about \$8 million dollars for a five-year project to serve 1500 families in rural areas to help these families build skills in handling stress, finances, and relationships.

With consistent federal funding over the past 10 years, what are the findings from Responsible Fatherhood programs?

The Federal Role in Father Involvement—Research

Klempin and Mincy (2011-2012) undertook a comprehensive survey of Responsible Fatherhood programs. They reported that the majority of these programs monitor clients rather than collect program outcome data. Most of the evaluations focus on whether or not fathers gain knowledge or learn new skills

from a curriculum. But the knowledge and skills are not linked to determining if there is improvement in child well-being. Furthermore, only a select number of grantees, estimated at 15%, participate in impact evaluations. No grantees are allowed to use grant money for independent evaluations.

Within these limitations, what are the findings from the federal evaluations?

There are three types of federal studies underway. The first is known as PACT (Parents and Children Together), conducted by Mathematica. Zaveri, et al. (2015), presented early findings from the process study of four grantees in three states serving low-income fathers. Grantees were required to offer services in three core areas: (1) parenting and fatherhood, (2) economic stability, and (3) healthy relationships. The report describes program design and implementation and presents data on enrollment, initial participation, retention, and the amount of services fathers received. Here are some initial findings:

- In the first 21 months (December, 2012-August, 2014) of the PACT evaluation enrolling participants, Responsible Fatherhood (RF) programs enrolled 4,713 men, 99 percent of their collective enrollment target.
- On average, across the four RF programs in PACT, 80 percent of fathers attended at least one activity in the first four months after enrollment.
- At three of the programs, fathers were most likely to attend a parenting session; at the other program, fathers were more likely to attend an economic stability session.
- The percentage of fathers who attended more than half of the parenting workshop sessions ranged from 21 to 59 percent.
- Attendance at more than half of the economic stability workshop sessions ranged from 7 to 63 percent.
- Fathers were least likely to participate in relationship workshops.
- Averaged across programs, enrolled fathers received an average of 46 hours of services during their first four months of enrollment.

One recommendation in the report was to increase receipt of healthy relationship content by integrating it into parenting and economic services. A final report on program implementation is due in 2016.

A second group of studies is known as B3 (Building Bridges and Bonds) and will be enrolling participants in 2016. An impact study is due in 2018.

The final group of studies is coordinated through the Fatherhood Research and Practice Network (FRPN), a five-year national project (2013-2018) funded through

the US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

According to the FRPN website (www.frpn.org), there are four studies underway that use randomized-controlled trials (RCTs); are led by researcher/practitioner teams; and involve the collection of data from program participants and/or staff at pre and post-program time points to assess changes in father-child relationships and co-parenting. The projects and research goals include:

- *Circle of Parents*: to rigorously test the effect of a peer support network known as *Circle of Parents*, which will be delivered to 200 fathers of young children receiving Head Start/Early Head Start services.
- *Developing All Dads for Manhood and Parenting*: to test the efficacy of “Developing all Dads for Manhood and Parenting” (DAD MAP). The DAD MAP curriculum is grounded in behavioral theory and is culturally tailored to low-income, African American fathers. This study includes exploring the extent to which changes in parental behavior among fathers is associated with child wellbeing.
- *The Home Visiting for Fathers Study*: to test an enhancement to home visiting services called Dads Matter. Dads Matter is a modular intervention designed to be layered into any home visiting program model using a co-parenting approach. The study will be conducted within five Chicago-based home visiting programs. Study outcomes include mothers’ and fathers’ engagement in the intervention, the quality of the mother-father relationship, child wellbeing, the quality of father-child interactions, and the quality of the implementation of Dads Matter.
- *The Ridge Project*: to evaluate the effectiveness of a fatherhood program operated by the Ridge Project, Inc. The study includes a two-group RCT with 400 low-income fathers drawn from 11 research sites in nine Ohio cities.

The projects are testing models of services as well as curricula and could produce evidence-based practice for the field. In the past ten years over a half billion dollars have been spent on Responsible Fatherhood programs. The field is eagerly awaiting definitive findings.

For currently available definitive findings, let’s look at some other research.

Supporting Father Involvement

Three psychologists (Dr. Philip and Dr. Carolyn Pape Cowan and Dr. Marsha Kline Pruett) and one psychiatrist (Dr. Kyle Pruett) developed the Supporting Father Involvement project, the first such program with longitudinal randomized research. It is designed for low-income families from various cultural backgrounds to encourage fathers to become or stay positively involved in the rearing of their young children.

Cowan, et al. (2012) state that the best predictor of whether a father will be positively involved with his children is the quality of his relationship with the children's mother. In early studies participants were assigned randomly to one of three groups:

- a one-time informational meeting (3 hours);
- a group for fathers that met for 16 weeks (32 hours); or
- a group for couples that met for 16 weeks (32 hours).

The majority of the first 279 families in the Supporting Father Involvement study were Mexican American, children ranged in age from 0-7, and two-thirds of the families were at the lower end of the income scale. None of these families were involved with the child welfare system when they entered the study. All families were offered case management support for referrals to other services. All programs were delivered by clinically trained male/female pairs of group leaders.

The study results from the first 279 families show that fathers or mothers who participated in the:

- informational meeting did not show any positive changes over 18 months. They also showed negative changes over time in individual, couple, parent, and child outcome domains.
- fathers or couples groups showed significant positive changes over 18 months.
- couples group participants showed even more positive changes than those in the fathers-only groups over 18 months.
- Positive effects included couple relationship quality, fathers' involvement, and children's behavior.

In addition, staff providing the services became more father friendly in terms of policies and procedures, outreach, and services.

The initial study was replicated and included African American families with positive effects that were strongest in families with non-resident fathers.

The most recent phase of the Supporting Father Involvement program began in 2009 in five counties in California. The goal was to help families in the child welfare system. Here is a summary of the results for the parents who were referred by child welfare caseworkers:

- Reduction in use of alcohol
- More parental cooperation and collaboration
- Reduction in conflict
- Decrease in violent problem solving (yelling, throwing things, hitting)
- Decrease in harsh parenting
- Significant reduction in potential for child abuse (normed, 77-item questionnaire)
- Increase in family income

Now let's look at some additional findings from the fields of psychology and early intervention.

Infants and Young Children

Two psychologists at the University of South Florida conducted research on fathers of infants and young children. McHale and Phares (2015) express no doubts about involving fathers: "In jurisdictions across the United States, fathers are still often seen as trespassers in work with mothers and infants. Instead of adopting the posture: 'Where is the child's father? We cannot begin work without him. Let's redouble our energies to get him in here, engage with him, help him understand that our efforts on behalf of his baby will not succeed without him,' infant mental health professionals reflexively accept that he is not their target." The authors then cite some compelling studies that support father inclusion:

- Mothers with post-partum depression heal better when fathers are engaged in the treatment
- Better outcomes for children are dependent on family functioning that includes fathers

- A program that videotapes both fathers and mothers playing with their children has demonstrated improved parenting confidence as well as improved coparenting communication

Finally, additional findings from early intervention come from Early Head Start programs.

Mature Early Head Start Programs

Raikes, et al. (2002) compiled survey results from 261 Early Head Start programs. They discovered variations that were based on the program stage of development. Mature programs to involve fathers had these characteristics:

- Establishing a broad range of purposes including focus on the father's personal developments and on the father-mother relationship and also the leadership role of the program in the community.
- Conducting needs assessments and making referrals of fathers to community services.
- Hiring a father involvement coordinator. It is difficult to carry out a father involvement component without a person who takes ownership.
- Hiring men as program staff. Many mature programs hired a man as father involvement coordinator but men were also hired as program staff. Men are instrumental in recruiting fathers and in demonstrating that the program is for men as well as women and children. That image is very important to achieve higher levels of father involvement.
- Training the father involvement coordinator. Training is closely related to successful implementation of a father involvement component.
- Training *all* staff to work with fathers. Most staff are not sufficiently trained and benefit from learning new skills.
- Identifying and working through barriers and challenging situations. By identifying barriers and challenges, it's often possible to overcome them.
- Working with non-resident as well as resident fathers. It requires more planning and problem solving to involve non-resident fathers but mature programs do that as well as involving some of the most challenging fathers: those who are incarcerated.
- Recruiting fathers in many ways. Relying on men to attract men may be a critical reason why the mature programs operate at a much higher level of father involvement than other programs.

- Collaborating with child support and TANF administrators and many other community programs. Collaboration produces a critical mass for father involvement.
- Conducting many activities to become father friendly. There were 26 different types of activities for father involvement with the mature programs carrying out almost all of them.
- Recognizing the developmental nature of father involvement. It takes time to build a father involvement component; with time, however, high levels of father involvement are possible.

Having looked at definitive research findings, how does an agency implement a program for father involvement?

Implementing a Father Involvement Program—One Model

One evidence-based model of a father involvement program is the Supporting Father Involvement (SFI) program. From a telephone interview with Daniel Molina, Statewide Project Manager, we learn that SFI was originally funded by the California Department of Social Services. Because SFI was developed by researchers, it has been evidence-based from the start with ongoing studies still being conducted 12 years later. During that timeframe, many agencies in California and some agencies in other states and other countries have implemented SFI. Here's how it works:

- 1) SFI staff assess how prepared an agency is to implement father involvement. A father friendly assessment is conducted and agency policy/practice is reviewed.
- 2) SFI prepares a plan for implementation.
- 3) SFI staff (male/female pair) provide two days of onsite training that includes training staff who will implement the father involvement program and providing implementation tools (manual for fatherhood groups; and fidelity, assessment, and logistics tools).
- 4) SFI conducts two additional site visits post-training.
- 5) SFI provides ongoing coaching and consultation as they are considered the keys to success.

Training and technical assistance for implementation are currently done primarily through in-person contacts with SFI staff. SFI is developing an e-learning training which will allow the program to be much more widely disseminated and at a lower cost.

Now, how do we pull together all of this knowledge and findings into best practice?

Creating Best Practice for Father Involvement

Let's first address why many agencies today need to start from scratch with developing best practice.

In a brief survey, the National Family Preservation Network (NFPN) asked agency administrators that had had strong father involvement programs a decade ago where things stood now. They all thought father involvement was important but most had discontinued a focus on and training for practitioners on father involvement.

If practitioner turnover is 20% a year (many child welfare agencies have a much higher turnover rate), then every five years an agency has almost entirely new staff. So agencies that stopped providing training on father involvement 10 years ago have two generations of workers who likely do not know what best practice is regarding father involvement. Now is a good time to renew the focus and training before another generation of workers is lost and children lacking father involvement pay the price.

Teasing out best practice from the research findings listed in this report, here are the steps that agency *administrators* can take:

- 1) Conduct an agency self-assessment for father friendliness (free assessment tool is available through the National Fatherhood Initiative—see Resources).
- 2) Prepare a plan to become a father friendly agency with input from all staff.
- 3) Create an environment that is father friendly (staffing, service hours, pictures, etc.).
- 4) Appoint and train a father involvement coordinator.
- 5) Ensure that the agency has a sufficient number of male staff.
- 6) Provide initial and ongoing training for all staff. Use male/female pairs of trainers whenever possible.
- 7) Focus training for practitioners on treating mothers and fathers equally in all areas including assessment, goals, case plan, and services.
- 8) Set performance standards for practitioners on engaging and involving fathers. Incorporate these standards into supervision and case reviews.
- 9) Evaluate impact of improved father involvement through case reviews and child wellbeing outcomes.

- 10) Collaborate with fatherhood support groups and other community programs serving fathers.
- 11) Develop ongoing funding sources, training, and resources for father involvement.

Here are the steps that *practitioners* can take:

- 1) Review your current caseload to determine how many fathers you are engaging.
- 2) Evaluate whether you spend as much time engaging fathers as you do mothers.
- 3) Participate in training on father involvement at every opportunity.
- 4) Identify, locate, and contact the father within one week of referral.
- 5) Assess the father's current level of involvement with the child and what services could strengthen his involvement.
- 6) Share information with the mother about the benefits of involving the child's father.
- 7) Include the father in case planning. Also involve the father's extended family to the greatest extent possible.
- 8) Provide information to the father on child growth and development.
- 9) For non-residential fathers, arrange visits between the father and child.
- 10) Refer the father to support groups and other programs providing services to fathers, including employment services.
- 11) Be accountable for best practice in engaging and involving fathers in their children's lives (see Tool for Practitioners in Resources).
- 12) Advocate for resources for fathers in the community.

Finally, here are the steps to take when implementing *fatherhood support groups*:

- 1) Assess readiness and father friendliness of the agency(ies) that will implement the fatherhood support groups.
- 2) Conduct a needs assessment to determine the number of support groups and type of services for fathers that are needed in the targeted geographical area.
- 3) Use male/female pairs as trainers and group leaders.
- 4) Ensure that staff in leadership positions and trainers receive initial and ongoing training prior to training others.
- 5) Provide training and ongoing coaching and consultation to group leaders.
- 6) Employ a wide variety of methods to recruit fathers including male-to-male recruitment.
- 7) Establish couples groups whenever possible. At a minimum, include mothers and children in at least some of the fathers' group meetings.
- 8) Select a curriculum that is evidence-based (see Resources).

- 9) Provide or refer fathers to additional services including parenting, employment, financial (including child support), and recreational services.

The next steps are the hardest: integrating and sustaining father involvement.

Integration and Sustainability

Many agencies have trained practitioners on father involvement, established fatherhood support groups, and provided services to fathers. But it's difficult to find an agency that has fully integrated father involvement into practice and sustained it for a long period of time with demonstrated program effectiveness.

Why is it so difficult to integrate father involvement into best practice and sustain it? Initiatives come and go so that may be part of the answer. The social services workforce and the recipients of social services are primarily female and it may be that they don't think fathers are necessary. However, research tells us that the best predictor of whether a father will be positively involved with his children is the quality of his relationship with the children's mother. So the flip side of the coin is that support from mothers and other females, including the social services workforce, is happening or there would be even less father involvement.

Rather than focus on the "whys," it may be more productive to focus on solutions. What knowledge can administrators apply that would help integrate father involvement into best practice and sustain it over the long haul?

- 1) Provide initial and ongoing training to all staff on an annual basis.
- 2) Require documentation of all work to engage and involve fathers.
- 3) Review annually the extent to which workers are engaging fathers.
- 4) Reignite father involvement on a regular basis through motivational speakers, conferences, and finding out what children say about the presence or absence of a father in their lives (see children's essays about fathers in Resources).
- 5) Acknowledge the majority position of the female workforce in father engagement and develop training and resources that include the female worker perspective.
- 6) Target fatherhood support groups to couples. Emphasize healthy relationships and coparenting.
- 7) Use data collection that can inform outcomes, especially outcomes related to child wellbeing.

8) Commit to evidence-based practice on father involvement.

But it's not just administrators and practitioners that are responsible for father involvement. It will require a nationwide effort to complete the task.

The Nationwide Task

Many of the well-known fatherhood champions of the past have moved on. New champions are from diverse fields and seldom collaborate, foundation and other private sector funding sources have dried up, the federally-funded projects have yet to produce definitive findings, and there is no momentum.

It's going to require a concerted nationwide effort to sustain father involvement. These are some recommendations for current fatherhood leaders to consider:

- 1) Convene a summit of champions for father involvement. Develop a collaborative approach.
- 2) Explore ways to include father involvement in current nationwide initiatives, especially cross-systems and integrated practice.
- 3) Advocate to include funding for father involvement in new and expanding funding sources: behavioral/mental health, Medicaid, home visiting, etc.
- 4) Develop new tools, resources, and training on father involvement, incorporating the female perspective.
- 5) Develop culturally competent practice guidelines for father involvement.
- 6) Develop models for best practice that are scalable and sustainable.
- 7) Focus research on outcomes, especially child wellbeing.

The final recommendation is the most critical:

Develop explicit standards on father involvement for

- College/university degrees in social work and related degree programs
- agency accreditation,
- licensure for practitioners,
- performance reviews,
- case practice models,
- placement of a child,
- government-funded contracts,
- Child and Family Services Review (CFSR)

To integrate and sustain father involvement, we have to move from lip service and an intermittent emphasis to incorporating it into every aspect of agency policy, programs, and practice including compliance. There are over 250 reasons for integrating and sustaining father involvement, all of them related to the wellbeing of children (see first listing in References). Whatever our personal biases, preferences, and other priorities, if we look at father involvement from the perspective of a child, it will rise to the top every time. Let's finish the work...for the children.

Resources

National Fatherhood Initiative, Father Friendly Check-Up (includes leadership, policies/procedures, environment, staff, program development, community engagement), available at

http://www.fatherhood.org/ffcu?portalId=135704&hsFormKey=016e8e036eb1ce8d23e04ae291ce9cab&submissionGuid=2b75a0b7-e8c2-4f06-913d-76f88203df5f#module_13917846604363147

National Fatherhood Initiative, How to Start a Fatherhood Program, available at

http://www.fatherhood.org/start-fatherhood-program-ebook?utm_campaign=Father+Friendly+Check-Up%E2%84%A2+FFCU+Download&utm_source=hs_automation&utm_medium=email&utm_content=12054421&hsenc=p2ANqtz-PZGmE5XvQskqxPS1oJvIvldBj79csEXEWOKaysE1JlwMGe3VRvAWNXaLKiGTaQol9L3kJuJm3LvKCpnHRWZRXgGjcsW&hsmi=12054421

“What My Father Means to Me” Essay contests, National Center for Fathering, available at <http://www.fathers.com/programs/essaycontest/>

Watch D.O.G.S. program (fathers serving in schools as role models), National Center for Fathering, available at

<http://www.fathers.com/watchdogs/allaboutwatchdogs/>

Meeting CFSR standards, available at <http://www.nfnpn.org/father-involvement/meeting-cfsr-standards>

Father-Child visits, available at <http://www.nfnpn.org/father-involvement/father-child-visits>

Father Involvement Training/Curricula (many no/low cost) available at

https://library.childwelfare.gov/cwig/ws/library/docs/gateway/ResultSet?upp=0&rpp=-10&w=+NATIVE%28%27%28%28%28dt%3D%27%27training%27%27*%29+and+de+%3D+%28*%27%27father%27%27*%29%29+or+%28%28bibformat+%3D%27%27curricula%27%27*%29+and+de+%3D+%28*%27%27father%27%27*%29%29%29+AND+%28YEAR%3E2002%29%27%29&r=0&order=+NATIVE%28%27year%2Fdescend%27%29

Assessing Father Involvement--A Tool for Practitioners in Meeting CFSR Standards, available at <http://www.nfpn.org/father-involvement/meeting-cfsr-standards>

National Family Preservation Network: Father Involvement Resources, available at <http://www.nfpn.org/father-involvement>

References

Allen, S. & Daly, K. (2007). The effects of father involvement: An updated research summary of the evidence. University of Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

Available at

http://www.fira.ca/cms/documents/29/Effects_of_Father_Involvement.pdf.

Cowan, P., Cowan, C.P., Pruett, M., & Pruett, K. (2012). The supporting father involvement project. Final report, Phase IV. Available at

<http://www.familyresourcecenters.net/.../Phase-IV-final-report-text-plus-tables/>.

English, D. J., Brummel, S., & Martens, P. (2009). Fatherhood in the child welfare system: Evaluation of a pilot project to improve father involvement. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 3(3), 213-234.

Klempin, S. & Mincy, R. (2011-2012). Tossed on a sea of change: A status update on the responsible fatherhood field. Center for Research on Fathers, Children and Family Well-Being. Columbia University School of Social Work. Available at

http://crfcfw.columbia.edu/files/2012/09/OSF-Fatherhood-Survey_Final-Report_9.25.12_SK_RM.pdf.

Malm K., Murray J., & Geen, R. (2006). What about the dads? Child welfare agencies' efforts to identify, locate and involve nonresident fathers. Washington, D.C.: The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. Available at

http://www.urban.org/research/publication/what-about-dads/view/full_report.

Martens, P. (2011). Father involvement--meeting CFSR standards. National Family Preservation Network. Available at http://www.nfpn.org/Portals/0/Documents/cfsr_father_involvement.pdf.

McHale, J., & Phares, V. (2015). From dyads to family systems: A bold new direction for infant mental health practice. *Zero To Three Journal* 35 (5), 2-10.

Raikes, H., Boller, K., vanKammen, W., Summers, J., Raikes, A., Laible, D., Wilcox, W., Ontai, L., & Christensen, L. (2002). Father involvement in Early Head Start programs: A practitioners study. Available at http://ccfl.unl.edu/projects_outreach/projects/previous/pdf/Final_Father_Involvement_Report.pdf.

Solomon-Fears, C. (2015). Fatherhood initiatives: Connecting fathers to their children, *Congressional Research Service*. Available at <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31025.pdf>.

Zaveri, H., Baumgartner, S., Dion, R. & Clary, L. (2015). Parents and children together: Design and implementation of responsible fatherhood programs. OPRE Report Number 2015-76. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Available at https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/pact_initial_rf_implementation_report_9_11_15_508b.pdf.