



Fatherhood
Research
& Practice
Network

www.frpn.org

State Approaches to Including Fathers in Programs and Policies

May 22, 2018

Who is FRPN?



Jay Fagan, Ph.D.
Temple University
FRPN Co-Director



Rebecca Kaufman, MSW
FRPN Senior Research Coordinator



Jessica Pearson, Ph.D.
Center for Policy Research
FRPN Co-Director



Nancy Thoennes, Ph.D.
Center for Policy Research

Overview of FRPN

- Five-year, \$4.8 million cooperative agreement to Temple U & CPR
- Funding by U.S. DHHS, ACF, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, 2013-2018
- Targets fatherhood researchers & programs serving low-income fathers



Fatherhood Research And Practice Network

#1

Promote
Rigorous
Evaluation

#2

Build
Evaluation
Capacity

#3

Disseminate
Information



Presenters

Colorado

Jessica Pearson, Director CPR and Co-Director FRPN



Ohio

Kim Dent, Executive Director, Ohio
Commission on Fatherhood

Aldonis Grimes, Director, Cuyahoga
County Fatherhood Initiative



South Carolina

Patricia Littlejohn, Executive Director,
South Carolina Center for Fathers and
Families

Stephen Yarborough, Assistant Director,
Office of Policy and Training, Child
Support Services Division, SCDSS



Presenters

Kansas



Deanne Dinkel, Public Service Executive,
Department for Children and Families, Child
Support Services Division

Ishaku Miaikori, Director, Mental Health
Association of South Central Kansas



Why a Webinar on State Approaches to Including Fathers in Programs & Policies?

- Father engagement is a serious problem
- Few states have sustainable ways of supporting fatherhood initiatives
- HMRF grants are time-limited and project specific
- Many NCPs don't pay their child support because of unemployment but fatherhood programs and employment services are not allowable costs for child support agencies
- Most employment programs pay no attention to parenting and co-parenting; newer 2-generation initiatives focus on custodial parents and children.
- Some states use discretionary TANF funds, IV-D incentive funds, and direct appropriations from state legislatures

New FRPN Brief



“State Approaches to Father Involvement in Programs and Policies Dealing with Children and Families.”

Jessica Pearson, Ph.D.

Director, CPR & Co-Director FRPN

May 2018

www.frpn.org

Fatherhood Commissions

- Ohio, Connecticut, Illinois, Hawaii
- Legislatively established in 1999-2003, bi-partisan
- Housed in a state government agency w/members across multiple agencies & organizations
- Engaged in policy, education, fatherhood services, promotional events, and fundraising for operations
- TANF funding (Ohio)
- Disbanded in FL and MA, Attempted in 2015 in MN, Strong Families Commission under creation in PA
- A permanent organizational “home” for coordinated initiatives to enhance wellbeing of children by providing opportunities to fathers to become better parents, partners and providers





Panel Discussion #1: Fatherhood Commissions

Brief description of Ohio Commission on Fatherhood

- Background
- Activities
- Benefits and Advantages
- Challenges
- Evaluation

Impact on Cities & Counties

State Initiatives in Human Services Agencies

Fathers as economic providers

- Model program: Texas NCP Choices
- Focus on assessing, providing workforce services and monitoring compliance
- Child support, workforce & court collaboration
- Court-ordered for delinquent NCPs

Fathers as providers, parents & partners

- Model program: CSPED
- Focus on: case management, workforce services, fatherhood classes, enhanced child support
- Staffing by mix of child support staff, workforce personnel & CBOs
- Voluntary and court ordered at all stages of case processing



Panel Discussion #2: Initiatives in State Human Services Agencies Perspective of IV-D Agency

- How, when & why?
 - Client referral & engagement
 - Program approach & services
 - Desired outcomes
 - Benefits/challenges of CBO collaboration
 - Benefits/challenges of IV-D collaboration
- Kansas
- South Carolina

Funding Programs and Services



TANF, TANF state maintenance of effort (MOE)

- Discretionary TANF funds to promote or sustain marriage, promote responsible parenting and foster economic stability
- TANF-ACF-IM 2018: States may use TANF funds to serve NCPs in job programs
- In 2016, 20 states used TANF funds for “Fatherhood and Two-Parent Family Programs;” national average of 0.5% of total TANF; many use funds for other two parent-families programs---not fatherhood

Child Support Incentive Funds

- Regular child support funds cannot be used for NCP job services
- Child support incentive funds can be used for job services but funds lower (DRA of 2005)
- Only 4 states have obtained waivers from HHS to use incentive funds for job services
- OCSE-IM-18-02: States should request a waiver to use incentive funds for NCP work activities

Direct legislative appropriation

- MN S.F. 1504 appropriated \$1.1 million per year for FY 2018-19 to continue FATHER Project to “assist fathers in overcoming barriers” to support their children economically & emotionally



Panel discussion #3: Funding Father Initiatives

What have you tried?

What works?

- Obtaining TANF funds
- Using child support Incentives?
- Legislative appropriations
- Other sources of funding?

Ohio

Kansas

South Carolina



Assessing Program Benefits & ROI

- Required report to the legislature on child support payments & self-reported changes in parenting skills by participants (Ohio Commission on Fatherhood)
- Annual participant metrics: Child support payments of \$646,881, gross earnings of \$3 million, total savings and benefits to families & society of \$6 million (S.C. Center for Fathers and Families)
- Texas NCP Choices returns \$8.31 for every \$1 spent and saved State of Texas \$12 million in SFY 2016 due to: child support collections, employment & earnings, reductions in unemployment insurance claims & avoided TANF & SNAP benefits (Child Support Division of TX OAG)
- ROI study for FATHER Project MN documented: Return of \$3.41 for every \$1 spent for child support, earnings and tax revenue; and \$6.06 for every \$1 on estimated savings due to reduced criminal activity, paternity establishment, increased child literacy & father engagement in early childhood education (Wilder Research, 2009)



Panel Discussion #4: Documenting Benefits & Returns on Investment

What outcomes and measures are most useful for various audiences?

What challenges have you faced in trying to document benefits and returns on investment?

What type of ROI research would be most helpful for the fatherhood field?

Advice for other jurisdictions?

Ohio

Kansas

South Carolina



Questions for the Panel?



Contact Us

- Jay Fagan, PhD, FRPN Co-Director
 - jfagan@temple.edu, (215) 204-1288
- Jessica Pearson, PhD, FRPN Co-Director
 - jspearson@centerforpolicyresearch.org, (303) 837-1555
- Rebecca Kaufman, MSW, FRPN Coordinator
 - rebecca.kaufman@temple.edu, (215) 204-5706 See: FRPN

Research Brief: “State Approaches to Father Involvement in Programs and Policies Dealing with Children and Families.”

May 2018, www.frpn.org