Logic Model
National Quality Improvement Center on Non-Resident Fathers

Situation

- Limited child welfare agency involvement of fathers
- Complexity of collaborative systems
- Need for consistent and effective father involvement practice across diverse organizations
- No State is in substantial conformity with all CFSR outcome areas, especially in those areas related to father involvement

Priorities

- Child welfare system that is more responsive to the needs of fathers and children
- Cross system advocacy and collaboration resulting in greater father involvement
- Development of community based fatherhood partnerships
- Proactive legal advocacy for non-resident fathers

Knowledge Gaps

- Inconsistent father identification and location policies and procedures
- Child welfare agencies do not guide workers in collaborating and exchanging information
- Little focus in child welfare on best practice to contact and provide notice to non-resident fathers.
- No framework for how child welfare agencies should involve fathers in permanency efforts
- Modest empirical evidence regarding the relationship between father involvement and child safety, permanence, and well being

Inputs
Pre-existing Conditions

Contextual Factors

Knowledge Development Conceptual Framework

Model Service Program

Technical Assistance & Support

Cross-Site Peer Support & Evaluation

Dissemination & national network outreach

Funding to support NRF subgrantees

Site-Specific Requirements

State, county, or private child welfare agency as lead agency

Collaborative relationships with courts, child support, & community fatherhood programs

Existing policies and procedures to identify and locate fathers

Commitment to father involvement

Capacity to provide effective programming and research data

Strong financial and administrative capacity pertinent to federal sub-grants

Father-friendly check-up

Staff and agency training

Participation in IRB

External site evaluation

Interventions and Intended Outputs
Promising Practices

Subgrantee Intervention – Three-month cycles of programming for each cohort of non-resident fathers

1) **Gender-specific first contact of child welfare worker with non-resident father**
2) **Peer-led, solution focused groups composed of non-resident fathers**
   - **A. Self-help, mutual support process relationships**
   - **B. Gender-specific training consisting of:**
     - **Skill-based, gender-responsive responsible fathering programming**
     - **Effective co-parenting programming**
     - **Programming to help non-resident fathers best use paternal kin as a parenting/placement resource**
     - **Workforce readiness programming**
   - **C. Information dissemination and assistance for maneuvering through the child welfare and associated systems including information about:**
     - **Navigating through child protective services and the mental health system**
     - **Legal advocacy and court-related information including a special training component for attorneys**
     - **Understanding the facts and procedures associated with child support enforcement**
     - **The availability of resources to answer questions about housing, incarcerated fathers, military fathers, and available community assistance programs**

Outcomes and Indicators - Impact

Child/Father/Family/Worker/Agency/Interagency Partner

Short-Term:

Father participates in developing initial case plan

Case workers and agency value the contribution of fathers

Paternal kin identified and contacted

High father satisfaction with peer-led groups

Parenting self-assessment (pre-intervention) & understanding of barriers to responsible fathering

Mid-Term:

Father participates in ongoing case planning

Fathers self report greater levels of involvement

Increased frequency of father/child visitation

Case workers and agency value the contribution of fathers

Non-adversarial relationship of fathers and case workers

Parenting self-assessment (post-intervention) & improved understanding of barriers

Long-Term:

Relative to the control group, the intervention group will have:

Reduced re-occurrence of maltreatment at six months

Increase in school attendance

Increased academic achievement

Decrease in disciplinary reports in school and in home/foster care

Increased positive relationships with father and paternal kin

Improvement in community activities

Improved reunification rates

Reduced length of stay in foster care at six months

Reduced rate re-entry into foster care at six months

Reduced rate of termination of parental rights

Goal

Developing knowledge about how non-resident fathers and paternal kin impact child safety, permanence, and well-being through enhanced services, policy, and child welfare training

Overall Assumption

By identifying gaps, funding research, and generating evidence about effective practices, child outcomes will improve

Accelerating and Decelerating Factors

- Urban [not rural] to support peer-led model
- Racial, ethnic, and cultural characteristics
- Maturity of programs and collaborative systems
- Extent of social worker and attorney training in father-friendly practices