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 CFSP 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