



National Fatherhood Initiative InsideOut Dad™ Program in Maryland and Ohio Prisons Evaluation Report

Submitted by: Susan Kennedy Spain, M.S., Research Consultant, Richmond, VA
Not to be copied or cited without written permission from National Fatherhood Initiative.

Introduction

The social, economic, and emotional impacts of parents who are incarcerated are clearly suffered by the children of these parents. The National Institute of Corrections noted that, “Parental arrest and confinement lead to stress, trauma, stigmatization, and separation problems for the children. These problems are coupled with existing troubles that include poverty, violence, parental substance abuse, high crime environments, intra-family abuse, abuse and neglect, multiple care givers, or prior separations. As a result, these children often exhibit a broad variety of behavioral, emotional, health, and educational problems that are compounded by the pain of separation” (LIS, Inc. for NIC, 2002, p.1). In addition, children of incarcerated parents are six times more likely than other children to be incarcerated at some point in their lives (Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, Senate Report 106-404, 2001). These parents also feel the strain of separation from their families. There are many benefits to keeping the families intact even though a parent is incarcerated. Less strain and stress for both children and parents have been noted, and parents who are incarcerated can still be involved in their children’s lives in a positive way. Parental contact can build supportive and healthy relationships that help both the parents and children especially upon the offender’s reentry back into the community.

How widespread is the problem of incarcerated parents with minor children? In the most recent national survey of incarcerated parents conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and released as a Special Report: Incarcerated Parents and Their Children (Mumola, 2000), parents held in U. S. prisons had an estimated 1,498,800 minor children in 1999. Between 1991 and 1999, which represents an eight-year span, an increase of over 500,000 minors with parents in prison occurred. With the prison population continuing to increase (Harrison and Beck, 2006) and another eight year span approaching since the BJS survey on incarcerated parents, we can only surmise that we have at least another 500,000 children to add to the statistics cited from the 1999 survey bringing the estimated total to 2,000,000 minor children with parents in prison. The Center for Children of Incarcerated Parents estimates there are 2.8 million minor children with incarcerated parents in prisons and jails (2006).

Not much is being done in the prisons to address this widespread problem. Although more than half of the state prisoners and close to two-thirds of federal prisoners had at least one minor child, a majority of both fathers and mothers reported never having a personal visit with their children since admission (Mumola, 2000, p.5). Almost three-fourths of the fathers (and more than 50% of the mothers) were serving sentences of more than five years (Ibid. p.6). This means that many of these minor children will lose contact with their incarcerated parent for long periods of time and in some cases permanently.

Many states have inadequate resources for programs that provide services to families. Moreover, the limited programs currently found in prisons that address family reunification or parenting are more likely found in prisons for women rather than for men (LIS, Inc. for NIC, 2002, p.6). While these programs are essential for both parents, they are especially lacking for fathers in prison. National Fatherhood Initiative® (NFI) designed the InsideOut Dad™ Program to address the specific needs of incarcerated fathers by bridging the gap between the inmate father and his children (NFI, 2005). The following section provides a brief overview of the InsideOut Dad™ Program.

Brief Overview of the InsideOut Dad™ Program

The InsideOut Dad™ Program curriculum includes 12 one-hour core sessions and 26 optional sessions that coordinate with the core topic areas (NFI, 2005). The curriculum for the core sessions includes: (1) Ground Rules, (2) About Me (Self Awareness), (3) Being a Man, (4) Spirituality, (5) Handling Emotions, (6) Relationships, (7) Fathering, (8) Parenting, (9) Child Development, (10) Discipline, (11) Fathering from the Inside, and (12) Closing. The optional sessions allow facilitators the flexibility to add to the program based on the needs of the fathers served. The availability of these extra sessions makes the program ideal for use in short and long-stay facilities. The program is designed to increase knowledge and change attitudes about fathering and parenting. In addition, the program expects that the type and number of contacts between incarcerated fathers and their child(ren) will improve during and after participation in the program.

The InsideOut Dad™ Program was implemented in the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS), Division of Correction (DOC) and the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC), beginning in the spring of 2008. Screening criteria was done in collaboration with the DOC to ensure that the appropriate target population was selected for participation in the InsideOut Dad™ Program. NFI staff trained DOC staff to facilitate the program.

Purpose of the Evaluation

National Fatherhood Initiative requested an objective, third-party evaluation of the InsideOut Dad™ Program. The purpose of the evaluation was to see how well incarcerated fathers responded, through increased knowledge and shifts in attitude, to the program and whether or not participation in the program improved contact between these fathers and their children.

In 2007, Dr. Linda Smith conducted a similar evaluation of the InsideOut Dad™ program in 2007. It should be noted however that the evaluation included a control group that did not receive the InsideOut Dad™ program. The control group was small in number (N=13) and was not matched with the program group on demographic or other characteristics.

The current evaluation does not include a control group and focuses on participants in two states that received the InsideOut Dad™ program. Ideally, the evaluation would include a control group that closely matches the program group on demographics and any other factors with might impact the effects of the InsideOut Dad™ program. Due to the differences in the project design between the two evaluations (2007 and 2008), it is difficult to make direct comparisons.

Methodology

The evaluation of the InsideOut Dad™ Program used a pre and post survey administered to the program participants to assess program impact.

InsideOut Dad™ Pre and Post Survey Measure

The pre surveys were given at the beginning of the first session and the post surveys were given at the end of the 12th session. The survey had a total of 65 questions and covered five areas:

- Part A - About You and Your Family (Demographics)
- Part B - About Being a Father and Your Relationships
- Part C - About Your Fathering Knowledge
- Part D - How You Father Today
- Part E - Your Thoughts on Fathering

Results from the surveys were provided to the evaluator as raw data (the actual surveys). The responses to the survey questions were set up in a database using Microsoft ACCESS. SPSS 16.0™ was used to conduct the various analyses.

Findings

The findings from the evaluation of the InsideOut Dad™ program were based on the responses of the program participants to the InsideOut Dad™ survey. First, we provide a breakdown by institution of the InsideOut Dad™ program classes held in the Maryland Division of Correction and those held in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC). Next, we present the demographic and family background data (Part A of the survey) and the state of their family relationships (Part B of the survey) for the study population by state.

The findings show that only slight differences exist between the program participants from the Maryland and Ohio institutions when comparing their demographic profiles. Maryland participants were slightly more likely to be single and much more likely to be Black. Ohio participants also appear more likely to have been raised in two parent households. Program participants reported similar relationships with their families and no significant differences were seen.

Next, we present the findings from the responses for knowledge about fathering (Part C of the survey) comparing the pre and post survey responses for the program participants. We make the same comparisons for Part D and E of the survey and provide these results. These results are presented by state as well.

The findings show that most participants had positive attitudes regarding fathering and almost all of the participants would have children again. Program participants from both the Maryland and Ohio institutions showed significant change in their survey responses given before and after receiving the InsideOut Dad™ program.

In summary, the InsideOut Dad™ had a positive effect on program participants. More detailed data is available for these survey sections below.

Study Population

There were 219 program participants for the InsideOut Dad™ program classes held in six (6) Maryland correctional institutions (see Table 1) and in eight (8) Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Institutions (see Table 2). The data tables and summaries provided will be aggregated by state (Maryland and Ohio). No comparisons will be made between the individual institutions.

Table 1: InsideOut Dad™ Maryland Division of Correction's program participants by institution

Maryland Division of Correction Institution	Percentage (%) and Number (N) of Program Participants
Brockridge Correctional	29.8% (n=36)
Roxbury Correctional Institution	14.9% (n=18)
Newton Correctional Facility	5.8% (n=7)
MTCT	24.8% (n=30)
Metropolitan Transition Center	8.3% (n=10)
Maryland Correctional Institution - Jessup	16.5% (n=20)
Total	100.0% (N=121)
Jessup Correctional Institution	8.8% (N=9)
Metropolitan Transition Center	9.8% (N=10)
Maryland Correctional Institution - Jessup	7.8% (N=8)
Total	100.0% (N=102)

Table 2: InsideOut Dad™ Ohio's Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC) program participants by institution

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections (ODRC) Institution	Percentage (%) and Number (N) of Program Participants
Richland Correctional	29.6% (n=29)
Madison Correctional	10.2% (n=10)
Corrections Medical Center	12.2% (n=12)
Southeastern Correctional Institute	12.2% (N=12)
Noble Correctional Institute	6.1% (n=6)
London Correctional Institute	11.2% (n=11)
Grafton Correctional Institute	10.2% (n=10)
FCI – Elkton	8.2% (n=8)
Total	100.0% (N=98)

The demographics presented in Table 3 (Responses to Part A of the survey – “About You and Your Family”) for the program participants in both states show that the two groups were similar in age with a mean age of 33.8 for the MD program participants and 33.9 for the Ohio program participants. The marital status of the two groups was also similar. Slightly more of the Maryland group members were single or living with a partner while more of the Ohio program participants were married, but the differences were not significant. Examining the racial composition for the two groups we find that significantly more of the Maryland program participants were black while more of the Ohio group members were classified as white. Both groups also had comparable educational levels (11.41 for the Maryland program participants and 11.6 for the Ohio group) and each group had on average three children.

Table 3: Part A – “About You and Your Family” – Program Participant Demographics

	Maryland Program Participants	Ohio Program Participants
Age (in years, mean)	33.8 (N=121)	33.9 (N=98)
Marital Status		
Married	19% (n=22)	23.7% (n=23)
Single	53.4% (n=62)	38.1% (n=37)
Divorced	5.2% (n=6)	8.2% (n=8)
Separated	5.2% (n=6)	8.2% (n=8)
Living with Partner	14.7% (n=17)	8.6% (n=18)
Widower	.9% (n=1)	3.1% (n=3)
Other	1.7% (n=2)	0.00% (n=0)
Total	100.00% (N=121)	100.00% (N=98)
Race		
White	15.1% (n=18)***	43.3% (n=42)
Black	76.5% (n=91)***	48.5% (n=47)
Other	8.4% (n=10)	8.2% (n=8)
Total	100.00% (N=121)	100.00% (N=98)
Education (in grades, mean)	11.41 (N=110)	11.6 (N=91)
Number of Children (mean)	2.6 (N=121)	3.0 (N=98)

Two-tailed t-tests of mean differences between the Maryland and Ohio program participants on post survey responses. * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

In Table 4 (Responses to Part A of the survey – “About You and Your Family”), we find that the Maryland program participants were more likely to be raised by their mother only (54%), whereas a half of Ohio program participants were more likely to be raised by a mother and father. A similar percentage of program participants in both areas were likely to be raised by grandparents or other relatives, or “other”.

Table 4 also shows that the majority of both groups had a good or very good relationship with their mothers with a mean of 4.39 for Maryland program participants and 4.28 for Ohio participants (1=very bad, 2=bad, 3=okay, 4=good, 5=very good). These means fall into the good to very good range. Only 1 percent of either group reported having a very bad relationship with their mother and only 2 or 3 percent of the program participants reported having a bad relationship. For both groups the relationships with their father were not as good (see Table 4). More than one-fourth of the program participants in both states stated that they had a bad or very bad relationship with their father. The mean for the relationship with their father was 3.4 for both groups of program participants (these means fall into the okay to good range).

Table 4: Part A – “About You and Your Family”

	Maryland Program Participants	Ohio Program Participants
Who raised you as a child?		
Mother and Father	32.2% (n=39) *	50% (n=49)
Mother only	53.7% (n=65) *	39.8% (n=39)
Father only	3.3% (n=4)	6.1% (n=6)
Grandparents	18.2% (n=22)	14.3% (n=14)
Other Relatives	4.1% (n=5)	5.1% (n=5)
Foster Parents	0% (n=0)	4.1% (n=4)
Adoptive Parents	1.7% (n=2)	0.00% (n=0)
Other	3.3% (n=4)	3.1% (n=3)
Total	100.00% (N=121)	100.00% (N=98)
Relationship with Mother		
Very Bad	1.2% (n=2)	1% (n=1)
Bad	2.5% (n=3)	2.1% (n=2)
Okay	13.2% (n=16)	17.5% (n=17)
Good	22.3% (n=27)	26.8% (n=26)
Very Good	56.9% (n=72)	52.6% (n=51)
Total	100.00% (N=121)	100.00% (N=97)
Mean	4.39 (N=121)	4.28 (N=97)
Relationship with Father		
Very Bad	9.0% (n=10)	12.1% (n=11)
Bad	16.2% (n=18)	13.2% (n=12)
Okay	27.7% (n=33)	26.4% (n=24)
Good	17.1% (n=19)	19.8% (n=18)
Very Good	25.2% (n=28)	28.6% (n=26)
Total	100.00% (N=111)	100.00% (N=91)
Mean	3.44 (N=111)	3.40 (N=91)

Two-tailed t-tests of mean differences between the NFI program participants for continuous variables, and chi-square test for nominal variables on post survey responses. * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

In Table 5 (Responses to Part B of the survey – “About Being a Father and Family Relationships”), we see that the majority of program participants in both states felt very happy about being a father and felt good or very good about their relationship with their children. The majority of both groups would still be a parent if they could do it again (89.9% of Maryland program participants and 89.1% of Ohio participants). The relationship with the mother(s) of their children was more difficult for both groups. About 17% of the Maryland program participants and 20% of Ohio program participants had a bad or very bad relationship with the mother(s) of their children. Less than half of both groups had a good or very good relationship with the mother(s) of their children. The responses to these questions were not significantly different when comparing the two groups.

Table 5: Part B – “About Being a Father and Family Relationships”

	Maryland NFI Program Participants	Ohio NFI Program Participants
Happiness Being a Father		
Very Bad	2.5% (n=3)	3.1% (n=3)
Bad	2.5% (n=3)	2.1% (n=2)
Okay	5.8% (n=7)	5.1% (n=5)
Good	11.6% (n=14)	13.7% (n=13)
Very Good	76.9% (n=93)	75.8% (n=72)
Mean	4.61 (N=121)	4.57 (N=95)
Relationship Quality with Children (mean)	3.99 (N=120)	4.03 (n=97)
Relationship Quality with Mother(s) of Children (mean)		
Very Bad	5.2% (n=6)	8.9% (N=8)
Bad	9.5% (n=11)	10% (N=9)
Okay	37.1% (n=43)	35.6% (n=32)
Good	28.4% (n=33)	30% (n=27)
Very Good	19% (n=22)	15.6% (n=14)
Mean	3.5 (N=116)	3.33 (N=90)
Would You Still Be a Parent if You Could Do It Again? (1=yes)	89.9% (N=119)	89.1% (N=92)

Two-tailed t-tests of mean differences between the NFI program participants and comparison group members on post survey responses.
 * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

In Table 6 we see that there was a statistically significant difference between the Maryland program participants’ Part C pre survey and post survey scores (“About Your Fathering Knowledge”). The program participants showed statistically significant gains in knowledge after participation in the InsideOut Dad™ Program classes compared to their knowledge before beginning the classes. In Table 7 we see that there was a statistically significant difference between the Ohio program participants’ Part C pre survey and post survey scores (“About Your Fathering Knowledge”). The program participants showed statistically significant gains in knowledge after participation in the InsideOut Dad™ Program classes compared to their knowledge before beginning the classes.

The scores displayed in Tables 6 and 7 below were calculated by tallying the number of questions participants answered correctly in Section C (About your fathering knowledge) of the survey. For example, if a participant answered question 1 (Self worth is a term used to describe: a) How a person feels about himself, b) What a person thinks about himself, c) Both the feelings and thoughts a person has about himself, d) Don't know) correctly (Option c) than they were awarded one point. A participant had the opportunity to score a total of 26 points (1 point for each question in Section C).

**Table 6: Part C Score – “About Your Fathering Knowledge”
Maryland Program Participants Pre and Post Survey Responses (N=119)**

	Mean
Pre Survey	18.86
Post Survey	20.55***

Two-tailed t-tests of mean differences between NFI program participants on pre and post survey responses.
* $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

**Table 7. Part C Score – “About Your Fathering Knowledge”
Ohio Program Participants Pre and Post Survey Responses (N=98)**

	Mean
Pre Survey	20.14
Post Survey	21.21***

Two-tailed t-tests of mean differences between NFI program participants on pre and post survey responses.
* $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

Reports of the frequency of calls with their children did not significantly differ between the pre survey responses and the post survey responses for the Maryland program participants (see Table 8 – “How You Father Today”). It should be noted that some facilities may have different policies for calling or visiting with families which may affect the participants’ ability to call their children. However, post survey responses from program participants showed higher frequencies of writing to their children, with a statistically significant change in the mean frequency of writing. Reports of frequency of visits with their children did not significantly change. One hundred percent of the program participants reported telling their children that they loved them in their post survey responses. Post survey program participants were slightly less likely (not significant) to report knowing how their children were doing in school and significantly more likely to report knowing with whom their children spend time compared to pre survey program participants. It should be noted that facilities might have different policies regarding phone and visitation privileges that may affect the participants’ abilities to engage in these activities and may impact

**Table 8: Part D – “How You Father Today” Maryland
Program Participants Pre and Post Survey Responses**

	Pre Survey	Post Survey
Frequency of Calls to Children		
Never	17.9% (n=20)	11.2% (n=12)
Less than Once a Month	8% (n=9)	5.6% (n=6)
Once a Month	16.1% (n=18)	21.5% (n=23)
Once a Week	22.3% (n=25)	29% (n=31)
More than Once a Week	35.7% (n=40)	32.7% (n=35)
Mean	2.56 (N=102)	2.69 (N=102)

Two-tailed t-tests of mean differences between NFI program participants on pre and post survey responses.
* $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

Reports of the frequency of calls or writing to their children did not significantly differ between the pre survey responses and the post survey responses for the Ohio program participants (see Table 9 – “How You Father Today”). However, post survey responses from program participants showed higher frequencies of visits with their children, with a statistically significant change in the mean frequency of visits. Ninety-nine percent of the program participants reported telling their children that they loved them in their pre and post survey responses. Post survey program participants were slightly less likely to report knowing how their children were doing in school and slightly more likely to report knowing with whom their children spend time compared to pre survey program participants; however neither of these changes were statistically significant.

Table 9: Part D – “How You Father Today” Maryland Program Participants Pre and Post Survey Responses

	Pre Survey	Post Survey
Frequency of Calls to Children		
Never	22% (n=24)	9.3% (n=10)
Less than Once a Month	9.2% (n=10)	8.3% (n=9)
Once a Month	25.7% (n=28)	32.4% (n=35)
Once a Week	29.4% (n=32)	34.3% (n=37)
More than Once a Week	13.8% (n=15)	15.7% (n=17)
Mean	2.11 (N=102)	2.41* (N=102)
Frequency of Writing to Children		
Never	30.6% (n=33)	25.5% (n=28)
Less than Once a Month	13.9% (n=15)	14.5% (n=16)
Once a Month	29.6% (n=32)	26.4% (n=29)
Once a Week	13% (n=14)	23.6% (n=26)
More than Once a Week	13% (n=14)	10% (n=11)
Mean	1.65 (N=101)	1.85 (N=101)
Frequency of Visits with Children		
Never	30.6% (n=33)	25.5% (n=28)
Less than Once a Month	13.9% (n=15)	14.5% (n=16)
Once a Month	29.6% (n=32)	26.4% (n=29)
Once a Week	13% (n=14)	23.6% (n=26)
More than Once a Week	13% (n=14)	10% (n=11)
Mean	1.65 (N=101)	1.85 (N=101)
Have Told Children I Love Them (1=yes)	99.1% (N=117)	100% (N=113)
Know How Children Do in School (1=yes)	90.4% (N=104)	86.5% (N=104)
Know Who Children Spend Time With (1=yes)	70% (N=110)	78.2%* (N=110)

Two-tailed t-tests of mean differences between the NFI program participants and comparison group members on post survey responses.
 * p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, *** p ≤ 0.001

**Table 10: Part D – “How You Father Today” Ohio Program
Participants Pre and Post Survey Responses**

	Pre Survey	Post Survey
Frequency of Calls to Children		
Never	23.7% (n=18)	21.3% (n=16)
Less than Once a Month	11.8% (n=9)	6.7% (n=5)
Once a Month	11.8% (n=9)	18.7% (n=14)
Once a Week	31.6% (n=24)	36% (n=27)
More than Once a Week	21.1% (n=16)	17.3% (n=13)
Mean	2.21 (N=67)	2.33 (N=67)
Frequency of Writing to Children		
Never	11.1% (n=10)	5.6% (n=5)
Less than Once a Month	15.6% (n=14)	6.7%(n=6)
Once a Month	22.2% (n=20)	36% (n=32)
Once a Week	37.8% (n=34)	46.1% (n=41)
More than Once a Week	13.3% (n=12)	5.6% (n=5)
Mean	2.31 (N=85)	2.33 (N=85)
Frequency of Visits with Children		
Never	29.3% (n=24)	26% (n=20)
Less than Once a Month	24.4% (n=20)	24.7% (n=19)
Once a Month	31.7% (n=26)	33.8% (n=26)
Once a Week	9.8% (n=8)	9.1% (n=7)
More than Once a Week	4.9% (n=4)	6.5% (n=5)
Mean	1.36 (N=69)	1.57* (N=69)
Have Told Children I Love Them (1=yes)	99% (N=96)	98.9% (N=94)
Know How Children Do in School (1=yes)	89% (N=82)	85.7% (N=90)
Know Who Children Spend Time With (1=yes)	67.1% (N=81)	73.6% (N=86)

Two-tailed t-tests of mean differences between the NFI program participants and comparison group members on post survey responses.

* $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

Several of the items from Part E “Your Thoughts on Fathering” showed statistically significant improvements from the pre survey to the post survey for Maryland program participants (see Table 10). For the post survey response means, program participants agreed more strongly with the following three statements “When you bury your feelings of hurt it only builds up more anger inside of you”, “The self aware man takes responsibility for his own behavior”, and “When family spirituality is present, family members are more likely to cooperate, love, and respect each other.” In addition, program participants disagreed more strongly in the post survey responses with the following statements: “A dad can’t be a role model to his children while he’s locked up,” “religion and spirituality are the same thing,” When a dad wants to know if his child is developing the right way, he should compare them to other children of the same age” and “a dad can’t help his children to take care of their physical health while he’s locked up.” **The arrows indicate the desired direction of movement from pre to post survey response.**

Table 11: Part E – Fatherhood Attitudinal Items Maryland Program Participants’ Pre and Post Survey Responses

		Pre Survey	Post Survey
"The more a dad knows about himself, the more he can control his own behavior." (N=113)	↑	4.62	4.66
"A dad can't be a role model to his children while he's locked up." (N=113)	↓	2.23	1.87***
"It is not vital for the well being of your child to respect his/her mother." (N=110)	↓	1.69	1.77
"Good discipline focuses on the actor not the action." (N=108)	↓	2.89	3.06
"Children learn about relationships from their parents' relationship." (N=114)	↑	4.12	4.28
"There are good and bad ways to show your anger." (N=116)	↑	4.11	4.15
"It is just as vital for a dad to show his daughter what a good man looks like as it is for him to show his son what a good man looks like." (N=113)	↑	4.25	4.30
"The way a father shows his anger does not affect how his children show their anger." (N=116)	↓	1.72	1.78
"Religion and spirituality are the same thing." (N=116)	↑	2.62	2.27**
"When you bury your feelings of hurt it only builds up more anger inside of you." (N=113)	↑	4.25	4.44*
"Understanding the past does not help you better prepare for the future." (N=113)	↓	1.75	1.66
"The self aware man takes responsibility for his own behavior." (N=113)	↑	4.41	4.56*
"When a dad wants to know if his child is developing the right way, he should compare them to other children of the same age." (N=110)	↓	2.20	1.95**
"The view we have of ourselves comes from our past, even as far back as childhood." (N=113)	↑	3.90	4.0
"A good father doesn't need to respect the mother of his children." (N=113)	↓	1.46	1.53
"Fathering is the same as mothering." (N=112)	↓	2.63	2.70
"When family spirituality is present, family members are more likely to cooperate, love, and respect each other." (N=112)	↑	4.03	4.42***
"Self worth is how a man values himself." (N=111)	↑	4.28	4.41
"A good father knows that discipline is used to punish children instead of to teach and guide." (N=114)	↓	2.04	1.84
"A dad can't help his children to take care of their physical health while he's locked up." (N=114)	↓	2.33	2.11*

All items are coded such that 5 indicates "strongly agree," 4 indicates "agree," 3 is "uncertain," 2 is "disagree," and 1 is "strongly disagree." Arrows indicate the desired direction of movement from pre to post survey. Two-tailed t-tests of mean differences between the pre surveys and post surveys for the program participants. * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

Several of the items from Part E “Your Thoughts on Fathering” showed statistically significant improvements from the pre survey to the post survey for Ohio program participants (see Table 11). For the post survey response means, program participants agreed more strongly with the following three statements “Children learn about relationships from their parents’ relationship,” “When family spirituality is present, family members are more likely to cooperate, love, and respect each other”,

and “Self worth is how a man values himself.” In addition, program participants disagreed more strongly in the post survey responses with the following statements: “A dad can’t be a role model to his children while he’s locked up”, “The way a father shows his anger does not affect how his children show their anger”, “A good father doesn’t need to respect the mother of his children” and “a dad can’t help his children to take care of their physical health while he’s locked up.” The arrows indicate the desired direction of movement from pre to post survey responses.

**Table 12: Part E – “Thoughts on Fathering” Ohio
Program Participants’ Pre and Post Survey Responses**

		Pre Survey	Post Survey
"The more a dad knows about himself, the more he can control his own behavior." (N=93)	↑	4.51	4.61
"A dad can't be a role model to his children while he's locked up." (N=92)	↓	2.02	1.66***
"It is not vital for the well being of your child to respect his/her mother." (N=94)	↓	1.51	1.41
"Good discipline focuses on the actor not the action." (N=94)	↓	3.09	3.15
"Children learn about relationships from their parents' relationship." (N=97)	↑	4.28	4.36**
"There are good and bad ways to show your anger." (N=96)	↑	4.23	4.36
"It is just as vital for a dad to show his daughter what a good man looks like as it is for him to show his son what a good man looks like." (N=97)	↑	4.31	4.62
"The way a father shows his anger does not affect how his children show their anger." (N=96)	↓	1.51	1.35*
"Religion and spirituality are the same thing." (N=95)	↓	2.60	2.35
"When you bury your feelings of hurt it only builds up more anger inside of you." (N=98)	↑	4.42	4.53
"Understanding the past does not help you better prepare for the future." (N=96)	↓	1.73	1.67
"The self aware man takes responsibility for his own behavior." (N=98)	↑	4.45	4.45
"When a dad wants to know if his child is developing the right way, he should compare them to other children of the same age." (N=97)	↓	1.95	2.02
"The view we have of ourselves comes from our past, even as far back as childhood." (N=98)	↑	3.99	4.16
"A good father doesn't need to respect the mother of his children." (N=94)	↑	1.44	1.23*
"Fathering is the same as mothering." (N=95)	↓	2.59	2.72
"When family spirituality is present, family members are more likely to cooperate, love, and respect each other." (N=96)	↑	3.98	4.27**
"Self worth is how a man values himself." (N=97)	↑	4.21	4.47***
"A good father knows that discipline is used to punish children instead of to teach and guide." (N=96)	↓	1.77	1.76
"A dad can't help his children to take care of their physical health while he's locked up." (N=96)	↓	2.29	1.95*

All items are coded such that 5 indicates “strongly agree,” 4 indicates “agree,” 3 is “uncertain,” 2 is “disagree,” and 1 is “strongly disagree.” Arrows indicate the desired direction of movement from pre to post survey. Two-tailed t-tests of mean differences between the pre surveys and post surveys for the program participants. * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

Study Limitations

This evaluation of the InsideOut Dad™ Program had some study limitations. First, the evaluation did not include a process evaluation. Process evaluations are critically important with the start-up of any new program and should be conducted before the outcome evaluation (Smith and Potter, 2006). This ensures that the program is actually implemented as intended and that differences seen after program completion can be correctly attributed to the curriculum itself and not to other factors.

Because the program participant child contact information forms and the program session comment forms could not be collected, the evaluation used two measures from only the survey to assess the program's impact on the incarcerated fathers who participated in the InsideOut Dad™ Program. These two measures from the survey focused on knowledge gained and shifts in attitudes about fathering. Gains in knowledge and attitudinal changes are designed to measure intermediate outcomes rather than long-term outcomes. Consequently, there were no measures for long-term outcomes included in the current evaluation.

In summary, the evaluation report does not include process evaluation data nor does it include long-term outcome measures. The report only presents data from the assessment of two intermediate outcomes from the pre and post survey responses collected by the program facilitators. The study limitations outlined prevented a full assessment of the impact of the InsideOut Dad™ Program and reduced the methodological rigor of the evaluation. Nonetheless, the findings from the pre and post surveys provide important feedback about the impact of the program on fathers' knowledge and attitudes about fathering—an impact that is critical to affecting fathering behavior over the long-term. The findings also showed promise for positive effects on fathering behavior as evidenced by increased frequency of contacts with children.

Conclusion

The evaluation of the InsideOut Dad™ Program looked at gains in knowledge about fathering and shifts to more positive attitudes about fathering as the two intermediate outcomes for the study. In assessing gains in knowledge, the survey scores for Part C (which covers fathering knowledge) of the survey showed successful results when comparing the pre and post survey scores of the program participants. These results showed that for the post survey responses, program participants had statistically significant gains in knowledge about fathering compared to the pre survey responses for those who participated in the InsideOut Dad™ Program. We also found promising results when we examined the attitudes of program participants about “thoughts on fathering” and “fathering today.” When examining the program participants’ “thoughts on fathering” (Part E of the survey), many of the items showed statistically significant improvements from the pre survey to the post survey responses.

The evaluation results strongly support the notion that the InsideOut Dad™ program curriculum increases knowledge and improves the attitudes of program participants about fathering and parenting. Focusing on these two intermediate objectives of the program, the results show that this is a program worthy of consideration for correctional settings. The literature discussed earlier also supports the need for a program focusing on incarcerated fathers. The InsideOut Dad™ Program can serve as a model for other states that would like to address the needs of incarcerated fathers.

References

Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill (2001). Senate Report 106-404.

Harrison, P. and A. Beck (2006). *Prisoners in 2005: Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin*, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C., November.

LIS, Inc. (2002). *Services for Families of Prison Inmates. Special Issues in Corrections*. National Institute of Corrections,

U.S. Department of Justice. Longmont, CO, February.

Mumola, C. (2000). *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report: Incarcerated Parents and Their Children, 1997*.

Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.

National Fatherhood Initiative (2005). *InsideOut Dad™: A Program for Incarcerated Fathers*. Gaithersburg, MD.

Office of Juvenile Justice (2001). *Strategies for Evaluating Small Juvenile Justice Programs*. Justice Research and Statistics Association. Washington, D.C.

Smith, L. and Potter, R. (2006). "Communicating Evaluation Findings from Offender Programs," *Corrections Today*, 68(7): 98-101, December.