



RESEARCH REPORT

Final Implementation Findings from the Responsible Fatherhood Reentry Projects

February 2017

OPRE Report #2017-05

Final Implementation Findings from the Responsible Fatherhood Reentry Projects

February 2017

OPRE Report #2017-05

Jocelyn Fontaine, Lindsey Cramer, Emma Kurs, Ellen Paddock, Josh Eisenstat, Jeremy Levy, and Jeanette Hussemann

SUBMITTED TO

Nicole Constance, project officer
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Contract Number: HHSP23320095654WC

SUBMITTED BY

Jocelyn Fontaine, project director
Urban Institute
2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

This report is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary. Suggested citation: Fontaine, Jocelyn, Lindsey Cramer, Emma Kurs, Ellen Paddock, Josh Eisenstat, Jeremy Levy, and Jeanette Hussemann (2017). *Final Implementation Findings from the Responsible Fatherhood Reentry Projects*, OPRE Report #2017-05, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

This report and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation are available at www.acf.hhs.gov/opre.



Overview

The evaluation of the Community-Centered Responsible Fatherhood Ex-Prisoner Reentry Pilot Projects (“Fatherhood Reentry”) documented the implementation of six programs designed to help stabilize fathers and their families, help move fathers toward economic self-sufficiency, and reduce recidivism. This report presents the findings from the evaluation and provides an overview of the activities implemented by the programs, describes their various approaches to implementation, and identifies the implementation challenges they faced and the solutions they used to overcome those challenges. We conclude with recommendations for practitioners and funders looking to fund, design, and implement similar family-focused programs.

Primary Research Questions

The evaluation looked to answer the following key research questions:¹

1. What are the characteristics of the grantee organizations and their partnerships with agencies and community-based organizations?
2. What are the program models’ features, including target populations, outreach strategies, and key services. How are programs staffed and managed?
3. What are the issues and challenges in designing, implementing, and operating the programs?

Purpose

Based on the literature, there is much to learn from implementation assessments of family-focused reentry programs, and these programs may help mitigate the impact of incarceration on people experiencing incarceration and their families. Given the promise of fatherhood reentry programs, the purpose of this evaluation was to document program implementation to add to the field’s understanding of implementation across several dimensions, including successes and challenges.

Key Findings and Highlights

- The programs evolved over time in response to participants’ needs and local contexts.
- The programs implemented flexible program models with different services and activities.
- Varied approaches to implementation presented different advantages for serving participants and for system-level coordination.

- Partnerships were central to how the programs delivered activities and services.
- Creative thinking helped the programs make midcourse adjustments and overcome implementation challenges.

Methods

From October 2011 through September 2015, the evaluation team engaged in data collection activities including reviews of program materials and documents, bimonthly teleconferences with core program staff to discuss program implementation and key modifications, site visits to observe staff-selected program operations and activities, semistructured interviews with a broader set of program staff and stakeholders to gather more data on implementation, and participant focus groups to clarify their perspectives on program implementation.

The evaluation team reviewed project notes and program documents to understand the key aspects of and approaches to implementation, how implementation changed over time, as well as the reasons core program staff gave for these changes. Throughout the data collection period, the team noted any aspect of implementation that program staff reported as working well or being challenging as well as the methods staff found useful for overcoming implementation challenges.

Recommendations

- Be flexible and ready to adapt program offerings to meet participants' needs and respond to changes in policy and context.
- Be open to providing additional activities and services or prioritizing activities and services as needed.
- Meet families where they are.
- Build effective partnership networks.

Glossary

- **FOA:** funding opportunity announcement
- **KISRA:** Kanawha Institute for Social Research and Action, Inc.
- **LSS:** Lutheran Social Services
- **NJDOC:** New Jersey Department of Corrections Office of Substance Abuse Programming and Addiction Services
- **PB&J:** PB&J Family Services, Inc.
- **RIDGE:** The RIDGE Project, Inc.
- **Rubicon:** Rubicon Programs, Inc.

Contents

Acknowledgments	vi
Executive Summary	vii
Introduction	1
Program and Evaluation Context	2
Evaluation Study Methodology	5
Data Sources	5
Evaluation Study Sites	6
Analysis Approach and Report Scope	8
Activities and Services Implemented by the Programs	10
Overview of the Activities within the Three Core Components	11
Implementation Methods and Approaches	13
Organization Type and Orientation	13
Recruitment Strategies	17
Participant Enrollment and Service Delivery Start-Up	18
Service Delivery and Activity Locations	19
Program Management and Case Management	21
Partner Organization Engagement and Use	24
Overall Implementation Challenges, Solutions, and Recommendations	29
Challenges Serving the Target Population	29
Challenges with System Coordination and Collaboration	32
Conclusions	35
Appendix	36
Notes	41
References	42
About the Authors	45
About the Urban Institute	46
Statement of Independence	46

Acknowledgments

This report was funded by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE) in the US Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at www.urban.org/support.

The authors extend their gratitude to the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE) in the US Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families for supporting this research. Several OPRE staff members were particularly helpful over the course of the project: Nancye Campbell, former senior social science research analyst; Lauren Supplee, former director for the Division of Family Strengthening in OPRE; current social science research analyst Nicole Constance; and National Poverty Fellow Megan Reid, in residence at OPRE. The authors also thank former Office of Family Assistance program specialists Keyon Smith and Charles Sutton for sharing key information on the grantees' implementation progress throughout the project. The authors greatly appreciate the grantees' time and assistance with arranging field visits, stakeholder interviews, and teleconferences, and appreciate their partners' willingness to accommodate visits and requests for information. We also wish to thank several former Urban Institute researchers, including Hannah Dodd, Helen Ho, Ariel Sankar-Bergmann, and former coprincipal investigator Shelli B. Rossman, for their expert guidance and contributions to this study. Finally, the authors thank Bryce Peterson, senior researcher in the Justice Policy Center at the Urban Institute, who provided excellent comments in his review of the final document.

Photo by Amy Sancetta/AP.

Executive Summary

The evaluation of the Community-Centered Responsible Fatherhood Ex-Prisoner Reentry Pilot Projects (“Fatherhood Reentry”) documented the implementation of six programs designed to help stabilize fathers and their families, help move fathers toward economic self-sufficiency, and reduce recidivism. The six programs included in the evaluation were funded by the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) in the Administration for Children and Families, part of the US Department of Health and Human Services, to provide a range of activities to fathers with incarceration experiences and their families in institutional settings before release and in and around program offices in the community. The Urban Institute led the evaluation with funding from OFA in collaboration with the Administration for Children and Families’ Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. The following organizations were included in the evaluation:

- **Kanawha Institute for Social Research and Action, Inc. (KISRA)**, a faith-motivated nonprofit organization headquartered in Dunbar, West Virginia²
- **Lutheran Social Services (LSS)**, a faith-based nonprofit organization headquartered in Sioux Falls, South Dakota
- **New Jersey Department of Corrections’ (NJDOC) Office of Substance Abuse Programming and Addiction Services**, a state correctional agency headquartered in Trenton, New Jersey
- **PB&J Family Services, Inc. (PB&J)**, a nonprofit organization headquartered in Albuquerque, New Mexico
- **The RIDGE Project, Inc. (RIDGE)**, a faith-based nonprofit organization headquartered in McClure, Ohio
- **Rubicon Programs, Inc. (Rubicon)**, a nonprofit organization headquartered in Richmond, California

The Fatherhood Reentry projects provided activities to fathers and their families in institutional settings as they were nearing release (“prerelease”) and in their offices located in the community (“postrelease”). All six projects provided prerelease services in multiple institutional settings: federal prisons (KISRA), state prisons (KISRA, LSS, NJDOC, PB&J, RIDGE, and Rubicon), county/regional jails (KISRA, PB&J, RIDGE, and Rubicon), and residential substance abuse treatment facilities (Rubicon). All the projects provided postrelease services in their community-based offices for participants served by

the program prerelease. With the exception of the NJDOC project, fathers who were formerly incarcerated could be enrolled and served in the community-based offices without having been served by the programs in the institutions. Four projects (KISRA, LSS, NJDOC, and RIDGE) provided services in multiple communities across their respective states, and two (PB&J and Rubicon) provided services in one county. Five projects (KISRA, LSS, NJDOC, PB&J, and RIDGE) operated from September 2011 through September 2015, and the sixth (Rubicon) operated from September 2012 through September 2015.

As required by the authorizing legislation, the programs implemented a wide range of activities and services in three core areas: responsible parenting, healthy marriage, and economic stability.

Responsible parenting activities included curriculum-based parenting classes, family contact visits, and parenting support groups. **Healthy marriage** activities included curriculum-based healthy relationships and parenting classes, couple/family interaction activities, and assistance with child support modifications and payments. **Economic stability** activities included curriculum-based workforce readiness and financial literacy classes; vocational training and certification services and referrals; transitional job opportunities; and help accessing substance abuse services, housing, legal assistance, and workplace essentials such as clothing, identification, and transportation. The activities in the three areas were implemented in collaboration with various nonprofit and government agencies. As a complement to the OFA-funded activities authorized by legislation, the organizations helped participants address their reentry and fatherhood needs by using external referrals to nonprofit and government agency partners and internal referrals to services supported by other non-OFA funding streams.

Evaluation Methodology and Report Purpose and Scope

The implementation evaluation documented program implementation across several dimensions, including successes and challenges. The purpose of the evaluation was not to test program effects and impacts or to document participant and family outcomes. Instead, the evaluation looked to answer the following key research questions:

- What are the characteristics of the grantee organizations and their partners? What are the level and characteristics of their interactions and relationships?
- Who are the programs targeting? How do program designs relate to or vary by the characteristics of the target population, community context, and other key factors?
- What are the programs' strategies for participant outreach and engagement?

- What are the program models' features? What key services do they provide?
- How are the programs and services administratively operationalized, staffed, and managed?
- What are the issues and challenges in designing, implementing, and operating the programs?

From October 2011 through September 2015, the evaluation team collected data from several sources in each program or organization, including reviews of program materials and documents, bimonthly teleconferences with core program staff to discuss program implementation and key program modifications, site visits to observe staff-selected program operations and activities, semistructured interviews with a broader set of program staff and stakeholders to gather more data on implementation, and participant focus groups to clarify their perspectives on program implementation.

The evaluation team took detailed notes during the bimonthly teleconferences, semistructured interviews, and field observations. The team reviewed these notes to understand the key aspects of and approaches to implementation, such as the number and type of activities and services offered and the types of partnerships used to provide services. The team also reviewed these notes to understand how implementation changed over time, including changes in staff, partnerships, and service delivery locations and approach, as well as the reasons core program staff gave for these changes. Throughout the data collection period, the team noted any aspect of implementation that program staff reported as working well or being challenging as well as the methods staff found useful for overcoming implementation challenges.

Based on the data collected and the research questions guiding the evaluation, this report includes three main sections:

- An overview of the activities and services implemented by the Fatherhood Reentry programs within the three core program components.
- An analysis of the relative advantages of the different implementation approaches and key trade-offs to consider when funding, designing, and implementing similar programs, activities, and services.
- A description of the challenges the Fatherhood Reentry programs faced serving the reentry population and collaborating with government and nongovernment systems and organizations. This section also identifies solutions the programs used to overcome implementation challenges as well as recommendations and lessons for practitioners and funders interested in funding, designing, and implementing similar programs.

This report is one in a suite of products describing the implementation of the Fatherhood Reentry programs. Three companion briefs describe in-depth information and lessons learned about each of the activity areas: responsible parenting, healthy marriage, and economic stability.

Key Findings

Based on the data collected, the evaluation team identified five key findings:

- **The programs evolved over time in response to participants' needs and local contexts.** Through enrolling and serving participants, program staff came to better understand the unique needs of reentering fathers and their families. The programs developed services and activities in response to those needs based on their local contexts, partnerships, and resources. They continuously adapted their program offerings to better serve fathers and their families.
- **The programs implemented flexible program models with different services and activities.** The programs offered a wide array of activities and services for participants and their families to take advantage of as they were ready.
- **Varied approaches to implementation presented different advantages for serving participants and for system-level coordination.** Implementation approaches varied by organization type and orientation, recruitment strategies, participant enrollment and service delivery start-up, service delivery and activity locations, program management and case management structures, and partner organization engagement and use. These areas of distinction are relevant to consider when funding, designing, or implementing fatherhood reentry programs.
- **Partnerships were central to how the programs delivered activities and services.** The programs provided comprehensive services to fathers through the robust partnerships they fostered. Partners, including government, nongovernment, and correctional organizations, were used to allow the programs to better engage with fathers in correctional facilities and in communities.
- **Creative thinking helped the programs make midcourse adjustments and overcome implementation challenges.** The programs encountered obstacles to serving the reentry population and partnering with multiple agencies and organizations. In response, they created their own best practices for the reentry population, modified services based on participant feedback, and regularly convened partners to discuss participants' needs and coordinate service delivery.

Introduction

Beginning in September 2011 and funded by the Office of Family Assistance (OFA), in collaboration with the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation in the Administration for Children and Families, part of the US Department of Health and Human Services, the Urban Institute (Urban) conducted an implementation evaluation of OFA's Community-Centered Responsible Fatherhood Ex-Prisoner Reentry Pilot Projects ("Fatherhood Reentry"). Six organizations were funded to implement a range of activities intended to help stabilize fathers and their families, help move fathers toward economic self-sufficiency, and reduce recidivism. The following organizations were included in Urban's evaluation:

- **Kanawha Institute for Social Research and Action, Inc. (KISRA)**, headquartered in Dunbar, West Virginia
- **Lutheran Social Services (LSS)**, headquartered in Sioux Falls, South Dakota
- **New Jersey Department of Corrections' (NJDOC) Office of Substance Abuse Programming and Addiction Services**, headquartered in Trenton, New Jersey
- **PB&J Family Services, Inc. (PB&J)**, headquartered in Albuquerque, New Mexico
- **The RIDGE Project, Inc. (RIDGE)**, headquartered in McClure, Ohio
- **Rubicon Programs, Inc. (Rubicon)**, headquartered in Richmond, California

This report presents the findings from Urban's evaluation and begins with a literature review to provide context for the Fatherhood Reentry projects and the evaluation. We then discuss the evaluation methodology, including research questions, data sources, and analysis approach, and present the evaluation findings in three main sections. The first provides an overview of the activities implemented by the Fatherhood Reentry projects. The second includes the evaluation team's assessment of the relative advantages of the different program implementation approaches and key considerations for those interested in funding, designing, and implementing similar programs. The third describes the challenges the programs faced and the solutions they used to serve their target populations. We conclude with recommendations and key takeaways.

Program and Evaluation Context

The massive growth in incarceration over the past few decades has had an impact not only on the millions of men and women experiencing incarceration but their children and families as well. These men and women are also parents and partners; they are part of a family. Indeed, at least 2.7 million children have parents who are currently incarcerated (The Pew Charitable Trusts 2010), and over 5 million children have had a parent they were living with go to prison or jail (Murphey and Cooper 2015). African American children and children from less economically advantaged neighborhoods suffer from higher rates of parental incarceration and are therefore disproportionately affected relative to other groups (Annie E. Casey Foundation 2016; Glaze and Maruschak 2008; Murphey and Cooper 2015). When fathers are incarcerated, many families lose a significant source of financial and emotional support. Based on a nationally representative survey conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics in 2004, 54 percent of fathers in state prison reported having *primary* financial responsibility for their children before their incarceration and nearly half said they lived with their children in the month before their arrest (Glaze and Maruschak 2008).

An incarcerated father's family is at higher risk of financial and residential insecurity and instability than other families (Foster and Hagan 2007; Phillips et al. 2006; Wildeman 2014). Children with a father in prison or jail are at higher risk for academic problems (Wright and Seymour 2000), mental health issues (Murray and Farrington 2008), and antisocial and criminal behavior (Murray, Janson, and Farrington 2007; Murray and Farrington 2005). When a father returns from incarceration, family members typically provide a range of resources to assist in his reintegration into the community. This is in spite of their own significant resource limitations and service needs (Fontaine, Rossman, and Cramer 2015; Shollenberger 2009), further depleting resources and straining family units (Fontaine, Gilchrist-Scott, and Denver 2011). Indeed, incarceration is associated with consequences for not only fathers but their families and children too.

Supporting the economic stability of fathers—through skills building or job assistance practices, for example—can help them contribute to the financial stability of their families. Supporting economic stability can also mitigate the likelihood of fathers resorting to illegal sources of income (Sampson and Laub 1993; Uggen 2000; Visher, Debus, and Yahner 2008).

Other family-focused practices can also benefit fathers, their children, and their families. For example, supporting the relationship and coparenting skills of fathers helps them learn to effectively interact with and support the primary caregiver/coparent of their children and maintain positive, supportive relationships with their families, which can reduce the likelihood of reoffending (La Vigne,

Visher, and Castro 2004; Shollenberger 2009; Visher et al. 2009). Improving parenting skills may not only help parents become stronger sources of support for their children, it may also give them a sense of self-efficacy and meaning that prevents future criminal behavior (Edin and Nelson 2013). Parenting curricula offered in correctional institutions (Peterson et al. 2015; Wilczak and Markstrom 1999), quality visitation practices in family- and child-friendly environments in correctional institutions (Arditti and Savla 2013; Poehlmann et al. 2010; Arditti 2005; Johnston 1995; Sack and Seidler 1978), and family-focused case management practices for the incarcerated and reentry population (Fontaine, Gilchrist-Scott, and Denver 2011; Peterson et al. 2015) are just some of the promising methods for fostering family communication and contact.

Although the potential impact of family-focused programs and practices for fathers with incarceration experiences is great, the evidence base is limited because of the scarcity of rigorous impact studies. Bronte-Tinkew and colleagues (2008) reviewed 20 programs for incarcerated fathers and found that only 4 had been rigorously evaluated and shown to be effective. From these 4 programs, the researchers proposed eight promising practices, including the use of theoretically driven models, a diverse set of program delivery methods, and the use of incentives. More rigorous evaluations are needed to establish best practices, particularly regarding how programs can most effectively overcome the unique challenges of working with fathers impacted by incarceration. More is known about the effectiveness of programs targeting low-income fathers in general, who may not have criminal justice histories. Best practices for working with low-income fathers include providing concrete opportunities to practice information taught in classes, using incentives to encourage participation, and designing targeted and culturally specific curricula (Bronte-Tinkew et al. 2007; Kaminski et al. 2008; Mathematica Policy Research 2014; Mbwana, Terzian, and Moore 2009).

Furthermore, there is little empirical evidence on whether and how comprehensive, family-focused programs can effectively benefit fathers *and* their children and families (Peterson et al. 2015). However, there is a growing literature on the implementation approaches, successes, and challenges of organizations providing comprehensive, family-focused programming to fathers in correctional facilities and those returning to the community following incarceration. McKay and colleagues' (2015) implementation report on 12 fatherhood and family strengthening programs highlighted the range of approaches programs use to serve fathers and their families. That report also highlighted approaches to building collaborative partnerships with multiple and varied community-based service providers and public agencies, which differed based on available resources and local context. Their assessment discusses how program approaches to core functions and services, such as organizational missions and geographic contexts, are related to the successes and challenges they faced during implementation. In

their analysis of fatherhood implementation approaches, Zaveri and colleagues (2015) noted the importance of using diverse recruitment methods to reach the target population and similarly varied approaches to retaining participants once enrolled.

McKay and colleagues' (2015) implementation evaluation found that recruiting, retaining, and serving these partners was difficult. Partners were skeptical about whether participating fathers could change and were unable to fully engage in the program because of lack of time, competing commitments, and low interest. An implementation evaluation by Rossman and Fontaine (2015) of a comprehensive reentry program designed around family-focused services highlights the difficulty of recruiting and serving family members of people with incarceration experiences. The study identifies several key factors that limited family engagement, including strained family relationships, lack of interest among family members, and family members with needs that matched or exceeded those of the formerly incarcerated person and that the program could not address.

Based on the literature, there is much to learn from implementation assessments of family-focused reentry programs, and these programs may help mitigate the impact of incarceration on people experiencing incarceration and their families.

Evaluation Study Methodology

Given the promise of fatherhood reentry programs, this implementation evaluation was funded to add to the field's understanding of program implementation across several dimensions, including implementation successes and challenges. The evaluation was not funded or designed to test program effects and impacts or to document participant and family outcomes. Instead, the evaluation looked to answer the following key research questions:

- What are the characteristics of the grantee organizations and partners? What are the level and characteristics of their interactions and relationships?
- Who are the programs targeting? How do program designs relate to or vary by the characteristics of the target population, community context, and other key factors?
- What are the programs' strategies for participant outreach and engagement?
- What are the program models' features? What key services do they provide?
- How are programs and services administratively operationalized, staffed, and managed?
- What are the issues and challenges in designing, implementing, and operating the programs?

Data Sources

From October 2011 through September 2015, the evaluation team collected the following data from the programs and organizations:

- **Reviews of program materials and documents**, such as grantee applications, operational guidelines, manuals, training materials, curricula, progress reports, participant intake form templates, and assessment forms, to understand program operations and plans.
- **Bimonthly teleconferences with core program staff**, chiefly program directors and/or program managers, to discuss implementation progress and key program modifications and changes.
- **Biannual site visits** to observe staff-selected program operations and activities, such as partner meetings and participant classes and workshops, to clarify program operations and plans.

- **Semistructured interviews** with program staff, including case managers, key partners, collaborators, and stakeholders identified by program directors and program managers, to gather more data on implementation from a broader set of staff and stakeholders than was possible through the bimonthly teleconferences.
- **Eighteen participant focus groups**, typically comprising 8–10 participants each and held in institutions and in communities with fathers from all six programs, to clarify program implementation from their perspectives.

Evaluation Study Sites

As mentioned above, six organizations were included in the evaluation study: Kanawha Institute for Social Research and Action, Inc. (KISRA) in West Virginia, Lutheran Social Services (LSS) in South Dakota, the New Jersey Department of Corrections' Office of Substance Abuse Programming and Addiction Services (NJDOC) in New Jersey, PB&J Family Services, Inc. (PB&J) in New Mexico, the RIDGE Project, Inc. (RIDGE) in Ohio, and Rubicon Programs, Inc. (Rubicon) in California. Five of these organizations (LSS, NJDOC, PB&J, RIDGE, and Rubicon) were funded through OFA's Community-Centered Responsible Fatherhood Ex-Prisoner Reentry Pilot Projects ("Fatherhood Reentry") funding opportunity announcement (FOA), and KISRA was funded through OFA's Pathways to Responsible Fatherhood FOA. Fatherhood Reentry pilot projects were intended to specifically serve fathers who were currently or formerly incarcerated, while Pathways to Responsible Fatherhood pilot projects targeted low-income fathers who may not have had histories of incarceration. Five projects (KISRA, LSS, NJDOC, PB&J, and RIDGE) operated from September 2011 through September 2015, and the sixth (Rubicon) operated from September 2012 through September 2015.

The programs' target populations were guided by the FOAs. For all programs, participating fathers had to be 18 years or older and could be a natural, adoptive, step-, or expectant parent and a custodial, noncustodial, married, unmarried, cohabitating, or nonresidential parent. The five organizations funded through the Fatherhood Reentry FOA targeted fathers who were (1) within three to six months of release from incarceration or released within the last six months, (2) 18 years of age or older when convicted of the crime that led to their most recent incarceration, and (3) low income. KISRA targeted fathers who were (1) receiving or at risk of receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) assistance or had children receiving TANF, (2) previous TANF recipients, or (3) other low-income

parents facing challenges, such as noncustodial parents, parents with disabilities, parents who were veterans, and incarcerated or formerly incarcerated parents.

OFA encouraged each organization to collaborate with nonprofit and government agencies within their communities. All organizations were required to provide activities in three areas specified in the authorizing legislation: responsible parenting, healthy marriage, and economic stability.³ As a complement to the OFA-funded activities authorized by legislation, the organizations helped participants address their reentry and fatherhood needs by using external referrals to nonprofit and government agency partners and internal referrals to services supported by other non-OFA funding streams. All six organizations provided activities to fathers (and their families) in institutional settings as they were nearing release (“prerelease”) and in offices located in the community (“postrelease”). All six organizations provided prerelease services in multiple institutional settings: federal prisons (KISRA), state prisons (KISRA, LSS, NJDOC, PB&J, RIDGE, and Rubicon), county/regional jails (KISRA, PB&J, RIDGE, and Rubicon), and residential substance abuse treatment facilities (Rubicon). All the programs provided services in their offices in the community for participants served by the program prerelease. With the exception of the NJDOC program, fathers who were formerly incarcerated could be enrolled and served in the community-based offices without having been served by the program in the institutions. Four programs (KISRA, LSS, NJDOC, and RIDGE) provided services in multiple communities across their respective states and two (PB&J and Rubicon) provided services in one county.

Analysis Approach and Report Scope

The evaluation team took detailed notes during all teleconferences, field observations, interviews, and focus groups to understand the key aspects of and approaches to implementation, such as the number and type of activities and services offered and the types of partnerships used to provide services. We also noted how implementation changed over time, including changes in staffing, activity, and partnerships, as well as the reasons core program staff gave for these changes. Throughout the data collection period, we made note of any aspect of implementation that program staff reported as working well or as being challenging, as well as the methods staff found useful for overcoming implementation challenges. The team documented key summaries and themes throughout the evaluation and periodically shared this information with OPRE and OFA. The team also reviewed program materials and documents to inform our understanding of key program operations and plans. The evaluation team did not conduct an independent assessment of the programs' materials and documents to determine whether they were in accordance with best or promising practices related to fatherhood or reentry services. The team also did not assess the extent to which program staff consistently used program materials such as curriculum materials or assessment forms.

Based on the data we collected and the research questions guiding the evaluation, this report includes three main sections:

- An overview of the activities and services implemented by the Fatherhood Reentry projects within the three core program components—responsible parenting, healthy marriage, and economic stability—based on the rich information provided by the program staff (“Activities and Services Implemented by the Programs”). The evaluation team categorized program activities and services within the three areas to clarify their core objectives.
- An analysis of the relative advantages of the different implementation approaches and the key considerations when funding, designing, and implementing similar programs, activities, and services (“Implementation Methods and Approaches”). This section highlights six central areas of implementation related to program structure and service delivery. These are areas in which implementation distinctions could most easily be drawn and for which the evaluation team had reliable information across all programs.
- A description of the challenges programs faced serving the fatherhood reentry population and collaborating with government and nongovernment systems and organizations (“Overall Implementation Challenges, Solutions, and Recommendations”). This section also identifies

solutions the programs used to overcome implementation challenges as well as recommendations for practitioners and funders interested in funding, designing, and implementing similar programs.

This report is associated with three companion briefs that detail the specific activities and services implemented within the three core program areas.⁴ These briefs include key recommendations for practitioners looking to implement similar activities for fathers and their families. An interim implementation report documenting the programs' activities, target populations, management structures, partnerships, and initial implementation challenges as of May 2013 was completed by the evaluation team and released in 2015.⁵

Activities and Services Implemented by the Programs

The six organizations funded by OFA varied along several different dimensions (table 1). Additional details about each program’s key dimensions, including target populations and eligibility criteria, recruitment mechanisms, case management services, prerelease and postrelease curricula, activities and services, and partnership types, are included in the appendix.

TABLE 1

Key Program Characteristics

Organization	State	Type	Program name	Number of institutional settings (prerelease)	Number of office locations (postrelease)
Kanawha Institute for Social Research and Action, Inc.	West Virginia	Faith-based nonprofit	West Virginia Pathways to Responsible Fatherhood Initiative	42 total (14 state and federal prisons, 7 regional jails, 8 state work release centers, and 13 day reporting centers)	8
Lutheran Social Services	South Dakota	Faith-based nonprofit	Fatherhood and Families	6 state prisons	2
New Jersey Department of Corrections Office of Substance Abuse Programming and Addiction Services	New Jersey	State government	Engaging the Family	6 state prisons	3
PB&J Family Services, Inc.	New Mexico	Nonprofit	Fatherhood Reentry Program	2 total (1 state prison and 1 county jail)	1
The RIDGE Project, Inc.	Ohio	Faith-based nonprofit	TYRO	24 total (12 state prisons, 3 correctional camps, 7 community-based correctional facilities, and 2 county jails)	3
Rubicon Programs, Inc.	California	Nonprofit	Promoting Advances in Paternal Accountability and Success in Work	4 total (1 state prison, 1 county jail, and 2 substance abuse treatment facilities)	2

Overview of the Activities within the Three Core Components

The Fatherhood Reentry programs were funded to provide services and activities to fathers and their families in three core areas: responsible parenting, healthy marriage, and economic stability. The programs implemented a wide range of activities and services within each of the three core areas consistent with their key long-term goals. To clarify the purpose of the activities and services across the six programs, the evaluation team cataloged all of the activities, analyzed the information collected about their purpose, and identified broad objectives for the activities and services within the three core areas:

1. **Responsible parenting activities** included curriculum-based parenting classes, parenting support groups, family contact visits, video diaries, special family events, help with child support modifications and payments, and child care and sought to⁶
 - » build and develop fathers' knowledge of parenting and child development,
 - » increase and improve parent-child contact and communication, and
 - » remove or reduce barriers to family stability and reunification.

2. **Healthy marriage activities** included curriculum-based healthy relationships and parenting classes, couple/family interaction activities, help with child support modifications and payments, domestic violence assessments and screenings, domestic violence programming, and referrals to domestic violence treatment agencies and sought to
 - » strengthen relationships and encourage effective coparenting between fathers and their coparents/partners, and
 - » prevent domestic violence.

A note on language: the authorizing legislation uses the term “healthy marriage” as one of the three core activities. In this report, we use the term “healthy relationship,” which represents one aspect of the authorized healthy marriage service provision. As made permissible by the authorizing legislation and discussed in this report, the programs primarily provided healthy relationships classes and services within the healthy marriage activity area and characterized their programs as such.

3. **Economic stability activities** included curriculum-based workforce readiness classes; vocational training and certification services and referrals; curriculum-based financial literacy

classes; help with building and managing income and benefits; transitional job opportunities and positions within program-operated microbusinesses; employer networking and relationship building; help accessing substance abuse services, housing, and legal assistance; and the provision of workplace essentials (e.g., clothing, identification, and transportation) and sought to

- » improve fathers' employability,
- » increase their financial literacy and financial prospects,
- » provide them with various employment opportunities, and
- » reduce or remove barriers to economic stability and self-sufficiency.

Program staff reported that the range of activities and services they provided allowed them to match services to participants based on their level of readiness to focus on their reentry and parenting/family goals. Program staff also provided fathers with different opportunities to learn, practice, and implement skills to achieve their family reunification and self-sufficiency goals. In addition to serving fathers, the activities and services included their children, families, partners, and coparents/caregivers (discussed in more detail in the companion briefs).

Although the programs shared some commonalities, each program implemented a different set of activities and services, and all of the programs modified their activities and services over time. For example, all of the programs included a curriculum-based healthy relationships class, but none offered the same curriculum. Further, several activities and services, such as referrals to housing services and legal assistance, child care assistance, family contact visits, parent-child contact visits, and video diaries, were provided by only one or two programs.⁷ The programs implemented more economic stability activities than responsible parenting and healthy relationships activities. The healthy relationships component offered the narrowest range of activities to fathers and their families and consisted chiefly of curriculum-based classes. To some extent, the relative variety of economic stability activities reflected participant interest and ability. Program staff consistently reported that securing employment was a priority for participants; therefore, staff designed their programs to incorporate more economic stability activities. The relatively few activities within the healthy relationships component should not necessarily be viewed as a point of weakness because all of the activities were intended to be mutually reinforcing—for example, economic stability activities were intended to support fathers in both their family functioning and self-sufficiency goals. As highlighted in the “Program and Evaluation Context” section above, supporting the economic stability of fathers can help them contribute to the financial well-being of their families.

Implementation Methods and Approaches

This section discusses the relative advantages of the different implementation approaches based on the evaluation team's analysis of the implementation data (e.g., field observations, semistructured interviews, and focus groups). Informed by the research questions and the data collected, the team identified six key areas of distinction across the programs:

- organization type and orientation
- recruitment strategies
- participant enrollment and service delivery start-up
- service delivery and activity locations
- program management and case management
- partner organization engagement and use

We describe the implementation differences observed and noted by the evaluation team through analyses of the various data collected to clarify the different implementation approaches. The scope of this evaluation did not position the team to draw conclusions about the relative efficacy of any one approach over another. However, the team has drawn on program variations to comment on the relative advantages and disadvantages of these approaches as identified through semistructured interviews and teleconferences with program staff, field observations, and focus groups with program participants. This discussion is intended to highlight key considerations for others planning to fund, design, and implement fatherhood reentry programs in the future.

Organization Type and Orientation

The programs were implemented by six lead organizations that varied by **type** and **orientation**. Difference in these two domains shaped each program's implementation approach, activities, and services.

Type

Five programs were implemented by private, community-based nonprofit organizations (KISRA, LSS, PB&J, RIDGE, and Rubicon). The sixth program was implemented by a state government agency (NJDOC). Based on information collected through interviews and field observations, the different organization types presented advantages and disadvantages to enrolling and serving participants in the correctional institutions and in the community. An advantage for NJDOC, a correctional organization, was that it had direct access to the state correctional database, including information on booking, release dates, and risk and needs assessments of fathers in state prisons, which helped streamline identification and recruitment of participants into the program. Moreover, the agency directly controlled the programming in institutions, and administrators needed only to maneuver internal agency channels to find space and time for programs and activities. These factors facilitated program implementation and gave the program greater control over the activities implemented in institutions.

In contrast, the community-based nonprofit organizations had to establish relationships with correctional departments before they could operate in institutions. They reported needing to rely on the correctional departments to help them identify eligible fathers for their programs and to provide access to their facilities. As such, their ability to work collaboratively with correctional departments dictated how quickly they could enroll and serve participants. The nonprofit organizations were also subject to factors specific to each institution, including the strength of their relationships with correctional staff and administrators, facility and correctional staff turnover, and conditions in the facility itself, all of which dictated how, when, and where services were offered.

Differences in organization type affected service delivery and program retention in the community as well. NJDOC program staff could not contact and serve participants after release because participants enrolled in the program were serving “max out” sentences and were released without any community supervision. Therefore, NJDOC had limited contact with participants after release and had to contract with community-based organizations to deliver postrelease services. This structure made it essential for NJDOC and its community-based partners to coordinate and share participant information to ensure they received services in the community. The other five organizations faced no such restrictions on their ability to engage participants in the community; they were better positioned to maintain relationships with participants during the transition from incarceration to the community.

As observed by the evaluation team, the programs operated by nonprofit organizations were generally more nimble, and program staff could modify program activities more quickly than NJDOC. For example, the nonprofit organizations could more quickly select and partner with different

organizations or dissolve relationships to provide core or supplementary services responsive to participants' needs. They also had the flexibility to be more or less formal with their program partners, establishing memorandums of understanding or other data sharing and service agreements depending on program and partner needs. As such, the nonprofit organizations reported less administrative burden and a better ability to attract and build new partnerships. In contrast, NJDOC was bound by state rules and regulations that required them to publicly and formally solicit and competitively select community-based partners to carry out core services. Although NJDOC's process for developing partnerships may not reflect those of other government agencies—perhaps even most correctional departments—their process was wholly different (i.e., more formal and cumbersome) than the five nonprofit agencies studied.

Orientation

The organizations approached program design and delivery with unique missions, expertise, and prior experiences. Two programs (KISRA and LSS) were implemented by organizations established to support low-income people. One organization (Rubicon) focused on serving the low-income population specifically through the lens of workforce development services. Two organizations (PB&J and RIDGE) were established specifically to serve families affected by incarceration. And one agency (NJDOC) was a state department of corrections. Further, three of the five community-based organizations (KISRA, LSS, and RIDGE) identified as faith-based or faith-motivated organizations. Four of the organizations (KISRA, LSS, NJDOC, and RIDGE) had received previous funding from OFA for similar fatherhood activities while two organizations (PB&J and Rubicon) did not have prior experience providing fatherhood reentry activities and services through OFA funding. All six programs had prior experience providing services to persons with incarceration experiences.

These different orientations and starting points influenced each program's theory on how to promote responsible fatherhood and self-sufficiency among participants and their families. Orientations influenced how the agencies defined their target populations and what specific activities and services they implemented. For instance, NJDOC's stated mission is to "protect the public by operating safe, secure, and humane correctional facilities" and to, at least in part, focus on reducing recidivism. NJDOC, therefore, used its Fatherhood Reentry program to target a specific population of reentering fathers (those who were maxing out of prison) because these men would otherwise have been released without supportive services. NJDOC also prioritized fathers assessed to have substance use needs.

The programs' orientations also influenced whether they targeted only fathers or fathers *and* their family members for core services. Further, three programs (LSS, NJDOC, and PB&J) required fathers to have minor children to enroll. RIDGE permitted fathers with children under 21 years old to participate. KISRA and Rubicon did not specify an age requirement. Depending on their area of expertise, stated mission, and prior experience, the programs varied in how much they involved children, children's other parents or caregivers, or fathers' romantic partners in program activities. The organizations established to serve families and children specifically, like PB&J, designed activities to include family members in their service delivery. PB&J has long operated as a therapeutic preschool for children, and its program therefore included multiple activities that involved children, such as parent-child contact visits in correctional facilities and weekly family support groups with age-appropriate activities for children. NJDOC already had policies in place that facilitated partner/coparent/caregiver participation in the program based on requirements from its previous grant award with OFA. Healthy relationships classes were held in the evening, and partners/coparents/caregivers were encouraged to attend.

The organizations also had different starting points. Each program had expertise in particular areas, such as workforce development, services for low-income people, reentry services, or family-focused services. Based on interviews with program staff, this expertise and prior experience informed activity design and implementation and helped staff establish their own sets of practices and activities for their population. For example, LSS and RIDGE each had extensive experience serving fathers transitioning from incarceration to the community from implementing previous programs developed through other funding streams. Therefore, LSS and RIDGE were further along than some of the other programs in assembling partnerships and establishing the processes and suite of services they wanted to provide. Other programs, such as Rubicon, were newer to the fatherhood reentry space and needed more time to understand the strengths and needs of the population before implementing program services.

In interviews, program staff described how each organization's expertise and prior experiences were associated with varying preexisting relationships, partnerships, and resources used to expedite program start-up and provide services. This became clear to the evaluation team in assessing all six programs' implementation approaches. For example, Rubicon, as a workforce development organization, had relationships with employers in the community that enabled it to quickly launch transitional job opportunities for its participants. LSS, PB&J, and RIDGE had previous relationships with correctional agencies and were already operating in state prison facilities before receiving their OFA grant awards. Programs with preexisting relationships also had previously established access to broad partner networks (reentry coalitions) they could leverage to support participants and facilitate their transition into their communities. Rubicon was operating complementary programs at the same time as

its Fatherhood Reentry program, which gave program participants access to additional, non-OFA resources that further supported their fatherhood and reentry needs, such as legal assistance and housing assistance.

Recruitment Strategies

The programs used various mechanisms to recruit fathers. NJDOC relied on its correctional database to identify people serving “max out” sentences and determine who was eligible and who needed substance abuse treatment. The other five programs used multiple complementary mechanisms to recruit fathers, including posting fliers, making presentations or announcements, using social media and their public websites to solicit interest, and working with a range of nongovernment and government partners to garner referrals.

Program staff reported success using varied recruitment methods to find the target population in correctional facilities and in communities. For example, programs posted fliers in correctional facilities and around their community-based offices to advertise their services and activities. This required little staff time and project resources to execute, though it did not allow staff to meet potential participants, determine their eligibility, or gauge their interest in enrolling in the program. Programs that took a more active approach to recruitment, such as making presentations to potential participants in correctional facilities or in communities, devoted more resources and staff time. However, this allowed programs to meet and engage with potential participants directly to gauge their eligibility and interest. This more active recruitment method allowed programs to better determine which fathers would be most suitable for their services.

Program staff also collaborated with organizations that referred potential participants to the programs. Programs that collaborated with organizations to recruit participants reported they could more easily tap into additional populations served by their partners they may not have otherwise engaged. However, program staff mentioned one drawback to this approach: not all referrals were eligible or suitable for the program for various reasons, such as miscommunication about the target population, eligibility criteria, and exclusionary criteria.

Participant Enrollment and Service Delivery Start-Up

All six programs served fathers in institutions, but the programs began services at different points in their incarceration stays. Two programs (KISRA and NJDOC) started serving fathers at nine months before release, two (LSS and RIDGE) served fathers within six months of release, and two (NJDOC and Rubicon) began providing services to fathers within three months of release. Five of the programs allowed fathers living in the community to enroll without having previously been served in the institutions where the program was based as long as they had a recent history of incarceration. NJDOC, the exception, did not enroll fathers living in the community.

In our semistructured interviews, staff reported that enrolling fathers several months before release enabled them to offer services to and establish relationships with fathers that would ease the transition into their communities. Program staff said earlier program enrollment allowed them to coordinate and provide more prerelease activities such as curriculum-based classes and family activity days. However, earlier enrollment also required program staff to engage participants over a longer period of time, which was reportedly difficult for some participants who were not ready to engage in services designed for family reunification and community reintegration. In contrast, enrolling fathers within a few months of release made it difficult for staff to provide the full suite of services to fathers with limited time before their release. Program staff had to carefully consider what activities and services were possible in the time frame—this was particularly an issue for programs implemented in local jails, where incarceration stays are relatively short. Staff also reported that limited prerelease engagement with fathers affected whether fathers engaged in the postrelease component of the program.

Some programs permitted fathers who met the eligibility criteria but were unable to access or did not know about their services while incarcerated to begin accessing the program in the community. A clear downside to this approach, as understood by the evaluation team in analyzing programs' materials and logic models, was that participants did not have the opportunity to participate in prerelease activities that may have helped them better meet their economic stability and family functioning goals. Although the evaluation team cannot say that these participants were unable to meet their goals, the Fatherhood Reentry programs' logic and the reentry literature clearly suggest that prerelease services and engagement are associated with greater postrelease success.

Service Delivery and Activity Locations

All of the programs were designed to deliver services to fathers and their families in correctional facilities and continue serving them in the community. The programs varied in the **number and types of institutional settings** where they implemented activities and the **number of communities in which their activities were offered**.

Number and Types of Institutional Settings

All six programs delivered activities and services in more than one correctional facility, and some operated in more than one type of correctional facility. The programs were generally flexible and willing to deliver services in multiple institutions when and where their correctional partners requested. Program staff said this allowed them to serve more fathers and families and be responsive to a wider set of partners. As just one example, RIDGE expanded from 8 institutions at program start-up to 24 by the end of the grant period because of demand for its services from corrections administrators.

Yet, the evaluation team observed that being in multiple institutional settings required programs to modify their activities to accommodate differences in institutional contexts. Programs had to be flexible in their service delivery depending on different rules, policies, schedules, and accommodations in the different institutions. Therefore, one disadvantage to this approach, demonstrated in the programs' records and identified through stakeholder interviews, was that all participants in a program did not have access to the same set of activities or services. The programs operating in multiple institutional settings had to modify their curriculum-based classes depending on available space and time. In another example, some facilities and administrators were willing to accommodate certain equipment in some institutions but not others. RIDGE offered commercial driver's license training in some institutions and welding in others, but some institutions did not permit them to offer either training.

Operating in different institutional settings also led to variations in whether families and children could participate in program activities. All institutions have specific policies on whether and when they allow families and children to enter. For the Fatherhood Reentry programs, staff discussed how this influenced how they delivered their curriculum-based classes and other services. The type of institution also dictated how much time the programs had to deliver services and build relationships with participants while they were incarcerated. Jail sentences are shorter than prison sentences, and some of the programs modified the curriculum dosage or class schedule in jails to accommodate the limited

opportunity for engagement. Further, fathers in federal and state prisons were often located far from their families, which made it difficult to engage family members in activities in those institutions.

Number of Communities where Activities Were Offered

Four programs (KISRA, LSS, NJDOC, and RIDGE) were implemented in multiple communities, and the other two programs (PB&J and Rubicon) operated in only one county. Program staff reported that their activities and services were in demand by a large number of people, and some organizations, including KISRA and RIDGE, were the only programs in their respective states offering a robust set of services for the target population in several communities. A natural advantage to programs that implemented activities in multiple offices in the community was an ability to reach fathers in a larger geographic area. Some staff reported that their programs were implemented in multiple communities specifically to serve more people. Program directors described designing their programs to operate in multiple communities to provide services close to where formerly incarcerated fathers lived and worked. In this way, the programs intended to reduce the barriers to participation in the program, such as a lack of transportation or competing demands (e.g., work schedules or legal obligations) and increase their retention of fathers in program activities.

However, the evaluation team observed that attempts to serve more participants in multiple locations presented some drawbacks. Program staff in multicomunity programs, relative to those operating in one or two communities, reported they struggled to be responsive to the high level of need with their relatively limited capacity in terms of staffing, funds, and available space. Therefore, service delivery in multiple communities and through multiple offices had the potential to diminish a program's ability to maintain fidelity to its service model and overextend its staff and resources. In line with the previously mentioned drawback of inconsistent service provision across locations, another disadvantage demonstrated in program records and identified through stakeholder interviews was that not all participants in a program had access to the same set of activities or services.

Drawing from lessons across the programs, the evaluation team observed that programs implemented in multiple communities were better positioned to develop relationships with partners across their respective states (e.g., state and county agencies, reentry coalitions, employers, and social service providers) and expand their reach and recognition. In contrast, the programs operating in one county reported having better opportunities to develop strong relationships with a wider range of local partners. The single-county programs appeared to be able to devote more time and attention to create a more comprehensive continuum of local services and activities to address fathers' multiple reentry and family

needs. Additionally, these programs had more opportunities to meet, interact, and convene with their organizational partners because of their close proximity, facilitating more effective coordination and communication. For example, Rubicon convened a quarterly meeting with all of its partners and PB&J built and fostered partnerships through its active participation in local reentry coalitions. The programs implemented in multiple communities had to manage relationship building and networking across several communities, which required coordinating with multiple entities in multiple locations.

Program Management and Case Management

Although all of the programs had program managers, they varied in how they structured program management. Two programs (NJDOC and Rubicon) used a central program manager to manage the entire program, and four programs (KISRA, LSS, PB&J, and RIDGE) used multiple program managers. KISRA and RIDGE assigned a manager to oversee one region or community office. LSS assigned one manager to oversee all program activities in the institutions and one manager to oversee all program activities in and around its offices in the community. PB&J assigned one manager to oversee all responsible parenting and healthy relationships activities and another to oversee economic stability activities. These different approaches to program management presented their own advantages and disadvantages. Program staff interviews suggested that programs overseen by a central program manager could more easily facilitate consistency in services and activities across locations. In comparison, the programs with multiple managers were more flexible and could be tailored to locally available resources, policies, and partners.

Case management services were a central part of all six programs and included one-on-one coaching and counseling; assessments of participants' needs; and referrals, connections, and links to services offered through the program or through external partnerships. Case management activities functioned as a conduit for fathers to access program activities and services and were intended to help fathers address their needs and reunify with and support their children and families. Case managers collected sociodemographic and background information from fathers upon enrollment and through one-on-one meetings to learn about their experiences and goals as they related to their children, partner/coparent/caregiver and family relationships, and finances. Using an individualized case management approach, case managers in all the programs connected fathers to the various activities and services described above. All the programs structured their case management so that the same case manager working with a father also worked with his romantic partner or the coparent/caregiver of their

children. Case management services for partners and coparents/caregivers consisted of meeting with them as needed.

Table 2 presents information on each program’s case management structure. Some programs assigned more than one primary case manager to participants, and each organized their case managers differently. Programs assigned or reassigned case managers to participants according to activity area, geographic location, or service delivery setting.

TABLE 2

Case Management Structure by Program

Program	Structure	Position title	Functions
Kanawha Institute for Social Research and Action, Inc.	Initially assigned by activity area and functions: general case managers, class facilitators, and economic stability case manager. Later, one to one: one case manager performed all of the responsibilities formerly designated to case managers, class facilitators, and job coaches. In Dunbar, separate economic stability case managers served participants, whereas smaller jurisdictions may not have had enough jobs available or staffing resources to warrant the position.	Program specialist Job coach	Program specialists taught prerelease and postrelease classes, activities, and services. Job coaches (in larger jurisdictions) provided postrelease employment services and activities.
Lutheran Social Services	Assigned by service delivery setting: prerelease case managers and postrelease case managers.	Case manager	Prelease case managers had offices in the institutions and facilitated prerelease classes and activities. Postrelease case managers facilitated postrelease employment classes and services.
New Jersey Department of Corrections Office of Substance Abuse Programming and Addiction Services	Assigned by service delivery setting: prerelease case managers and one of three community-based employment services providers referred to participants after release.	Case manager	Prerelease case managers facilitated prerelease classes and activities. One Engaging the Family case manager facilitated all participant handoff to community-based service providers. Subcontracted community-based providers offered case management and employment services in the community.
PB&J Family Services, Inc.	One to one.	Parent-reentry specialist	Facilitated direct services, including prerelease and postrelease classes. Applied a team approach to its case management, which included frequent staff meetings with program leadership and parent-reentry specialists.
The RIDGE Project, Inc.	Assigned/reassigned by geographic location (northeast, northwest, central, or southwest).	Case manager	Facilitated direct services, including prerelease and postrelease classes and case management services.
Rubicon Programs, Inc.	Assigned by activity area: parenting/healthy relationships case manager and economic stability case manager.	Fatherhood coach Reentry career coach	Fatherhood coaches facilitated prerelease and postrelease parenting and relationship classes and activities. Reentry career coaches facilitated postrelease employment classes and activities.

How programs assigned and organized case managers presented advantages and disadvantages for participants and staff. Case managers assigned to just one activity area focused primarily on that one aspect of participants' lives, which reportedly gave them time to learn about each participant's background, goals, barriers, and strengths pertaining to the specific area. For example, case managers devoted solely to economic stability and job coaching worked directly with participants on skill building while also familiarizing themselves with local job and educational opportunities, developing relationships with local employers, and pursuing job leads for participants. In contrast, case managers that worked with participants on all three activity areas reported an ability to spread their time and attention across multiple areas and develop a wider perspective on fathers, their families, and their needs across the three core program components and how these needs were interrelated. Moreover, as understood by the evaluation team from stakeholder interviews, programs structured to involve several case managers for one participant required them to navigate and build interpersonal relationships with multiple people.

Case managers assigned by region were located closer to participants when they returned to the community following incarceration, facilitating more frequent contact with fathers, which the literature suggests benefits them by reducing their barriers to access services. This structure reportedly gave case managers the opportunity to learn the local service landscape and leverage these opportunities for participants through their specialization in the resources and/or barriers in the region. Likewise, case managers that worked with incarcerated participants had offices in the institutions and reported having more time to develop collaborative relationships with corrections staff and administrators and facilitate the scheduling and arranging of prerelease program activities. One drawback, however, was that staff reported that participants assigned to a different case manager in the community had to develop a new relationship with program staff after their release, which the literature suggests is a particularly critical time for the reentry population. Having different prerelease and postrelease case management staff was also reported to require more coordination between program staff to ensure the participant stayed engaged in the program during the transition back to the community.

Partner Organization Engagement and Use

All of the programs partnered with multiple community-based organizations and government agencies to help with program recruitment, conduct reentry planning, document program performance, and enhance and supplement their activities in the three core areas. The programs varied in how they approached their partnerships, in the **types of organizations and agencies with which they partnered**, and in how they used

partners in their **management of the three core activity areas**. Although staff reported that partnerships were critical to providing comprehensive fatherhood reentry services, they also required significant staff time and resources to develop, maintain, and sustain. However, these partnerships allowed programs to provide a range of services and activities to comprehensively meet participants' needs more than they could have without such partnerships. Partnerships also helped the programs provide services they were not allowed to offer through their grant but that are known to be essential for the reentry population, such as housing assistance or substance abuse or mental health treatment.

The programs managed partnerships differently both across and within programs. Formal partnerships managed by the programs included funding for specific core program components, data sharing agreements or shared system access, and memorandums of understanding. For example, LSS executed a memorandum of understanding with the South Dakota Department of Corrections to develop a shared database that allowed LSS program staff and correctional staff to track participants' involvement, including class attendance and contact with case managers, and to access case notes, release dates, risk assessment scores, and parole officer assignments. This helped LSS case managers know when participants were transferred to different facilities or released to the community and helped them assign fathers to the appropriate prerelease or postrelease case manager.

All six programs used formal and informal partnerships, and both types presented different advantages that affected service delivery. An informal partnership may have reflected a working knowledge of the partnering agencies and a willingness to provide referrals to those agencies or receive referrals from them. Through formal agreements, program staff reported they could more easily document and agree to roles and responsibilities. Formal agreements also allowed the programs to define and streamline service delivery processes and hold organizations accountable to the agreed-upon services or activities. In contrast, stakeholders reported that informal partnerships were advantageous because they were easier and quicker to establish and did not require concrete commitments from the organizations.

Types of Organization and Agency Partnerships

To effectively serve currently incarcerated fathers, all of the programs partnered with criminal justice agencies, such as state and federal prisons and local and regional jails, to provide services in those settings. These partnerships allowed programs to engage with fathers and offer program services in correctional facilities and assist with their reentry planning. In addition to correctional agencies, all of the programs partnered with other criminal justice agencies, such as probation and parole departments

and police departments; other government agencies; nongovernment, community-based organizations; academic institutions; and businesses and the for-profit community.

Each type of partner presented different advantages and challenges that affected program implementation. Partnering with criminal justice agencies allowed the programs to recruit and serve fathers in correctional facilities. Programs could implement key activities in these settings, including responsible parenting, healthy relationship, and economic stability classes; family activity days; parent-child contact visits; coached telephone calls; letter writing; video diaries; case management; and reentry and family planning. Although partnering with criminal justice agencies was essential for service delivery, staff reported challenges penetrating the correctional bureaucracies. Further, staff reported that different institutions had different rules of engagement with external organizations, influencing when and how their programs could provide services. Finally, programs found it difficult to predict issues in the facilities that could disrupt activities, such as lockdowns or scheduling changes.

Partnerships with other government agencies, such as health and human services departments, child support offices, departments of labor, and housing authorities, enabled programs to complement their core family-focused activities, such as parenting and relationship classes, family activity days, and vocational training opportunities. For example, partnerships with local child support offices allowed programs to help fathers obtain child support modifications or reinstate their driver's and occupational licenses—the very services that would help them achieve their family reunification and functioning goals. Program staff reported using partnerships with health and human services departments to help participants secure public benefits such as Supplemental Security Income, TANF, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and Medicaid.

Programs partnered with nongovernment, community-based organizations, such as faith-based or faith-motivated organizations, reentry coalitions, treatment providers, and other nonprofits. Through these partnerships, the program staff reported being able to connect and refer participants to additional services and treatment opportunities that complemented or supplemented their offerings. For example, program staff reported collaborating with treatment providers specifically to refer fathers to necessary mental health or substance abuse treatment services they could not provide under their grant terms. Program staff explained these partnerships enabled them to connect fathers with broader social service networks that helped fulfill their fundamental needs, such as transportation and clothing. The challenges discussed by staff regarding these types of partners included ensuring the missions of both organizations aligned and limiting scope creep (i.e., continuous, undefined growth in the partners' roles and responsibilities). Staff also mentioned how some partner organizations, such as treatment

providers, already had high caseloads and lacked sufficient resources, which limited their ability to serve program participants.

As discussed in more detail in a companion brief,⁸ the programs also partnered with academic institutions and local businesses that provided training opportunities, certifications, and employment opportunities. The programs engaged in these partnerships needed to ensure consistent demand from program participants and that training programs were appropriate for participants. The programs that partnered with the business community also needed to acclimate to a for-profit mindset that they may not have been accustomed to and needed to educate employers on the utility of serving the reentry population.

Management of the Three Core Component Areas

All of the funded organizations used their programs to provide activities and services in the three required core activity areas. The programs varied, however, in how they managed the activities while keeping with their organizational missions. Two programs (NJDOC and Rubicon) used partners to manage implementation of at least one of the three core components; the other four programs managed implementation of all three components without partners.

Using partner organizations to manage core components of the programs helped NJDOC and Rubicon implement their programs, but based on observations by the evaluation team and staff interviews, it also presented some challenges. Rubicon partnered with two community-based organizations to provide responsible parenting and healthy relationships activities.⁹ Both organizations had extensive experience providing family-focused and fatherhood services to incarcerated people. Rubicon used this expertise to provide family services while it focused on providing the economic stability activities it had developed expertise in over several decades. Similarly, partnering with three community-based organizations enabled NJDOC to offer economic stability services in the community because it could not provide postrelease services.

Based on the evaluation team's observations, one disadvantage to using partners to provide core services was that it demanded effective coordination and communication between the two organizations. A partner may be able to more effectively provide services it specializes in, but the core organization must coordinate and monitor that partner (and its staff) closely. For example, NJDOC program staff indicated they had to closely monitor data collection and performance measurement for its three partners because each organization used a different data system and none of the systems were

integrated into NJDOC's database. Additionally, programs had to ensure their partners' missions aligned with theirs and that services were provided in a way that supported their goals and objectives.

The programs that used partners to deliver core services also had to manage staff in a different organization. Based on the evaluation team's observations, this presented challenges where organizational structures differed and where program staff and participants needed to work with multiple program managers. For example, Rubicon had to host monthly staff meetings with its case managers and its partners' case managers to review participants' cases, gauge their engagement and outcomes, and troubleshoot coordination and staffing challenges between the organizations. These types of partnerships required the programs to share data on participants, such as class attendance, contacts, case notes, and outcomes. The programs needed to execute data sharing agreements and establish mechanisms for partner staff to access and enter data. It was difficult, according to program staff, in cases where organizations used incompatible or different data infrastructures or had different ways of collecting and reporting data.

Overall Implementation Challenges, Solutions, and Recommendations

As illustrated in the previous section, all six programs set out to accomplish the same set of goals outlined in their FOAs but used different implementation approaches to do so. Each program was designed to achieve several complex and interconnected goals: reduce recidivism, increase family functioning, and improve self-sufficiency. In their implementation efforts, the programs encountered obstacles to serving fathers with incarceration experiences and their families and navigating system-level barriers. Based on the data collected by the evaluation team, the programs demonstrated dynamic decisionmaking processes to create and execute solutions to address those barriers. The following section, based on the evaluation team's observations and interviews with program staff, describes the key implementation challenges that programs encountered, some solutions they implemented to address those challenges, and subsequent recommendations developed by the evaluation team.

Challenges Serving the Target Population

Participants had multiple interconnected needs, many of which were critical to their successful reintegration. The Fatherhood Reentry program participants—consistent with other reentry populations—needed stable housing, an income to support themselves, services to address their substance use issues, and a need and desire for family contact, support, and reunification. Participants also lacked some postrelease necessities, such as proper identification and access to transportation. Many of these needs are interconnected and related to reentry success or failure.¹⁰ The Fatherhood Reentry programs faced challenges when these needs could not be adequately addressed by their offerings. Program staff, some of whom were relatively new to serving the reentry population directly, found themselves needing to identify, prioritize, and address fathers' various reentry needs through their available activities, services, and partnerships.

This is a challenge with family-focused reentry services in general. Indeed, there is an extensive literature describing the challenges providing comprehensive services to the reentry population given the great level of need.¹¹ However, at least one program offered some helpful solutions. LSS **developed a needs assessment** based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs to identify participants' reentry needs, such as housing, identification, employment, and child support orders, and help case managers prioritize the service needs most critical to their ability to reach self-sufficiency quickly. Program staff reported more

interest and engagement from participants once this needs assessment was implemented. As shown in the appendix, all of the programs implemented a suite of services and activities and tried to **expand their services and activities over time** to be responsive to fathers interconnected needs.

Participants struggled prioritizing certain program services after release. Several program staff mentioned that participants' reentry needs often competed with their desire and interest in certain program services. Participants tended to prioritize their need for a job or stable housing over attending parenting or relationship classes, for example, because the participants felt those needs were more critical. In addition, program staff said fathers had trouble getting to and from program activities or finding child care while they and their partners, coparents, or child's caregivers attended. Program staff reported it was therefore difficult for the programs to retain participants in their community-based responsible parenting and healthy relationships classes and to provide classes that were responsive to participants' interests and schedules.

To mitigate these challenges, some programs **modified the sequence of activities they offered and focused on different activities in institutions and in community-based offices.** For example, several programs focused more on parenting and relationship activities in institutions and shifted to economic stability activities in their community-based offices. Other programs, like KISRA, encouraged fathers returning to the community to participate in all three core program components by making some of the parenting and relationship activities mandatory before fathers could engage in economic stability or job training activities. Over time, programs also **modified their services and activities, often based on feedback from participants, by incentivizing participation and modifying class schedules and length.** To encourage participation among fathers and their families, several programs rescheduled their healthy relationships classes and family activities to weekends or evenings instead of weekdays. Several programs also provided transportation to and from program activities and provided child care subsidies for participants who attended.

Fathers recently released from incarceration have different service needs than other low-income fathers, and programs faced difficulties making their programs responsive. Although many of the activities and services designed for low-income fathers were also appropriate for fathers who were formerly incarcerated, fathers recently released from incarceration face unique challenges stemming from their criminal justice system involvement. This meant participants had to overcome acute barriers, such as finding employment to achieve self-sufficiency, family contact, and family reunification. Employment was particularly challenging because of the significant employment gaps and lack of networks and relevant skills that result from incarceration. Some industries do not hire people with criminal histories, and people with incarceration experiences, particularly black men, face employer

discrimination (Pager 2003). In addition, many participating fathers were released with significant child support debt. This meant that programs found their activities were at times not relevant or meaningful to their participants.

To be more responsive to these unique needs, several programs ***designed their own practices for working with the reentry population***. For example, LSS reported that its planned financial literacy classes, which focused on topics such as managing assets or balancing checkbooks, were not as relevant to its participants given that they had not earned an income in some time. LSS eliminated this component of its program over time and instead gave participants interested in individual financial literacy counseling a voucher to attend a session at its Center for Financial Resources. Similarly, RIDGE partnered with a local financial literacy expert to redesign its financial literacy curriculum. The new course was designed to be more responsive to the financial stability needs of people who had been incarcerated and covered topics such as responsible financial habits. Rubicon redesigned its economic stability workshop to help participants feel more comfortable discussing their justice system involvement with potential employers and teach them how to broach criminal records on job application forms and in interviews. Recognizing that certain tattoos may limit employability, PB&J partnered with a tattoo removal organization to remove fathers' tattoos at little to no cost to the participants. Programs also created job opportunities by launching their own microbusinesses, including farms, food trucks, and woodworking shops.

Not all participants were ready or able to engage their family members in the program activities. Because being in a romantic relationship or marriage was not a requirement for participation, programs faced a population of fathers who were at different levels of readiness to engage their families or interact with their families and children. Consistent with the literature, participating fathers had differing family dynamics—some had family members they wanted to engage with and others had more strained relationships.¹² Further, not all participants or their partners/coparents/caregivers were ready or willing to allow their children to engage in program activities such as contact visits in institutions and family dinners in community offices.

To address these challenges, the programs ***tried different approaches to engaging the families*** of participating fathers. The programs recognized the importance of family context and tried to match participants to what they *could* offer based on family relationship dynamics and readiness to reunify and reengage. For partners/coparents/caregivers willing to participate in the program and to allow their children to participate, the programs had several opportunities for interaction with fathers in institutions and in the community. These activities ranged from coached telephone calls and video diaries, curriculum-based classes for fathers and their partners/coparents/caregivers, family support groups, and special events such as sporting events or holiday gatherings. These allowed fathers to

practice and apply the communication, coparenting, and conflict resolution skills they learned in parenting and relationship classes. In all six programs, family members and children were able to participate in as many or as few family activities as they (and the father or partner) wished.

Challenges with System Coordination and Collaboration

Participants' needs crossed over several different service domains and agencies. Participants' reentry and fatherhood needs varied considerably, and no one agency or service provider could meet all of these needs. The programs needed to collaborate and coordinate across staff members, partners, and external stakeholders, many of whom the programs had no direct access to or control over (e.g., housing authority or parole agency staff). The lack of coordinated supports and services has been well documented as a challenge in the reentry literature.¹³ Although individual providers may offer a particular service, program staff reported often experiencing a lack of service coordination that made it difficult to align and sequence their services properly and left gaps in meeting some needs and redundancies in meeting others.

To help participants address their needs, make connections, and avoid redundancies, the programs ***built relationships to coordinate services and make them more accessible to participants***. Many programs offered space and time at their community-based offices for partner staff to offer services. For instance, Rubicon hosted the California Department of Child Support Services to present during its economic stability workshop at its community-based offices and educate participants about its services and connect with them regarding their child support cases. Moreover, because there was overlap between the programs' target populations and the clients of other agencies and programs, the programs built referral mechanisms and were active in local coalitions and groups recruiting people who could benefit from the program but may not have known about it. The programs also coordinated with other agencies to help participants meet their obligations when they reintegrated into the community. For example, the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Adult Parole Authority stationed one of its parole officers at RIDGE's Canton office to meet with supervisees. The South Dakota Department of Social Services allowed LSS's parenting classes to satisfy a requirement for child visitation court orders.

Partnerships can be difficult to coordinate and maintain. All of the programs used partnerships with multiple government and nongovernment agencies and service providers to provide activities and services to their participants. Program staff reported that some of the partnerships were challenging to coordinate because of redundancies in service delivery and intake processes, barriers to data sharing,

staff turnover, and high caseloads or limited budgets. Partners also sometimes had different or conflicting policies, procedures, resources, and rules of engagement for the target population. For example, correctional departments had specific policies for providing programming and services to fathers in institutions, and the nonprofit organizations had to familiarize themselves with these procedures and work collaboratively with their correctional partners to gain access to fathers in correctional facilities.

In response, the programs made sure to ***cast a wide net to identify and engage a range of partners with common objectives***. The programs were also flexible and willing to create new partnerships or dissolve partnerships that were not working. They continuously advocated for their participants and articulated the benefits of their programs to partner staff. The programs also formalized and managed relationships carefully. Some programs, for example, held frequent convenings with their partners or participated in local reentry coalitions and other committees, like chambers of commerce, to stay in touch with current and potential partners.

With these implementation challenges and solutions in mind, we offer the following recommendations for practitioners seeking to fund, design, and implement fatherhood reentry programs in the future.¹⁴ These recommendations are grounded in the extant family functioning and reentry programming literature and based on the analyses and findings of this evaluation:

- **Be flexible and ready to adapt program offerings to meet participants' needs and respond to changes in policy and context.** Multisite and comprehensive programs like the Fatherhood Reentry programs are likely to encounter multiple implementation challenges. Participants also have varying needs, goals, and degrees of readiness to engage with program services. Programs need to be responsive to these realities and adapt services and activities accordingly.
- **Be open to providing additional activities and services or prioritizing activities and services as needed.** Similarly, programs need to be willing to adapt, modify, or refocus service offerings in response to service gaps, unmet participant needs, and participant feedback.
- **Meet families where they are.** Families vary in their readiness to reunify. Not all participants and their families are ready to receive and engage with program activities at the same time. Programs need to be responsive to participants by allowing them and their families to engage with services as they are ready. Programs also benefit from offering multiple activities that can engage families to different degrees depending on their readiness. Families have tremendous potential to be strong partners in fatherhood reentry programs and are an important source of social, emotional, and financial support for returning fathers before and after release.¹⁵

- **Build effective partnership networks.** Comprehensive reentry and family programs like the Fatherhood Reentry programs need to engage in strategic and effective partnerships with a broad range of government and nongovernment organizations. Programs must prioritize these partnerships in a way that fills gaps in their offerings and meets participants' needs. There are several hallmarks of effective partnerships, such as collaboration across systems and agencies, resource sharing, ongoing education to build buy-in, frequent client- and agency-level information sharing, regular self-evaluation, and understanding of partners' missions, operations, and policies.¹⁶ By clarifying expectations, goals, roles, and resources at the outset, programs can help foster buy-in and maintain effective collaboration through proactive, ongoing communication and engagement. Finally, programs should be open to pursuing innovative or less traditional partnerships that may provide unique services to address unmet needs.

Conclusions

Although this implementation evaluation was not designed to assess the impact programs had on participants or their families, it nonetheless demonstrates the wide range of activities and services they provided to fathers with incarceration experiences. Their efforts also demonstrate the many possible approaches to service delivery, which serve as useful lessons to other programs intending to help fathers and their families achieve self-sufficiency and stronger family functioning. Based on its analysis of the data collected, the evaluation team identified five key takeaways:

- **The programs evolved over time in response to participants' needs and local contexts.** Through enrolling and serving participants, program staff came to better understand the unique needs of reentering fathers and their families. The programs developed services and activities in response to those needs based on their local contexts, partnerships, and resources. They continuously adapted their offerings to better serve fathers and their families.
- **The programs implemented flexible program models with different services and activities.** The programs offered a wide array of activities and services for participants and their families to take advantage of as they were ready.
- **Varied approaches to implementation presented different advantages for serving participants and for system-level coordination.** Implementation approaches varied by organization type and orientation, recruitment strategies, participant enrollment and service delivery start-up, service delivery and activity locations, program management and case management structures, and partner organization engagement and use. These areas of distinction are relevant to consider when funding, designing, or implementing fatherhood reentry programs.
- **Partnerships were central to how the programs delivered activities and services.** The programs provided comprehensive services to fathers through the robust partnerships they fostered. Partners, including government, nongovernment, and correctional organizations, were used to allow the programs to better engage with fathers in correctional facilities and in communities.
- **Creative thinking helped the programs make midcourse adjustments and overcome implementation challenges.** The programs encountered obstacles to serving the reentry population and partnering with multiple agencies and organizations. In response, they created their own best practices for the reentry population, modified services based on participant feedback, and regularly convened partners to discuss participant needs and coordinate service delivery.

Appendix

TABLE A.1

Program Matrix

	KISRA	LSS	NJDOC	PB&J	RIDGE	Rubicon
State	West Virginia	South Dakota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Ohio	California
Type	Faith-based nonprofit	Faith-based nonprofit	State government	Nonprofit	Faith-based nonprofit	Nonprofit
Program name	West Virginia Pathways to Responsible Fatherhood Initiative	Fatherhood and Families	Engaging the Family	Fatherhood Reentry Program	TYRO	Promoting Advances in Paternal Accountability and Success in Work
Target population and eligibility criteria ^a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fathers who were current or former Temporary Assistance for Needy Families recipients or whose children were receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; or fathers with incomes at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level; or fathers with six to nine months remaining until release from prison; or fathers who were formerly incarcerated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fathers (including expectant fathers) incarcerated in a South Dakota Department of Corrections prison with a child under age 18. Fathers who were 18 years old or older when convicted. Fathers with up to six months remaining until release; or fathers released from incarceration within past six months. Potential participants were excluded if they were referred to domestic violence classes (based on assessed need) but declined to participate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fathers with six to nine months remaining until release from an NJDOC prison. Fathers whose terms of incarceration were expiring (“maxing out”). Fathers with at least one child under age 18. Potential participants were excluded or considered on a case-by-case basis if they were convicted of a sexual, domestic violence, or violence offense. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fathers with children under age 18. Fathers with three to six months remaining until release from Bernalillo County Metropolitan Detention Center or Central New Mexico Correctional Facility and returning to the Albuquerque/ Bernalillo County area; or recently released fathers referred by the New Mexico Probation and Parole Division. Potential participants were excluded if they were convicted of a sexual offense or of methamphetamine manufacturing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fathers with up to six months remaining until release from an Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections prison; or fathers released from incarceration within past six months and residing in a county serviced by RIDGE. Fathers with low incomes. Fathers with children ages 21 or under. Potential participants were excluded if they were convicted of a sexual offense unless they were awarded legal contact with their children. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fathers who were at least 18 years old when convicted. Fathers with low incomes. Fathers who are natural or adoptive parents or stepparents (custodial or noncustodial). Fathers who are married, unmarried, or cohabitating. Fathers returning to Richmond or Antioch. Fathers released from incarceration within past 180 days. Potential participants were excluded or considered on a case-by-case basis if convicted of a sexual, domestic violence, or abuse offense.

	KISRA	LSS	NJDOC	PB&J	RIDGE	Rubicon
Recruitment mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program partners Social media KISRA website E-mail correspondence Posters/fliers in institutions and communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program partners Presentations at prison reception Posters/fliers in institutions and communities Family visiting days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information within NJDOC data systems on prisoners that are maxing out Correctional staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program partners Announcements at the correctional facilities Correctional staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program partners Posters/fliers in institutions and communities Presentations in institutions Community events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program partners Posters/fliers in institutions and communities Presentations in institutions Correctional staff
Number of institutional settings (prerelease)	<p>42 total</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14 state and federal prisons 7 regional jails 8 state work release centers 13 day reporting centers 	6 state prisons	6 state prisons	<p>2 total</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 state prison 1 county jail 	<p>24 total</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12 state prisons 3 correctional camps 7 community-based correctional facilities 2 county jails 	<p>4 total</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 state prison 1 county jail 2 substance abuse treatment facilities
Number of office locations (postrelease)	8	2	3	1	3	2
Case management services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program specialists taught pre- and postrelease classes and provided parenting, relationship, and economic stability activities and services. Job coaches provided postrelease employment services and activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prelease case managers facilitated prerelease classes and activities. Postrelease case managers facilitated postrelease employment classes and services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prerelease case managers facilitated prerelease classes and activities. Postrelease case managers helped facilitate prerelease classes, contacted participants after they were released from prison, and served as a liaison with employment subcontractors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parent-reentry specialists facilitated pre- and postrelease classes and activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional case managers facilitated pre- and postrelease classes and services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fatherhood coaches facilitated pre- and postrelease parenting and relationship classes and activities. Reentry career coaches facilitated postrelease employment classes and activities.
Prerelease responsible parenting curriculum and activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parenting Inside Out curriculum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> InsideOut Dad curriculum Family activity days Video diaries Dad Packets Handwritten letters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active Parenting Now curriculum Coached family calls Living in Balance curriculum (substance abuse) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> InsideOut Dad curriculum Therapeutic parent-child contact visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TYRO Dads curriculum TYRO Alumni Communities Family Days Time with Dad 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parenting Inside Out curriculum Back to Family curriculum

	KISRA	LSS	NJDOC	PB&J	RIDGE	Rubicon
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child support modification applications 				
Prerelease healthy relationships curriculum and activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Our Reach and Within My Reach curricula 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walking the Line curriculum Moral Reconation Therapy-Domestic Violence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Married and Loving It! curriculum Understanding Domestic Violence curriculum 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Couple Communication 1 and 2 curricula Transportation assistance for coparents/partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Couples Enhancement curriculum
Prerelease economic stability curriculum and activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Peace University curriculum Getting the Job You Really Want curriculum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Credit Where Credit is Due curriculum and Work Training Program (if risk level warranted enrollment) Placement on public housing waiting list upon program entry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Money Smart curriculum 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job Ethics Training TYROnomics Commercial driver's license training Welding training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job club Job coaching Financial Opportunity Workshops: The Academy (if fathers were permitted to leave Neighborhood House)
Postrelease responsible parenting curriculum and activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parenting Inside Out curriculum Child support modifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Starter kits Child support modifications Fatherhood Fridays support group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child support modifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> InsideOut Dad curriculum Child support modifications Support groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TYRO Dads curriculum TYRO Alumni Communities Child care reimbursement Child support modifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Back to Family curriculum Child support modifications Hygiene kits
Postrelease healthy relationships curriculum and activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Our Reach and Within My Reach curricula DV-101 curriculum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moral Reconation Therapy-Domestic Violence 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home visits Domestic violence services and treatment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Couple Communication 1 and 2 curricula Domestic violence services and treatment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Couples Enhancement Domestic violence services and treatment
Postrelease economic stability curriculum and activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Peace University curriculum Getting the Job You Really Want curriculum Workforce-readiness assessment Individual Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work Training Program Certification programs (e.g., welding, forklift operation, commercial driver's license) Work supplies and clothing Tuition reimbursement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment skills training Certification programs (e.g., forklift training, masonry, computer repair, web design) Job search assistance Job coaching Résumé writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial literacy workshops Workforce development center Money Club Individual Development Accounts Transitional jobs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job Ethics Training TYROnomics Job search assistance Job coaching Résumé writing Interview skills Farm-to-Plate program Culinary internship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Opportunity Workshops: The Academy The Number Transitional employment Job search assistance Job placement Job club

	KISRA	LSS	NJDOC	PB&J	RIDGE	Rubicon
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounts ■ Small Business Association microloans ■ Greenhouse program ■ Transitional employment and job placement ■ Vocational training programs at community colleges ■ Job search assistance ■ Résumé writing ■ Interview skills ■ Interview clothing ■ Transportation assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> at technical schools ■ Job search assistance ■ Help reinstating driver's licenses ■ Job coaching ■ Résumé writing ■ Interview skills ■ Transportation assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Interview skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Job fairs ■ Bank accounts ■ Help filing taxes ■ Job coaching ■ Résumé writing ■ Interview skills ■ Help reinstating licenses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Commercial driver's license training ■ Vocational training courses ■ Interview clothing ■ Help reinstating driver's licenses ■ Transportation assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Computer literacy classes ■ Job coaching ■ Résumé writing ■ Mock interviews ■ Interview clothing
Other services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Credit counseling ■ Child development center and after-school programming for children ■ Courage to Change curriculum (cognitive behavioral therapy) ■ Health clinic ■ Affordable homes as a community housing development organization ■ Mentoring program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Substance abuse treatment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Responsible Parenting Program and case management to help with child support issues ■ Additional substance abuse treatment programs and services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Referrals to support services (e.g., mental health treatment, addiction counseling and treatment, domestic violence services, education and job training, job readiness and placement services, tattoo removal, and housing) ■ Transportation assistance ■ Family reunification and domestic violence and child abuse prevention services ■ Therapeutic preschool and adolescent programs ■ Cash emergency assistance 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Legal assessment and assistance ■ Child support services ■ Housing services ■ Substance abuse services ■ Transportation assistance

	KISRA	LSS	NJDOC	PB&J	RIDGE	Rubicon
Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Academic institution ■ Business/for-profit community ■ Child support agency ■ County detention/jails ■ Evaluation/assessment partner ■ Family court ■ Health and human services agency ■ Housing/transitional housing providers ■ Labor agency ■ Police ■ Social services providers ■ State correctional agency ■ Workforce development provider 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Academic institution ■ Child protective services agency ■ Child support agency ■ Domestic violence treatment provider ■ Evaluation/assessment partner ■ Housing agency ■ State correctional agency ■ Substance abuse treatment provider ■ Parole agency ■ Workforce development providers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Child support agency ■ Workforce development providers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Academic institution ■ Business/for-profit community ■ Child support agency ■ County detention/jails ■ Domestic violence treatment provider ■ Evaluation/assessment partner ■ Housing agency ■ Housing/transitional housing provider ■ Labor agency ■ Mental health treatment provider ■ Probation and parole agency ■ Social services providers ■ State correctional agency ■ Substance abuse treatment provider 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Academic institutions ■ Business/for-profit community ■ Child support agency ■ County detention/jails ■ Domestic violence treatment providers ■ Educational assistance provider ■ Evaluation/assessment partner ■ Probation and parole agency ■ State correctional agency ■ Workforce development providers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Behavioral health agency ■ Business/for-profit community ■ Child support agency ■ County detention/jails ■ Domestic violence treatment provider ■ Educational assistance providers ■ Housing/transitional housing providers ■ Legal aid ■ Probation agency ■ Social services providers ■ State correctional agency ■ Workforce development providers
Enrollment ^b (average per quarter) ^c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 1,136 prerelease and postrelease^d 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 254 prerelease ■ 128 postrelease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 138 prerelease ■ 105 postrelease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 57 prerelease ■ 66 postrelease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 367 prerelease ■ 64 postrelease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 58 prerelease ■ 89 postrelease

Notes: In this table, we refer to activities by the names the programs used to describe them (e.g., Money Clubs, Family Activity Days).

^a Fathers had to meet all program eligibility requirements to enroll in the program, unless otherwise specified.

^b The Urban Institute analyzed the performance measurement data collected by the programs through the Online Data Collection reports submitted to the Office of Family Assistance. Programs reported this information biannually. The evaluation team did not validate these data and cannot comment on their accuracy.

^c Enrollment was defined by the programs and may include fathers who had substantially different levels of engagement both within and across the fatherhood reentry program.

Individuals may be counted across prerelease and postrelease conditions and across quarters.

^d Prerelease and postrelease enrollment breakouts were not provided by KISRA, as required by its grant.

Notes

1. These represent a summary of the key research questions. The full list of research questions that guided the evaluation can be found in the executive summary and in the “Evaluation Study Methodology” section.
2. KISRA was funded under a different funding opportunity announcement than the other five projects and served fathers who may not have had recent incarceration histories.
3. The Fatherhood Reentry projects were part of the Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood initiative, a discretionary grant program originally authorized under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 and reauthorized under the Claims Resolution Act of 2010.
4. Additional information about the responsible parenting, healthy marriage, and economic stability activities can be found in the three companion briefs: Fontaine, Cramer, and Paddock (2017); Fontaine, Eisenstat, and Cramer (2017); and Fontaine and Kurs (2017).
5. See Fontaine and colleagues (2015).
6. The OFA-funded Fatherhood Reentry projects were not permitted to use grant funds for child support payments.
7. The authorizing legislation did not permit the programs to use OFA funding for the provision of substance abuse, housing, or legal services. Because the programs found it useful to provide these services in response to participants’ needs, they referred participants to available community-based partners and services as well as in-house services available through non-OFA funding streams.
8. See Fontaine and Kurs (2017).
9. Rubicon partnered with one organization to provide responsible parenting and healthy relationships services from 2012 to 2013, then partnered with another organization from 2013 to 2015.
10. See, for example, Makarios, Steiner, and Travis (2010); Visher, Debus, and Yahner (2008); Naser and Visher (2006); and Turney (2015).
11. See, for example, Rossman and Fontaine (2014) and Visher, La Vigne, and Travis (2004).
12. See, for example, Fontaine, Gilchrist-Scott, and Denver (2011); McKay and colleagues (2010); and McKay and colleagues (2015).
13. See, for example, Rossman and Fontaine (2014).
14. These recommendations include suggestions for service provision that are not allowable by the authorizing legislation that funded the Fatherhood Reentry projects.
15. See Naser and Visher (2006) and Nelson, Deess, and Allen (1999).
16. See Kraus (1980) and Stuart, Thornton Walker, and Minzner (2011), cited in Jocelyn Fontaine and Janeen Buck Willison, “Effective Partnerships for Family-Focused Reentry Services: Findings from Urban’s Reentry Research Portfolio,” Urban Institute, February 23, 2016, <http://www.urban.org/events/effective-partnerships-family-focused-reentry-services>.

References

- Annie E. Casey Foundation. 2016. *A Shared Sentence: The Devastating Toll of Parental Incarceration on Kids, Families, and Communities*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Arditti, Joyce. 2005. "Families and Incarceration: An Ecological Approach." *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services* 86 (2): 251–60.
- Arditti, Joyce, and Jyoti Savla. 2013. "Parental Incarceration and Child Trauma Symptoms in Single Caregiver Homes." *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 24 (3): 551–61.
- Bronte-Tinkew, Jacinta, Mary Burkhauser, Kassim Mbwana, Allison Metz, and Ashleigh Collins. 2008. *Elements of Promising Practice in Programs Serving Fathers Involved in the Criminal Justice System*. Gaithersburg, MD: National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse.
- Bronte-Tinkew, Jacinta, Jennifer Carrano, Tiffany Allen, Lillian Bowie, Kassim Mbwana, and Gregory Matthews. 2007. *Elements of Promising Practice for Fatherhood Programs: Evidence-Based Research Findings on Programs for Fathers*. Gaithersburg, MD: National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse.
- Edin, Kathryn, and Timothy J. Nelson. 2013. *Doing the Best I Can: Fatherhood in the Inner City*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fontaine, Jocelyn, Lindsey Cramer, and Ellen Paddock. 2017. "Encouraging Responsible Parenting among Fathers with Histories of Incarceration: Activities and Lessons from Six Responsible Fatherhood Programs." OPRE Report #2017-02. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
- Fontaine, Jocelyn, Josh Eisenstat, and Lindsey Cramer. 2017. "Supporting Healthy Marriages among Fathers with Histories of Incarceration: Activities and Lessons from Six Responsible Fatherhood Programs." OPRE Report #2017-03. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
- Fontaine, Jocelyn, Douglas Gilchrist-Scott, and Megan Denver. 2011. *Impact of Family-Inclusive Case Management on Reentry Outcomes: Interim Report on the Safer Return Demonstration Evaluation*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Fontaine, Jocelyn, and Emma Kurs. 2017. "Promoting the Economic Stability of Fathers with Histories of Incarceration: Activities and Lessons from Six Responsible Fatherhood Programs." OPRE Report #2017-04. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
- Fontaine, Jocelyn, Shelli Rossman, Lindsey Cramer, Hannah Dodd, Helen Ho, Jeremy Levy, and Dave McClure. 2015. *Early Implementation Findings from Responsible Fatherhood Reentry Projects*. OPRE Report #2014-68. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Foster, Holly, and John Hagan. 2007. "Incarceration and Intergenerational Social Exclusion." *Social Problems* 54 (4): 399–433.
- Glaze, Lauren E., and Laura M. Maruschak. 2008. *Parents in Prison and Their Minor Children*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Johnston, Denise. 1995. "Parent-Child Visitation in the Jail or Prison." In *Children of Incarcerated Parents*, edited by Katherine Gabel and Denise Johnston, 135–43. New York: Lexington Books.
- Kaminski, Jennifer, Linda Valle, Jill Filene, and Cynthia Boyle. 2008. "A Meta-analytic Review of Components Associated with Parent Training Program Effectiveness." *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 36 (4): 567–89.
- Kraus, William A. 1980. *Collaboration in Organizations: Alternatives to Hierarchy*. New York: Human Sciences Press.

- La Vigne, Nancy, Christy Visher, and Jennifer Castro. 2004. "Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Makarios, Matthew, Benjamin Steiner, and Lawrence F. Travis. 2010. "Examining the Predictors of Recidivism among Men and Women Released from Prison in Ohio." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 37 (12): 1377–91.
- Mathematica Policy Research. 2014. *Implementing Parent Education in Fatherhood Programs: Putting Lessons from Research into Practice*. Gaithersburg, MD: National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse.
- Mbwana, Kassim, Mary Terzian, and Kristin A. Moore. 2009. *What Works for Parent Involvement Programs for Children: Lessons from Experimental Evaluations of Social Interventions*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends.
- McKay, Tasseli, Elise Corwin, Mindy Herman-Stahl, Anupa Bir, Christine Lindquist, Hope Smiley-McDonald, and Sarah Siegel. 2010. "Parenting from Prison: Innovative Programs to Support Incarcerated and Reentering Fathers." Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.
- McKay, Tasseli, Christine Lindquist, Elise Corwin, and Anupa Bir. 2015. *The Implementation of Family Strengthening Programs for Families Affected by Incarceration*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.
- Murphey, David, and P. Mae Cooper. 2015. *Parents Behind Bars: What Happens to Their Children?* Bethesda, MD: Child Trends.
- Murray, Joseph, and David Farrington. 2005. "Parental Imprisonment: Effects on Boys' Antisocial Behaviour and Delinquency through the Life-Course." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 46 (12): 1269–78.
- . 2008. "Parental Imprisonment: Long-Lasting Effects on Boys' Internalizing Problems through the Life Course." *Development and Psychopathology* 20 (1): 273–90.
- Murray, Joseph, Carl-Gunnar Janson, and David Farrington. 2007. "Crime in Adult Offspring of Prisoners: A Cross-National Comparison of Two Longitudinal Samples." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 34 (1): 133–49.
- Naser, Rebecca, and Christy Visher. 2006. "Family Members' Experiences with Incarceration and Reentry." *Western Criminology Review* 7 (2): 20–31.
- Nelson, Marta, Perry Deess, and Charlotte Allen. 1999. *The First Month Out: Post-incarceration Experiences in New York City*. New York: Vera Institute.
- Pager, Devah. 2003. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108 (5): 937–75.
- Peterson, Bryce, Jocelyn Fontaine, Emma Kurs, and Lindsey Cramer. 2015. *Children of Incarcerated Parents Framework Document: Promising Practices, Challenges, and Recommendations for the Field*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Phillips, Susan D., Alaattin Erkanli, Gordon P. Keeler, E. Jane Costello, and Adrian Angold. 2006. "Disentangling the Risks: Parent Criminal Justice Involvement and Children's Exposure to Family Risks." *Criminology and Public Policy* 5 (4): 677–702.
- Poehlmann, Julie, Danielle H. Dallaire, Ann Booker Loper, and Leslie D. Shear. 2010. "Children's Contact with Their Incarcerated Parents: Research Findings and Recommendations." *American Psychologist* 65 (6): 575–98.
- Rossman, Shelli B., and Jocelyn Fontaine. 2014. *The Framework for Safer Return: A Research-based Community Initiative*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- . 2015. *Safer Return Demonstration: Implementation Findings from a Research-based Community Reentry Initiative*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Sack, William H., and Jack Seidler. 1978. "Should Children Visit Their Parents in Prison?" *Law and Human Behavior* 2 (3): 261–66.

- Sampson, Robert J., and John H. Laub. 1993. *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shollenberger, Tracey L. 2009. *When Relatives Return: Interviews with Family Members of Returning Prisoners in Houston, Texas*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Stuart, Jennifer Bagnell, Jessica Thornton Walker, and Amy Minzner. 2011. *A Critical Review of Partnership Capacity and Effectiveness: Moving from Theory to Evidence*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates Inc.
- The Pew Charitable Trusts. 2010. *Collateral Costs: Incarceration's Effect on Economic Mobility*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Turney, Kristin. 2015. "Liminal Men: Incarceration and Relationship Dissolution." *Social Problems* 62 (4): 499–528.
- Uggen, Christopher. 2000. "Work as a Turning Point in the Life Course of Criminals: A Duration Model of Age, Employment, and Recidivism." *American Sociological Review* 65: 529–46.
- Visher, Christy, Nancy La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis. 2004. *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry: Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Visher, Christy, Sara Debus, and Jennifer Yahner. 2008. *Employment after Prison: A Longitudinal Study of Releasees in Three States*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Visher, Christy, Carly Knight, Aaron Chalfin, and John Roman. 2009. *The Impact of Marital and Relationship Status on Social Outcomes for Returning Prisoners*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Wilczak, Ginger L., and Carol A. Markstrom. 1999. "The Effects of Parent Education on Parental Locus of Control and Satisfaction of Incarcerated Fathers." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 43 (1): 90–102.
- Wildeman, Christopher. 2014. "Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness, and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 651 (1): 74–96.
- Wright, Lois E., and Cynthia B. Seymour. 2000. *Working with Children and Families Separated by Incarceration: A Handbook for Child Welfare Agencies*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.
- Zaveri, Heather, Scott Baumgartner, Robin Dion, and Liz Clary. 2015. *Parents and Children Together: Design and Implementation of Responsible Fatherhood Programs*. OPRE Report Number #2015-76. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

About the Authors

Jocelyn Fontaine is a senior research associate in the Justice Policy Center at the Urban Institute, where her research portfolio is focused primarily on evaluating innovative community-based crime reduction and reentry initiatives targeted to vulnerable populations.

Lindsey Cramer is a research associate in the Justice Policy Center, where her research focuses on evaluating programs and developing policies designed to support and strengthen fathers and families impacted by the criminal justice system.

Emma Kurs is a research associate in the Justice Policy Center, where her work focuses on children and families of justice-involved individuals, juvenile justice reform, and reentry initiatives.

Ellen Paddock is a research associate in the Justice Policy Center. Her work focuses on the overlap between public health and criminal justice and on public safety strategies that effectively reduce crime and minimize collateral damage to vulnerable communities.

Josh Eisenstat is a research assistant in the Justice Policy Center, where his work focuses on incarcerated fathers, reentry initiatives, justice reinvestment, and culture reform in prisons.

Jeremy Levy is a former research assistant in the Justice Policy Center, where his research focused on jail and prison reentry programs and crime trends in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area.

Jeanette Hussemann is a senior research associate in the Justice Policy Center. Her research portfolio focuses on indigent defense, victimization, and juvenile justice.

ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is dedicated to elevating the debate on social and economic policy. For nearly five decades, Urban scholars have conducted research and offered evidence-based solutions that improve lives and strengthen communities across a rapidly urbanizing world. Their objective research helps expand opportunities for all, reduce hardship among the most vulnerable, and strengthen the effectiveness of the public sector.

STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

The Urban Institute strives to meet the highest standards of integrity and quality in its research and analyses and in the evidence-based policy recommendations offered by its researchers and experts. We believe that operating consistent with the values of independence, rigor, and transparency is essential to maintaining those standards. As an organization, the Urban Institute does not take positions on issues, but it does empower and support its experts in sharing their own evidence-based views and policy recommendations that have been shaped by scholarship. Funders do not determine our research findings or the insights and recommendations of our experts. Urban scholars and experts are expected to be objective and follow the evidence wherever it may lead.



2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

www.urban.org