# Alabama Department of Child Abuse & Neglect Prevention

# **Evaluation Report** Congressional District 2

# **Impact On Adult Participants**

**4,967 adults in Congressional District 2** received services through five types of ADCANP/CTF-funded programs: parent education, home visiting, respite care, fatherhood, and public awareness and training. The population served were primarily parents of lower resources, based on work status, education level, and income reported. An additional **17,506 parents and professionals** participated in community awareness programs.

Four primary funding sources provide support:

- The Community Based Child Abuse Prevention Program (CBCAP)
- The Children First Trust Fund (CFTF)
- The Education Trust Fund (ETF)
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

An independent Evaluation Team from Auburn University's Human Development and Family Science Department documented the outreach and effectiveness of these programs.

- 75% Women | 25% Men
- 36% European American/White | 52% African American/Black
- 34 average age
- 47% reported an annual income of less than \$10,000
- **45**% reported not working for pay
- **17%** reported not completing high school
- 52% reported a high school degree/GED as their highest level of education

Analyses of data revealed statistically significant improvements (p<.01) on many relevant measures of commitment, skill, and knowledge based on average scores from pre-program to post-program for Parenting Education, Home Visiting, and Respite programs.

The outcomes are indicators of protective factors that reduce the risk of child maltreatment and promote individual and family strengths.

ADCANP/CTF-funded programs reduced the likelihood of adults in **Congressional District 2** engaging in child abuse/neglect and enhanced the likelihood of current and future strong and stable families.



# **Parent Education & Home Visiting**

16 parent education and home visiting programs provided support and educational programs to parents. An assessment of 7 targeted outcomes with
984 participants revealed statistically significant improvements in average scores for:

- Stress Management Skills
- Skills to Manage Maltreatment Risk
- Understanding Various Forms of Maltreatment
- Medical Care Commitment
- · Parenting Skills & Child Development Knowledge
- · Knowledge of and Commitment to Use Support Services
- Use of Informal Support Networks

#### **Respite Care**

I respite care program provided respite services and parent education. An assessment of **4 targeted outcomes** with **26 participants** revealed statistically significant **improvements** in average scores for all but one outcome (i.e., positive view of child):

- Stress Level
- Positive View of Child
- · Knowledge of and Commitment to Use Support Services
- · Use of Informal Support Networks

#### Fatherhood

6 fatherhood programs provided educational sessions and support to non-residential parents. Participants are invited to complete a post-program benefit checklist survey that includes a list of 29 possible improvements/ benefits they perceived they obtained from the program. These benefits are reflected in 9 categories, grouped within the five protective factors of the Strengthening Families<sup>™</sup> Protective Factor Framework. Results from **325 participants** indicate:

Perceived Benefit Received from Program	Percentage Reporting Improvement
Workforce Development Improvement	79%
Financial Benefit	54%
Greater Access to Community Resources	63%
Improved Basic Needs	25%
Better Adult Relationship Skills	90%
Improved Parenting	87%
Improved Child Functioning	<b>7</b> 2%
Better Coping Skills	94%
Cooperation with Court System	65%



# **Impact On Youth Participants**

**19,205 youth** in grades 3-12 were served through 6 ADCANP/CTF-funded programs in **Congressional District 2**. These programs offered classes and mentoring services in schools and communities. An additional **5,396 youth** participated in community awareness programs.

All were focused on enhancing life skills, school performance, overall wellbeing, and reducing risks for children of maltreatment. Program objectives included: improved social competence, improved emotion knowledge, improved self-confidence, improved abuse awareness and resourcefulness, increased cooperative behavior, enhanced assertiveness, and avoidance of delinquent behaviors.

Funding for youth programs came primarily from one funding source:

- The Education Trust Fund (ETF)
- **20%** in grades 3-5 | **80%** in grades 6-12
- **53%** boys | **47%** girls
- **46**% African American/Black | **36**% European American/White
- 8% identified as Hispanic/Latino

Analyses of data revealed statistically significant improvements (*p*<.001) in ALL target areas on relevant measures of commitment, skill, and knowledge based on average scores from pre-program to post-program.

The outcomes are indicators of the protective factor: social and emotional competence of children, that reduces the risk of child maltreatment and promotes individual and family strengths.

# Grades 3-5 Youth Programs

6 youth focused programs provided educational sessions to youth participants. An assessment of 6 targeted outcomes with 253 3rd-5th grade participants revealed statistically significant improvements in average scores for:

- Social Skill Development
- Abuse Awareness
- · Improved Self-Confidence
- Emotion Identification and Regulation
- Enhanced Assertiveness
- · Cooperative Behavior

# **Grades 6-12 Youth Programs**

6 youth focused programs provided educational sessions to youth participants. An assessment of **7 targeted outcomes** with **1,019 6th-12th grade participants** revealed statistically significant **improvements** in average scores for:

- Emotion Knowledge of Self
- · Emotion Knowledge of Others
- Self-Confidence
- Social Competence
- · Commitment to Avoid Risky & Delinquent Behavior
- · Cooperative Behavior
- Abuse Awareness & Resourcefulness



The 2022-2023 Evaluation Report prepared by the Auburn Evaluation Team documented the combined effort and effectiveness of program offerings through an evaluation of funded programs. © 2024 by Auburn University. All rights reserved. January 2024