

Running head: EFFECTIVENESS OF PARENT-TO-PARENT

An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of a Parent-to-Parent Program in Changing Attitudes
and Increasing Parental Engagement in the Juvenile Dependency System

This is the author version of a paper that was accepted for publication in *Children and Youth
Services Review*, 2012, volume 34, pages 2036-2041.

Abstract

Parent mentor programs, which have helped parents with disabled children, are emerging in the field of child welfare as a means of engaging parents in the juvenile dependency process. Two current studies assessed a parent-to-parent program implemented in King County, Washington. Study 1 assessed a change in attitudes that occurred following participation in the program. Study 2 assessed differences in outcomes between participants in the program and parents who were invited, but did not attend the program. Results from study 1 suggest that there was a significant, positive change in attitudes following program participation—parents increased trust in child protection services, better understood the role of the stakeholders, increased their awareness of case issues, and increased belief that they had personal control over the case outcomes. A few race and gender differences were noted in attitude change. Findings from study 2 suggest that program participants were more engaged in the juvenile dependency court process, as evidenced by increased presence at court hearings, increased compliance with court ordered case plans, and increased visitation. Overall, the program appears to be effective in shaping parents' attitudes and improving parents' engagement in the juvenile dependency court process.

Keywords: parent mentor, child welfare, veteran parent, peer support program, engagement

1. Introduction

Engaging parents in the juvenile dependency court process continues to be a challenge for child welfare agencies and courts. According to the most recent Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) findings, a common challenge among all states is involving parents in case planning (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011). In particular, child welfare agencies do not consistently make concerted efforts to involve families in case planning. Most frequently, there is a deficiency in engaging fathers, but engagement of mothers and children is also a concern (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011).

Difficulty in engaging parents in case planning and participation results from a variety of factors. Unlike engagement in other services, most of the families involved with child welfare are not voluntary participants, which makes engagement more challenging (Rooney, 1992). As an involuntary participant, additional challenges—parents' willingness to change, understanding the needs of the child, and cooperation with child welfare workers—are often present (Darlington, Healy & Feeney, 2010). These challenges are often compounded by system problems, such as high social worker turnover (Cyphers, 2001), and ability of social workers to build good relationships with parents (Darlington et al., 2010). Parents often believe that social workers treat them disrespectfully and that they are not part of the decision-making process (Dale, 2004; Kapp & Propp, 2002). Despite these challenges, engaging parents is fundamental to successfully reuniting families (Jellineck et al., 1992).

Research has shown that increasing parental involvement in case planning can improve outcomes for families (Dale, 2004; Maiter, Palmer & Manji, 2006; Thomson & Thorpe, 2003). Engaging parents may lead to enhanced cooperation with social workers and ultimately increases

the likelihood of reunification (Atkinson & Butler, 1996; Jellineck et al., 1992). As these studies illustrate, engaging the family is an essential component.

One innovative approach to enhancing parental engagement that has recently emerged in child welfare is the use of peer-to-peer programs, which pair veteran parents who have successfully been through the child welfare process (e.g., were reunited with their children) with parents new to the system (Nilsen, Affronti, & Coombes, 2009). Veteran parents help parents to navigate the juvenile dependency process by providing support, helping parents advocate for themselves, giving them a voice in the system, explaining the court process, and ensuring parents receive the services they need. Parent-to-parent programs are based on the premise that “beneficial effects derive from sharing information, experience, and practical solutions to common problems” (Ireys, Chernoff, Stein, DeVet, & Silver, 2001, p. 204). Shared common experiences are something that other programs cannot offer and are at the heart of this type of model (Santelli, Turnbull, & Higgins, 1997).

The use of parent-to-parent programs, while new to child welfare, has long been supported in the medical field. More than 500 parent support programs in the United States assist parents who have disabled children or children with chronic health conditions (Santelli et al., 1997). In a national survey of parent-to-parent programs, participating parents believed the program was useful in helping them learn about their child’s disability, reducing stress, and increasing hope (Santelli et al., 1997). Mentor support programs are effective in reducing parents’ anxiety, with parents who participated in the programs demonstrating a reduction in reported anxious symptoms (i.e., feeling tense or upset stomach) compared to those in the control group (Ireys et al., 2001). While research on parent-to-parent programs in the medical field has

been productive, research on application of this type of program to child welfare is still developing.

A few studies have examined the effects of parent support and mentor programs on child welfare outcomes. A program evaluation of the Kentucky Parent Advocate Program tracked the use of parent advocates who were tasked to provide parents with information on the child welfare system, provide support, and encourage parents to participate in case planning. The evaluation showed that children whose families had an advocate had fewer placement moves, had higher rates of reunification, and spent less time in care than those without an advocate (The Commonwealth of Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services Department for Community Based Services, 2007). Despite these promising results, the study design was limited by sample selection and methodology, and the study could not demonstrate a statistically significant causal relationship.

A meta-analysis of family support programs found small, but significant, effects on both child and parent outcomes (Layzer, Goodson, Berstein, & Price, 2001). Parents showed a change in attitude and an improvement in parenting behaviors (i.e., appropriately interacting or teaching the child) following participation (Layzer et al., 2001). Another review of programs found that participants in mentor programs had lower incidences of future abuse reporting than other program types; however, there was no effect of the program on re-entry rates (Chaffin, Bonner, & Hill, 2001). Together, these studies provide tentative evidence that family support and mentor programs, including parent-to-parent programs, often help change parent's understanding of their current situation and lead to positive outcomes.

2. Study Overview

The current study seeks to advance the developing literature on the use of veteran parent support programs in child welfare. As veteran parent programs are prolific in the medical field, and have demonstrated efficacy in helping parents (Santelli et al., 1997), it is important to assess the potential for similar effects in child welfare. Programs with similar elements, such as mentor programs or family support programs, have been shown to be effective in changing parents' attitudes and in improving outcomes. Studies often fail to examine *parent engagement* in the process. The current study seeks to fill this void by evaluating the effectiveness of a newly implemented Parent-to-Parent program in King County, Washington in terms of positive attitude change and increased engagement in the court process. The evaluation has two components. The first is a process evaluation that examines attitude changes due to participation in the program. The second component is an outcome evaluation that examines parents' engagement in the dependency process.

2.1 Parent-to-Parent Program Overview

The King County Parent-to-Parent program attempts to engage parents early in the dependency process through education and peer support from veteran parents who have successfully navigated the child welfare system (Juvenile Court Department of the King County Superior Court, 2011). Implemented in 2009, the program has two key components: veteran parent support at the 72-hour shelter care hearing and a "Dependency 101" class.

Prior to the 72-hour shelter care hearing, a veteran parent meets with parents to help alleviate any apprehensions or fears about the dependency system. The veteran parent also talks with parents about the Dependency 101 class, including the benefits of attending, sits with parents through the shelter care hearing, and signs them up for Dependency 101. If a parent does

not attend the first hearing, a veteran parent (or the Parent-to-Parent Program coordinator) tries to make contact with him or her at a subsequent hearing.

The second component of the program is the Dependency 101 class, a two-hour informational session that educates parents about the dependency system and provides an opportunity for parents to gain a better understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders involved in the system. At Dependency 101, parents receive a packet of information, watch an educational video about the dependency process, hear from juvenile dependency court stakeholders, (i.e., social workers, attorneys, and Court Appointed Special Advocates) and listen to two or three veteran parents share their experiences with the dependency process. Dependency 101 was selected as the focus of this study because it was implemented with a built-in evaluation component (pre/post surveys) and had data available that tracked participants.

3. Study 1 - Process Evaluation

Prior research has indicated that parent-to-parent programs are effective in helping parents to understand the needs of the child, feel less alone, accept their situation, have more hope, and experience less anxiety (Santelli et al., 1997; Ireys et al., 2001). While these studies have been limited to parent support programs in the medical field, Nilsen et al. (2009) argue that using veteran parents in parent-to-parent programs in child welfare can have similar beneficial results, as veteran parents can help parents to understand what they need to do to reunify with their children. To determine if the program can affect parents' understanding and perception of the dependency process, the process evaluation examines the effectiveness of the Dependency 101 program in changing parents' attitudes. This evaluation uses a pre/post test survey design to determine if the Dependency 101 class changed parents' attitudes across five dimensions: (1)

trust in child protective services (CPS), (2) awareness of parenting issues, (3) understanding roles of stakeholders, (4) perceived control, and (5) feeling alone.

3.1 Method

3.1.1 Procedure

Four hundred-eighty-five parents who participated in the King County Parent-to-Parent Program between July 2009 and May 2011 provided feedback on their experiences with the program. When participants arrived for the Dependency 101 class, they were given a pen and paper survey containing demographic questions (e.g., gender, race, and age). In addition, parents rated nine statements relating to their trust in Child Protective Services (CPS), awareness of their dependency case issues, understanding of the roles of professionals in the dependency system, and their perceptions of control and feeling alone on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 – *Disagree Strongly* to 5 – *Strongly Agree*. At the conclusion of Dependency 101, parents received another pen and paper survey where they were asked to re-rate the same nine statements. Both surveys were completed in the classroom and returned to the program coordinator. Surveys were numbered in order to match pre and post responses. Identifying information (e.g., names, birthdays) was not collected.

3.1.2 Participants

Of the 485 participants who completed the pre/post test survey, 24 were dropped because they attended Dependency 101 in a support role (i.e., not as the involved parent), resulting in 461 participants in the study. Participants were primarily female (65%) and Caucasian (43%), with 24% African American, 10% Hispanic/Latino, 7% bi-racial, 6% American Indian, 5% Asian, and 4% Native Hawaiian. Eighty-five percent of parents reported that this was their first dependency case.

3.2 Results

A paired samples t-test examined differences pre and post to assess change in attitude following the Dependency 101 training. There was a statistically significant change in responses to the attitudinal questionnaire for all but one of the statements: “I believe there are things I can do so that the Court will return my children to me.” Increasing values from pre to post-Dependency 101 indicate more agreement with the statement, while decreasing values indicate less agreement. Results suggest that participants thought more positively about the juvenile dependency system after participating in Dependency 101. Mean responses and t-scores are reported in Table 1. The largest changes appeared in attitudes toward child protection services (CPS).

[Insert Table 1]

3.2.1 Gender Differences

A difference score was calculated for each pre-post attitudinal item and summed to create an aggregate change in attitude score. Females showed significantly more attitude change than males, $t(353) = 3.36, p = .001$. Specifically, females exhibited greater change in attitudes related to three items (“I feel like I can trust CPS to be fair and see my side of things,” “I understand the roles of the professionals involved in the child welfare system,” and “I feel like I am the only one that is involved with CPS”). Gender differences are reported in Table 2.

[Insert Table 2]

3.2.2 Race Differences

African American participants showed *less* attitude change than other participants did, although this change was not statistically significant, $p = .32$. One item that assessed trust in CPS

(“I feel like I can trust CPS to be fair and see my side of things”) did show a significantly lower attitude change $t(419) = 2.62, p = .009$. Race differences are also reported in Table 2.

4. Study 2 - Outcome Evaluation

Study two examined outcomes related to participation in Dependency 101. The goal of the veteran parent program is to provide support through shared experiences and help engage parents in the process by improving their understanding of the process. Therefore, the outcome evaluation was designed to examine whether or not participation in the Parent-to-Parent Program, specifically the Dependency 101 class, led to more engagement in the dependency court process.

4.1 Method

4.1.1 Procedure

Researchers conducted case file review comparing participants in Dependency 101 to non-participants. The Parent-to-Parent Program Coordinator provided information on parents who had been approached by a veteran parent and referred to Dependency 101 beginning in January of 2010. This information included: (1) date the parent was approached, (2) gender of the parent, (3) race of the parent, and (4) date parent participated in Dependency 101 (when applicable). Utilizing structured case file review instruments, researchers reviewed and coded 80 cases of parents who were approached to participate in Dependency 101. In 43 of the cases, at least one parent participated, forming the participant group. In the other 37 cases, no parent participated, forming a comparison group.

4.1.2 Measuring Engagement

The dependent variable of interest is engagement of the parent. Engagement is not easily defined. Drawing on prior research, engagement was operationalized via three variables: (1)

presence of the parent at court hearings, (2) court finding that the parent has or has not visited the child, and (3) court finding of parent compliance with court-ordered case plan.

4.2 Results

When a parent participated in the Dependency 101, it was most often the mother only (49%) or both parents (39%) and rarely the father only (12%). The racial make-up of the sample was 48% Caucasian, 28% African American, 13% Native American, 9% Hispanic, and 2% mixed race. Analyses were run separately for mothers and fathers for each of the engagement variables. Sample size was not sufficiently large enough to examine the data by race. A series of ordinary least square and binary logistic regression analyses examined the effect of participation in Dependency 101.

4.2.1 Comparability of the Groups

The two groups were comparable in terms of parent's race, child's age, the type and number of allegations, and presenting problems, allowing comparison between Dependency 101 participants (those who were invited and did attend) and non-participants (those who were invited but did not attend). T-test and chi square analyses revealed that the two groups were similar across each of these variables. Case factors did not differ between the two groups, indicating that any further differences that might emerge are not due to case differences and are more likely due to participation in Dependency 101. Table 3 portrays overall descriptive information and engagement findings.

4.2.2 Parent's Presence at Key Court Hearings

The first measure of engagement was the presence of the parent at court hearings (e.g., shelter care, adjudication, six-month review, and first permanency planning). Using a yes/no (presence/absence) count of when parties were present, researchers calculated an overall

percentage of how often the parent was present at the hearings. On average, mothers were present in 74% of hearings and fathers were present in 54% of hearings.

Mothers. A linear regression revealed that that participation in Dependency 101 significantly predicted mother's participation in key court hearings $\beta = .32$, $F(1, 77) = 8.46$, $p = .005$. Participation in Dependency 101 explained 10% of the variance ($R^2 = .10$) Mothers who participated in Dependency 101 were present in 82% of hearings; mothers who did not participate were present in 69% of hearings.

Fathers. Although fathers who participated in Dependency 101 were present slightly more often than fathers who did not participant (61% compared 47%), this difference was not statistically significant, $p = .13$.

4.2.4 Compliance with Visitation Orders

Beginning with the first review hearing, the court typically makes a finding of whether the parent has had consistent visits with the child. Researchers utilized logistic regression models to examine the effects of participation in Dependency 101 on findings of visitation compliance (a dichotomous has/has not measure) at the six-month review and first permanency hearing. Mothers were found to be in compliance with visitation orders at review hearings in 56% of cases and in compliance with visitation at permanency hearings in 44% of cases on average. Fathers were found to be in compliance with visitation orders at review hearings in 40% of hearings and in compliance with visitation orders at permanency hearings in 37% of cases, on average.

Mothers. Participation in Dependency 101 was statistically significant at the $p = .07$ level, $\beta = .96$, $S.E. = .53$, $e^{\beta} = 2.61$ for visitation compliance at the review hearing. Mothers who participated in Dependency 101 were more likely to have visited their children (68%) than those

who did not participate (44%). For the permanency hearing, there was no effect of participation, $p = .74$.

Fathers. For fathers, participation in Dependency 101 significantly predicted visitation compliance at the six-month review hearing $\beta = -1.54$, S.E. = .63, $e^{\beta} = 4.68$, $p = .01$, but not at the permanency hearing, $p = .39$. At the six-month review hearing, fathers who had participated in Dependency 101 were more likely to have visited their children (55%) compared to fathers who had not participated (21%).

[Insert Table 3]

4.2.5. Compliance with Court Ordered Case Plan

Compliance with the ordered case plan was measured based on a court finding of compliance. At each review and permanency planning hearing, judicial officers make compliance findings of *no*, *partial*, or *in compliance* for all parents who are a party to the case. Compliance was calculated on a scale of 0 (no) to 2 (in compliance) for both the six month review and first permanency planning hearings. Mother's case plan compliance averaged 1.06 ($SD = .83$) at the six-month review hearing and 1.03 ($SD = .78$) at the first permanency hearing. Father's case plan compliance averaged .98 ($SD = .93$) at the six-month review and .86 ($SD = .92$) at the first permanency hearing.

Mothers. For mothers, participation in Dependency 101 did not affect the finding of case plan compliance at the review hearing, $p = .12$. For the permanency hearing, the effect of Dependency 101 on case plan compliance approached but did not reach statistical significance, $p = .11$.

Fathers. For fathers, participation in Dependency 101 significantly predicted case plan compliance at both the review $\beta = .45$, $F(1, 58) = 14.24$, $p < .001$ and the permanency hearings β

= .30 $F(1, 55) = 5.29, p = .02$. Dependency 101 explained 20% of the variance for compliance at the review hearing ($R^2 = .20$) and 9% of the variance at the permanency hearing ($R^2 = .09$).

Fathers who participated in Dependency 101 were more likely to be found in compliance at both hearings (see Table 3).

5. Discussion

The current study examined the effects of a Parent-to-Parent Program implemented in child abuse and neglect cases. The study had a process evaluation component that examined whether the Parent-to-Parent Program effectively changed parents' attitudes and understanding, and an outcome evaluation component that assessed whether the Parent-to-Parent Program effectively engaged parents in the dependency process. A statistically significant change in attitudes and understanding of the dependency process followed participation in the Dependency 101 class. The biggest change was in the items related to trust in child protection services (CPS). Following participation in Dependency 101, parents' attitudes toward CPS were more positive. Further, parents reported an increased understanding of the roles of child welfare stakeholders, an increased awareness of the issues that brought them before the court, and an increase in the belief that they were not alone. In contrast, perceived control of the situation did not change. This may be because pre-survey responses were already high on this item. Overall, findings from the process evaluation suggest that the parent-to-program can effectively change the attitudes of participants.

Results of the outcome evaluation also yielded positive findings. Participation in Dependency 101 enhanced parental engagement in the process, as evidenced by increased presence at hearings and higher levels of visitation compliance and case plan compliance. Mothers who participated in Dependency 101 showed increased presence in hearings as

compared to mothers who did not participate. Further, participating mothers also showed better case plan compliance than non-participating mothers, although this finding was not statistically significant. For fathers, the results were slightly different. Participation in Dependency 101 had no influence on father's presence at key hearings, but did appear to affect father's compliance with visitation, at least at the six-month review. Participating fathers also showed higher degrees of case plan compliance than non-participating fathers did. The overall findings from both studies clearly indicate that the Parent-to-Parent Program positively influences parent's attitudes and increases engagement in the dependency process. The evaluations also identified some gender and race differences in program effectiveness.

Mothers' attitudes were significantly more likely to change because of participation than were fathers' attitudes. This may indicate that the program has more of an effect for mothers than for fathers. The difference may be explained by the gender of the veteran parents who participated in program. The underlying theory behind having the veteran parents is based on shared common experiences. If the majority of veteran parents were females, this might mean that the effect of the veteran parents was more prominent on females. The study did not identify the gender of the veteran parents who participated, however.

This gender difference may also stem from a discrepancy already apparent in the child welfare field—fathers are frequently less involved in the case. Fathers are often the non-custodial parent, and the focus remains on the mother as the primary caretaker and object of the majority of petition allegations. Prior research has already established that fathers are rarely involved any child welfare case planning (O'Donnell, 2001; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011). This may be because of the perceptions the court system treats fathers more harshly than mothers or that fathers typically mistrust the system, and therefore avoid it (O'Donnell, Johnson,

D'Aunno, & Thornton, 2005). These perceptions may inhibit father's involvement in the process. Despite the gender differences identified in the process evaluation, fathers still showed a significant change in attitudes following participation in the program. This was also true for the outcome evaluation.

The outcome evaluation demonstrated that the program is equally effective in engaging fathers as it is mothers. Although mothers showed an increased likelihood of appearing in key hearings and fathers did not, both mothers and fathers showed increased engagement through their better compliance with court ordered case plans. Fathers who participated in Dependency 101 also demonstrated better compliance with visitation than fathers who did not participate. Even though attitude changes may differ by gender, behavioral changes did not. The significant changes for fathers indicate that the Parent-to-Parent Program may be a useful tool for overcoming barriers related to father's engagement in the dependency process.

The process evaluation also indicated a small race difference in effectiveness. African American participants' attitude change was less pronounced than other racial groups. Only one item related to trust in CPS showed a significant difference, with African American participants less likely to show an increased trust in CPS. There is the potential that the race of the veteran parent may have played a role in changing participants' attitudes. Overall, both African American and Caucasian families showed positive changes in attitudes following the program. No race effects were examined in the outcome evaluation.

6. Limitations and Future Research

Like all similar field research, the current study does have a few limitations to note. The first is that process evaluations could not be linked to outcome measures. Since the pre-post survey did not collect identifying information, it was impossible to link this to case information.

Future research could examine whether individual changes in attitudes are directly related to improved outcomes for that individual to see if those who have the greatest attitude shifts are more likely to show improved engagement. A second limitation is that the study did not directly ask parents about their perception of being engaged in the process. As earlier studies (Kapp & Propp, 2002) have found that parents often do not feel part of the decision-making process, asking parents their perception of involvement may have yielded useful findings. A third limitation was that the sample size for the outcome evaluation was low. This inhibited examining the data from multiple race perspectives. Future research could seek to oversample racial groups in order to determine if the Parent-to-Parent Program is more or less effective depending on the race of the participant. A final consideration is that the current study only examined engagement as an outcome variable. Research on the effectiveness of parent-to-parent programs must be extended to include dependency case outcomes. Without examining the resolution of the case, it is impossible to determine whether engagement leads to better outcomes for families and children.

7. Conclusion

The Parent-to-Parent Program is an effective tool in shaping parents attitudes toward CPS, increasing parents understanding of dependency stakeholder's roles, decreasing feelings of being alone, and increasing parental engagement in the dependency process. Despite the fact that the current study did not examine case outcomes, prior research has clearly indicated that parents' participation in hearings is related to timelier reunification (Wood & Russell, 2011) and that compliance with case plans is related to increased probability of reunification (Jellinek et al., 1992). Further, the research shows that the program yielded positive findings for both mothers and fathers. The Parent-to-Parent Program was effective in increasing father's compliance with

the case plan. As the CFSR findings indicate that no states are making concerted efforts to engage fathers (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011), programs such as this, which increase father engagement, may be an ideal starting point for improving father's involvement in the case.

Acknowledgements

This research was conducted in partnership with the Washington Administrative Office of the Courts. The authors would also like to thank Jennifer McClellan for her research assistance on this project.

References

- Altman, J. C. (2008). A study of engagement in neighborhood-based child welfare services. *Research on Social Work Practice, 18*, 555-564.
- Atkinson, L., & Butler, S. (1996). Court-ordered assessment: Impact of maternal non-compliance in child maltreatment cases. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 20*, 185-190.
- Chaffin, M., Bonner, B. L., & Hill, R. F. (2001). Family preservation and family support programs: child maltreatment outcomes across client risk levels and program types. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 25*, 1269-1289.
- Cyphers, G. (2001). *Report from the child welfare workforce survey: State and county data and findings*. Washington, D.C.: American Public Human Services Association. Retrieved from <http://www.aphsa.org/policy/Doc/cwvsurvey.pdf>
- Dale, P. (2004). "Like a fish in a bowl": Parents' perceptions of child protection services. *Child Abuse Review, 13*(2), 137-157.
- Darlington, Y., Healy, K., & Feeney, J. A. (2010). Challenges in implementing participatory practice in child protection: A contingency approach. *Children and Youth Services Review, 32*, 1020-1027
- Santelli, B., Turnbull, A. & Higgins, C., (1997) Parent to parent support and health care. *Pediatric Nursing, 23*, 303-306.
- Ireys, H., T., Chernoff, R., Stein, R. E., DeVet, K. A., Silver, E. J. (2001). Outcomes of community-based family-to-family support: Lessons learned from a decade of randomized trials. *Children's Services: Social Policy, Research, and Practice, 4*(4), 203-216.

Jellinek, M. S., Murphy, J. M., Poittrast, F., Quinn, D., Bishop, S. J., & Goshko, M. (1992).

Serious child maltreatment in Massachusetts: The course of 206 children through the courts. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *16*, 179–185.

Juvenile Court Department of the King County Superior Court. (2011). *Juvenile dependency – parent to parent program*. Retrieved from

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/courts/JuvenileCourt/dependency/parenttoparent.aspx>

Kapp, S. A., & Propp, J. (2002). Client satisfaction methods: Input from parents with children in foster care. *Child and Adolescent Social Work*, *19*, 227-245.

Kemp., S. P., Macenko M. O., Hoagwood, K., & Vesnecki, W. (2009). Engaging parents in child welfare services; Bridging family needs and child welfare mandates. *Child Welfare*, *88*, 101-126.

Layzer, J.I., Goodson, B.D., Berstein, L., & Price, C. (2001). *National Evaluation of family support programs: Final report, volume A: The meta-analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Maiter, S., Palmer, S., & Manji, S. (2006). Strengthening social worker-client relationships in child protection services: Addressing power relationships and ruptured relationships. *Qualitative Social Work*, *5*, 161–186.

Nilsen, W. J., Affronti, M. L., Coombes, M. L. (2009) Veteran parents in child protective services: Theory and implementation. *Family Relations*, *58*, 520-535.

O'Donnell, J. M. (2001). Parental involvement in kinship foster care services in one father and multiple father families. *Child Welfare*, *80*, 453-479.

O'Donnell, J. M., Johnson, Jr., W. E., Easley D' Aunno, L., & Thornton, H. L. (2005). Fathers in child welfare: Caseworker's perspectives. *Child Welfare*, *84*, 387-414.

Rooney, R. H. (1992). *Strategies for work with involuntary clients*. New York: Columbia University Press.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services Department for Community Based Services (2007). *Parent Advocacy Program evaluation anchor site: Jefferson County, Kentucky*. Retrieved from http://chfs.ky.gov/nr/ronlyres/f17af937-836e-4514-aa47-59fe1b3ecb9b/0/parentadvocateprogramevaluation_retouch_july1107.pdf

Thomson, J., & Thorpe, R. (2003). The importance of parents in the lives of children in the care system. *Children Australia*, 28, 25–31.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2011). *Federal child and family services review: Aggregate report, round 2, fiscal years 2007-2010*. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/cwmonitoring/results/fcfsr_report.pdf

Wood, S. M., & Russell, J. R. (2011). Effects of parental and attorney involvement on reunification in Juvenile dependency cases. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 22, 1730-1741.

Table 1. Average Pre and Post-Dependency 101 Responses

	<i>Pre</i>	<i>Post</i>	<i>t</i>
Trust in CPS			
I believe my family will get help we really need from CPS.	3.08	3.44	-7.40*
I feel like I can trust CPS to be fair and see my side of things.	2.74	3.19	-11.14*
I think things will get better for my child(ren) because CPS is involved.	2.91	3.30	-7.84*
CPS is not out to get me	3.25	3.50	-5.22*
Awareness of Issues			
I realize I need some help to make sure my kids have what they need.	3.79	3.96	-4.48*
There were definitely some problems in my family that CPS saw.	3.30	3.45	-2.31*
<i>Understanding Roles</i>			
I understand the roles of the professionals involved in the child welfare system.	3.59	3.99	-4.86*
Perceived Control			
I believe there are things I can do so that the Court will return my children to me.	4.47	4.56	-.67
Feeling Alone			
I feel like I am the only one that is involved with CPS.	2.17	2.02	3.42*

Note: Higher numbers indicate greater agreement with the statement.

* $p \leq .05$

Table 2. *Gender and Race Differences in Attitudinal Change Scores*

	Gender		Race	
	Female	Male	Black	Non-Black
Trust in CPS				
I believe my family will get help we really need from CPS.	.40	.29	.33	.36
I feel like I can trust CPS to be fair and see my side of things.	.53	.33*	.26	.54*
I think things will get better for my child(ren) because CPS is involved.	.40	.38	.33	.41
CPS is not out to get me	.26	.22	.24	.25
Awareness of Issues				
I realize I need some help to make sure my kids have what they need.	.19	.18	.20	.09
There were definitely some problems in my family that CPS saw.	.22	.01	.11	.23
Understanding Roles				
I understand the roles of the professionals involved in the child welfare system.	.57	.14*	.44	.38
Perceived Control				
I believe there are things I can do so that the Court will return my children to me.	.42	-.36	-.05	.19
Feeling Alone				
I feel like I am the only one that is involved with CPS.	.27	.04*	.24	.16
Overall Pre-Post Difference Score	3.57	1.29	2.05	2.87

* $p < .05$

Table 3. Comparison of Engagement Variables Related to Participation in Dependency 101 for both Mothers and Fathers

	Participated in Dependency 101	Did not Participate in Dependency 101
Mothers		
Percent Presence at Key Hearings	82%	69%*
Visitation Compliance		
Review	68%	44%
Permanency	43%	48%
Case Plan Compliance		
Review	1.21	.91*
Permanency	1.17	.85*
Fathers		
Percent Presence at Key Hearings	61%	47%
Visitation Compliance		
Review	55%	21%*
Permanency	42%	30%
Case Plan Compliance		
Review	1.35	.52*
Permanency	1.09	.54*

* $p < .05$