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Executive Summary
GOOD+ Foundation retained external evaluators to conduct an independent evaluation of their Fatherhood Initiative to determine where their program could be improved and identify the impacts of their work on their partner organizations, the fathers that they serve and their children. The research was conducted using a mixed methods approach, including interviews and questionnaires with staff and leadership, focus groups with program leaders in New York and Los Angeles and surveys of participating fathers. The results of the evaluation are captured in the full report.

The leadership of GOOD+ Foundation was interested in gathering information to validate some of their Fatherhood Initiative hypotheses. The first was about how their goods and special activities affected fathers, particularly their sense of self, confidence and desire to be good dads. They were also interested in whether the goods and special activities provided created bonding opportunities and strengthened the relationships between fathers and their children. Finally, they were also interested in how their donations could remove parenting barriers faced by fathers to participating in their children’s lives including court imposed barriers and those created by mothers or custodial family members.

“Baby Buggy (GOOD + Foundation) could advocate on issues like the need for changing tables in men’s restrooms, paternity leave, changing child support laws, shifting DCF practices and other systems, changing things that affect our dads’ daily lives. They have the bully pulpit and ability to bring in media attention a lot more than we do as programs.” Program Leader

The program staff of the partner organizations provided insights into the impact of these donations and activities from their perspective. They validated the assumptions made by the staff of GOOD+ Foundation in terms of the enormous value that their donations made to the fathers and to the programs. The programs deeply valued the responsiveness and “lack of strings attached” to the programming and donations, and felt like GOOD+ Foundation believed in what they were doing. They did however point out myriad ways in which the Foundation could expand its role to bring greater awareness to Fatherhood programs, raise up what works and contribute to field building efforts.

The surveys conducted during the summer of 2016 took a snapshot of fathers participating in GOOD+ Foundation partner programs at that point in time and were completed by 235 responding fathers. They reported having a total of 521 children, which averages to 2.2 children per respondents but some families were as large with six children but many (91 respondents) had only one child.¹

Overall, the respondents to the surveys were overwhelmingly positive about the impacts of goods that they had received as well as the impact of the activities. Some notable statistics are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a Result of Receiving Goods:</th>
<th>As a Result of Participating in Activities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96% Felt better about themselves</td>
<td>97% Shared a positive experience with their child and made positive memories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93% Improved their relationship with their child</td>
<td>96% Connected with child in a new way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91% Trusted staff more</td>
<td>92% Willing to work harder in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79% Purchased other needed items for their child</td>
<td>77% Mothers allowed dads more time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Since 2010, GOOD+ Foundation has served over 20,000 families in fatherhood programs through 19 program partners and has distributed over 470,000 children’s products to these families.
Introduction

GOOD+ Foundation (formerly Baby Buggy) has been providing goods, support and a platform for high-functioning nonprofit and community-based organizations working to break the cycle of poverty for families. The programming is dedicated to supporting new mothers, engaging fathers and promoting early childhood education. Their work with fatherhood programs is their most recent initiative focused on reengaging fathers in the lives of their children and families. The purpose of this report is to provide the results from an evaluation of the impact of the GOOD+ Foundation’s contributions to the families, the programs and the field.

This multi-tiered evaluation used a mixed methods approach to identify and document key outcomes, provide feedback to the organization on its process and inform programming moving forward for the organization. Given that stage of development of the Fatherhood Initiative, it was an ideal time to evaluate the program to codify what works and prioritize program components.

Fathers are garnering more attention than previously as research and experience demonstrates the lifelong impact that their engagement in children’s lives provides. Father engagement contributes to factors of resilience for children, decreasing rates of poverty and incarceration, and increasing educational attainment and other protective factors. However, fathers have systematically been prevented, shamed and under supported in learning how to be a positive and present force in their children’s lives. A movement has emerged to develop strong programming for Dads and GOOD+ Foundation is enhancing, strengthening and raising awareness about these efforts through their work.

At the initiation of this evaluation, GOOD+ Foundation had been testing its role in Fatherhood programming, building on its long history of supporting organizations that served mothers. Throughout the course of the evaluation, GOOD+ Foundation has recognized the significant role it can play in changing the conversation around fathers, strengthening programs that serve them and filling a gap for fathers to better engage with their children.

This evaluation report provides GOOD+ Foundation with reasonably robust impact data of its current Fatherhood Initiative program strategy. This strategy is decidedly ‘non-obtrusive’ and designed to be responsive to meeting grantee’s needs for supplemental products and services to enhance their program’s inventory and capacities. Within this program’s philanthropic context, GOOD+ Foundation is achieving noted positive impacts with its programming supporting fatherhood programs. We hope that this evaluation report provides GOOD+ Foundation insights on how best to adjust its program support and relationships with grantees in ways that enhance desired impacts.

Methods

The evaluation of GOOD+ Foundation’s Fatherhood Initiative employed mixed methods appropriate to the developmental stage of the program. Both process and outcomes measures were developed and studied and feedback was given to the organization throughout the evaluation.

Document Review and Landscape Scan:

The first step in the evaluation was to understand the components of the Fatherhood Initiative and its history. Staff and leadership provided literature documentation that informed the program’s design and implementation approach and related successes, challenges, impacts to date and details of grantee
partner’s characteristics. These documents and additional requests for supplemental background information provided the evaluation team with a baseline to understand GOOD+ Foundation’s Fatherhood Initiative. In addition, we scanned the literature on fatherhood programs to better understand how GOOD+ Foundation’s approach compared with others and to identify key questions for the staff, its program partners and participants to better inform our evaluation design and interview protocols.

**Staff Questionnaires and In-Person Meeting:**
GOOD+ Foundation leadership and staff were sent a questionnaire to fill out independently prior to an all-day in-person meeting with evaluators (Attachment A). The answers to these questions were compiled and informed the agenda for the meeting. The evaluators then met with the leadership and management of the organization to better understand their goals and objectives for the evaluation. This was a brainstorming and prioritization meeting that resulted in a deeper understanding of what the GOOD+ Foundation leadership wanted to learn most about the effectiveness of their programming approach and its related impact.

**Focus Groups:**
The principal objective of the focus groups was to determine the efficacy of the program’s implementation efforts to date from the point of view of current Fatherhood Initiative program implementers. In general, we wanted to learn how the Fatherhood Initiative aligned with the organizational goals and objectives and what we could learn from GOOD+ Foundation’s staff and from current partner organizations about how program implementation could be improved. The critical questions that framed these discussions were:

- How well is GOOD+ Foundation’s Fatherhood Initiative accomplishing its programming objectives?
- What has been the impact of its efforts to date?
- Is GOOD+ Foundation’s current working relationship with Fatherhood Initiative programs achieving desired efficacy and results?

It is important to note that the Fatherhood Initiative was relatively new for GOOD+ Foundation. Consequently, their preferred grant/service/working relationship with Fatherhood Initiative program staff reflects a strong value proposition that achieving desired outcomes from these investments depends not only on the grant/gift resources provided but also on the quality of working relationships/partnerships with program implementers.

**Stakeholder Interviews**
Initially, it was planned that the evaluators would interview stakeholders of the Fatherhood Initiative, including Leadership Council members, partner organization leadership, fatherhood experts and others. It was determined by staff at the time of data collection launch that they would prefer to do this outreach themselves for the organization. It was believed that using Good+ Foundation’s staff for initial data gathering would better inform the rebranding effort that was occurring concurrently rather than inform the research. The evaluation therefore did not contain stakeholder interviews.

**Program Participant Surveys:**
The bulk of qualitative information collected was as a result of a data gathered from detailed program participant surveys. The surveys were developed in concert with GOOD+ Foundation staff (Attachment
B). It was intended that the surveys would provide a baseline to inform future data collection instruments, including an evaluation plan for GOOD+ Foundation. The surveys were administered as paper surveys for ease of administration, with a Spanish version provided as well. Program leaders were asked to administer the survey to all participants and then to send the completed surveys to the evaluators. Program leaders were provided copies of the surveys, detailed administration instructions and prepaid and addressed priority mail envelopes. They were asked to conduct the surveys with as many participants as possible and to return them within three weeks of receipt.

Once the surveys were administered and sent to the evaluation team’s researchers, they were given identification numbers. All of the surveys were coded by the evaluation team’s Senior Researcher. Anomalies, errors and trends were discussed and reconciled with GOOD+ Foundation’s senior staff. It is also important to note that determinations on coding were based on what information the organization was most interested in receiving. Recommendations and changes to the survey were documented during the process to improve the validity of the survey instrument. The data was entered manually into a database and then was spot-checked for accuracy. Further data cleaning was conducted after running frequencies.

The data was analyzed with the evaluation team’s Senior and Junior Researchers and in partnership with GOOD+ Foundation staff. Recommendations and an evaluation plan for GOOD+ Foundation moving forward were developed. Revised survey instruments and data collection tools were developed as well. An infographic was created by GOOD+ Foundation using key data points identified by the staff and evaluators.

Results and Recommendations:
GOOD+ Foundation Staff Questionnaire and Meeting:
The purpose of the evaluation team’s meeting with GOOD+ Foundation senior staff on May 4th, 2015 was to confirm the goals, assumptions and next steps for the evaluation. A brief survey was sent to the GOOD+ Foundation leadership team (including both NY & LA-based staff members) prior to the meeting and was filled out by some of its members in advance. The results demonstrated a range of understanding of the mechanics of their Fatherhood Initiative and differing perspectives on the goals of the evaluation of the Fatherhood Initiative. Establishing a common understanding of the purpose and utility of the evaluation became an added agenda item to be addressed at this meeting.

In general, we wanted to learn how the Fatherhood Initiative aligned with GOOD+ Foundation’s organizational goals and objectives. Contextually, we wanted to frame a discussion with the foundation’s lead staff and their current partner organizations to explore how desired program impacts/results could be improved.

It was essential for the evaluators to understand all of the components of GOOD+ Foundation’s Fatherhood Initiative to best determine what should be evaluated. Clearly the leadership team was interested in affecting change at numerous levels. Most of the conversation focused on the impact their services and donations were making on dads and their relationships with their children. However, to be able to measure that empirically is challenging because there are so many other intervening factors that GOOD+ Foundation is not trying to explicitly affect. It is important to note that unlike the traditional grantor-grantee relationship wherein grantees are ‘accountable’ to comply with some level of grant
award reporting on achieving ‘intended results’ specified in their grant award, GOOD+ Foundation’s Fatherhood Initiative is based more on establishing mutually respectful and non-intrusive working relationships. It is also important to note that the relative success of the Fatherhood Initiative could, in great part, be due to this ‘respectful grantor-grantee’ relationship. This recurring theme is present throughout the evaluative process. The trade-off however, may be a missed opportunity to collect more robust performance and impact data across a variety of grantees, their communities and the organizational context.

*Figure 1: Impact of GOOD+ Foundation*

At this point in establishing the evaluation questions, the leadership of GOOD+ Foundation articulated all of the components of their activities that contribute to their Fatherhood Initiative. The list included the following:

- Donations (strategic, emergency and life-saving or enhancing)
- Modeling (sharing information and knowledge)
- Father-Child Moments/Activities (these are usually opportunistic and funder driven—e.g. a movie screening, donor providing tickets to a baseball game, family picnics)
- Engaging in and changing the conversation around fathers
- Capacity-building for partner organizations (Including convenings, evaluation tools, peer and leadership learning and support for programs)
- Providing connections for partner agencies

The goals for the evaluation were established in this meeting as well. These were tempered by what could be reliably captured given the scope of the evaluation. Overall, the leadership was interested in a multi-layered evaluation that would inform decisions about the direction of the program and help them prioritize their work based on the impact it was having. In articulating the impact of their work and that
of their partners, they hoped to bring more resources into programming for fathers. The leadership was interested in candid feedback from partners, stakeholders and leaders in the field, which was a reason for bringing in outside evaluators.

These meetings worked well to inform the breadth and scope of the evaluation framework that was ultimately utilized. The mixed method research that evolved included the following components:

**Program Focus Groups:**
The evaluation is intended to inform the optimal positioning of the Fatherhood Initiative into GOOD+ Foundation’s programming and organizational framework. GOOD+ Foundation’s experience and feedback to date suggest that their entry into Fatherhood Initiative programming has been successful and uniformly welcomed by front line program beneficiaries. GOOD+ Foundation’s staff has been flexible and responsive in adding program features that have made the program a signature initiative in the field. Feedback from community-based Fatherhood Initiative grantees increasingly suggest that GOOD+ Foundation could heighten their “funding profile” as a leading funder of “learning/convening” and a model for “effective programming” in the field. They urged GOOD+ Foundation Fatherhood Initiative staff to find ways to feature the programming approach in the literature, which to them lacked sufficient descriptions of working models and the salient characteristics related to program success.

They also decried their sense of the lack of deep societal concern on the gravity of the disintegration of family life among America’s growing low-income population and in particular the absence of effective programming focused on bridging ‘dads’ viable relationships with their children. Given their working relationships with GOOD+ Foundation’s Fatherhood Initiative and their knowledge of programming in the field of practice, they were decidedly convinced that there is ‘leadership role’ and or ‘voice’ vacuum that the foundation could play/fill.

The combined results of the focus groups (one in New York and one in Los Angeles) brought to light some key themes for consideration. These include:

- **Visibility:** Notably, increasing national attention is being paid to ‘family fragmentation’ issues and relatedly on the need for Fatherhood Initiative programs.
- **Resources:** Despite this attention, grant support from the philanthropic community, state, federal or local social does not seem to be addressing the problem with adequate programming or financial support.
- **Evidence:** GOOD+ Foundation’s Fatherhood Initiative partners consider their program implementation strategy to be relatively robustly grounded in evidence-based data, and focused on addressing the extant and underlying issues of family fragmentation in our society. They welcome opportunities for program assessment that could inform the achievement of more effective results.

The program leaders spoke in detail about the different levels of impact that GOOD+ Foundation had on the fathers and the programs. They identified the areas of vulnerability for fathers that were most impacted by the donations, including:

- Building the self-esteem, confidence and skills of dads
- Reducing stress and building social connectedness
- Encouraging dads to reach out to gatekeepers, including the child’s mother or guardian
- Meeting court requirements and overcoming barriers
- Educating dads on what children really need
One participant in the focus group was particularly eloquent in describing the importance of educating dads about what kids need in the absence of stable father relationships and developmentally appropriate responses. He provided the example of when dads were provided with carriers for their young children. The dads’ responses were that “Men in our neighborhoods don’t walk around with babies strapped to them. That is for white guys.” However, through the resources provided by GOOD+ Foundation, dads learn about the importance of attachment, safety and other things.

The program leaders also discussed and highlighted the value of the goods provided to the programs. They can be used as an incentive for participation and also an engagement strategy for the programs.

“It is our experience that the first step is always to provide a concrete service. You have got to understand that these fathers have been failed so many times by the system, broken promises, denied access to employment, decent education, negative incarceration experiences, promised programs that don’t deliver. . . they come to our program with a lot of cynicism about what can positively happen” Program Leader

According to program leaders, it is imperative to value the impact of the opportunities provided by GOOD+ Foundation products, services and programs that allow dads to connect with their children/families. They described the importance of providing both “once in a lifetime” opportunities and child-included activities that the dads can model and replicate in the future, like bowling or a tea party. These moments continue to build connectedness between dads and their children, providing opportunities for fun, bonding and trust building.

The focus group results from both Los Angeles and New York City demonstrated what a unique and valued partnership the program leaders recognized they had with GOOD+ Foundation. They were particularly complimentary of the flexibility, responsiveness and belief in what the programs are doing. Few funders provide resources without strings attached or red tape conditions. Repeatedly, GOOD+ Foundation was described as being an excellent partner to its grantees.
Program leaders also identified areas for improvement in the existing practices of GOOD+ Foundation as well as opportunities to expand, inform and build knowledge for the field. In terms of concrete gifts, it was advised that GOOD+ Foundation could be more responsive to older siblings, not just infants. There was also a desire by program staff to see more professional attire for the dads, both so they fit in during special events and for job interviews and the workforce. There were some process suggestions as well, particularly in terms of lessening the burden of programs to pick up donations.

As noted above, it is worth repeating that there also was an emphasis in the two focus groups on the broader role that GOOD+ Foundation could play to build knowledge of what works in the field. Program leaders discussed the lack of standardization in the field and that now “everyone was saying they have services for fathers even if they don’t.” There was a tension around evidence-based programming that emerged. Many recognized the need for it but also felt funders pay too much attention to fidelity and metrics that stifles seasoned program leaders’ responsiveness and innovation particularly in this field of service that is not sufficiently matured or informed by effectiveness data. This can constrain program staffs who know their clientele and their needs. It is in this context that respondents recommended GOOD+ Foundation should document best practices and raise up programming that was working. Further there was a significant call for GOOD+ Foundation to use its national platform to advocate and increase awareness of the needs of fathers.
The results of the focus groups, questionnaires and leadership planning meeting were processed in great detail with the leadership of GOOD+ Foundation and a more detailed analysis is provided in the interim report which is provided in Attachment C.

**Pilot Survey of Program Participants:**
A survey designed to capture insights and experiences of participating fathers was created in concert with the leadership of GOOD+ Foundation to answer many questions they were interested in understanding about the impact of their Fatherhood Initiative work. This effort was to pilot test the survey and captures a snap shot of the impact of the Fatherhood Initiative work of the organization. It was not intended to evaluate or compare the partner programs but to understand how what GOOD+ Foundation provides affects the participating fathers.

Surveys were sent to all the programs that GOOD+ Foundation currently worked with during the spring of 2016; however, one program was in the process of finding a new program leader and was not meeting during the period of data collection. Below are the response rates by program.

*Figure 3: Response Rates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Estimated Participants</th>
<th>Actual Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronx Fatherhood</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII Project Fatherhood</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestdale</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeboy Industries</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strive International</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>359</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
<td><strong>65%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response rates are a bit deceiving in that while there is a total N of 235 respondents, more than half of these reported that they had never received any goods or participated in any events that were supported by GOOD+ Foundation. This resulted in them only responding to the first few demographic questions and nothing else. In discussing these results with GOOD+ Foundation leadership, numerous possible explanations emerged to explain this lack of program beneficiary’s knowledge of the foundation’s benefactor role. On one hand, rectifying the lack of knowledge about GOOD+ Foundation with the direct beneficiaries on this issue can be easily addressed moving forward. On the other, if

“Baby Buggy (GOOD + Foundation) could advocate on issues like the need for changing tables in men’s restrooms, paternity leave, changing child support laws, shifting DCF practices and other systems, changing things that affect our dads’ daily lives. They have the bully pulpit and ability to bring in media attention a lot more than we do as programs.” Program Leader
ensuring that program beneficiaries are aware of what is provided by GOOD+ Foundation is not important to the foundation as a matter of philosophy, values and style, it might make it difficult to document and assess intended/desired program effects that might be attributed to its funding strategy. This is a question that will require reflection by GOOD+ Foundation on their funding philosophy and practice. From another point of view, this issue could be rectified moving forward if GOOD+ Foundation implemented the survey themselves, rather than program leaders, to assure uniformity across all sites. This implementation strategy allows the foundation an opportunity to provide greater background and documentation of what participating grantees have received from the foundation. Another option would be to conduct a training webinar with program sites along with the written instructions that were provided. It is interesting to note that prior to implementing the survey to program participants, one of the program leaders provided a written list of all the resources each father had received from the Fatherhood Initiative. This process increased respondent’s survey completion.

In general, it is most likely that the reason for the lack of responses to those questions was because the participant fathers do not know that those resources come from GOOD+ Foundation. Again, GOOD+ Foundation needs to reflect on the implications of this and whether it is important to them that the participating fathers are aware of their contributions or if they are comfortable with a more understated or “humble” role. There are subtle ways to promote these donations and contributions, from asking the program leaders to mention it to putting a sticker on goods with the organization’s name and logo. In any case, for the purposes of evaluating impact on fathers it is important that they are aware of the source of resources to delineate from other program impacts.

Demographics:
The demographic characteristics of responding fathers were relatively expected given the program locations and purpose. Figure 4 below describes the marital status of respondents with fifty-five percent of respondents indicating that they were either single or in a relationship. Only twenty-six percent were married at the time of responding.

*Figure 4: Marital Status of Respondents*
The employment status of fathers also was in line with expectations. Figure 6 demonstrates that eighty-one percent of respondents were employed either full or part-time. Of those who were not working, numerous indicated that they were retired, on disability or self-employed. This figure does not capture whether respondents are under-employed, make a living wage or have benefits associated with their position. Given current workforce shifts this could be an area for further inquiry. GOOD+ Foundation had indicated a hypothesis that their goods and services, as well as those of the program partners, helped men find employment, stay employed and advance in their work. This information could be captured more concretely in future research, particularly if pre and post-tests are employed to demonstrate change over time for fathers.

*Figure 5: Employment Status of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Working</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race and ethnicity was asked as an open-ended question so that respondents could self-identify. The results were then coded into census categories and are presented below in Figure 6. The number of Hispanic or Latino respondents is significantly higher than relative to the national census number of 16.3% (QuickFacts, 2016). However Hispanics or Latinos make up 27.5% of the demographics of New York City and 48.5% of Los Angeles. (QuickFacts, 2016)
We attempted to capture the characteristics of the fathers’ children, including their ages and whether the father had full-time, part-time or no custody. In total, there were 521 children reported by the 235 respondents. On average, fathers reported having 2.2 children. The question was phrased in a way that asked them to report on any children that they are a father to as opposed to specifying biological, step, adoptive or other types of relationships. The figure below demonstrates the make-up of households as reported by respondents.

**Figure 7: Number of Children Reported by Respondents**
Length of program participation reported by respondents has great potential to inform the extent to which desired program impact is being achieved. Figure 8 below demonstrates the length of time fathers have been participating in the Fatherhood programs. Twenty-nine percent of respondents had been participating in programming for three months or less. Thirty-two percent of respondents had been participating for longer than a year. This participation rate indicates a variety of lengths of participation within programs. Many fathers are added individually into existing participant groups throughout the programs and are not brought in necessarily as a cohort, except for Strive and Forestdale which do have a cohort model. Such lack of uniformity in program exposure makes it difficult to discern program impact over time and in general how program features might have a desired impact on participants over time. There was variation in all of the programs. Should there be an interest in learning more about program exposure and desired program participant impact it will require a more ‘intrusive’ evaluation design that identifies and follows up with program participants who experienced different levels of program exposure.

*Figure 8: Length of Program Participation*

It was assumed that almost all of the respondents would have received some goods from the resources provided by GOOD+ Foundation. The figure below demonstrates that either the respondents were unaware of the source of the goods that they received or had not received any goods. When this data point was discussed with GOOD+ Foundation leadership, they confirmed that lack of knowledge of the source of goods was the most likely explanation and they intended to confirm this with program leaders. This result indicates that GOOD+ Foundation could strengthen its branding with grantee partners so that program participants are more aware of the source of resources, particularly if documenting impact will continue to be a priority for the organization.
GOOD+ Foundation was interested in understanding when and how programs utilized the resources that they offer. Of the respondents who indicated that they received resources, the majority (61%) reported that they received them either part way through their participation or as they needed them. This is consistent with reports from program leaders that they tried to be responsive to the needs of the participating fathers and provide timely resources on an as needed basis.

Figure 9: Number of Respondents who Reported Receiving GOOD+ Foundation Goods

Figure 10: When Respondents Received GOOD+ Foundation Resources
Respondents were asked what receiving goods through the Fatherhood Initiative had allowed them to do and whether they were able to do more, the same or less compared to before they received goods. The vast majority of respondents felt that receipt of goods had increased their time with their children (77%), allowed them to connect with their child (81%) and to feel more like a dad (82%). Another theme that emerged was that the receipt of goods also offset financial strains allowing them to either purchase other items (79%) or pay for activities (74%) for their child and also to participate in the program without worrying about the day to day costs of purchasing items for their child (73%). There was less of an effect from donated goods on either fulfilling court-mandated requirements (48%) or sharing the workload of parenting with the child’s mother (60%). Figure 11 and Figure 12 both represent these results.

**Figure 11: Receiving Goods Allowed Respondent To. . .**

![Bar chart](image)

**Figure 12: Table of Percentages of Receiving Goods Allowed Respondent To. . .**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did More</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Did Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spend more time with child</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase other items for child</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for activities for child</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect with child</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel more like a dad</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share parenting workload</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in program more</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfill court requirements</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked to articulate whether the below statements were true for them as a result of receiving goods from GOOD+ Foundation. The results were very strong in terms of having a positive impact on fathers’ attitudes and perceptions including their feelings about themselves (96%) and feeling less stress (91%). Fathers’ positive attitudes about the program increased (90%) as did their trust level with staff (91%). Fathers’ relationships with their children reportedly improved (93%) and there was improvement in relationships with the child’s mother and other relatives but to a slightly lesser extent (82%). A comfort level to ask for help increased (91%) as did a willingness to share challenges with staff (88%). The lowest percentage of impact was on motivation to find stable employment (80%) which is likely confounded with many other factors. These results indicate a very strong positive response for the fathers, their relationships and their engagement and participation in the programs.

Figure 13: As a Result of Receiving Items I...
Respondents were also asked how their participation in special events and activities changed their behavior or perceptions as a parent. The results were overwhelmingly positive as demonstrated in figure 15 and 16 below. Fathers and children shared a positive experience which grew their relationships (97%), made positive memories for them (97%) and resulted in them laughing and smiling together (95%). Similarly the events and activities opened fathers’ eyes to new ways of connecting with their children (96%) and motivated them to do more with their children in the future (94%). Respondents also articulated a strong impact in pushing them out of their comfort zones and expanding their horizons as well as providing an opportunity for them and their child to see their neighborhood or city in a different way (both 87%). A question was asked of non-custodial dads whether their child’s mother or custodian allowed them more time with their child because of this event; 77% responded positively, however, some of the respondents answered that had articulated earlier that they had custody of their children which confounded this question. Overall the impact of the special events and activities was viewed very positively by the fathers in terms of their behavior and perceptions.

*Figure 15: Changed Behavior as a Result of Activities and Events*
Respondents were asked whether their attendance at events and activities made them more willing to do a range of things. Respondents confirmed that it made them feel like a better dad (96%) and that they continued to find ways to share these types of experiences with their children (97%). The events and activities made fathers want to continue in the program (97%), motivated them to work harder in the program (92%) and also felt like a reward for their work (94%). Many families still talked about their experiences with the events and activities (87%) and less, but still three quarters of respondents, said it was something they never would have done on their own (75%). In future evaluation of this program it would be interesting to be able to differentiate the events and activities to assess the relative weight and variance of impact of the array of program activities.

Figure 16: Percentages of Changed Behavior or Perspective as a Result of Participation in Activities or Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New ways to connect with child</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took out of comfort zone</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing and smiling together</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared positive experience</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build community of dads</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made positive memories</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See city in different way</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated to do more activities</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's mother allowed me more time</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 18: Percentage of Special Activities Increasing Willingness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue in program</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never would have done</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find ways to continue</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel like a better dad</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work harder in program</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward to accomplish goals</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about experiences</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, while the number of responses for the questions about the impact of the goods and activities was lower than the response rate indicated (as was discussed earlier), the responses across the board were overwhelmingly positive. The goods and activities provided by GOOD+ Foundation built fathers’ sense of self, strengthened their bonds with their children and their participation in the programs. While still extremely positive, some of the things that were not as widely acclaimed were the ideas that dads would not have done things by themselves or that this pushed them beyond their comfort zones. Also, the goods provided were making a surprising level of difference with relationships with their children’s mothers and the courts given how many other factors may play into those dynamics.

**Recommendations:**

The results of this mixed-method multi-layered evaluation have implications for GOOD+ Foundation and their Fatherhood Initiative moving forward, in terms of both programming and evaluating impact. The Fatherhood Initiative was in an adolescent stage at the beginning of the evaluation as evidenced by its opportunistic approach to partnerships. In terms of organizational development, throughout the process of the evaluation, the Fatherhood Initiative matured and became more strategic. Continuing this process of maturation requires ongoing program reflection and prioritization of goals and objectives. The recommendations provided in this section will identify opportunities and trade-offs in terms of program strengthening, expansion and evaluative needs.

GOOD+ Foundation’s work is one step removed from the participants. Moreover, the Fatherhood Initiative does not dictate program components to its partners. While this is appreciated and deeply valued by partners, it does make determining causal links of desired impacts challenging. Fundamentally, the leadership of the Initiative needs to determine how important it is to them to be able to claim credit for the changes that its resources are having on the program participants given its lack of control over program components and implementation. GOOD+ Foundation desires to continue learning about the impact of their programs to continually improve them, to raise up the issue of fatherhood in service provision as well as for marketing and fundraising purposes.

The results of this evaluation indicate that the hypotheses that drove GOOD+ Foundation to study its impact were validated. The Fatherhood Initiative’s program strategy is having a positive impact on participating programs’ clients and their families. The provision of goods as well as activities and events are making a difference in participants’ lives and programs. The responsive and opportunistic components of the programming have worked, begging the question of whether a more structured
approach to selecting programs, providing particular goods and resources or providing them at a particular time or to particular types of participants would enhance or limit the impact that GOOD+ Foundation is currently having. It is all a question of trade-offs. The researchers would caution the organization against making significant shifts as the data and interviews suggest that the “secret sauce” of GOOD+ Foundation’s impact is dependent on the relationships with programs and could be lost with too much structure.

GOOD+ Foundation tends to work with programs that are based on evidence, led by strong leadership and contained within a broader organization. Based on future plans to work with organizations like Nurse-Family Partnership, they will continue to seek out programming that is data-driven and well-established as opposed to more grass-roots or “mom and pop” programming. A central assumption underlying the impact of the Fatherhood Initiative is its ability to discern, attract and develop program partnerships that demonstrate good potential to administer strong and impactful programs. Continuing to support programs of this caliber allows GOOD+ Foundation to stimulate added impacts on dad’s relationship with their family/children.

One of the more striking insights of the evaluation has been a perceived need for field-building through knowledge development, awareness-raising and setting standards of best practice. GOOD+ Foundation could be very effective in this role. Following the results of the interim report, detailed discussions were held with leadership about how they contribute to building the field around fatherhood programming without losing what makes GOOD+ Foundation unique. The researchers would encourage continuing this exploration but doing so in a measured way. Field-building, policy change and advocacy require a different set of skills than the current strategy employs. Should the organization consider investing time, effort and resources along these lines, we advise picking just two or three narrow issues or efforts to work in these categories of potential interest as the field of fatherhood programming is complex and expansive.

We base these suggestions on our conversations with organizational leadership as they often identified ways in which GOOD+ Foundation could continue strengthening the existing cohort of fatherhood programs and the field of practice in general. Several suggestions emerged from focus groups discussions and from our interactions with grantees. Among them were several ‘meaning making convening’ activities whereby program practitioners convene to share experiences, practices and related results achieved by their respective programs in an attempt to identify what common practices seem most effective in achieving desired impact, and should be highlighted for learning and replication potential in the field of practice.

One focus group respondent spoke of the value of “positive cross-contamination” and developing a peer network for leadership as a way to continue strengthening existing partner organizations. A ‘Learning Convening’ of Fatherhood Initiative programs has the potential to contribute to building useful field-wide knowledge. GOOD+ Foundation is well-positioned to such play a role. As a philanthropic organization, GOOD+ Foundation is considered to be neutral, that it is not an advocate of any one particular program modality relative to others. Indeed, the foundation works with a cohort of Fatherhood programs that has a wide range of program modalities. More importantly, it has developed an acknowledged interest in discerning and documenting program features that are most related to achieving enhanced impacts on fatherhood programs. The question is whether or not there exists an
organizational interest to invest any further in taking on a role as a facilitator of practitioner/field-based ‘knowledge development’.

There are ways in which GOOD+ Foundation can support this work without conducting it themselves, which we recommend considering. Raising up the voices and knowledge of your partner organizations is a powerful strategy. Many of those leaders are limited in their resources to be able to think about the field given the demands of their individual efforts. The Foundation could consider strategies such as subsidizing time for those leaders closest to the work to present at a conference, for example. The advisory committee for the Fatherhood Initiative is also an incredible asset to these potential efforts given their media connections and platforms.

We note that GOOD+ Foundation has articulated a desire to continue expanding its efforts in supporting quality fatherhood programming. Expansion or scaling its efforts will require further investment in building strong relationships with partnering organizations. The onus of this could be mitigated by working with programs with whom the foundation already has established working relationships. Another option is to expand in partnership with existing networks of programs such as the Nurse-Family Partnership program or other evidence-based programming. The personal touch employed by the staff of the Fatherhood Initiative currently is important to its success and continued impact.

In terms of recommendations for evaluation moving forward, it is essential for the Foundation to continue honing the questions it seeks to answer through the inquiry. It would be helpful for the organization to identify and assess all of the current information it seeks from current grantees, including the annual data report and periodic ad hoc surveys on needs and capacity building they are required to submit as a condition of partnership. All of this information provides data points to inform the strength of current program success and learning.

In general, it is critically important for the organization to decide the relative importance of evaluation tools and practices given its program and service philosophy. We do not mean to suggest that more evaluation is necessary or practical. However, reframing existing data collection to ensure that they are yielding good data that capture basic effectiveness of the foundation ‘effort’ and related ‘effects’ is crucial. For example, how important is it for program recipients to know that the goods they receive facilitate relationships with their children, spouse and family and that assist in their job seeking efforts were donated from GOOD+ Foundation? Or is it simply sufficient for program staff/leaders know the donation source? Or is it sufficient to learn how the foundation’s donations assisted in positive client outcomes? In any of these scenarios assessing current data collection protocols to determine how well they inform the relationships between the foundation’s donations and program participant outcomes is important to guide and specify the scope and limits of evaluation tools going forward. In general, a simple and explicit evaluation framework of performance data that can best be collected across all programs investments and to better position the foundation to assess post-investment impacts on grantee performance would be useful.

Again, we are not recommending that GOOD+ Foundation invest in the development of new or more sophisticated evaluation practices. We do recommend that it considers applying more systematic use of qualitative data and story-telling as an important component of its evaluation strategy. If interest and or the need for deeper answers to the relationship between foundation donations and program participants’ outcomes arise in the future, quantitative data collection, including surveys, could be added to the foundation’s assessment tool box. If more rigorous evaluation methods emerge in the
future, surveys should be implemented as participants enter programs and on regular intervals following to be able to show a change over time. We do not discern that GOOD+ Foundation’s current program investment interest and focus should require this level of evaluation design investment. Occasional “self-report retrospective evaluative analyses” employed in this pilot might be sufficient at this stage of the program development. However, it should be understood that this evaluation design and report provide a snapshot in time. It is limited in its capacity to empirically document changes that can be directly attributed to the Fatherhood Initiative, as opposed to the work of the program partners.

It is conceivable that in the future GOOD+ Foundation would develop a comparative evaluation of the impact of its partner programs to discern which was more ‘effective’ in achieving stated program goals and related outcomes for participants (which was beyond the scope of this engagement). This could narrow in on what works and for who in more depth than the current inquiry did. However, this type of evaluation can be costly and can limit the practice of partner programs and reduce their responsiveness to the needs of their participants. The researchers recommend this type of evaluation only if there is interest and commitment from the program partners. Some of the program leaders expressed wariness about this concept in focus groups. In general, we discern a reluctance of fatherhood programs to be placed under such evaluative microscope and this is rightly so.

Data is only as good as how it is used to make decisions or inform practice. GOOD+ Foundation should ensure that program leaders are consulted on the development and interpretation of evaluation strategies and results. Bringing results back to the focus groups or meeting with program leaders will add context to the evaluations moving forward. The participatory and inclusive style of conducting evaluation with partners is more accurate and powerful given the Initiative’s stage of development.

Finally, GOOD+ Foundation should consider how much capacity it is interested in building organizationally around evaluation versus out-sourcing these efforts when needed. There are numerous tools like Survey Monkey, open data platforms and more advanced excel functions that make analysis of information more accessible. GOOD+ Foundation has solid capacity in evaluation in house with existing staff, however they all have numerous other responsibilities as well. Dedicating staff and other resources to evaluation would be needed if the Foundation wanted to expand its evaluative activities.

Conclusion:
GOOD+ Foundation has flexible and valuable goods and services that it provides to program partners. Programs deeply value the genuine and committed partnerships that they have with the Foundation. The resources strengthen and enhance their programmatic efforts across the board. The program partners were also interested in GOOD+ Foundation expanding their efforts to build the field of fatherhood programs and using their influence to raise awareness and change the narrative around fathers. The goods and resources the Foundation provides to fatherhood programs improve dads’ sense of self, relationships with children and their engagement in the programs. The events and activities are a unique and powerful addition to the programming that partners are currently able to provide. GOOD+ Foundation is a deeply valued resource which unequivocally has a positive impact on individual participants, their families and the programs. While there is a desire for the Foundation to do even more, serious and strategic consideration needs to be given to the trade-offs that are inevitable with more structure, formalization and expansion. GOOD+ Foundation’s commitment to understanding its impact and continually seeing ways to improve its practice is the hallmark of a learning and growing organization.
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Attachment A: Staff Questionnaire

Baby Buggy Fatherhood Initiative

Questions to consider prior to in-person meeting

1. **What are your expectations for the impact of your work?** As specific as reasonably possible list the full range of potential desired outcomes you wish to see manifested as an outcome of your organization’s investments in the Fatherhood Initiative.

2. **What are the key components of your program that make a difference?** Consider for example the full range of support that Baby Buggy provide to father’s initiatives (indirect, informal provision of services, ‘partnership affiliations or other supportive gifts) which of these over time seems most critical to achieving ‘father initiative’ desired outcomes?

3. **Do you have an explicit theory of change or logic model from which you work?** If so please attach and if not please answer the questions below (‘Theory of Change...is a type of ‘logic model’...it attempts to link the underlying ‘assumptions’ and ‘constructs’ and/or ‘general thinking’ that informs the ‘logic’ of your program approach to addressing the ‘problem’ that your organization committed to address. It makes ‘explicit’ the reason your organization is investing spending time, money, and social capital to drive outcomes. It makes explicit your best attempt to articulate why you do what you do to achieve desired outcomes. It allows you to examine, assess if your program, staff, and related investments are aligned with the activities you have assumed to be critical to driving desired outcomes.
   - What are the ‘problems confronting father engagement families and consider what services and or supports Baby Buggy provides that addresses them directly and/or indirectly?
   - Are there particular theories of fatherhood engagement that has informed Baby Buggy’s strategic programming?
   - What Fatherhood Initiative program related activities are assumed to impact partner programs desired results?
   - What are your assumptions, expectations of how Fatherhood Initiative support activities are supposed to work, directly or indirectly, to achieve desired effects against the problem(s) you are attempting to address?
   - What are the range of desired client outcomes and which are particularly targeted for fatherhood programming impact?

4. **To assist us in understanding your working relationship with Fatherhood Initiative programs please respond to the following questions:**
   - How are the Fatherhood programs different from other programs that Baby Buggy supports?
   - What are Baby Buggy’s program criteria for selecting fatherhood partner programs?
   - What program attributes do the partners in the Fatherhood Initiative have in common?
   - What information does Baby Buggy collect from them?
   - Who are the fathers that are served by the programs/partners? What common attributes do they share?
   - Which are the higher performing fatherhood programs that are your partners? What explains their performance? How does your programming support their performance?
   - Which programs are struggling to make an impact and why? Are any of these a part of your support portfolio?
Attachment B: Participant Survey
GOOD+ Foundation
Fatherhood Initiative: Participant Survey

1. What is your age? ____________________________________________________________

2. What is your race/ethnicity? ______________________________________________

3. Below please provide information about your children, biological, step or otherwise for whom you act as a parent. (Provide their age as a number and check boxes that are appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Lives with You</th>
<th>Working Towards Custody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is your marital status? (Check one)
   - Single, Never Married
   - In a Relationship
   - Married
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Widowed

5. What is your employment status? (Check one)
   - Working Full Time
   - Working Part Time
   - Not Working, Please Explain__________________________________________

6. In which fatherhood program do you participate? (Check one)
   - Children's Institute Inc. - Project Fatherhood
   - Forestdale Inc. Fathering Initiative
   - Homeboy Industries
   - SPIRITT Family Services Fatherhood Program
   - Strive International Fatherhood Program
   - VNSNY Bronx Fatherhood
   - VNSNY/CDI Fathers First Rockaways
7. How long have you been participating in the fatherhood program? (Check one)
   - Less than 1 month
   - 1-2 months
   - 3-6 months
   - 6-12 months
   - More than 12 months

8. Did you receive special items from Baby Buggy/GOOD+ Foundation, such as diapers, formula, clothing or strollers, through your participation in the fatherhood program? (Check one)
   - Yes
   - No (SKIP TO Question 14)

9. When during your participation in the fatherhood program did you receive these items from Baby Buggy/GOOD+ Foundation? (Check one)
   - Right at the beginning
   - Part way through the program
   - After accomplishing a personal or professional goal
   - At the end of the program/graduation
   - Throughout my participation as I needed them
   - After I completed the program

10. By receiving these Baby Buggy/GOOD+ Foundation items through the fatherhood program, were you able to do more, the same or less of the following compared to before receiving the items? (Please mark one box per line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did More</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Did Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Spend more time with my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Purchase other items for my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Pay for other activities for my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Connect with my child more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Feel more like a “dad” with my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Share the parenting workload more with my child’s mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Participate in the fatherhood program without worrying about the day-to-day costs of providing items for my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Fulfill court-mandated requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____________________________________________
11. Can you share with us which items you received from Baby Buggy/GOOD+ Foundation that have helped you the most? Why?

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

12. Please mark all statements that are ‘true for you’ as a result of receiving Baby Buggy/GOOD+ Foundation items through the fatherhood program. (Please mark one box per line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My attitude towards the program improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I trusted the staff more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My relationship with my child improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My relationship with my child's mother and/or other relatives improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I felt better about myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I felt less stress in my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I felt more comfortable asking for help/services for other things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I was more willing to share other challenges I was having with staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. It motivated me to find more stable employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Did you participate in a special activity/event such as a movie, sporting event, or other activity that Baby Buggy/GOOD+ Foundation provided for you and your child through the fatherhood program?
   □ Yes
   □ No (SKIP to Question 17)
14. Please share with us how participating in a Baby Buggy/GOOD+ Foundation special activity/event changed your behavior or perspective as a parent if at all. (Please mark one box per line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. It opened my eyes to new ways of connecting with my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It took me out of my comfort zone and expanded my horizons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Resulted in us laughing and smiling together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Allowed us to share a positive experience to grow our relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Helped us connect with other dads and children and build more of a sense of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Made positive father-child memories for my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Provided an opportunity to me and my child to see my neighborhood or city in a different way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Motivated me to do more activities with my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. For non-custodial dads: My child’s mother allowed me to spend more time with my child because of this event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Did attending a Baby Buggy/GOOD+ Foundation special activity make you more willing to:

(Please mark one box per line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. It made me want to continue in the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It was something I never would have done on my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I have continued to find ways to share these types of experiences with my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. It made me feel like a better dad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. It motivated me to work harder in the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. It was a reward for accomplishing goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. We still talk about the experiences we had</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other, explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Are there any other ways that the goods and experiences you received from Baby Buggy/GOOD+ foundation through the fatherhood program affected you that were not covered above?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR FEEDBACK
Baby Buggy Fatherhood Initiative Focus
Group Results Summary
Elenore Garton, Ph.D and Ricardo Millett, Ph.D
Baby Buggy Fatherhood Initiative
LA and New York Focus Group: Summary Highlights

Summary: This is an interim report to provide the results of the New York and Los Angeles Focus Groups that were conducted regarding the Baby Buggy Fatherhood Initiative. The results are condensed into key questions and areas of inquiry and were analyzed to provide further context for the ongoing research. All of the responses were compiled and are being reported in the aggregate so as to not identify the respondents.

What does BBFI do?
- Provide diapers and now other ‘concrete things’ for fathers and kids; things they can’t get on their own.
- They hold events and provide opportunities for special moments for families
- Create awareness about the importance of fatherhood initiatives
- Use media to create buzz
- Work on national, local and organizational policies by providing a more informed perspective on father engagement
- Provide knowledge and share learnings

➢ Summary: Baby Buggy provides concrete products and services that are critical to achieving desired program objectives.

What is the impact of BBFI work?
- They level the playing field for Dads. Example of when a child has everything that they love at mom’s including their mickey mouse spoon and dishes but don’t want to go to dad’s because he doesn’t have the special stuff like that. Once they receive those things it makes kids more likely to want to spend time at dad’s home.
- The concrete goods provided by Baby Buggy encourage fathers to connect with “gate keepers” (Usually the child’s mother or other family members as well as the legal community)
- Programs can use these as incentives for participation as well as an engagement strategy for bringing dads into the program.
- These goods can help dads fulfill requirements for court in terms of custody
- Goods can help change relationships for dad and kids, dad and moms and others in their lives. They create an opportunity for dads to spend “quality time” with their kids.
- Build the self-esteem and confidence of dads and give them skills
- Reduce stress for dads (Maslow’s hierarchy of needs)
- Can actually prevent maltreatment
- Shift the mindset of dads to one of a co-parent or part of a team
- Educate dads and programs on what kids need. E.g. “Men in our neighborhoods don’t walk around with babies strapped to them. That’s for white guys. But through these resources they learn about the importance of attachment, safety and stuff.”
- Build social connectedness.
- Ticket to events (theater, museums, exhibits provide dads/kids with an opportunity to see/know the world outside of their neighborhood.
- Help men realize they are part of a bigger community and then provide support for one another.
- Contact with kids increases when basic needs are met.
- There are so many barriers to overcome to be able to see kids sometimes and the donations help them overcome the alienation they feel. They can then get over the mental blocks to participating in their kids life.
- They have a sense of earning something for their family and make them proud.
- Dads are being more responsive and family members are seeing the change in them.
- “It is our experience that the first step is always to provide a ‘concrete service’. You got to understand that these fathers have been failed so many times by the system, broken promises, denied access to employment, decent education, negative incarceration experiences, promised programs that don’t deliver...they come to our program with a lot of cynicism about what can ‘positively happen.’”

> **Summary:** Baby Buggy’s goods and services facilitates the attainment desired motivation of fathers to connect with their children, reduces barriers to ‘co-parenting’, enhances their willingness to engage in ancillary programs that benefit their personal development, reduces legal constraints that can act as barriers to their willingness to engage as a parent, provide opportunity to be part of a ‘support group’ experience that enhances self-esteem and positive, reinforcing ‘fatherhood role modeling’.

**What is the value of the moments or special experiences?**
- Creates excitement and things to look forward to.
- Opens peoples’ eyes and provides new experiences Eg. Camping, getting out of their neighborhoods to experience other things.
- Fun.
- Builds trust with dad and kids and creates bonding opportunities.
- Create space for dads to share a new experience.
- Should be both once in a lifetime opportunity and things that dads can replicate. Eg. Theater and baseball game versus tea party, bowling and games at a picnic.

> **Summary:** Breaks social constraints and stigma as ‘disconnected, unconcerned, irresponsible’ and motivate dads to continuously engage in positive opportunities that reveal ways to manifest desired parenting behaviors.

**What are the key factors that programs appreciate?**
- The flexibility of the resources. There are less chains on their dollars.
- They are open to understanding how they can enhance the lives of families.
- The responsiveness of Baby Buggy.
- They let programs do what they do. Not dictatorial and little red tape.
- They understand the needs of the programs and allow them to meet the needs of their participants.
- They provide those unrestricted resources that most other funding sources don’t.
- They have not jumped on the evidence based bandwagon and they support what is working or what is evidence informed.
- It is important that they provide a wishlist. They should continue to give both safety things and those that are for comfort and pleasure. The spectrum of what they provide is very large.
-They are a great partner because they are flexible and don’t tell us how to do things. There is not a right or wrong way to do this. It is still early in the field in terms of figuring out what works and they realize that.
-They don’t start from an assumption that fathers don’t want to be engaged but they realize there are barriers. They are changing the narrative around.
-They don’t make us change our programs to get support.
-Allowing for experiential knowledge.
-They get that dads are different. You can’t just change the name of a program from “mommy and me” to “daddy and me” and think that will suffice.
-They provide programs with dignity. They don’t make dads feel badly when they come to events that they can’t afford to do on their own.
-They are highly resourceful and always willing to try and find a way to fulfill a request.
-They are great at sticking to the bottom line: Helping Fathers connect with their kids.

➢ Summary: Respondents greatly appreciate and respects Baby Buggy’s style and approach to grantmaking. They feel respected as ‘partners’ in achieving mutually understood desired objectives. Unlike, the more standard approach of grantmakers, Baby Buggy solicits their voice, perspective, and experiences on programming implementation, needs and suggestions for gifts and ways that they might need to be programmatically supported. They have a deep understanding of the social and economic context that drives the conditions that fatherhood programs addresses and frames their funding role accordingly.

Are the improvements or things BBFI could do better?
-Need to provide opportunities and resources for older kids too.
-Need a male “Face of Fatherhood”
-Help to show real people not just those
-Open more opportunities for the programs to share their knowledge not just opportunities to ask for what they need.
-Support creating more sustainable programs through advocacy and using their national platform
-They could help to build the evidence for what is working within our programs and help others understand that a program that works one place doesn’t necessarily work everywhere. Identify and highlight what is working in a field that desperately needs ‘evidence based programming’.
-They can help us identify champions given their connections to celebs for things like galas etc.
-Use the prestige of Baby Buggy supporters to bring the issue of fatherhood more to light.
-Create a culture of collaboration among their programs. “Value positive contamination”
-Help to create and spread a common language. They could support going to conferences and more opportunities for learning.
-They have a real opportunity to be a pioneer and leader in this movement.
-Sometimes the deadlines are hard to meet and if there was a way to systematize the ordering or streamline it that would be appreciated.
-Providing more lead-time for ordering and stuff
-Providing support for transportation i.e. Bus passes for participation
-Providing more donations for dads like a nice shirt, shoes and tie for the special events so they fit in and feel more comfortable to pursue job interviews/searches.
-Picking things up from the warehouse can be challenging.
Consider providing more professional attire for Dads so that they can enter the mainstream workforce. Help identify partnerships and opportunities for jobs and internships with some of their corporate supporters.

- **Summary:** In terms of ‘concrete gift’ it would be good if they were responsive to older siblings as well as infants. The logistics of accessing BBFI gifts could be improved to lessen burden on grant recipients. But most importantly, Baby Buggy might consider taking their potential impact up another notch by capturing their programming approach and impact and sharing it with a field of practice that needs to learn more from evidence based models. They have the potential to bring attention to the need for such programming, the standards that makes programming effective and sustainable and more general public attention to this societal wide problem.

**How can Baby Buggy help to sustain “the movement” around fatherhood?**

- Provide connections to people to act as spokesmen for the movement
- Educate others (funders, social service organizations) that all dads could use these skills and this know how not just poor men or Black men for that matter. “This is not just poor dads, it is a culture shift. Most dads used to just be expected to be the breadwinner and didn’t know how to do any of this.” “We need those fathers that have resources but struggle with being a good and engaged dad to speak out on this.”
- Baby Buggy is in a unique position to really take a leadership role in being a part of the solution and systems change.
- They can connect organizations build networks and provide space and time to share learnings for programs and dads.
- They can help tell the stories of dads and the programs helping them.
- They could provide a forum or platform (digital) for dads to connect and programs to share learning.
- Share programmatic opportunities so we aren’t duplicating and our participants have more opportunities.
- They could provide webinars on best practices. Ideas included:
  - A module on child support: What it means legally? What are Dads obligations? How to best respond? How to avoid legal consequences while remaining connected to your child?
  - How to best connect to educational services: GED programs, adult education, job readiness and internships.
  - How to build on recent program trends that take the “whole dad” into account, like meditation and other things.
- Baby Buggy could advocate on issues like the need for changing tables in men’s restrooms, paternity leave, changing child support laws, shifting DCF practices and other system change opportunities that the programs see on the ground but Baby Buggy has the bully pulpit and ability to bring media attention to better than the programs.
- Baby Buggy can set standards for father friendly environments and almost give a seal of approval.
- They can provide more opportunities to listen and hear from all of us and get more input from those on the ground. They don’t have to be the expert.
- They can set standards of what a good fatherhood program looks like and highlight the evidence-based and informed practices that make for a good program. There are a lot of poorly thought out and managed fatherhood programs and baby Buggy can highlight good practice.
- The field is in desperate need of evidence based informing, standardization, definition, compiling data from strong program implementation and identification of measurable results.
- Provide serious social analysis and assessment of programming and how it leads dads to a more viable life. Document best practices and help seed the development and replication of effective programs that actually meets that level of need at scale.

- **Summary:** Baby Buggy has the potential to become a leader in field of practice. Beyond their reputation as excellent grantmakers and partners they could leverage their association with nationally known personalities to promote fatherhood programs, ‘best practices’ lessons learned in the field of practice, and sponsor opportunities for field wide convening development.

**How can Baby Buggy evaluate its fatherhood initiative?**

One flat evaluation is not going to work because programs are different. Allowing for that is critical moving forward.

- **Donations:**
  - What is needed and what is most useful
  - Whether money is more valuable than the donations it receives

- **Programmatic:**
  - Break down the components of programs and determine their effectiveness
  - If participants become leaders
  - The spillover effects into other parts of the organization
  - The shift from self-focus of participants to community

- **Moments:**
  - Get the stories and testimonials
  - Qualitative info
  - How dads felt before and after the events
  - Empowerment of dads
  - How many dads repeat the event on their own (as opposed to having to comply with a ‘service mandate’)

- **Collaboration**
  - To what extent to they comply with other programs in their service area? To what extent do they collaborate with other programs in the organizations within which they are embedded?

- **Number and quality of ‘fatherhood trainings’**
  - What was learned and how did it change programs or behavior
  - Cross-organizational learning
  - Training the trainer: how many people changed behavior as a result of one person learning

- **Strengthen the ‘host’ organizations:**
  - Ask the other staff at the agencies about how having a fatherhood initiative has changed things
  - Whole family orientation across organization
  - Provide resources to evaluate programs
  - Share best practices
Organizational/Contextual assessments: Does the location of ‘Baby Buggy programming’ with the larger organization matter? How can Baby Buggy influence the support of their programs with the organization in which they are located?

➤ Summary: The ‘fatherhood’ field of action is in great need evidence based documentation to that can guide effective program operations. The challenge is how best to bring practitioners experiences to collectively inform what is known, where the field might focus on program attributes related to and achieving desired impact. The question is what role could Baby Buggy play in responding to this field wide need?

What words describe Baby Buggy and their support of programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Respectful</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
<th>Fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humble</td>
<td>Genuine</td>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Passionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>Invested</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourceful</td>
<td>Willing</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>Accountable</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>