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ABSTRACT

Millions of children in the United States experience the incarceration of a parent. These children are more at risk than their peers to become involved in delinquent activities, face problems in school, and suffer from psychological disorders. This paper presents the results of a two-year evaluation of Children United with Parents, a program designed to provide intensive case management and family counseling for children with incarcerated parents.

INTRODUCTION

Millions of children in the United States experience the incarceration of a parent. These children are more at risk than their peers to become involved in delinquent activities, face problems in school (Reed & Reed, 1997), and suffer from psychological disorders (Bilchik, Seymour, and Kreisher, 2001). While programs have been developed to address the needs of children and their families affected by the incarceration of a parent, little research into the effects of such programs exists.

This paper presents the results of a two-year evaluation of Children United with Parents, a program designed to provide intensive case management and family counseling for children with incarcerated parents.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Prevalence of Children with Incarcerated Parents

At mid-year 2005, more than 2.1 million men and women were incarcerated in local, state, and federal facilities in the United States, representing a 2.6 percent increase in the previous 12 months (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006). Many of the individuals who are incarcerated are parents. Although there is no exact figure for children who have at least one parent who is incarcerated, some estimate the number to be about 1.5 million (Arditti, Lambert-Shute, & Joest, 2003; Reed & Reed, 1997).

Recent figures have been calculated by the Center for Children of Incarcerated Parents (CCIP). CCIP (2005) estimated there were approximately 1.3 million parents incarcerated in United States jails and prisons in mid 2004. Reviewing a number of studies, CCIP (2005) has also estimated that incarcerated mothers have a mean of 2.4 minor children each and incarcerated fathers have a mean of 2.0 minor children each. Based on these estimates, there were approximately 2.8 million children with an incarcerated parent in 2004 (CCIP, 2005). The authors of these calculations point out the estimates were derived from one-day counts and therefore “the number of minor children who have experienced parental incarceration within 2004 is significantly greater than the …totals [and] the number of minor children who have ever experienced parental incarceration is many times greater than the …totals” (CCIP, 2005).

From 1991 to 2000, the number of children with a mother who was incarcerated increased by approximately 98 percent and the number of children with an incarcerated father increased by approximately 58 percent (Smith, Krisman, Strozier, & Marley, 2004).
Characteristics of Children with Incarcerated Parents and the Need for Services

While there is a considerable amount of information available about individuals who are incarcerated in the criminal justice system, much less is known about the children of these individuals. Children under the age of 18 who have a parent who is incarcerated “are among the most at-risk, yet least visible, populations of children” as they are infrequently recognized as a “group” of children needing services to address their needs (Reed & Reed, 1997). Children with incarcerated parents are generally not formally recognized as a group. However, these children are often well-known and stand out in other settings. For example, children with incarcerated parents are often viewed as disciplinary problems in the schools and among law enforcement authorities. Children with an incarcerated parent are more at risk than their peers to become involved in delinquent activities and face problems in school (Reed & Reed, 1997). They are also more likely to suffer from various emotional and psychological disorders (Bilchik et al., 2001).

The challenges faced by a child with an incarcerated parent can begin before the parent entered the criminal justice system. Often, children have been living in homes affected by poverty, substance abuse, and/or violence before the parent is arrested. After parental incarceration, children are likely to develop emotional and behavioral difficulties as well as problems in school, problems with alcohol and drugs, and suffer from low self-esteem. These children are also more likely to become involved in the criminal justice systems themselves (Bilchik et al., 2001, Reed & Reed, 1997). Familial separation in itself is a risk factor for juvenile delinquency (Carr and Vandiver, 2001). Some estimates indicate that children who have an incarcerated parent are up to six times more likely
than their peers without an incarcerated parent to become involved in criminal activity and be incarcerated during their lives (Bilchik et al., 2001; Arditti et al., 2003).

Programs Assisting Incarcerated Parents and Their Families

Although various programs exist, and there is a considerable amount of program descriptions, there is little research on the results. Adalist-Estrin (1995) finds some common characteristics among programs that work in strengthening inmate-family relationships. These characteristics include 1) maintenance of family ties with the development and/or strengthening of attachments among inmates and their children; 2) visits and/or support and discussion groups with parenting classes for inmates to learn and practice parenting skills; and 3) the idea that family support programs must be seen as an essential component when an incarcerated parent is released into the community and the home. A recent study exploring incarcerated parents emphasizes a “need for a multidisciplinary, wraparound approach to designing services for affected parents, children, and caregivers” (Smith et al., 2004. p. 187).

Reed and Reed (1997) discuss some ideas included in models designed to address and alleviate problems that families face due to parental incarceration. These models include the following: crisis intervention to help reduce effects of the experience of the arrest, providing information about the criminal justice process, and providing sources for ongoing support for the family of the incarcerated individual. Therapeutic interventions can help children who have been traumatized to overcome future problems and aid in the development of personal coping skills. Parent-child visitation that occurs in environments oriented toward the child can help make visiting an incarcerated parent a
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more positive experience. Also, support groups composed of children with incarcerated parents can encourage the expression of concerns and help alleviate some of the shameful feelings associated with parental incarceration (Reed & Reed, 1997).

Some differences have been found among programs, specifically juvenile delinquency prevention programs, based upon the sex of the clients served. For instance, many programs serving girls are intervention oriented programs (Chesney-Lind, 2001). Serving girls in a delinquency prevention role is significantly less common than serving boys (Chesney-Lind, 2001; Peters, 2001). Many programs that work to prevent juvenile delinquency are only for males or geared towards males, even if females are served in the program. Although there are many similarities between at-risk males and females, there are gender differences of juvenile offenders and different strategies are recommended to reach each group (Chesney-Lind, 2001).

Additionally, previous research indicates that relationships are key factors in female juvenile delinquency. While healthy relationships foster positive outcomes, negative relationships can encourage aggression in response to their personal pain (Peters, 2001).

Children United with Parents (CUP) Program

The Children United with Parents (CUP) program was established in 2001 to help decrease the cycle of crime in communities the agency primarily serves. The program was a service of daniel, Inc., an agency that assists troubled youth and their families through various services and programs in Northeast Florida. daniel is Florida’s oldest agency serving children; it was established in 1844 as an orphanage and currently
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provides a multitude of services to help children, adolescents, and families. The State Attorney’s Office and the Department of Juvenile Justice partnered with *daniel* to create the CUP program (*daniel*, n.d.). The Northeast Florida Center for Community Initiatives (CCI), a research center at the University of North Florida, was contracted to perform the independent evaluation of the CUP program.

CUP clients, the children of the incarcerated parents, were referred to *daniel* for the CUP program by the Community Correction Division of the State Attorney’s Office and River Region Human Services, Inc. Clients received services through various case management and therapeutic support activities that included relational education, career development, and violence prevention (*daniel*, 2004). As previously discussed, such services have been identified in other effective programs serving families with incarcerated parents.

While CUP shares many of the same approaches and goals of other programs that offer services to children with incarcerated parents, it has differed from other programs in that, until July 2004, it served only girls. Additionally, these clients were served in a prevention, not an intervention, role.

A key focus of the CUP program was on building positive family relationships among the child, their incarcerated parent, and their caregivers. CUP addressed relationship issues in various ways, including offering services to help foster positive family relationships among the clients they served. Services were provided not only to the clients, but to the incarcerated parents and current caregivers as well. Incarcerated parents in the program included not only the biological parents, but also any mother or
father figure. Caregivers could be a biological parent, another family member, or a temporary caregiver not biologically related to the client.

Families received eight weeks of intensive counseling with one-year of aftercare through one of two program tracts. Tract 1 served both the children and their incarcerated parents directly. Tract 2 dealt directly with the children and provided services to them, but did not deal directly with their incarcerated parents. Services of the program included psychosocial assessments of children, case management, therapy, crisis intervention, coordination of parent/child meetings, and educational support sessions for the current caregiver (Daniel, n.d.). An emphasis was placed on school performance, regular school attendance, absence of pre-delinquent behavior, and parent-child relationships (Daniel, 2004).

During the eight weeks of intensive counseling, the children were visited weekly by their case manager and/or therapist at home with their caregivers. Most of the time during these visits was spent working directly with the children. Weekly meetings with the therapist were held at the jail for incarcerated parents. These visits lasted for one and a half hours and were conducted in a group setting. During the groups, the focus was on issues that included the impact of parental incarceration, violence prevention, the link between truancy and delinquency, and parent-child bonding. The therapist worked to build a relationship and establish rapport with the incarcerated parents.

Bi-weekly, family groups were held at the jail where parents, children, and caregivers all participated. These visits lasted for an hour and a half and both the CUP case manager and therapist were present. The time was spent between positive, informal interaction time and therapeutic activities with children and parents. The caregivers
either participated in these activities or they would go to a separate room for a support group with the case-manager during the parent-child activities with the therapist. After the eight weeks of intensive counseling, services were made available for families for one additional year. During this time, while there were no formal or regularly scheduled meetings, families could request services from the therapist or case manager.

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Procedures

Quantitative Data

Multiple data sets were collected to assess progress of the CUP participants during their involvement in the program. As described below, the measurement indices, school grades and attendance, and juvenile justice involvement data were all collected independently by the CUP staff. In addition, focus groups were conducted by trained CCI staff to measure program satisfaction.

Four indices were used to measure personal and social functioning within the family and to help determine family and relationship characteristics among members of the clients’ families. Each of these indices is designed to measure a specific family relationship: Index of Family Relations, Index of Parental Attitudes, Child’s Attitude toward Mother, and Child’s Attitude toward Father. Each index has a reliability of 0.90 or greater and a validity of 0.060 and greater (Walmyr Publishing Company, n.d.).

Once calculated, each index has a final score ranging from zero to 100. Higher scores indicate greater problems in the relationship being measured (Walmyr Publishing

---

1 For these Family Adjustment Scales, the term “mother” could be used to describe the biological mother, female caregiver, and/or female role-model or mother-figure. The term “father” could be used to describe the biological father, male caregiver and/or male role-model or father-figure.
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Company, n.d.). The tests were given by CUP therapists at the start of the program and again at the conclusion of treatment in order to measure progress. Falling scores from pre- to post-test are indicative of a lesser degree of problems in a particular family relationship during the time period between tests and rising scores suggest a greater degree of problems. The CUP program was looking for falling scores in the Family Adjustment Scales to denote improvement in family relationships while receiving services through CUP. Paired t-tests were also performed to test for significant differences between the pre- and post-test scores of each index.

School information was collected on clients for the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 school years, depending on the time the client enrolled in the CUP program. Information on the number of unexcused absences as well as grade information was gathered for the clients. A goal for clients in the CUP program was to maintain high attendance rates. Additionally, CUP encouraged a high standard of school performance among clients. Grade information was collected in the subjects of two categories: math and science (math); and English, reading, and spelling (English). These subjects are the main components of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), and thus important for successful school performance.

A search of the Florida Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) of CUP clients was performed to determine if any clients had any involvement with the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) before, during, or after entering the CUP program. This method of

---

2 The FCAT is taken by students in Florida to measure performance in accordance with Florida’s Sunshine State Standards. Reading and mathematics FCATs are taken each year and Writing and Science FCATs are taken by students in 5th, 8th, and 10th grades (Florida Department of Education, 2003). Students must pass the grade 10 reading and the math sections of the FCAT before they are eligible for graduation. In some instances (decided by local school boards), performance on the FCAT is used to determine whether a student will be promoted to the next grade (Florida Department of Education, 2004).
analysis was used to determine if CUP was achieving the goal of keeping clients out of legal trouble.

Qualitative Data

Focus groups were conducted with clients, parents, and caregivers who were currently participating in the CUP program or who had recently completed the program. Focus groups were administered during a family visit at the jail and included three groups: one consisting of clients (children with incarcerated parents), one of caregivers, and one of parents. This method was used to obtain personal, first-hand opinions and experiences of individuals who had participated in the CUP program. Each group (children, incarcerated parents, caregivers) was asked a separate set of questions. While each group’s questions were designed to elicit responses on the CUP program, questions were tailored to encourage discussion of specific CUP program goals and results based on each group’s unique place in the family. In each group, some representatives were present who had completed the program and the parent was no longer incarcerated. The mix of current and past clients allowed for perspectives on the program at various stages of the CUP program.

Quantitative Data

Information on eighty-two girls who received services during the time period of July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004 (program year 2003-04) was available. The database of this client group includes clients who began receiving services as early as 2001. Clients
ranged in age from 5 to 18. Of the 81 clients with race information available, 56 percent were black, 39 percent (32 clients) were white, and the remaining five percent were Hispanic or biracial. Program tract information was available for all clients; 84.1 percent were enrolled in Tract 1 with the remaining 15.9 percent enrolled in Tract 2.

Since July 1, 2004 (program year 2004-05), 43 new clients entered the program. These clients ranged in age from 5 to 16. Males made up 51.2 percent of the total group and females 46.5 percent. Of the 42 clients for which race information was available, 90.5 percent were black and 7.0 percent white. Program tract information was available for 42 clients; 73.8 percent were enrolled in Tract 1 with the remaining 26.2 percent enrolled in Tract 2.

A total of 125 clients received CUP services between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2005. Of the available information, 17.7 percent were male and 82.3 percent female. Nearly 29 percent were white, 67.8 percent black, and 4.0 percent Hispanic or biracial. The mean age of the overall clients was 10.3 years of age.

Qualitative Data

Focus group subjects consisted of clients, incarcerated parents, and current caregivers. Eight clients participated in the client focus group. Six adults participated in the incarcerated parent group; two of these participants had completed their jail sentence and the CUP program. Five adults participated in the caregiver focus group. The caregivers were all partners or spouses of the incarcerated parent and parents of the participating children. Two of the participants in the caregiver group had spouses who have been released from jail.
DATA RESULTS

Family Adjustment Scales

Table 1 summarizes results from pre- and post-test data from the Family Adjustment Scales of CUP participants. The information presented in Table 1 is representative of clients and participating family members who completed both a pre- and a post-test (a set) for a given index. Clients and family members who did not complete a set for a given index were excluded from this analysis. A total of 283 test sets were collected from the 2003-04 and 2004-05 clients and their family members. Overall, 184 tests (65.0 percent) had falling scores, 88 tests (31.1 percent) had rising scores, and 11 sets (3.9 percent) had equal pre- and post-test scores. More than two-thirds of the test results of the Child’s Attitude Toward the Father and the Index of Parental Attitudes scales resulted in declining scores. Nearly 60 percent of the scores for the Index of Family Relations decreased from the pre-test to the post-test.

Table 1 about here

Of all clients included in this report, 60 pre- and post-test sets of either the Child’s Attitude Toward Mother or Child’s Attitude Toward Father were taken by the child regarding their incarcerated parent. Seventy percent of these test sets had lower scores at the post-test than at the pre-test. The results of these tests are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2 about here

Because a major goal of CUP was to help facilitate a positive relationship between the child and their incarcerated parent, it is notable that the majority of scores on
these tests taken by the child toward their incarcerated parent decreased. This indicates a

decline in the severity of problems in the relationship as perceived by the child.

Of all clients included in this report, 33 pre- and post-test sets of the Parent’s

Attitude Toward Child index were filled out by an incarcerated parent. Two-thirds of

test sets had decreased scores. The results for these tests are displayed in Table 3.

| Table 3 about here |

Again, the majority of overall scores for the incarcerated parent’s attitude toward

his or her child decreased. The falling scores suggest a lesser degree of parent-child

relationship problems as perceived by the incarcerated parent.

Preliminary t-tests were performed to test for significant differences in each of the

index’s pre- and post-test means between the 2003-04 and 2004-05 clients. The only

index with significantly different means between the two groups of clients was the

Child’s Attitude Toward Mother scale. As a result, the descriptive statistics provided in

Table 4 are combined for all of the indices except for Child’s Attitude Toward Mother

scale.

A t-test was performed for each family adjustment scale to determine statistically

significant differences between pre- and post-test scores. The findings were significant

for the Index of Parental Attitudes and Child’s Attitude Toward Mother (2003-04 clients)
scale at the 0.01 level and the Child’s Attitude Toward Father scale at the 0.05 level.
While the majority of scores for the remaining tests decreased, t-test findings for the

Index of Family Relations and Child’s Attitude Toward Mother (2004-05 clients) scales

were not determined to be statistically significant between the pre- and post-tests.
School Information

Clients ranged in grade level from pre-kindergarten to 11th grade. Fifteen clients served during the 2003-04 year were in Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, or 1st grade. Therefore, these clients were not yet receiving letter grades in school. Table 5 summarizes available school information on the 2003-04 clients and includes the descriptive statistics of cumulative math and English grades for the school year in which information was available for individual clients. GPAs are tabulated on a 4.0 scale. Mean cumulative GPAs for math and English were similar at 2.6 and 2.5 respectively.

Table 5 also summarizes attendance rates for these clients based on all available information for the school year. Two clients were of Pre-Kindergarten age and not yet enrolled in school leaving no attendance information available. Additionally, CUP contact was lost with three clients who did not remain in the Duval County School system, resulting in no attendance information for these clients. As a result, attendance data was collected for 74 2003-04 clients. CUP’s goal was 90 percent attendance for clients and the mean attendance rate for the 2003-04 clients was 94.6 percent.

The 2004-05 clients ranged in grades from Pre-Kindergarten to 10th grade. Thirteen were in Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, or low elementary grades for which no

---

3 Cumulative averages are based only on available information, which could be partial school years. Report card data comes from the most recent school year available, 2003-2004 or 2004-2005.
4 4.0=A, 3.7=A-, 3.3=B+, 3.0=B, 2.7=B-, 2.3=C+, 2.0=C, 1.7=C-, 1.3=D+, 1.0=D, 0=F
The school data for the two groups of clients (2003-04 and 2004-05) are presented separately as t-tests illustrated significantly different cumulative math and English GPAs.
letter grades are given. Twenty-seven clients entering the CUP program after July 1, 2004 had GPA information available. Table 6 summarizes GPA information for these clients. The cumulative math and English GPAs were 3.5 and 4.0 respectively.

Of the 42 clients entering the program after this date for which attendance information is available, 60.7 percent of clients maintained at least a 90 percent attendance rate for the 2004-2005 school year. While the percentage is lower for this group of clients, many of the clients recently entered the program. The mean attendance rate was 92.0 percent. Table 6 summarizes the attendance rate for clients entering the program after July 1, 2004.

Table 6 about here

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) Records

Of the clients in the 2003-04 CUP program, two clients had contact with DJJ prior to entering the program. However, the charges against these clients did not result in adjudication. Neither of these clients have had any contact with DJJ since they entered the CUP program. Only two CUP clients have had any contact with DJJ since entrance into the program. Each of these clients received charges from a single incident, but neither were adjudicated.

Four clients during the 2004-05 program year had contact with DJJ. Two of these clients had this contact prior to entering the CUP program and two clients had contact after entrance. None of these clients’ charges resulted in adjudication.
Focus Group Results

Focus groups were conducted with clients, parents, and caregivers who were currently participating in the CUP program or who had recently completed the program. Administered during a family visit at the jail, eight youth participated in the client group; five adults participated in the caregiver group; and six adults participated in the incarcerated parent group. Persons who had completed the program and were no longer incarcerated as well as their family members participated in the focus groups. The mix of current and past clients allowed for perspectives on the program at various stages of the CUP program.

Responses from focus groups indicated that children, incarcerated parents, and caregivers all benefited from increased visitation with one another during therapy sessions and the case management component. Participants in all of the groups revealed that the CUP program helped them to better understand their situations and the availability of CUP staff members to talk to and to help in various areas of life was a benefit. All groups agreed that communication was improving among family members. They all also agreed the CUP was important to their families and had been successful in helping them in improving their lives. One caregiver explained, “This is a life-changing strategy. The dysfunction, to a great level, has been alleviated because everyone has learned what they needed to change and we realize how our actions affect other people.”

CONCLUSION

The findings from this assessment indicate that the CUP program was achieving its primary goals. Results indicate progress was being made in building stronger family
relationships. Additionally, clients were regularly attending school and were remaining out of trouble with the juvenile justice system.

More specifically, findings from data on the family adjustment scales illustrated that the majority of CUP participants completing both pre- and post-tests perceived fewer problems in individual relationships throughout the program. When examining all available client information, t-tests were significant for all of the tests except the Index of Family Relations and the Child’s Attitude Toward Mother (2004-05 clients). Changes in pre- and post-scores were significant for the Index of Parental Attitudes, Child’s Attitude Toward Mother (2003-04 clients) scale, and the Child’s Attitude Toward Father scale. This information suggests that families made progress and reached goals of the CUP program in terms of bettering family relationships.

While the pre- and post-test sets for the Family Adjustment Scales do indicate progress, there were a low number of tests completed relative to the number of clients. For clients included in this analysis who entered the program after July 1, 2004, the low number can be explained by many clients still being active in the program. Some of these clients had not reached the point at which post-tests can be administered.

Discussions taken place during the focus groups support the findings from the Family Adjustment Scales. Incarcerated parents, their children, and their family members all found positive results in their family and personal lives through participation in the CUP program. Each group focused on specific aspects of the program that helped in their unique situations, still all groups agreed that family relationships were getting stronger and that CUP had made a positive impact on their lives.
Clients had minimal involvement in the criminal justice system and high school attendance rates. While these favorable measures cannot be proven to be attributable to CUP, they are positive signs that a majority of the children are staying out of trouble and attending school. As established in the literature review, children with a parent in the criminal justice system are more likely than their peers to become involved in delinquent behavior themselves. They are also more likely to have problems in school, including poor attendance. Findings from the CUP program indicate that, overall, clients are steering away from crime. Instead, they are regularly attending school and working with their families to create positive outcomes regardless of the fact that they have an incarcerated parent. Caregivers and incarcerated parents are also increasing communication with each other and their children in order to support these positive outcomes.

While the data collected for this program evaluation signify that improvements were made in a majority of the family units that participated in CUP, there are limitations in regards to this evaluation. For instance, there is a possibility that some of the Family Adjustment Scale tests were taken more than once by several individuals, thus affecting the strength of this analysis. Additionally, there are some limitations to the school and DJJ data collected for the project. For example, the time frame during which school data were collected inhibited the measurement of long-term changes in GPAs and/or rate of attendance that may have resulted from children’s participation in CUP. Finally, while the DJJ data demonstrate that the overwhelming majority of clients were not involved with DJJ prior to or during their involvement with CUP, further analysis is needed to determine whether CUP had any long-term impact on clients’ delinquent behavior.
Despite these limitations, the results of this study clearly illustrate that the Children United with Parents program had a positive impact on a majority of the participants. Indeed, the CUP program described in this paper is best seen as a pilot program offering lessons to developing broader efforts. With rising prison and jail populations (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2005), programs such as CUP are increasingly needed to alleviate the stressors families experience when a parent is incarcerated. Previous research has identified some common practices among successful programs, which CUP implemented.

Future research is recommended to further determine the effects of such programs and to identify the specific program components that positively affect the lives of the participants. Unfortunately, such research would have to be conducted with another program for youth with incarcerated parents, as the CUP program is no longer in existence due to a cut in funding. Despite the limitations of this evaluation, CUP provides an important model for helping at-risk youth with incarcerated parents.
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Table 1. Results From Family Adjustment Scales of 2003-04 and 2004-05 Clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of Family Relations</th>
<th>Number of clients</th>
<th>Total number of test sets</th>
<th>Percentage of decreased scores</th>
<th>Percentage of increased scores</th>
<th>Percentage of equal scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Parental Attitudes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Attitude Toward Father</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Attitude Toward Mother</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: daniel/CUP program database

Note: The number of clients includes only the clients who took both the pre- and post-tests. Clients only taking either a pre- or a post-test were excluded from these calculations. Also, one client or clients’ family members may have taken more than one of each test.

Table 2. Scores for Child’s Attitude Toward Incarcerated Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of pre/post test set of child's attitude toward incarcerated parent</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Decreased</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Increased</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: daniel/CUP program database

Table 3. Scores for Incarcerated Parent’s Attitude Toward Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of pre/post test set of incarcerated parent's attitude toward child</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Decreased</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Increased</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores Equal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: daniel/CUP program database
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Family Adjustment Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of Family Relations (n = 77)</th>
<th>Pre-Test Mean</th>
<th>Pre-Test SD</th>
<th>Post-Test Mean</th>
<th>Post-Test SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Parental Attitudes (n = 97)</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Attitude Toward Father (n = 40)</td>
<td>16.3**</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.5**</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Attitude Toward Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04 Clients (n = 47)</td>
<td>25.4*</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.7*</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05 Clients (n = 22)</td>
<td>36.8**</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>32.1**</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: daniel/CUP program database
*p ≤ 0.05  **p ≤ 0.01

Note: T-test results found the pre- and post-test means of only the Child’s Attitude Toward Mother index to be significantly different between the two time frames (2003-04 and 2004-05). Therefore, the two sets of clients were combined for all other indices.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of 2003-2004 Client School Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Clients</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Math GPA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative English GPA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Rate</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: daniel/CUP program database

Note: T-test results found the cumulative math and English GPA means to be significantly different between the two time frames (2003-04 and 2004-05). Therefore, the two sets of clients are presented separately.
Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of 2004-2005 Client School Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Clients</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Math GPA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative English GPA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Rate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: daniel/CUP program database

Note: T-test results found the cumulative math and English GPA means to be significantly different between the two time frames (2003-04 and 2004-05). Therefore, the two sets of clients are presented separately.