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Executive Summary

Adult Treatment is a tertiary prevention program whose goal is to break the cycle of child abuse and neglect. The Adult Treatment program has shown consistently throughout 6 years to be effective in reducing the risk of child abuse and neglect. The paired samples t-test demonstrated positive change for empathy, corporal punishment, and oppression as evidence by statistical significance. Examining the different risk categories also showed a movement towards lower risk for those in high and moderate risk categories. Compassion Workshop, Responsibility Processing, and Nurturing Parenting all displayed an increase in knowledge gained through the program on the part of the participants, and that change was statistically significant. Overall, the program has shown remarkably consistent results throughout the years.

Child Therapy has a goal of improving the parent-child relationship, and providing the parent with strategies for dealing with their children’s behaviors. Hope scores were not statistically significant. Using the Crowell assessment allows the team to observe the parent and child and provide suggestions on how to improve that relationship. Results from the Crowell Assessment showed some positive change, particularly with such variables as positive affect, intrusiveness, enthusiasm, and emotional responsiveness. There were several variables that were not statistically significant. Generally speaking, the number of those individuals in the clinical and problematic range on the TSCYC decreased. Overall, there are some positive outcomes with regards to the Child Therapy programs.

Healthy Families and Safe Care are a home visiting program that enrolls pregnant women and families with children up to one year old who are at moderate to high risk for abuse and neglect due to circumstances such as teen mother, single head of household, unemployment, lack of support system, or poverty. The goal of the Child Well-Being Scale is to measure a variety of areas related to child safety and protective factors. Note that because data was interpreted differently with regards to time points, that Healthy Families data is not comparable to SafeCare Data. With regards to Healthy Families on household sanitation, at baseline the majority of respondents were in the baseline time point with the majority (73%) having appropriate household sanitation. SafeCare found that 58% had appropriate household sanitation. Regarding Healthy Families on physical health care, at baseline 97% had appropriate care. SafeCare found that 94% had appropriate care. With regards to parental expectations of children in Healthy Families, 58% had appropriate expectations. SafeCare found that 42% had appropriate expectations. Due to a low sample size, t-tests were not computed on Hope scores. The total mean score was 50.67 at time 1 and 51.77 at time 2.
**Kids on the Block** program has a goal to provide children of various ages the knowledge needed to deal with tough situations and the motivation to seek help when necessary. The results for the Kids on the Block program were consistently positive. Of all teachers who responded, 88% agreed that they would recommend the program to others. And 86% agreed that the performance was interesting while 86% agreed that it was developmentally appropriate. Teacher comments were also positive towards the program, both in terms of content of the program as well as the presentation itself. Overall, Kids on the Block received positive feedback from teachers.
Adult Treatment

Goal

Adult Treatment is a tertiary prevention program whose goal is to break the cycle of child abuse or neglect. The objective of the first phase is to assist parents in taking responsibility for court involvement and to assist them in understanding what changes they need to make in their life to break the cycle of abuse and neglect. The objective of the second phase is to reduce the risk of future child abuse and neglect through parenting education.

Purpose

The goal of research within Adult Treatment is twofold: first, analyzing the current data being collected to determine improvement from pre to post; second, to determine improvements that can be made in both data collection and use of instruments.

Procedure

Upon entrance to the adult treatment program, participants are put in either the Compassion Workshop or the Responsibility Processing Group. Upon completion, participants will enter the Nurturing Parenting program, and when completed, will fill out the Adult-Adolescent Parenting Inventory (AAPI), which was also filled out upon entrance to the program. For this report, all of the data on the AAPI was collected in 2015 and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the program over a longer period of time.

Instruments

Adult-Adolescent Parenting Inventory (AAPI-2) – The AAPI-2 is comprised of 40 items that measure parenting attitudes and child rearing practices of both adults and adolescents. The goal of the AAPI-2 is to ascertain the level of risk of child abuse and neglect based upon 5 constructs: parental expectations, empathy, corporal punishment, family roles, and oppression of child’s independence. The AAPI-2 has a Form A and Form B as a pre-test and post-test, respectively. The AAPI-2 has been normalized to the general population. Individuals’ raw scores are converted to STEN scores, or risk scores, in order to compare their scores with that of the general population. Risk scores are best used to determine where an individual stands in relation to a normal distribution of scores, and in this case, is used to determine risk of child abuse or neglect. Risk scores of 1-3 are considered high risk, 4-7 are moderate risk, and 8-10 are low risk.

Knowledge Quizzes - The Parent Child Center also developed a knowledge quiz for both Compassion Workshop and Responsibility Processing. These quizzes are administered before the program begins and immediately after. The results are then analyzed to determine whether the change in correct scores was significant.

Hope Scale – The Hope scale was designed by Snyder (2002) and consists of eight items and has two subscales (pathways and agency). A total score is also calculated. It is administered every 6 months.
Descriptive Statistics

- **Gender:** Of the 178 respondents, 57.3% (n=102) were female and 42.7% (n=76) of them were male.

- **Age:** The average age of respondents was 32.4 with a range from 12 to 69.

- **Race:** 58% were Caucasian, 19% were Native American, 16% were African American, 6% were Hispanic, and the other 1% was Asian or Unknown.

- **Education:** The majority of respondents were high school graduates (30%) with 25% completing some college and 7% being college graduates. 15% completed 11th grade, 10% completed 10th grade, 7% completed 9th grade, 3% completed 8th grade, and 2% completed less than the 8th grade.

- **Employment:** The majority of respondents reported being employed full-time (42%) while 18% were employed part-time. 26% reported being unemployed and 10% reported being unemployed due to disability. 1% was retired and 2% employment was unknown.

- **Income Level:** The majority of respondents reported making under $15,000 (35%). 14% reported making between $15,001 and $25,000. 16% reported making between $25,001 and $40,000. 3% reported making over $60,000. 28% reported not knowing how much they made per year.

- **Marital Status:** The majority of respondents were either single (34%) or married (30%). 19% were unmarried partners, 7% separated, 6% divorced, and 2% widowed. 2% reported not knowing.

- **Abuse Inside of Home:** 37% of respondents reported experiencing abuse within their family as a child while 53% had not. 10% didn’t know if they had or not.

- **Abuse Outside of Home:** 22% reported abuse outside of their home while 66% did not. 12% reported not knowing if they had or not.
Graph 1: Adult Treatment Risk Scores

The above graph displays risk scores within the Adult Treatment program. Risk scores are measured on five constructs, including Expectations of Child, Empathy, Corporal Punishment, Role Reversal, and Oppression. High risk individuals fall between 1-3, moderate risk between 4-7, and low risk between 8-10. Thus, higher scores indicate lower risk, while lower scores indicate higher risk. In the graph above, the mean scores at time 1 are in the moderate risk category and show improvement from time 1 to time 2. However, the more important question is whether the change is significant change, as well as what percentage of individuals moved from one risk category to another. The following pages will answer that question.
Summary of Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory (AAPI)

Table 1: What is the level of risk?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Time 1: Percentage of Clients in High or Moderate Risk Group</th>
<th>Time 2: Percentage of Clients in High or Moderate Risk Group</th>
<th>Time 1: Percentage of Clients in Low Risk Group</th>
<th>Time 2: Percentage of Clients in Low Risk Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEN A: Expectations of Children</strong></td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEN B: Empathy Towards Children’s Needs</strong></td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEN C: Use of Corporal Punishment as a Means of Discipline</strong></td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEN D: Parent-Child Role Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEN E: Children’s Power and Independence</strong></td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decrease Indicates Progress | Increase Indicates Progress

N=178

The preceding table examines what percentage of individuals moved from one risk category to another. The goal of this program is to reduce risk to the lowest group. The above table illustrates the percentage of clients in the moderate to high risk group at time 1 and time 2 of analysis. For example, 76.4% of respondents at time 1 were considered high or moderate risk regarding corporeal punishment (construct C), but that percentage dropped to 55.6% at time 2. In addition, at time 1 only 23.6% of people were in the low risk group for use of corporal punishment, while at time 2, that percentage rose to 44.4%. The only STEN that observed no change was the expectations of children (construct A).
Summary of Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory (AAPI)

Table 2: Number of respondents in risk categories from time 1 to time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High 1</th>
<th>High 2</th>
<th>Mod 1</th>
<th>Mod 2</th>
<th>Low 1</th>
<th>Low 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppression</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=178

The above table displays the actual number of people in the high, moderate, and low risk groups at time 1 and time 2. For the high and moderate risk categories, the total number of respondents in each group decreased for all variables except expectations, where numbers increased. The low risk group increased in total numbers from time 1 to time 2 in all categories except expectations, where it remained the same.
Summary of Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory (AAPI)

How has risk changed across time? The following provides specifics of direction of change based upon their rating at time 1 to time 2 (N=178).

Construct A: Expectations of Children
High Risk (n=16): 75% improved to moderate or low risk, 25% stayed the same.
Moderate (n=133): 10% improved, 83% stayed the same, 7% moved to high risk.
Low (n=29): 45% stayed the same and 55% moved to moderate risk.

Construct B: Empathy Towards Children’s Needs
High Risk (n=36): 75% improved to moderate or low risk, 25% stayed the same.
Moderate (n=121): 36% improved, 61% stayed the same, 3% moved to high risk.
Low (n=21): 91% stayed the same, 9% moved to moderate risk.

Construct C: Use of Corporal Punishment as a Means of Discipline
High Risk (n=13): 92% improved to moderate risk; 8% improved to low risk.
Moderate (n=123): 42% improved, 57% stayed same, 1% moved to high risk.
Low (n=42): 64% stayed the same, 36% moved to moderate risk.

Construct D: Parent-Child Role Responsibilities
High Risk (n=19): 58% improved to moderate or low risk, 42% stayed the same.
Moderate (n=115): 21% improved, 71% stayed the same, 8% moved to high risk.
Low (n=44): 61% stayed the same, 39% moved to moderate risk.

Construct E: Children’s Power and Independence
High Risk (n=20): 90% improved to moderate risk or low risk, 10% stayed the same.
Moderate (n=115): 22% improved, 72% stayed the same, 6% moved to high risk.
Low (n=33): 61% stayed the same, 33% moved to moderate, 7% moved to high risk.

Thus, for Construct A, of those identified as high risk, 75% improved to the moderate or low risk group, and of those in the low-risk category, 45% stayed the same and 55% moved to moderate risk. For Construct C, 100% of those identified as high-risk improved, while 42% of those in the moderate group improved, and of those identified as low-risk, 64% stayed the same and 36% moved to moderate risk. Construct E also showed improvement, with 90% of those in the high-risk group moving to the moderate or low risk group, while 22% of those in the moderate group improved to low risk.
Paired Samples T-Test

The next goal was to determine whether this change across time was significant. To achieve this goal, a paired samples t-test was used. The purpose of a paired samples t-test is to determine whether the change in mean scores from time 1 to time 2 is statistically significant. As the table below displays, positive change was observed for empathy, corporal punishment, and oppression as evidenced by statistical significance. Scores for expectations and role reversal were not statistically significant. See the table below for further description.

Table 3: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>-7.891</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>-8.36</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Reversal</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppression</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>.008**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of significance:
*p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

The goal of adult treatment is to decrease caregiver risk. The data presented for AAPI scores show that this goal is being achieved for those in the high risk and moderate risk categories. The next page displays the paired-samples t-test for each year from 2009-2014.
Paired Samples T-Test (split by year)

The following tables show the results of the paired-samples t-test for each year from 2009-2014. The results are positive and show consistent and significant change from pre to post in every year on all variables with three exceptions. The year 2009 only has nine individuals in the sample, which reduces the likelihood of significance from the start. The other exception is one construct (oppression) from the year 2013 and 2014, which was not significant.

Table 4.1: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2 (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>3.082</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Reversal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppression</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>2.739</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2 (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Reversal</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppression</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2 (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>1.378</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Reversal</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppression</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2 (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct A</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct B</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct C</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct D</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct E</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2 (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct A</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct B</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct D</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct E</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2 (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct A</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct B</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct C</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct D</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct E</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the above tables illustrate, and with the exception of the year 2009, there is statistically significant change consistently throughout the last 5 years. In the years 2013 and 2014, there was not a significant change in oppression. In the years 2010-2012, all constructs showed a significant change. Overall, the program has been consistent on an annual basis in reducing risk scores as evidenced by the paired samples analyses.
Knowledge Quizzes

Participants in the adult treatment program go through one of two initial groups, Compassion Workshop or Responsibility Processing, and then continue on to the Nurturing Parenting group. The t-test analysis examined the correct responses at time 1 with time 2 to determine whether the increase in correct responses was significant and indicative of an increase in knowledge. The table below is similar to the tables from the previous pages, which show the mean score pre and post, the change in the mean scores, and whether this change was significant. The sample for the quizzes only includes participants from 2015.

Table 5: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2 for all three groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compassion Workshop</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>19.99</td>
<td>22.74</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Processing</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing Parenting</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>-3.33</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 presents findings from the t-test analyses. As can be seen, the number of correct responses from time 1 to time 2 changed in a statistically significant way, indicating that those going through the program are displaying an increase in knowledge of the presented material.
Graph 2: Hope in Adult Treatment

The preceding graph shows Hope scores for pre, post, and follow up after participating in parenting classes. Paired samples t-test were conducted for each time point. The change between pre and post Hope scores was statistically significant \( t (89) -2.53; p =.013 \). The change between pre and follow up Hope scores was also significant \( t (90) -2.76; p = .007 \). The change between post and follow up scores was not significant.
Summary

The Adult Treatment program has shown consistently throughout 6 years to be effective in reducing the risk of child abuse and neglect. The paired samples t-test demonstrated positive change for empathy, corporal punishment, and oppression as evidenced by statistical significance. Scores for role reversal and expectations were not statistically significant in 2015. Examining the different risk categories also showed a movement towards lower risk for those who had scored as high risk during time 1; however, people who were low risk during time 1 sometimes moved into the moderate risk category during time 2. Compassion Workshop, Responsibility Processing, and Nurturing Parenting all displayed an increase in knowledge gained through the program on the part of the participants, and that change was statistically significant. Overall, the program has demonstrated positive results this year and throughout the years studied.
Child Therapy

Goal

The Parent Child Center of Tulsa Children’s Treatment Department offers a comprehensive range of services to children ages 0-12 and their families. Children of all ages, including infants and toddlers, can be impacted by traumatic events such as separation or loss of a caregiver, or frightening events that impact their world. Child Therapy uses two main treatment models: Child Parent Psychotherapy and Play Therapy. The former is used to help caregivers effectively manage infant/toddler behavior problems such as aggression, depression, and feeding and sleeping problems that may result from their exposure to traumatic experiences. For the latter, the child therapy services for children age 6-12 include a combination of individual and family therapy interventions to help children and families heal and improve their relationships with one another. PCCT acknowledges that parents are the most effective agents of change for their children, and it is our goal to empower parent-child relationships to grow and become sources of stability for both parent and child.

Purpose

The purpose of research within the Child Therapy program is to analyze current outcome measures being used by PCCT as well as examine the relationship between hope and parent-child behavior.

Procedure

PCCT staff use a variety of instruments with the clients in their program and these clients fill them out upon entering the program. The scores from these assessments are entered into a database and used for analysis. The Crowell Assessment is administered every six months, as is the Hope Scale.

Instruments

Hope Questionnaire – This scale was developed by staff at PCCT and consists of questions regarding hope in the parent and hope in the child. It is administered every 6 months.

Crowell Assessment – The Crowell Assessment is a method for evaluating parent-child interaction within a variety of situations, including free play, clean up, and separation/reunion. The goal is to ascertain the quality of the parent-child relationship. All structured assessment observations are videotaped and scored by trained staff at PCCT. The Crowell is designed for use with children aged 0-5.
Trauma Symptoms Checklist for Young Children (TSCYC) – The TSCYC is a 90-item caregiver report questionnaire designed to assess for trauma symptoms with their children. A variety of categories are measured, including posttraumatic stress, sexual concerns, anxiety, and depression. This measurement is used with children aged 6-12.

Trauma Symptoms Checklist for Children (TSCC) – the TSCC is a child self-report assessment for ages 8-12. It contains 54-items, two validity scales and six clinical scales. For validity, the Under-response and Hyper-response scales measure whether the respondent is in denial (the former) or is over-responding due to being overwhelmed or needing to seem symptomatic. Under-response scores 70 or over, and Hyper-response scores 90 or over deem the assessment invalid. Scores above 65 are considered clinically significant for the other scales.
Graph 3: Parent and Child Hope Means

![Parent and Child Hope Means](image)

The above graph illustrates the mean scores for parent and child hope. Parent hope decreased from 7.57 to 7.42, while child hope increased from 7.03 to 7.7. Higher scores indicate higher total hope. T-test were used to compare differences in mean scores for measurement one and measurement two. The change in scores for Child Hope was significant. The table below presents data with regards to the t-tests.

### Parent and Child Hope Paired-Samples T-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiz</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Hope</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Hope</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the above table, the differences in parent hope from time 1 to time 2 was not statistically significant, but the differences between child hope was **statistically significant**.
Correlations

The table on the next page provides the correlation matrix for all the scales described above. A correlation represents the level of relationship between two variables. The interpretation is based upon the strength of the relationship as well as the direction. Strength of a correlation is based upon Cohen’s (1990) effect size heuristic. More specifically, a correlation (+ or -) of .10 or higher is considered small; a correlation (+ or -) of .30 is considered moderate, and a correlation (+ or -) of .50 is considered strong. With regards to direction, a positive correlation indicates that higher scores on one variable are associated with higher scores on the other variable. A negative correlation indicates that higher scores on one variable are associated with lower scores on the other variable. Using a correlation matrix is an easy way to present several correlations among multiple variables. Identifying a specific correlation is based upon matching a row to a particular column.
## Hope and Crowell Free Play Correlations

Table 7: Correlations Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Caregiver Hope (1)</th>
<th>Child Hope (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver Hope (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Hope (1)</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Positive Affect</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>.177*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Withdraw/Depression</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>.245**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Anger/Hostility</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Intrusiveness</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Behavioral Responsiveness</td>
<td>.187*</td>
<td>.293**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Emotional Responsiveness</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>.218**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Positive Affect</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.294**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Withdraw/Depression</td>
<td>.164*</td>
<td>.439**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Anxiety/Fear</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Anger/Hostility</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Non-Compliance</td>
<td>.182*</td>
<td>.244**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Aggression</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Enthusiasm</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.276**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=153-208
Levels of significance:
* p < .05;
** p < .01

The above table displays correlations between hope scores of the parent and child with scores on the free play Crowell assessment. Correlations examine whether the relationship between two variables is significant. The numbers with asterisks indicate significant correlations. Again, a positive number means that as one variable increases the other increases as well, while a negative number would mean that as one variable increases the other variable decreases. Child hope and parent hope are positively correlated, such that higher child hope is related to higher parent hope. Higher parent hope is positively related to parent positive affect, behavioral responsiveness, emotional responsiveness, and withdraw/depression scores. Higher child hope is related to both parent and child withdraw/depression. In addition, higher child hope is positively related to child positive affect, non-compliance, and enthusiasm.
Graph 4: Parent Free Play Crowell Mean Scores

The preceding graph presents mean scores for the Parent Free Play/Reunion on the Crowell assessment. T-test analyses were used to compare differences in mean scores for measurement one and measurement two. There was a statistically significant difference between Crowell scores for Positive Affect, Withdraw/Depression, Intrusiveness, Behavioral Responsiveness, and Emotional Responsiveness. See Table 8 for additional quantitative information.

Table 8: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Play Parent</td>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-3.972</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play Parent</td>
<td>Withdraw/Depression</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>-3.574</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play Parent</td>
<td>Anger/Hostility</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>-1.218</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play Parent</td>
<td>Intrusiveness</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>-3.746</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play Parent</td>
<td>Behavioral Responsive</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>-2.861</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play Parent</td>
<td>Emotional Responsive</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>-3.622</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of significance:
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Graph 5: Child Free Play Crowell Mean Scores

The above graph presents mean scores for the Child Free Play on the Crowell assessment. T-test analyses were used to compare differences in mean scores for measurement one and measurement two. There was a statistically significant difference between Crowell scores for Positive Affect, Withdraw/Depression, and Enthusiasm. Positive change was observed for all statistically significant findings. See Table 9 for additional quantitative information.

Table 9: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Positive Affect</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>-5.913</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Withdraw/Depression</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>-2.473</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Anxiety/Fear</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>-1.033</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Anger/Hostility</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Noncompliance</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Aggression</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>-.536</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Enthusiasm</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-5.989</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of significance:
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Graph 6: Parent Task Crowell Mean Scores

The above graph presents mean scores for the Parent Cleanup/Task on the Crowell assessment. T-test analyses were used to compare differences in mean scores for measurement one and measurement two. There was a statistically significant difference between Crowell scores for Positive Affect, Withdraw/Depression, Behavioral Responsiveness, Emotional Responsiveness, and Positive Discipline. See Table 10 for additional quantitative information.

Table 10: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-3.718</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-3.718</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>-2.706</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Withdraw/Depression</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>-2.706</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>-.980</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Anger/Hostility</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>-.980</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>-1.211</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Intrusiveness</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>-1.211</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>-3.794</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Behavioral Responsive</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>-3.794</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-5.348</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Emotional Responsive</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-5.348</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>-3.853</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Positive Discipline</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>-3.853</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>-.587</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Negative Discipline</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>-.587</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of significance:
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Graph 7: Child Task Crowell Mean Scores

The above graph presents mean scores for the Child Cleanup/Task on the Crowell assessment. T-test analyses were used to compare differences in mean scores for measurement one and measurement two. There was a statistically significant difference between Crowell scores for Positive Affect, Withdraw/Depression, Enthusiasm, and Persistence. Positive change was observed for all statistically significant findings. See Table 10 for additional quantitative information.

Table 11: Significance of mean change from time 1 to time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Positive Affect</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-3.975</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Withdraw/Depression</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>-3.734</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Anxiety/Fear</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>-1.153</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Anger/Hostility</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Noncompliance</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>-.583</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Aggression</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>-.843</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Enthusiasm</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>-3.794</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td>Child Persistence</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>-2.393</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of significance:
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Graph 8 presents scores for the TSCYC. The TSCYC has 11 subscales that are scored to determine whether an individual falls into a clinical range. T-test analyses were used to compare differences in mean scores for time 1 and time 2. There was a statistically significant difference between scores for Depression. See Table 12 for additional information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Level</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45.15</td>
<td>44.41</td>
<td>-1.819</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical Response</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55.31</td>
<td>53.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69.84</td>
<td>66.24</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.88</td>
<td>61.35</td>
<td>2.358</td>
<td>.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65.85</td>
<td>64.46</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD Intrusion</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64.24</td>
<td>68.22</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD Avoidance</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72.78</td>
<td>72.44</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD Arousal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65.29</td>
<td>68.41</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68.56</td>
<td>72.78</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissociation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>64.89</td>
<td>-.614</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Concerns</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55.98</td>
<td>60.22</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of significance: *p < .05
As presented in Graph 9, the TSCYC has 11 subscales that are scored to determine whether an individual falls into a clinical range. Those scores that are greater than or equal to 70 are considered clinically significant. Those scales ranging from 65-69 are considered problematic. Scores can range from 35 to 110. The above graph displays the number of individuals with scores in the clinical (70 or greater) at time 1 and time 2. The PTS-Total score had the highest number of individuals in the clinically significant range at time 1 with 50, while PTS-Arousal and PTS-Avoidance each had 48. At time 2, PTS-Arousal had the highest number with 17 individuals.
The above graph displays the number of individuals with scores in the TSCYC problematic (65-69) range at time 1 to time 2. At time 1, anxiety was the category with the most individuals in the problematic range. At time 2, sexual concerns was the highest category with 7.
Graph 11: Trauma Symptoms Checklist

Trauma Symptoms Checklist for Children (TSCC)
Mean Scores

N=7-20

The above graph displays the mean scores for the TSCC at time 1 and time 2. Due to a small sample size, t-test analyses were not computed. Scores can range from 35 to 111.
Summary

Child Therapy has a goal of improving the parent-child relationship, and providing the parent with strategies for dealing with their children’s behaviors. Parent Hope scores were not statistically significant but the child hope scores were. Using the Crowell assessment allows the team to observe the parent and child and provide suggestions on how to improve that relationship. Results from the Crowell Assessment showed some positive change, particularly with such variables as positive effect, emotional responsiveness, and behavioral responsiveness. There were several variables that were not statistically significant. With regards to the TSCYC, 1 out of 11 scales was statistically significant. Generally speaking, the number of those individuals in the clinical and problematic range on the TSCYC decreased. Overall, there are some positive outcomes with regards to the Child Therapy programs.
Healthy Families and Safecare

Goal

Healthy Families (HF) enrolls pregnant women and families with children up to one year old who are at moderate to high risk for abuse and neglect due to circumstances such as teen mother, single head of household, unemployment, lack of support system, or poverty. The mission is to provide these families with the tools necessary to prevent child abuse and neglect.

SafeCare (SC) is a program for high-risk families that provides broad-based, individualized parenting support and education to families with children ages 0-5. It is a voluntary, home-based program designed to strengthen parent/child relationships and enhance home safety and child-well being. SafeCare enrolls pregnant women and families with at least one child under the age of 5 who are interested in improving their parenting skills and/or their ability to nurture and care for their child.

Purpose

The purpose of research in these departments is to determine the degree to which individuals progressed every six months on a number of different skill sets.

Procedure

The Child Well-Being Scales (CWBS) and Hope Scale are given every 6 months.

Instruments

Child Well-Being Scales (CWBS) – The CWBS is comprised of multiple variables. For purpose of this report, 6 will be reported. Its goal is to measure a variety of areas related to child safety and protective factors. Healthy Families administered the CWBS at the given chronological age of the child (i.e. infant, 6 months, 12 months, 18 months, etc.). SafeCare administered the CWBS at intake, then every 6 months. Thus, data is presented separately since time points are interpreted differently for each program.

Hope Scale – The Hope scale was designed by Snyder (2002) and consists of eight items and has two subscales (pathways and agency). A total score is also calculated.

The first set of graphs present CWBS findings from the Healthy Families (HF) program. SafeCare (SC) findings are presented thereafter.
Graph 12 illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding household sanitation. The majority (73% time 1; 66% time 2) of respondents had appropriate household sanitation. 25% of respondents at time 1 had mildly inadequate sanitation while 29% of respondents at time 2 did.
Graph 13: HF Home Safety

HF Home Safety

Graph 13 illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding home safety. Time 1 had 39% with appropriate home safety and 52% with mildly inadequate. Time 2 had 32% with appropriate home safety and 53% with mildly inadequate.

N1=152
N2=90
Graph 14: HF Physical Health Care

HF Physical Health Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Inadequate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriously Inadequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N1=145
N2=90

Graph 14 illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding physical health care. The majority (97% time 1; 98% time 2) of respondents had appropriate physical health care.
The above graph illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding developmental and educational care. The majority (80% time 1; 73% time 2) of respondents had appropriate developmental and educational care. 20% of respondents at time 1 had mildly inadequate care while 27% of respondents at time 2 did.
Graph 16 illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding parental positive interaction with child. The majority (65% time 1; 76% time 2) of respondents had appropriate positive interaction. 34% of respondents at time 1 had mildly inadequate positive interactions while 28% of respondents at time 2 did.
Graph 17: HF Parent Expectations of Child

The above graph illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding parent expectations of child. The majority (58% time 1; 57% time 2) of respondents had mildly inadequate expectations. 38% of respondents at time 1 had appropriate expectations while 41% of respondents at time 2 did.
The above graph illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding household sanitation. The majority (58% time 1; 54% time 2) of respondents had appropriate sanitation. 24% of respondents at time 1 had appropriate expectations while 32% of respondents at time 2 did.
The above graph illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding home safety. The majority (45% time 1; 61% time 2) of respondents had mildly inadequate safety. 22% of respondents at time 1 had appropriate safety while 18% of respondents at time 2 did.
Graph 20: SC Physical Health Care

Graph 20 illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe physical health care. The majority (94% time 1; 100% time 2) of respondents had appropriate physical health care.

N1=78

N2=30
The above graph illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding development and educational care. At time 1, 42% of respondents had appropriate care and 54% had mildly inadequate care. At time 2, 56% of respondents had appropriate care and 34% had mildly inadequate care.
Graph 22: SC Parental Positive Interaction with Child

N1=76  
N2=29

Graph 22 illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding parental positive interaction with child. At time 1, 43% of respondents had appropriate positive interactions and 42% had mildly inadequate positive interactions. At time 2, 66% of respondents had appropriate positive interactions and 24% had mildly inadequate positive interactions.
Graph 23 illustrates the number of respondents in each timeframe regarding parent expectations of child. At time 1, 42% of respondents had appropriate expectations and 42% had mildly inadequate expectations. At time 2, 63% of respondents had appropriate expectations and 30% had mildly inadequate expectations.
The preceding graph presents Hope scores including pathways and agency subscale scores and the total scale score. Due to limited matching data, a t-test could not be computed. The present data is group level mean scores. The Pathways mean score was 25.83 at baseline and 26.6 at the 6-month follow up. The Agency mean was 24.83 at baseline and 25.7 at the 6-month follow up. The total scale score was 50.67 as baseline and 51.77 at the 6-month follow up.
Kids on the Block

Goal
The mission of the Kids on the Block program is to provide children of various ages the knowledge needed to deal with tough situations and the motivation to pursue help when necessary. The program achieves these goals through the use of puppetry in the Japanese Bunraku style, and currently focus on five main themes: bullying, divorce, stranger danger, physical abuse and sexual abuse. KOB also has clear messages that it is attempting to communicate, such as “tell an adult and keep telling”, or “abuse is not your fault”.

Purpose
The aim of research within this program is to determine the effectiveness of Kids on the Block in educating children in various concepts related to abuse and bullying as well as determine whether a change in behavior is likely.

Procedure and Instrument
The Kids on the Block program was evaluated using self-report questionnaires for the teachers who attended the presentation. Teachers responded to the self-report measures. The self-report consists of six Likert-type questions and four open-ended items. PCCT staff in conjunction with OU developed the scale so that questions would be directly related to the content being presented.
Teacher Evaluations

Teachers were given a questionnaire to address four main variables, including puppeteer performance, audience reaction, developmental appropriateness, and increase of awareness. The following graphs display the responses to each of these variables in percent form.

Graph 25: Puppeteer Performance

![Graph showing performance was interesting](image)

N=386

The above graph displays the overwhelmingly positive responses to the item, “The performance was interesting and engaging for the students.” As reviewed by teachers, 86% of teachers stated the performance was “excellent.”
Graph 26: Content Increased Awareness

Teachers responded to the question, “The content increased student awareness of the subject of all respondents, 81.5% of teachers stated the reaction was “excellent.”
Teachers responded to the item, “The performance was developmentally appropriate.” As can be seen, 86.1% of teachers responded that the appropriateness of the presentation was “excellent.”
Graph 28: Contact and Schedule with KOB Staff

N= 287

Teachers responded to the item, “I was able to contact and schedule with KOB staff within a reasonable time frame.” Of all respondents, 74.9% indicated “excellent.”
Graph 29: KOB Staff: On Time and Organized

N= 370

Teachers responded to the item, “KOB staff arrived on time and the presentation was well organized.” Of all respondents, 88.1% indicated “excellent.”
Graph 30: Recommend Program

N=384

Teachers responded to the item, “I would recommend this program to others.” Of all respondents, 87.5% indicated “strongly agree.”
Teacher Comments

The following are comments teachers provided about the program during their evaluation.

The response to the following item, “I expected:”

- a high-engagement performance
- a puppet show to educate students about bullying
- I had seen it last year and this year was just as good
- teaching good life skills and manners
- kids to learn what to do if they’re being abused
- the kids to receive good information in a fun way
- to see dramatization through puppets of anti-bullying lessons
- I didn’t know what to expect
- to watch puppet shows
- a puppet show
- a good puppet show
- an engaging relevant performance
- it to be good and wow it was great
- wonderful performance
- a quality performance since I had seen one before
- a puppet show about bullying
- a funny and informative play
- an educational age appropriate fun show
- a play
- a great show and that is what we got this is the second time to see kob and they -
- fun, engaging and useful information that my students could use and learn from
- an informative and entertaining performance
- student participation
- a developmentally appropriate performance
- unsure - this was my first experience a puppet show
- age appropriate content
- no expectations - this was my first experience with kob
- the students to enjoy the performance and learn something new
- I didn’t really know what to expect
- a great show for my students to enjoy
- an interesting show about issues these kids face daily
- a great educational program
- a great performance that the children loved
- a learning and engaging presentation
• the children learn a lesson
• just like last year's
• information about bullying
• this type of presentation - I've been fortunate enough to see KOB presentations before
• loved it
• a much needed lesson on bullying
• it to be great - as usual
• a show like last year - same topic, but different material in the show
• a good message
• entertainment
• an interactive presentation raising awareness of bullying
• I wasn't sure
• a show with puppets about bullying
• the performance to keep the children's attention
• the program to be entertaining
• I didn't know what to expect - pleasant surprise - every one of my students could tell me what they learned from the puppets
• an engaging puppet show
• an engaging performance
• an engaging, applicable presentation for second graders
• my students to learn about how to handle bullying
• a performance that holds the kids attention
• a great performance due to past experiences in watching this show
• student engagement
• to have a fun and engaging program
• 5th graders lose interest, but wanted them to get the message
• an entertaining developmentally appropriate show
• didn't know what to expect
• a puppet presentation
• information to be given to students regarding handling name-calling and safety when encountering a stranger
• an informative performance
• a great presentation
• knowledgeable info for young children
• the kids to love it - they did
• too much joking around loses the message
• a quality program that discussed conflicts and strangers in an age appropriate manner
• that the puppeteers would have more clearly distinguished between stranger - good stranger
• just puppets
• to raise the awareness of stranger danger
• the performance to be informative
• to raise the students awareness of stranger danger and ways to recognize bullying
• helpful insight for kids to learn how to handle their emotions better
• a great performance
• an engaging puppet performance
• a puppet show with informative information
• fun event for parent and kids to join along
• to see practical advice to young children
• a helpful message
• content organized to teach kids how to deal with bullying and stranger situations
• an entertaining show to teach life skills
• a great learning experience for my students
• more songs - more skits
• I've previously seen the program and expected the same quality as before
• first time to see this group - excellent
• a lesson to teach children how to handle a situation if someone's calling them names and stranger tips
• I know what to expect because I have had the privilege of seeing your show before
• a presentation on bullying from a kids perspective
• I had no idea
• an entertaining and educational program that is age appropriate
• this was new to me
• this was great - so engaging and such good information - really held the kids attention
• a puppet show
• a non-educational puppet show that was more relaxed to a theme or movie
• entertainment and engaging
• fun and engaging
• puppets that taught character building stories in an entertaining way
• KOTB had come before but I think this was the exact same performance we had last time
• a good lesson for the students - I wasn't sure about what topic
• puppets
• just a performance
• too be much longer
• behind a curtain puppets sitting
• a traditional puppet show
• I've seen kids on the block many times so I knew what to expect
• a puppet show that informed the children on a social issue
• a simple performance explaining to the kids in the most basic sense about each topic and how to handle it
• to have to tell the kids to be quiet and pay attention
• I have seen this before here and it was punctual, professional and entertaining and informative
• a puppet show that helped the kids learn good life skills - I expected something fun that included the kids.
• I have used this program for several years - you always deliver a spectacular show - some of my kids have watched many times and still love these shows
• age appropriate entertainment and information
• always a treat to have you here - kids love these shows
• visuals and lecture type assemble with examples shown
• a great show
• engaging developmentally appropriate social skills lessons
• engaging lesson for students
• accurate engaging info for students
• a bully concept
• to watch a puppet show
• exactly what was received
• not sure first time watching
• this was the 1st time I had seen a performance so I wasn’t sure what to expect
• to see examples of bullying and how to handle it
• great job
• a high quality show with lots of info to deal with bullies
• a puppet show about bullying
• loved it
• I’ve seen this before its very good
• a good program with lots of entertainment
• that it would be just as awesome as it was the last two times I saw the performance
• the students to be focused on the show
• a waste of time
• a great experience I have seen the show before I love it
• good info for my students on calling names and stranger danger
• a good show
• a wonderful presentation because of past experience with this group
• age appropriate material
• a fun and engaging story about emotional development
• on level subject
• a performance that explicitly taught my children how to handle situations of bullying/abuse
• a performance that encouraged students to be good friends
• it to keep the children attention and be on their level
• a performance that shows students that words can really be hurtful
• the children to talk about feelings and name calling
• a great educational show
• wonderful presentation
• student involvement
• engaging show
• a shows that teaches and is enjoyable for my students
• a puppet show
• a fun show where the kids learn
• good information
• children to be entertained
• an awesome learning experience for my students
• a great learning experience for my students and that is exactly what they got
• a great program and was not disappointed - great show
• puppet show to help teach about strangers energetic fun learning experience
• interactive puppet show
• a puppet show about bullying aimed at young children
• exactly what we got
• tiny puppets but loved the large ones
• a good lesson because I saw it last year and you gave a good lesson
• great performance
• a great performance
• an engaging program that kept kids interest
• fabulous
• what we have received the past several years
• a fun and exciting puppet show with a purpose
• great skit that helps students with bullying and abuse
• presentation on bullying
• a great engaging performance
• professionals
• just a talk about bullying
• an entertaining puppet show to teach students about bulling and strangers
• the students to love the puppets and learn the subject matter
• engaged students
• avoidance of bullying to be taught, avoidance of strangers to be taught
• a play about preventing bullying
• a puppet show
• that my students would learn what to do if a stranger approached them
• an engaging performance that held the attention of the kids and taught them useful tools for name calling and stranger danger
• my class to get valuable info on bullying
• to learn about bulling and strangers
• info on bullying and stranger danger
• information on bullying and child safety presented in an engaging way
• a great show
• information in a visual - verbal - communicating way for first grade
• an educational puppet show

The response to the following item: “I received:”

• a high-engagement performance
• a puppet show which highlighted to students ways to handle bullying situations
• the kids were engaged the whole time - they loved it
• good job - very good with the students
• kids answered questions correctly, engaged in presentation
• helpful information to assist students in being able to distinguish bullying from kids being kids
• a lot of information about bullying
• some great tips to help guide the students
• a super engaging and educational show
• a great well thought out program
• hand-outs to use with students - strategies - children can use to stay safe and set boundaries
• an amazing puppet show that taught the children about how important words are
• an awesome puppet show
• what I expected - :)
• a lot of great info
• same quality show
• what I expected and it was not only informative - but funny too
• a great show with very valuable information for my students
• what I expected
• exactly what I expected
• a very entertaining puppet show
• delivered a wonderful, kid friendly learning experience
• what was expected
• just that
• great feedback
• a performance that gave students information for handling bullying and strangers
• a wonderful performance with great information
• a fantastic program that both entertained and educated my students
• an entertaining, age-appropriate performance which taught critical safety strategies
• great lessons reinforcing important skills we try to teach in pre-k regarding bullying and strangers
• a great show for my students that they enjoyed and learned from them - lots of laughs :-)
• what I expected - I have been to several shows - I always enjoy watching the kids watch the program
• a great program
• an engaging show the children enjoyed
• an entertaining, learning experience for my students
• better than expected - very informative info on the children's level
• it was better - liked the inclusion of technology
• how to not be a bystander and help others - related how it feels to be a bully or to be bullied - friends can listen - violence is not a solution - seek adult help
• a KOTB packet
• loved it
• a very entertaining and informative performance - demonstrating useful ways to handle bullying
• a fantastic performance that my class loved
• kids on the block packet for my students
• entertainment
• a great packet filled with resources
• my expectations were met
• a packet of information
• a wonderful show about bullying and strangers
• a great performance that was engaging, interactive and humorous about bullying topics
• was captivated and entertained
• great info about bullying
• age-appropriate wording and examples that can be used in class
• an entertaining and engaging program
• an engaging presentation with a great packet we can take back to the classroom
• valuable information
• a great performance as always
• tips at dealing with bullies
• student engagement
• great tips for the kids
• a fun and engaging program
• the 5th graders loved the show
• exactly what I expected
• good information to give to students tools on how to be safe and dealing with bullies
• the puppeteers were excellent
• interactive instruction and all kids were engaged
• a great presentation
• magic - great information in a memorable, kid-friendly program
• engaging information with audience participation and modeling
• an enjoyable performance for my class that gave great information
• an engaging and informative performance
• information I use everyday
• good info to help my kids respond
• an age appropriate program on conflict resolutions
• positive feedback from students about the program - concepts
• an entertaining show with a valuable lesson
• the importance of reminding and reviewing bullying and stranger danger to schools
• a nicely puppeted informative performance
• an awareness of how to talk to the students about stranger danger making them more aware of how to run like a rocket and stay safe
• real life examples and audience participation - the help of music and art to express their emotions
• the students were quite engaged
• options vs violence - walking away - screaming into a pillow - stress balls
• great message on self-respect, no one deserves to be bullied
• a great performance
• thank you for keeping them engaged with visuals - this is important
• an excellent puppet show with kind, interactive and caring people
• participation from all
• say "please stop" - ignore - walk away - tell the teacher - I don't talk to strangers - get away fast - step back - no gifts without ok from mom
• engaging performance which taught just that
• everything we thought it would be
• a great learning experience for my students
• child appropriate skits - the lecture at the end was inappropriate and lost the kids attention
• organized, valuable, intentional, life principles
• good information - loved it
• exactly what I expected
• excellent presentation - appropriate for this age group
• quick - easy lessons
• great information from the session
• a valuable program that kept the kids focused and entertained
• great information in a super-fun manner
• great program - entertained and involved the students
• a life lesson expressed & explained in a serious but funny way
• an excellent performance that kept the children excited and engaged the entire puppet show
• great resources
• both
• great lesson
• exactly what I expected
• it was good the first time but not as interesting after watching it a second time in a row
• great information that students can use immediately
• an awesome show
• interactive experience
• very engaging puppets with matching hand gestures
• a different yet simple approach that kept the kids attention
• what I expected
• skits over bullying
• a very engaging performance that presented their material well
• good reviews from the kids
• just as I expected
• almost exactly what I expected - they taught a very good lesson on how to deal with bullying - they kept the kids attention the whole time - they also included the kids
• a new term for telling - report
• both
• a great show
• exactly that
• fun and valuable lessons for bullying
• another good performance
• an excellent job
• a puppet show about bullying and strangers
• excellent job
• good information
• a great and educational performance
• the above
• great job
• what I expected
• a lot of information to take back to my students
• very entertaining - thank you
• a great engaging presentation
• a wonderful appropriate program
• loved it
• a very child friendly program with lots of excitement
• excellence
• the students paying attention to the show
• an engaging puppet show about bullying and stranger danger
• great life lessons that are developmentally appropriate fun meaningful and unforgettable
• the kids loved the shows
• a great show that the students loved
• and excellent experience with a message much needed in our classroom - calling names has been an issue lately so this lesson is great reinforcement
• fun and interactive material for students
• more than I ever expected - the kids were immersed into the lesson and even I was laughing and engaged - wonderful presenters
• great information
• hand outs
• a performance that was educational and exciting for the students
• a great performance that taught kids what they can do about bullies
• strategies to help children who are teased
• a great educational age appropriate show
• as expected it was wonderful
• valuable lessons on safety, positive reinforcement
• an important discussion for kids
• a show that was so great - teaching the kids about name calling and being nice and about bad strangers
• a puppet show that explained how the puppets worked
• a great show teaching the kids great lessons
• good information - ways to deal with name calling and strangers
• entertainment with awareness education
• a great experience to solve problems between the students and not to hurt feelings
• info about what the show taught them
• same - was fun for kids
• good information of the kids to use
• exactly what I expected
• a very professional performance
• good information
• great performance
• a fantastic performance
• a great performance - very helpful
• fabulous
• a fabulous presentation on the students level ;-) 
• a great puppet show with a great message
• great skit that helps students with bullying and abuse
• what I expected
• a great performance
• thanks so much - this title 1 - poverty school - students need to learn and hear this - great show and age appropriate
• professionals
• a coloring packet to make some copies for my kids
• what I expected
• definitely students
• both
• a play about preventing bullying
• a neat puppet show
• just that
• good shows - wiggle breaks - words - tools - for kids to use interaction with kids
• valuable info on bullying
• great job
• bullying and stranger information in a fun way
• info on bullying - stranger danger - and how to look for help - good strangers
• exactly what I expected
• a great tool for kids
• always enjoy your programs - great job
• yes students engaged with voices and puppets
• an informative - fun - puppet show that taught the kiddos great lessons

The response to the following item: “I most valued:”

• the class involvement
• the reach of the students to their show
• awareness of subject
• the above information
• the excellence of the ability of the puppeteers
• the comedy used to draw the kids in for the information - I like that the students were told that not everything is not bullying
• the clear lessons that will be easy for the kids to remember and apply
• what the kids get out of it - great tips
• the energy of the puppeteers
• the content that was taught
• how they were able to keep all students engaged
• that the performers were professional - on time - etc
• their desire to keep kids safe
• giving the students solutions without scaring them - loved the bad-good stranger
• wonderful appropriate content
• the age appropriateness
• the content was very informative and important for my students
• the lessons taught in a funny way
• the discussion about strangers & the humor
• how the puppeteers interacted with the students - very age appropriate
• it was not to long for young children - just right
• the children laughing and learning at the same time
• student interaction
• the kids loved the show
• the ability of the puppeteers to keep the students attention and set a kindergarten appropriate time frame
• information shared
• stranger danger strategies
• how age appropriate it was
• the age appropriate content
• show was presented on pre-k level - it was age appropriate
• that the show was age-appropriate and relevant
• that it was age appropriate
• how fun and entertaining the lessons were
• how much the students enjoy the show
• talking to the kids at their level - good examples
• the information given to the children in such an appropriate method - vocabulary used in scenario
• the kids being presented with this important information from adults outside of our school and including social media information
• the advice the puppets gave the students for conflict resolution
• seeing my class engaged and having fun
• the way the message was delivered in such an entertaining way
• kids very attentive and interested
• ideas from kids - nice to hear their input and what they do - acting out their ideas
• the information about how to treat others - no matter shape size or color - magic trick was great
• the suggestions to diffuse bullies
• loved it
• the definition of bullying - ways to help kids being bullied
• that this topic is so relevant
• the various options they gave the students
• the laughs from my students - they were engaged but also had fun doing it
• the interest the kids showed
• the kids interaction with the show
• great lesson
• great puppet show - kids are engrossed the whole time
• love the examples given to kids on how to get someone away from a bully - making the students laugh
• how involved the kids were and entertaining the puppeteers were
• the suggestions to prevent bullying and encouraging reporting bullying
• the patience of the puppets with the children and the follow up of understanding
• how the puppeteers interacted with the students
• the humor it helps the older kids engage more
• new ideas to address bullying
• the different approach to learning about the value of reporting or rescuing about bullying
• content taught - stranger danger - bullying
• the humor and audience engagement
• the way the message was delivered - it taught that words do hurt and strategies to use instead - I like the recap for the students
• the content - students connected well with the material and learned important lessons about safety
• wonderful performance
• the message that was shared
• thank you!
• the difference between tattling and reporting
• the ways examples are shown on what to do and repeated
• humor in the script
• the whole performance
• great job
• strategies to deal with bullying
• the message, how trouble-free the production is for the school
• the fact students could easily hear content presented
• this program is age appropriate and very important to this age
• I have seen this program many times - this was the best I have ever seen it done - the addition of microphones and speaker were very helpful :) 
• the idea behind we can't take back the words we say - like the toothpaste - the values and lessons presented were excellent
• hearing the kids talking about what they were taught
• difference between bullying and normal peer conflict; specific examples what to say - do when someone bullies
• specific examples of ways strangers might persuade a child to go with him
• the lessons given
• the fun lesson about bullying
• the students learned while having fun
• their topics
• the presentation and the content, the kids learned and had fun
• the conflict resolution scenarios
• the presentation format - puppets to introduce and important concept for young children
• the student activity (toothpaste) at the end
• the way the presenters explained and discussed subject matter
• how they were age appropriate for the age group
• the way the presenters brought it down to the level of the students
• the connection to the civil rights movement excellent reminder
• the incorporation of the therapeutic qualities of art and music
• advice about talking to a friend - stand up - get help - speak up
• cynthia called on a student who then forgot their answer - she handled this beautifully 'let me say the question again - wait - I forgot" - thank you for reaching our kids through your amazing puppets and your talents!
• the examples on how to handle bullies - telling and reporting
• breaking down conflict resolution for them
• the content of the performance
• I thought it was good information that will hopefully help them to make good choices
• the puppet show keeping pre-k students interested for a longer period of time
• that the staff reiterated on the bullying and stranger danger
• I always tell my grown-up what going on
• the fun engaging show - interactive
• the children reception of this information
• they were calm with the kids
• the way they engaged the students
• the useful hand motions
• developmentally appropriate - humor - interaction with children - appropriate modeling of real life circumstances - conflict resolution - stranger safety - both good and bad
• the way the program held the kid's attention
• good information about good strangers
• the simplicity of the lesson so children can remember and fun interaction
• the kids love the puppets - they are so engrossed by them and tend to hang on every word
• the information that was shared with the parents
• how the kids responded and paid attention to the message
• how they connected with the kids on their level
• students were entertained and learning at the same time
• magic tricks were great - students really enjoyed the show
• this was very informative - the children loved it and stayed interest in it the whole time - very good
• using humor to discuss serious subjects in a way that caught their attention - they will remember the key phrases used
• the puppet show was very appropriate for kids - the students were engaged and enjoyed the show
• examples of how to stop bullying in a safe way
• you’re not the boss of me teaching children how to handle bullying
• appropriate presentation
• interaction with the children
• the message
• lesson spoke age appropriate
• the humor and kindness demonstrated
• something new
• the performance and lesson students learned
• the value of the message
• q & a session
• I enjoyed the presentation myself - good for me that I can explain to the children
• the role playing and the explicit steps to dealing with rescue and report
• the kids being engaged and being able to understand it
• where the kids were told that bullying is where it happens over and over and on purpose
• the puppeteers ability to keep the kids attention
• the information about bullying for the kids - how to handle bullies
• they presented realistic problems and showed safe solutions - called it reporting - not tattle-telling
• the fun they had
• the interaction and keeping the attention of kids so they would receive the great message
• the humor that they put into the show because it always keeps kids attention and they have fun and don't even realize that they're learning something
• the reinforcement of the subject
• the information presented in a manner that kept the kids involved and brought to their minds new ideas that they didn't think of before
• the messages they delivered
• the humor; the content
• the students attention they gave to this performance
• how you keep the students engaged and how much they learn
• their ability to keep their attention
• the sticks and stones talk
• the engagement and kid friendly language
• the distraction method is a great idea to teach kids
• great job
• I liked the way they involved the students
• the word upstander I’ve never heard this before and will discuss with kids
• the content presented during the show
• the way they interacted with the students q & a style was effective
• the humor that kept everyone engaged
• how they got the students involved to make it more interesting
• reference to magic triad and great attention getters
• that the show was so developmentally appropriate for little ones, very good information and great at involving the students
• great job
• the stranger portion
• the fun and funny way the content was presented
• how quick and to the point the skits were
• the message the children received to protect themselves - this is the 2nd year for my class - they so enjoy the program
• the characters show how to keep a friend from lashing out for no reason - talking to another person about the bully
• the way the presentation was presented on a level the kids could understand and relate to
• involvement of the audience
• the examples given to the examples
• the puppets explaining that it is never oh to put your hands on anyone
• the lesson regarding strangers
• everything it was all great
• lessons taught that they will stay will the kindergartners for a life time
• that the information was presented in a fun engaging meaningful way
• how they are kind and age appropriate for the kids
• how engaging the show was
• audience participation
• positive interactions with children - enthusiasm
• that troy and cynthia involved the students and were very animated
• how they interact with the kids and are age level
• the explanations and problem solving modeling the characters displayed - especially the steps to avoid being taken by a stranger.
• the interaction with the kids
• all of it - it was on grade level - the children enjoyed it - the performers were great
• the interaction the puppeteers have with kids
• the message of name calling and its effect on students
• they way they were so friendly to the kids
• the entertaining way you delivered such an important message
• student participation
• the techniques show to the kids on how to handle situations
• the topics about bad strangers - very helpful
• the fact that the manner in which the presenters made my students feel at ease
• the interaction with the kids - the examples they gave the kids to use
• examples
• how they engaged the children and kept them in control
• the lesson they learned
• their passion to teach this important information
• definitions and examples of what to do
• the different scenarios
• they gave multiple examples/solutions to conflict
• entertainment with a message
• the message conveyed to our students about name calling
• topics taught - with laughter
• I love how they draw the kids in and how well they pay attention
• the lesson that was taught
• giving kids ways to deal with bullies
• relating to kids real life
• I love this program and so do the kids
• the students relate to the presentations
• interaction with students
• what to do when...
• great explanation
• puppet format and on children's level
• clearly speakers and colorful characters
• the talk about stranger danger
• the way the presenters interacted with the students
• the students enthusiasm to the puppets and content
• definitely interested and engaged students
• both, but particularly stranger
• the audience participation
• the actors talking with the children
• that it was age appropriate and the performers allowed the kids to get excited and loud at certain points
• stranger is anyone you don’t know - ask a grown up not a kid
• you guys are great
• the fact that students were given specific strategies to combat bullying and choosing between right and wrong and being able to stand up for your right choices
• good show - funny - easy to follow - very informative
• how the puppeteers connected to the kids
• kids were focused and entertained and learning
• the messages about bullying - name calling - and stranger danger in a fun way
• their enthusiasm and humor in dealing with serious issues - keeps the kids engaged
• the concrete ideas you give kids to cope with perceived threats - bullying - positive ways to diffuse / deescalate
• your time
• the topics stranger danger - no bullying
• the lessons the kids were taught

The response to the following item, “In the future I would like to see:”

• a smaller setting - I think my kids were too spread out
• more audience participation
• more presentations like this one - great job
• any of the other bullying scripts
• another show
• this same program - thank you so much
• shake it up
• a different show for 1st grade on safety and bullying
• more of them again
• the stranger danger part be approached with a little less humor
• not sure
• more great work
• more of the shows - I think you guys put on a good show with great lessons - thank you
• another show
• more examples of situations
• more of the same - thanks so much for sharing with my students
• great job
• more shows on different topics
• to continue these discussions
• more the kids loved it
• more shows
• you come back
• another show added - maybe - shake it up or rescue or report
• shake it up - conflict resolution - vocabulary for students to use to identify solutions - the golden rule
• nothing changed
• other shows on bullying
• other scripts too :)
• any of the presentations - awesome - awesome - thank you
• :-)
• more about girl on girl bullying - acted out
• loved it
• shake it up - conflict resolution
• I love it just as it is
• more about cyberbullying
• more of the same
• any of the shows
• more about bullying
• the program again
• more :)
• engaging and memorable
• they need one more person to walk around with a microphone when doing the questions at the end
• discuss the difference between a bully and someone just having a bad day - bullying is repeated behavior
• conflict resolution
• more of the awesome shows
• thank you
• a program of what is and is not bullying
• you again
• more of the same
• more shows geared for different age groups
• some of the other programs - like other "abuse" programs or divorce
• another presentation - excellent - thanks!
• shake it up
• careful thought put into discussing bad strangers and good strangers - I felt the presentation was a bit confusing in this area
• another puppet show on same subjects with a clearer distinction made between strangers - good strangers - police officers etc and - bad strangers - someone you don’t know
• more student response
• shake it up and this one again
• bullying - conflict resolution
• everything was great
• I enjoyed both presentations
• thank you
• more visits - maybe should have been on the stage so kids in the back could see
• more
• more of the performances
• more songs - more skits - more info to take home with kids
• self-regulation - example conscious discipline by beck bailey
• more presentations
• simple material that are age appropriate to pass out to children - also a body safety class - talking about body parts
• a program on middle school issues since they are moving on to that the next year
• abuse with older kids
• shake it up
• 1st grade may need to be divided into a smaller group
• please come back
• maybe a little bit longer or maybe do 2 puppet shows instead of one
• thank you
• them at my school 2 x a year
• more of the same - maybe some hygiene education for kindergarten
• other workshops listed about - great job
• how to resolve conflict without fighting
• growing up, adolescent years, pre-teens, body changing etc
• more of their shows
• louder mics
• how even playful jokes can hurt - don't reciprocate the name calling/bullying
• them come back and talk to the older kids
• it was a little hard to understand what they were saying a first so maybe project a little more and pronounce the consonants a little more loudly. Please warn people if they are sitting somewhere that is going to block a spot that you go to during the show
• the difference between tattling and reporting - telling
• this program each year
• special effects - just kidding, it’s always great ;-) 
• same
• the same type of presentation
• you're not the boss of me and shake it up
• more puppets and a little louder performance
• great - thank you
• great job
• I really like the list of best brain deads ever
• the same show
• additional topics - presentation is amazing
• shake it up - maybe later in the school year
• last year was the same - If I remember correctly - and so a few of mine that went to prek said they had seen it before - maybe a movement sond could be fun halfway through - great show
• the name calling came at the right time - we had a talk about name calling this morning
• you're not the boss of me
• shake it up
• more puppets
• other puppet shows - it was great
• more shows
• I wouldn't change a thing - great job
• another show with the same 2 people
• continued awareness for children
• more about bullying and what to do
• a lot of the same scripts you are already performing
• fyi a little hard to hear troy when he was melody
• you are good at what you do, but most of our kids are too old to take this seriously
• other scripts - wonderful program - thank you so much
• one on sharing and listening to adults as well as following directions
• the kids love them
• every year
• these presentations again
• just keep coming back - good job - could be a little louder - little hard to hear with other distractions & noises in the area
• more talk about strangers danger
• this performance
• less talking before the show - talk about bunraku after the show
• the actors give a detailed introduction
• nothing it was great
• repeat for kinder next year - may how to - why we follow rules
• the same stuff - it’s awesome
• more like this
• the same info
• more of the same
• even more shows
• great
Summary

The results for the Kids on the Block program were consistently positive. The teacher response to the program was positive. Of all respondents, 87.5% agreed that they would recommend the program to others. And 86% agreed that the performance was interesting while 86.1% agreed that it was developmentally appropriate. Teacher comments were also positive towards the program, both in terms of content of the program as well as the presentation itself. Overall, Kids on the Block received positive feedback from teachers.
**Never Shake a Baby**

The Never Shake a Baby program has drastically changed in the past year. Up until the end of 2014, the program focused solely on delivering the *Period of PURPLE Crying* curriculum via one Nurse Educator meeting with moms of newborns in local hospitals. The *Period of PURPLE Crying* is an evidence-based infant abuse prevention program which educates parents and caregivers about normal infant crying and the dangers of shaking an infant.

In 2015, PCCT integrated a new component into our hospital outreach called *Talking is Teaching*, which is presented alongside the *Period of PURPLE Crying* curriculum. Messages shared include the value of talking, storytelling, reading, and singing to babies which increases bonding and attachment while also serving as effective strategies for calming crying babies. The goal of *Talking is Teaching* is to build the earliest foundations of literacy. The program is based on the research of Betty Hart and Todd R. Risley who found that daily exchanges between parents and children shape language and vocabulary development.

The Parent Child Center of Tulsa currently employs five full time Nurse Educators who embed themselves into the six major hospitals in the Tulsa area. The Nurse Educators present the *Period of PURPLE Crying* and *Talking is Teaching* curricula to mom's and other caregivers of newborns prior to hospital discharge. The Nurse Educators also provide families with the *Period of PURPLE Crying* DVD and *Talking is Teaching* materials such as: tote bag, book, CD, DVD, booklet with important milestones, t-shirt, and other information.

Due to the expansion in staff and the addition of *Talking is Teaching*, The Parent Child Center of Tulsa spent time this year re-evaluating its outcome measures for this program. New outcome measures have been created and the collection of information revised. These measures were implemented during the latter part of 2015; therefore, there is limited outcome information to report at this time. By next year, the measures will have been in process long enough to have information to share.
Shelter

The Parent Child Center of Tulsa’s Shelter program is a service within the Tulsa County Emergency Shelter that provides support to families with children during their stay there. Shelter residents are offered the opportunity to meet with the Family Support Worker for individual or family support. Family Support Services provides crisis intervention, counseling, educational hand-outs, and groups to discuss parenting issues, personal issues as well as a time for family interaction, games and crafts. Information about needed community resources is provided when families have needs outside the scope of services provided by the Parent Child Center Family Support Services or County Shelter programs.

In the past year, the Shelter program has experienced some transition that has prevented outcomes from being obtained from this program. Initially, a Shelter resident survey was being collected with the intention of gaining information on how to make the groups more beneficial for parents in the shelter. While making these changes, the Family Support Worker resigned from this position. Additionally, the funding source changed this year from the City of Tulsa EGS Grant to the Tulsa County Shelter providing a smaller amount of funds to assist with this position. At this time, the Parent Child Center of Tulsa is currently working with the Tulsa County Shelter staff to redesign the program to best meet the needs of the residents and staff. Once that piece is accomplished, outcomes will be redesigned to measure the impact being made with this population.