

Next Steps for Rigorous Research on Two-Generation Approaches

Two-Generation Mutual Reinforcement Measurement Tool

**Sponsored by
Administration for Children and Families,
Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation**

June 2023

INTRODUCTION

The Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE), within the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), has developed the Next Steps for Rigorous Research on Two-Generation Approaches (NS2G) project to continue building the evidence base for two-generation approaches to improving outcomes for children, primary caregivers, and families. This measurement tool was developed as part of the NS2G project.

The Two-Generation Mutual Reinforcement Measurement Tool taps into four concepts: Partners, Principles, Infrastructure, and Service Delivery Strategies. It is intended to provide an indication of mutual reinforcement, which is defined as *Service providers aligning and building on each other's efforts toward achieving a shared vision and common or compatible goals for serving whole families*. The involved service providers may be from one or multiple organizations, depending on the structure of their two-generation initiative. Efforts of these service providers can include, but are not limited to, designing and offering services of high quality and appropriate intensity to primary caregivers and children in the same families; developing and using consistent age-appropriate measures for both caregivers and children in the same family to assess and evaluate their goals; and seeking to create a common theory of change or aligned mission statements to positively affect both generations within a family. Efforts are intentionally differentiated and coordinated to leverage each service provider's area of strength or expertise, with the idea that those efforts will become synergized and strengthened to achieve broader, shared outcomes for each generation beyond what each service provider would have been able to achieve alone.

EXERCISE DESCRIPTION

This measurement tool can be used by (1) evaluators to quantify a two-generation initiative's mutual reinforcement, and (2) two-generation initiative teams and partners to identify opportunities to strengthen their mutual reinforcement.

EXERCISE HOW-TO

1. **Complete the questionnaire.** One person is not likely able to answer all the questions on their own. Consider completing the questionnaire in a small group or working individually and then meeting with your team to reach consensus among staff and partners. The survey should take about 25 minutes for each person to complete individually. Additional group collaboration should take an estimated 30 minutes depending on the depth of discussion.
2. **Tabulate responses.** Enter your responses in the electronic version of the tool to generate your mutual reinforcement score. The electronic version is available in Appendix D at <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/opre/report/two-generation-mutual-reinforcement-measurement-tool>.
3. **Review your results.** Discuss your results with your two-generation staff and partners. Consider the areas where you might work together or internally within your organization to strengthen the initiative's mutual reinforcement.

IMPORTANT EXERCISE DEFINITIONS

- **Two-generation initiative.** A program, strategy, or effort that intentionally combines intensive, high-quality adult-focused services with intensive, high-quality child-focused programs (such as Head Start or early childhood education) to improve outcomes for children, primary caregivers, and families.
- **Two-generation partner.** Entities, such as service providers, researchers, or funders, who come together to design, implement, and/or assess a two-generation initiative. Partners often have a decision-making role. These entities may be internal or external.
- **External interested party.** Persons, groups, or organizations that have an interest in an organization's success, such as families served, other partner organizations, and policymakers. Interested parties might serve in an advisory role that consists of giving advice, formulating opinions, or making recommendations on topics that affect the community, but they do not play a decision-making role.
- **Family.** The two-generation model views a family as a child or children and the adults with primary caregiving responsibility for the child or children. Adults in a child's life who fulfill the caregiver role may be parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles, foster parents, stepparents, and others.

- **Outcome data.** Information collected to track the results of an activity, results of a service, and/or participant progress and help inform decision making, such as possible changes to the initiative’s design or the services it provides.
- **Outcome measure.** A metric that staff or evaluators can use to assess the extent to which an initiative has achieved its expected results.
- **Shared data.** Data that can be accessed and analyzed across various reports, systems, software, and platforms.
- **Shared data system.** A data management system (software and platform) that is centralized and/or easily accessible across internal and/or external service providers that partner to deliver the two-generation services; enables initiatives to collect and store data about families and services, as well as conduct analysis and reporting.
- **Shared vision.** A common understanding of a problem and a joint approach to solving it through agreed-upon actions.
- **Theory of change.** An explanation of how a group of partners expect to reach a commonly understood long-term goal; sometimes referred to as a logic model.

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

- Instructions are noted in **blue**.
- Answer all questions to the best of your ability and be as accurate as possible.
- For each item, please mark only one answer.
- Some answer options are followed by a directional arrow (→) and a “GO TO” instruction. After marking your response, please proceed to the appropriate question, as indicated by the arrow and “GO TO” instruction.
- If no instruction is provided, you should continue to the next question.

We want to know how many *two-generation partners* you work with in your initiative. By *partner*, we mean the organizations or individuals (for example, service providers, researchers, or funders) that you work with to design, implement, and/or assess your two-generation initiative. Partners often have a decision-making role. This does not include *external interested parties* who serve in advisory, non-decision-making roles or partners you work with who are not involved in your two-generation initiative (for further clarification, see the definitions of *partner* and *external interested parties* in the *Important Exercise Definitions* section).

- Please list all of your distinct two-generation partners in the table below. List each partner only once. If a partner falls under multiple categories, please use the category that best describes their primary role within your initiative. Enter "0" if no partner falls under a category.**

IF NONE, ENTER 0

TYPE OF PARTNER(S)	NAME OF PARTNER(S)
a. COMMUNITY SERVING ORGANIZATIONS (e.g., out-of-school-time programs, child care providers, community-based organizations, elderly services, employment programs, family services providers, health care establishments).	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
b. LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENT (e.g., child welfare agencies, education representatives, human services agencies, juvenile justice agencies, local policy makers, state policy makers).....	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
c. OTHER (e.g., media/communications, philanthropists/funders, researchers, academics, or evaluators).....	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

For the remainder of this survey, “All partners in our two-generation initiative” refers to your organization and the organizations, agencies, and/or individuals you indicated in Question 1.

2. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements: All partners in our two-generation initiative...

MARK ONLY ONE PER ROW

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER DISAGREE NOR AGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
a. Have access to a <u>list and description</u> of all partners involved in the initiative.....	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
b. Are <u>knowledgeable</u> about all partners involved in the initiative.....	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
c. Understand how all partners <u>work together</u> in the initiative.....	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
d. <u>Share an overarching vision</u> for change of how they would like to affect family well-being	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
e. Are <u>committed</u> to the shared vision	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
f. Have common or compatible <u>goals</u> to achieve the shared vision and serve the families enrolled in the initiative.....	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
g. Have <u>mission statements</u> that align with the shared vision	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
h. Have agreed on a <u>theory of change</u> for two-generation work	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
i. Have agreed on an <u>action plan</u> that specifies the strategies and actions that different partners have committed to implementing.....	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
j. Have changed their individual programs/services to <u>better align</u> with the action plan	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
k. <u>Review</u> the action plan in response to learning about our two-generation initiative’s successes, challenges, and opportunities.....	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>

We would like to know more about the programs and services you and all of your partners provide as part of your two-generation initiative.

3. Across all two-generation partners, including your own organization, approximately how many programs/services are available as part of your two-generation initiative that match the following descriptions? Count each program/service only once. If a program/service falls under multiple categories, please use the category that best describes the focus of the services provided. Enter "0" if no program/service falls under a category.

IF NONE, ENTER 0

	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS/ SERVICES
a. Child-focused (e.g., early childhood education)	_ _
b. Child-focused with parent elements (e.g., parenting skills, family literacy)	_ _
c. Whole family (e.g., food, housing, transportation)	_ _
d. Parent-focused with child elements (e.g., child care, work supports).....	_ _
e. Parent-focused (e.g., employment services)	_ _

4. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements: All partners in our two-generation initiative...

MARK ONLY ONE PER ROW

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER DISAGREE NOR AGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	DON'T KNOW
a. Have access to a <u>list and description</u> of all programs/services offered	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
b. Understand <u>all</u> programs/services offered	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
c. <u>Regularly communicate</u> with one another about all programs/services	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
d. Regularly review all programs/services to determine if they can be better <u>linked or aligned</u>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
e. Regularly review all programs/services to ensure they are of <u>appropriate intensity</u> to support families in reaching their goals	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
f. Regularly review all programs/services to <u>identify gaps or duplication</u>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
g. <u>Realign</u> programs/services to be implemented more coherently across the initiative	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
h. Hold each other <u>accountable</u> for implementing programs/services as planned.....	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
i. Seek out opportunities to <u>build upon</u> existing programs/services	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
j. Use <u>partners' known strengths</u> when creating new programs/services	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
k. Have developed or refined <u>internal policies or procedures</u> to support programs/services	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
l. Have devoted resources for <u>staff development, training and/or competency</u> to deliver high quality programs/services	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
m. Have <u>common measures or indicator(s)</u> to track progress of families consistently across time	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>

5. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements: **All partners in our two-generation initiative...**

MARK ONLY ONE PER ROW

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER DISAGREE NOR AGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	DON'T KNOW
a. Have made efforts to <u>simplify</u> how families access programs and services across partners	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
b. Have <u>tailored</u> the <u>enrollment process</u> so families can easily enroll in programs/services that meet their needs <u>across partners</u>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
c. Have <u>aligned</u> adult-child <u>eligibility requirements</u> across all programs/services to the best of their abilities.....	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
d. Have overlapping <u>on-site</u> programs/services for parent(s) and child(ren) in the <u>same family</u>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
e. <u>Collaborate across</u> programs/services around the needs of parent(s) and child(ren) in the <u>same family</u> to the best of their abilities	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
f. Have <u>aligned</u> the <u>content</u> of programs/services for parent(s) and child(ren) in the same family	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>
g. Seek out <u>family feedback</u> to monitor program/service quality	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>	d <input type="radio"/>

We would like to know how you and your partners collect and share data related to your two-generation initiative. These data could be individual information on families, the programs, or services in which families are enrolled; outcome measures; or aggregated program information like reports.

6. Do you and your partners **collect** data about families, services, or outcomes related to your two-generation initiative?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Yes, all partners
- 2 Yes, most partners
- 3 Yes, about half of partners
- 4 Yes, but only a few partners
- 0 No, partners do not collect any data → GO TO END

7. Do you and your partners **share aggregate or individual** data about families, services, or outcomes related to your two-generation initiative?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Yes, all partners
- 2 Yes, most partners
- 3 Yes, about half of partners
- 4 Yes, but only a few partners
- 0 No, partners do not share any data → GO TO Q14

8. **Shared data, aggregate or individual, are available to you and your partners for which of the following family members...**

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Child only
- 2 Parent only
- 3 Both parent and child
- 0 Neither parent nor child → GO TO Q14

9. **Which method best describes how you and your partners share data about families, services, or outcomes related to your two-generation initiative?**

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Partners have a common shared database
- 2 Partners have access to other partners' databases
- 3 Partners share individual data, routinely
- 4 Partners share individual data, but only as needed
- 5 Partners share aggregate data, routinely
- 6 Partners share aggregate data, but only as needed → GO TO Q13

10. **Do you and your partners have the ability to link outcome data for parent(s) and child(ren) in the same family?**

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 All data are linked
- 2 Some data are linked
- 0 None, data are not linked

We would like to know what individual data you and your two-generation partners collect or share and whether the data are linked amongst members of the same family. If you don't have a partner that collects information described in one of the listed categories, select not applicable (n.a.).

11. For families who are enrolled in your initiative, which of the following individual outcome data do you have access to?
12. If you have access to these data, is it linked to other data for other members in the same family?

FOR EACH QUESTION, MARK ONLY ONE PER ROW

	Q11					Q12	
	n.a.	DON'T HAVE ACCESS TO THESE DATA	CHILD DATA ONLY	PARENT DATA ONLY	BOTH PARENT AND CHILD DATA	NO, DATA ARE NOT LINKED	YES, DATA ARE LINKED
a. Early care and education (e.g., Head Start, child care partnerships, Pre-K, home visiting).....	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>
b. Elementary and secondary school (e.g., elementary/middle/high school or vocational training at the secondary level)	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>
c. Postsecondary education (e.g., community college, training or certification).....	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>
d. Employment services (e.g., apprenticeships, on the job training)	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>
e. Health and well-being (e.g., mental, physical or behavioral health, access to care).....	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>
f. Economic stabilization and basic needs (e.g., asset building, housing and public benefits, transportation, food assistance)..	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>
g. Other (specify) _____	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	0 <input type="radio"/>	1 <input type="radio"/>

13. When sharing aggregated or individual two-generation data in the past six months, all partners in our two-generation initiative have demonstrated the following...

MARK ONLY ONE PER ROW

	NEVER	SELDOM	ABOUT HALF THE TIME	USUALLY	ALWAYS
a. Timely data entry	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
b. Accurate data entry	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
c. Standardized data entry	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
d. Complete data entry	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>

14. In the past six months, all partners in our two-generation initiative have used aggregated or individual data to...

MARK ONLY ONE PER ROW

	NEVER	SELDOM	ABOUT HALF THE TIME	USUALLY	ALWAYS
a. Measure progress on shared goal(s).....	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
b. Guide shared action/strategy.....	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
c. Improve program/service quality	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>
d. Evaluate impact of shared efforts	1 <input type="radio"/>	2 <input type="radio"/>	3 <input type="radio"/>	4 <input type="radio"/>	5 <input type="radio"/>

END

Thank you for completing the questionnaire!

References

Anderson, A.A. "The Community Builder's Approach to Theory of Change: A Practical Guide to Theory Development." New York: The Aspen Institute, June 2011. https://www.theoryofchange.org/pdf/TOC_fac_guide.pdf.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. "Data Governance for Two-Generation Programs: Planning Tool Kit." Baltimore, MD: AECF, October 2019. <https://assets.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-datagovernancefortwogen-2019.pdf>.

Ascend at the Aspen Institute. "Making Tomorrow Better Together: A Guide to Outcomes for 2Gen Policymakers." Washington, DC: Ascend at the Aspen Institute, October 2017. <https://ascend-resources.aspeninstitute.org/resources/making-tomorrow-better-together-a-guide-to-outcomes-for-2gen-policymakers>.

Ascend at the Aspen Institute. "Making Tomorrow Better Together: Process Outcomes and Measures for 2Gen Organizational Change." Washington, DC: Ascend at the Aspen Institute, October 2020. <https://ascend-resources.aspeninstitute.org/resources/making-tomorrow-better-together-process-outcomes-and-measures-for-2gen-organizational-change>.

Conroy, Kara, Sarah Brunskill, and Amanda Carrillo-Perez. "The Two-Generation Mutual Reinforcement Measurement Tool: Development and Pilot Findings." OPRE Report #2023-149, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2023.

Future Services Institute and Minnesota 2-Gen Policy Network. "2-Gen Principles to Practice: A Tool for Minnesota Program Managers Committed to Using 2-Gen Approaches for Implementing Social Programs." Minneapolis, MN: January 2018. <https://mn.gov/mmb-stat/2-gen/2-Gen-Principles-to-Practice.pdf>.

Lynn, J., S. Stachowiak, L. Gase, J. Roos, S. Oppenheimer, A. Dane, T. Akey, Jet al. "When Collective Impact Has an Impact: A Cross-Site Study of 25 Collective Impact Initiatives." Denver, CO, and Seattle, WA: Spark Policy Institute and ORS Impact, March 2018. http://www.orsimpact.com/DirectoryAttachments/10262018_111513_477_CI_Study_Report_10-26-2018.pdf.

Marguerite Casey Foundation. "Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool." Marguerite Casey Foundation, April 2012. <https://cbtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Marguerite-Casey-Blank.xlsx>.

McDaniel, M., T. Anderson, A. Okoli, S.J. Popkin, A. Coffey, and P. Gwam. "Developing Place-Based Two-Generation Partnerships: Lessons from Three Community Change Initiative Partnerships." Report submitted to the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Baltimore, MD: Urban Institute, 2021. <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/103680/developing-place-based-two-generation-partnerships.pdf>.

Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. "Next Steps for Rigorous Research on Two-Generation Approaches (NS2G): 2019–2023." Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, August 2020. <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/opre/project/next-steps-rigorous-research-two-generation-approaches-ns2g-2019-2023-0>.

Preskill, H., M. Parkhurst, and J. Splansky Juster. "The Guide to Evaluating Collective Impact: Learning and Evaluation in the Collective Impact Context." Boston, MA: FSG, 2001. <https://www.fsg.org/resource/guide-evaluating-collective-impact/>.

Ward, C., A. Metz, L. Louison, A. Loper, and D. Cusumano. "Drivers Best Practices Assessment." Chapel Hill, NC: National Implementation Research Network, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Based on Fixsen, D.L., K. Blase, S. Naom, A. Metz, L. Louison, and C. Ward. "Implementation Drivers: Assessing Best Practices." Chapel Hill, NC: National Implementation Research Network, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED606172.pdf>.

Mathematica and Equal Measure. "Self-Assessment of Place-Based Systems Change Efforts." Prepared for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. 2021. <https://www.mathematica.org/publications/self-assessment-of-place-based-systems-of-change-efforts>.

June 2023
OPRE Report 2023-149

Project Officers: Kathleen Dwyer, Erin Cannon, and Emily Ross
Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

This report and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation are available at www.acf.hhs.gov/opre.

Contract/Task Number: HHSP233201500035I / 75P00119F37047

Project Director and Deputy Project Director: Emily Sama-Miller and Scott Baumgartner, Mathematica
1100 1st Street, NE, 12th Floor, Washington, DC 20002-4221

This report is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary. Suggested citation: Conroy, Kara, Sarah Brunskill, and Amanda Carrillo-Perez (2023). The Two-Generation Mutual Reinforcement Measurement Tool, OPRE Report #2023-149, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Connect with OPRE

