Project Performance Report:

Advancing Equity in Child Support

Submitted to:
The State of Minnesota Department of Children, Youth, and Families

Submitted by:[1]
Melissa Perez
Mindy E. Scott



12300 Twinbrook Pkwy, Suite 235, Rockville, MD 20852 | Tel: (240) 223-9200 | childtrends.org

This research is supported by Grant Number HHS-2023-ACF-OCSE-FD-0022 from the Office of Child Support Services within the Administration for Children and Families, a division of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Neither the Administration for Children and Families nor any of its components operate, control, are responsible for, or necessarily endorse this research (including, without limitation, its content). The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Administration for Children and Families and the Office of Child Support Services.

[1] **Acknowledgement:** The authors thank Ellen Rutledge and Jane Venohr for their substantive reviews.

Contents

Introduction 3
Collaborating Organizations and Roles 3
Review of Objectives 4
Objective 1 4
Objective 2 6
Objective 3 8
Objective 4 9
Objective 5 11
Continuous Quality Improvement Efforts 12
Conclusion 12
Appendices 14
Appendix A. Project performance monitoring plan 14
Appendix B. Monthly pulse survey questions 25

Introduction

The Advancing Equity in Child Support (CS) project has several objectives:

- **Objective 1**: Conduct a family-centered assessment (FCA) in each of the lead and co-lead states; based on findings, develop resources and recommendations to advance family-centered principles
- **Objective 2**: Demonstrate how to collect and analyze data to assess how well programs center families' perspectives, well-being, and outcomes
- **Objective 3**: Demonstrate how to effectively build relationships and engage with program participants and other partners
- **Objective 4**: Raise awareness of family-centered principles for grant participants as well as broader CS audiences
- **Objective 5**: Manage the project to ensure integrated and seamless collaboration across partners

This report details the project tasks implemented to meet each objective, including a summary of inputs, status and major milestones, and measures of success. For each objective, this report will describe in detail how associated tasks were implemented and the successes and challenges encountered. See Appendix A for the inputs, key activities, and outcomes identified to achieve each objective.

Collaborating Organizations and Roles

This project was a collaboration between the following organizations:

- **Minnesota Department of Children, Youth, and Families (MN DCYF), Michigan Department of Health and Human Services Office of Child Support (MDHHS OCS), and California Department of Child Support Services (CA DCSS)**: MN DCYF is the prime recipient of a federal grant from the Office of Child Support Services (OCSS). MN, MI, and CA served as co-lead states working with CGI Technologies and Solutions Inc. (CGI) and Child Trends (CT) to develop and tailor their FCA of the needs of parents, children, and families within their state. Office and program leadership provided insight from their experiences supporting families, and they offered feedback at many stages in the process.
- **CGI**: CGI led overall project functions, including overseeing CT and the Center for Policy Research's (CPR) respective scopes.
- **CT**: CT designed and implemented FCAs for each state. CT conducted document reviews, analyzed data from state administrators and/or parents ordered to receive or pay support, and detailed their findings in each state's report. CT also developed a

conceptual model, resource guide, and historical brief to inform the direction of the work.

- **CPR**: CPR led the environmental scan and literature review task, as well as the analysis of administrative data to further inform each state's focus of their FCA.
- **Research in Action (RIA)**: RIA led the creation and establishment of the Parent Advisory Council for Minnesota. RIA also developed and administered the state-wide survey.
- **National Fatherhood Initiative (NFI)**: The NFI served as a consultant to RIA, providing expertise on the establishment of the Parent Advisory Council as well as the state-wide survey.

The information presented in this report was gathered from various sources. With the exception of RIA and the NFI, the organizations listed above submitted monthly pulse surveys reporting on the work completed in the previous month. See Appendix B for a detailed list of questions asked in the pulse surveys. The responses were input into Google Notebook, which summarized the responses and organized them under the established objectives. Other project artifacts, including PowerPoint slides from quarterly consortium meetings, were used to provide context to each organization's roles and responsibilities. Monthly status reports submitted by CGI, which included updates from each organization, were also analyzed to identify the status of key activities and report on obstacles.

Review of Objectives

Objective 1

Objective 1 was to conduct FCAs in each of the lead and co-lead states, and to develop resources and recommendations based on the findings from the assessments to advance family-centered principles. Each state also focused on a specific child support issue of interest: California selected pass-through of arrears (PAA) payments to former assistance families, Michigan focused on Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) distributions, and Minnesota's assessment focused on child support policies for parents with incarceration histories. Two tasks were implemented to assist with this objective. Task 1.1 was a literature review and environmental scan to help inform the assessments. Task 1.2 included the development and application of an FCA tool. See Appendix A for the inputs, key activities, and outcomes identified to achieve Objective 1.

1.1 A literature review and an environmental scan to inform state FCAs

Implementation

CPR was responsible for conducting a literature review of existing CS policies and practices that promote equity, as well as an environmental scan of existing equity analysis tools and resources

used by state and local CS programs. CPR shared their drafts and findings with the project's partners and federal partners for review.

Successes and Challenges

One success from Task 1.1 was the amount of positive and constructive stakeholder feedback received on early drafts of the literature review. This indicates that reviewers were engaged and invested in the outcome of the review and valued CPR's effort to summarize the current state of the field.

The main challenge encountered with Task 1.1 was delays in the writing schedule, as well as extensive feedback from OCSS. One respondent to the monthly pulse survey expressed regret about not working more closely with OCSS early in the process to identify their expectations for the literature review.

1.2 Development and application of an FCA tool to guide CS programs

Implementation

To implement this task, CT developed a conceptual model and toolkit/resource guide. The conceptual model, titled "*A Conceptual Model to Support Family-Centered Assessments of Child Support Programs*," defines family-centered programs and highlights the importance of family-centered assessments for CS systems. The conceptual model also offers suggestions for adapting CS programs to be aligned with family-centered principles. The resource guide details five key activities for conducting an FCA, including goals, tasks, definitions, questions, and checklist templates.

CT conducted FCAs for MI, CA, and MN, developing a report for each state that outlined the assessment process and activities aligned with the resource guide and summarized key findings. As part of each assessment, CT assisted states in selecting policies to focus on, determined and requested relevant information, assessed policy information, and worked with states to collect qualitative data from program participants and/or administrators.

Successes and Challenges

Successes for Task 1.2 include meaningful collaboration across states and a strengthened understanding of existing infrastructure, providing states with new ways to think about their in-house data. For example, as a result of this task, the MI information technology (IT) staff scheduled weekly meetings to review data requests and rolled out administrative data extracts in chunks, using an iterative process to troubleshoot issues quickly and efficiently.

In implementing Task 1.2, the project team encountered several challenges related to data collection. Some examples include delays in obtaining data sharing agreements (DSAs), challenges navigating state- and organization-level Institutional Review Board (IRB)

requirements, difficulty recruiting parents, and incompatible data pulled from administrative systems.

Objective 2

Objective 2 was to demonstrate how to collect and analyze data to assess how well programs center families' perspectives, well-being, and outcomes. Two tasks were implemented to achieve this objective. Task 2.1 included the collection of new data in MN's administrative data system to support family-centered analysis. Task 2.2 was the analysis of CS administrative data in the lead and co-lead states that could be used to fulfill or partially fulfill the data questions of the FCA tool. Each state was asked to identify a child support issue where they had concerns or reservations about child support policies. See Appendix A for the inputs, key activities, and outcomes identified to achieve Objective 2.

2.1 Collection of new data in MN's administrative data system to support family-centered analysis

Implementation

MN DCYF recognized the longstanding need to update race and ethnicity data fields in PRISM, its case management system. When PRISM was built, the seven values for identifying race and ethnicity were limited and reflected language and terms used at that time. Adding to the problem, interfaces between PRISM and other systems were overriding race and ethnicity values, making the data inaccurate. This grant provided funding and resources for MN DCYF to make the necessary changes. Namely, MN currently offers 23 race and ethnicity options for participants to select. This will allow for more specific data collection to help the agency develop policies and practices that enable them to monitor program satisfaction for all families.

Successes and Challenges

Despite a small risk of delays, the PRISM system enhancements in Task 2.1 were successful, completed on schedule, and achieved alignment with the project's principles related to family centering.

CGI created the "*Updating Child Support Systems for Inclusivity Guide*," which documents the process for another agency wishing to conduct a similar project.

2.2 Analysis of CS administrative data in the lead and co-lead states

Implementation

Analyses were conducted to further inform the FCAs, specifically, on a state-identified issue (i.e. PAA in California, DRA distributions in Michigan, and child support actions taken against parents after they are released from prison in Minnesota). CGI and CPR established DSAs with the lead and co-lead states. CPR analyzed child support outcomes for each state's identified topic of

interest. The analysis considered differences in several family/parent demographics such as age, race and ethnicity, number of children, and other demographics.

Successes and Challenges

The project team faced several challenges in Task 2.2. Namely, there were considerable delays in getting the data to the point where it could be analyzed due to the delays in obtaining DSAs, working with state information technology experts on what system data matched the data request, parceling the data extracts into manageable files, reviewing extracts for data quality and accuracy, rolling up the data to the case or individual level and then merging the files, and developing data dictionaries from the automated system that could be used by the researchers.

Data parceling helped streamline the extracts. The data were parceled by how the data were organized (e.g., demographics were by the parent or the child support order, and payment data was organized by whether it was distributed to current support, family/state arrears and the type of arrears: child support or medical support). In turn, CPR rolled up the data to the unit of the analysis (e.g., the parent when a parent had multiple cases or orders). This is a tedious task when it comes to payments and distributions since most cases have dozens of payments and distributions that had to be rolled up to the case level.

Although automated systems are documented, there is no way to easily extract a data dictionary that aligns with the data being used for the analysis easily. Data labels are not always obvious (e.g., whether Medi-arrears means arrears owed for Medicare and whether that includes cash medical support and Medicare birthing fees). Creating a data dictionary for research purposes required a lot of back and forth between the state's data experts and CPR.

CPR found periodic meetings with the staff extracting the data very helpful. CPR and Michigan programmers met weekly for about six months. CPR and Minnesota programmers met bi-weekly for about four months. In Minnesota, the use of Department of Corrections (DOC) data that Minnesota programmers were able to match to the child support added another layer of complexity as the DOC data were not well documented. CPR and Minnesota data experts worked with another state agency that had analyzed DOC data to learn from their experiences. Although this was extremely beneficial and helpful, it further delayed obtaining the data. Because there was so much time needed to get the data to the point where it could be analyzed, there was little time left for the analysis. Another issue faced was that once CPR began seeing the data, CPR could not change what CPR was requesting because of the data sharing agreement (e.g., excluding cases with Medicaid arrears only from the random sample). The major success was that administrative data was indeed analyzed in each state and the results from the analysis provided meaningful insights about each state's caseload that could not be achieved any other way.

Objective 3

Objective 3 was to demonstrate how to effectively build relationships and engage with program participants and other partners. Two tasks were implemented to achieve this objective. The goal of Task 3.1 was to uplift family voices in program administration through parent advisory councils or focus groups. Task 3.2 consisted of the collection and analysis of survey data from families to inform programs and policies. See Appendix A for the inputs, key activities, and outcomes identified to achieve Objective 3.

3.1 Uplift family voices in program administration through parent advisory councils or focus groups

Implementation

MN partnered with RIA and the NFI to create MN's Parent Action Council (PAC). MN hired a Community Engagement Coordinator to assist in designing the plan to gather parent input.

Successes and Challenges

The PAC received positive feedback from local groups after conducting initial stakeholder engagement meetings for recruitment, allowing them to build a strong foundation for the Parent Action Council.

Several challenges arose in Task 3.1, however, including delays in the launch of the PAC due to hiring delays and unclear guidance on how personal information would be collected. Per MN state regulations, a Tennessen warning notice must be provided to individuals when the state intends to collect private or confidential information. Due to shifting priorities and new review criteria under the current administration, approval of the Tennessen warning and recruitment materials for the PAC were significantly delayed.

3.2 Collection and analysis of survey data from families to inform programs and policies

Implementation

Using the input of the Parent Advisory council, RIA led the development of a statewide survey in MN.

Successes and Challenges

There were delays in determining an appropriate length and format for the survey, and limited resources to compensate participants (as only 100 random Child Support participants would receive a $50.00 gift card upon completion of the survey). RIA also faced challenges in completing the IRB processes and are still waiting for final approval of their materials to release the survey for participants. At the time of this report, the parent survey had not been administered.

Objective 4

Objective 4 was to raise awareness of family-centered principles for grant participants as well as broader CS audiences. Four tasks were implemented to achieve this objective. Task 4.1 was to hold learning conversations with a consortium of nine states and one Tribal CS program. Task 4.2 was the development of family-centered training materials. Task 4.3 was the publication of family-centered briefs and the "*Family-Centered Assessment Resource Guide*." Task 4.4 was the dissemination of project resources to national audiences. See Appendix A for the inputs, key activities, and outcomes identified to achieve Objective 4.

4.1 Learning conversations with a consortium of nine state and one Tribal CS program

Implementation

MN shared project updates and lessons learned with the consortium on a quarterly basis. MN, CA, and MI provided technical assistance to the consortium as they began to apply the resource guide to their programs.

Successes and Challenges

The full consortium and lead state meeting held on January 27th, 2025, was described as highly successful in aligning work and fostering strong partner relationships through open and honest communication.

One challenge included the change in federal administration in January 2025, which impacted the level of contact with the federal OCSS and state participation. For example, changes within the federal administration resulted in a few of the Consortium States (e.g. Kansas) having to terminate their participation within the project. Additionally, some of the Consortium States did not choose an equity activity because the current changes within the federal administration have placed a great strain on leading DEI activities for implementation.

Despite these changes, the consortium states that were able to continue and the lead state members remained actively involved.

4.2 Development of family-centered training materials

Implementation

Under Task, 4.2, Dendros Group partnered with MN DCYF to create an Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) assessment. The purpose of the assessment was to ensure basic knowledge competence about family-centered practices among MN DCYF employees and all project members. Dendros Group used the IDI to examine the role that implicit and explicit bias plays within customer service delivery of child support services. The assessment was sent to each organization within the Consortium project team.

Successes and Challenges

MN experienced challenges hiring for the e-developer role, which delayed the creation of additional training materials. An E-learning Developer Specialist will develop curriculum and training around the use of the IDI and culture competency in relation to the child support program.

4.3 Publication of family-centered briefs and the Family-Centered Assessment Resource Guide

Implementation

CT developed two briefs under this task: "*History Offers Lessons About Serving Families in the Child Support Program*" and "*Promoting Family-Centered Child Support Policies: Insights from California, Michigan, and Minnesota*." CT also developed the "*Family-Centered Program Assessment: A Resource Guide for State Child Support Programs*."

Successes and Challenges

The timeline for the "*Promoting Family-Centered Child Support Policies*" brief was delayed as a result of data collection challenges for MN, as the brief was intended to summarize findings across all three state reports.

4.4 Dissemination of project resources to national audiences

Implementation

The lead and co-lead states, in collaboration with the project teams, submitted proposals to attend and present at the following conferences:

Eastern Regional Intergovernmental Child Support Association Conference, 2024

Western Intergovernmental Child Support Engagement Association Conference (WICSEC), 2024

IT Solutions Management for Human Services (ISM), 2024

Administration for Children and Families Learning Community, October 2024

National Association for Welfare Research and Statistics, 2025

American Public Human Services Association Economic Mobility & Well-Being conference, 2025

Western Interstate Child Support Enforcement Council, 2025

ISM, 2025

Public Human Services Attorneys Education, 2025; and

the Association for Public Policy Analysis & Management annual conference, 2025.

Successes and Challenges

Several conference proposals were accepted.

Objective 5

Objective 5 was to manage the project to ensure integrated and seamless collaboration across partners. Two tasks were implemented to achieve this objective. Task 5.1 was to share family-centered competencies and behaviors to uphold family-centered principles within the project team. Task 5.2 was the development and implementation of a robust project performance monitoring plan. See Appendix A for the inputs, key activities, and outcomes identified to achieve Objective 5.

5.1 Sharing of family-centered competencies and behaviors to uphold family-centered principles within the project team

Implementation

As mentioned in Task 4.2, an IDI assessment was developed to establish a baseline of knowledge and expectations across the project team. Dendros Group facilitated 8 information sessions for lead state and consortium members.

Successes and Challenges

5.2 Development and implementation of a robust project performance monitoring plan

Implementation

CT developed and shared a draft of the performance plan with CGI and MN DCYF. The project team provided CT with periodic updates on processes and outcomes aligned with the plan.

Successes and Challenges

Task 5.2 was successful in terms of regularly reviewing and adjusting the overall plan based on delays in other tasks. However, the project is behind the original schedule, as a whole, and this delay has resulted in several of the partner organizations requesting no-cost extensions.

The change in federal administration has been a challenge for this grant. Since January 2025, the support from the federal office has been limited and inconsistent. MN DCYF had no contact with OCSS for the first 4 months of 2025. MN DCYF also faced several barriers and challenges with sending all external facing documents through a rigorous process of approval through the MN Government Communication Office, in addition to the General council.

Continuous Quality Improvement Efforts

The feedback detailed above was collected through an online form sent to key staff members at MDHHS OCS, CA DCSS, and MN DCYF, as well as CGI and CPR. CT and CPR sent monthly requests for feedback and reported major challenges to CGI in their regular meetings. The feedback

informed changes to project functions in order to facilitate smooth collaboration and efficient data collection. Additionally, CGI, operating as the Project Management Office for the project, met with MN DCYF weekly over the course of the project to monitor progress. MDHHS OCS, CA DCSS, and MN DCYF met monthly to monitor project progress and make necessary adjustments.

Conclusion

This project has made significant strides towards its objectives, including developing an FCA framework and tools, advancing data collection efforts, and fostering critical partnerships. However, it has also navigated considerable challenges, particularly those stemming from external factors. The project relied on many strengths, such as a strong and committed leadership team, excellent internal communications, flexibility and collaboration among all partners, innovative approaches to data management, and successful initial stakeholder engagement. The persistent challenges that faced most tasks included significant delays in recruitment and hiring; technical issues with administrative data extracts and DSAs; and the impact of federal administration changes on communications, approvals, and capacity.

The Advancing Equity in CS project should continue to leverage its strong internal communication and collaboration to navigate ongoing challenges and adapt timelines. The project is also well equipped to learn from the iterative data extract process with MI IT staff and to apply similar models to other data collection efforts. Finally, the project may wish to advocate proactively with state and federal entities for streamlined approval processes for community engagement materials, especially in changing political climates. Future projects should establish clearer, more robust communication protocols with federal oversight bodies regarding expectations and review processes for key deliverables from the outset of the project. They should also incorporate more flexible buffer times in initial project timelines to account for potential delays from external policy shifts and internal approval processes. Lastly, future efforts should prioritize early engagement with legal and communications teams within state agencies to pre-emptively address potential challenges with public-facing materials and data disclaimers. These lessons learned will greatly benefit future endeavors to continue building family-centered principles into CS programs.

Appendices

Appendix A. Project performance monitoring plan

Objectives	Inputs	Key Activities	Outcomes
1. Conduct an FCA in each of the lead and co-lead states; based on findings, develop resources and recommendations to advance family-centered principles	**1.1. A literature review and an environmental scan to inform state FCAs**		
	(1) Ability to identify CS equity tools from online sources and/or through connections with states (2) Access and familiarity with sources of information (e.g., academic databases) (3) Deep understanding of federal and state CS programs	(1) CPR conducts a literature review of existing CS policies/practices that promote equity (2) CPR conducts an environmental scan of existing equity analysis tools and resources used by state/local CS (3) CPR shares drafts and findings with CGI and partners	(1) A short description of the completed literature review (2) A short description of the completed environmental scan (3) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [e.g., fact check, 508 compliance]) (4) Documented lessons learned (what we planned, what was the final result, how we adapted) (5) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes
	1.2. Development and application of an FCA tool to CS programs		
	(1) Expertise in equity, equity assessment, and policy analysis (2) Experience in technical assistance and collaboration with state agencies (3) Deep understanding of	(1) CT develops an equity assessment conceptual model and "*Family-Centered Program Assessment*" and incorporates input from states (2) CT conducts assessments for the lead	(1) A short description of the conceptual model and the resource guide (2) A short description of the resource guide included in the larger toolkit

Objectives	Inputs	Key Activities	Outcomes
	federal and state CS programs	and co-lead states; as part of each FCA, CT: a. Assists states with selecting one or several related policies, services, practices to focus on b. Determines what relevant information is needed for the assessment and requests the information from the states c. Assesses and evaluates the policy information received from states in relation to project aims d. Works with states to collect the necessary and relevant qualitative data from program participants and/or program administrators e. Creates a report for each state which details the findings and makes policy recommendations (3) CT revises the conceptual model and the resource guide based on state feedback (4) CT shares updates periodically with CGI and all partners	(3) A short description of the FCA reports (4) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [e.g., fact check, 508 compliance]) (5) Monthly calls with states to collect state feedback on the model, resource guide, and assessment processes (6) Documented lessons learned
2. Demonstrate how to collect and analyze data to assess how well programs center families'	**2.1. Collection of new data in MN's administrative data system to support FCA**		
	(1) Expertise in MN's CS administrative data system (PRISM)	(1) CGI modifies PRISM to expand the demographic data collected on CS participants to increase	(1) A short description of the completed PRISM project

Objectives	Inputs	Key Activities	Outcomes
perspectives, well-being, and outcomes	(2) Cooperative relationship with the MN IT agency and CGI (3) Understanding of how data are connected to CS policies in MN	the options and allow for multiple selections (2) MN and CGI perform these tasks in alignment with equity principles; share updates with CT and all project members	(2) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, task performed in alignment with the conceptual model and equity principles, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [i.e. fact check, 508 compliance]) (3) Documented lessons learned (4) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes
	2.2. Analysis of CS administrative data in the lead and co-lead states to assess disproportionality		

Objectives	Inputs	Key Activities	Outcomes
	(1) Expertise in quantitative data methods and analyses (2) Expertise in state CS administrative data (3) DSAs and supporting staff (4) Resources: the literature review, the environmental scan, and the project assessment tool	(1) CGI and CPR establish DSAs with the lead and co-lead states; states assist with the processes (2) As part of state assessments, CPR analyzes new (for MN only) and existing data to examine disproportional access to CS services and policies, with a focus on racial/ethnic disproportionality (3) CPR shares updates and findings with the lead and co-lead states and project partners (4) CPR shares findings with CT to be further analyzed and included in state reports and other dissemination products (see Task 4.3)	(1) A short description of the completed data analysis process (2) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, task performed in alignment with the conceptual model and equity principles, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [e.g., fact check, 508 compliance]) (3) Documented lessons learned (4) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes
3. Demonstrate how to effectively build relationships and engage with program participants and other partners	**3.1. Uplift of family voices in program administration through PACs or focus groups**		
	(1) Expertise in community engagement and community research (2) Participation of persons with lived experiences in PACs (3) Facilitation that focuses on topics around equity and program improvement	(1) MN partners with RIA and NFI to create MN's PAC (2) RIA and MN co-design a plan to gather parent input from the PAC (3) MN and RIA share findings with CT to be further analyzed and included in state reports and other dissemination products (see Task 4.3)	(1) A short description of the process for collecting PAC/focus group feedback, as a part of each state assessment (2) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, task performed in alignment with the conceptual model and

Objectives	Inputs	Key Activities	Outcomes
	(4) Resources: the literature review, the environmental scan, and the project assessment tool	and shares updates with all project partners (4) As part of the assessments, CT assists with collection of qualitative data from the PAC in MI and focus groups in CA	equity principles, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [e.g., fact check, 508 compliance]) (3) Documented lessons learned (4) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes
	3.2. Collection and analysis of survey data from families to inform programs and policies		
	(1) Expertise in survey designs, survey instruments, sampling methods, and data analyses (2) Recruitment of survey respondents (4) Resources: the literature review, the environmental scan, the project FCA tool, feedback from the PAC	(1) RIA develops and administers a statewide (MN) survey to understand client perception of the program and to identify ways to improve the program (2) RIA shares updates and findings with CT (for products in Task 4.3) and all partners	(1) A short description of the statewide survey questionnaire (2) A short description of the survey design and methods (3) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, task performed in alignment with the FCA conceptual model and equity principles, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [i.e. fact check, 508 compliance]) (4) Documented lessons learned

Objectives	Inputs	Key Activities	Outcomes
			(5) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes
4. Raise awareness of family-centered principles for grant participants as well as broader CS audiences	**4.1. Learning conversations with a consortium of nine state and one Tribal CS program**		
	(1) Project progress updates (2) Any fully developed project products (3) MN staff to deliver technical assistance to consortium states and Tribal program	(1) MN shares project updates and lessons learned and seek feedback on a quarterly basis with consortium states and Tribal program on calls or via a Microsoft Team Site (2) All project members complete security trainings to access the Microsoft Team Site (3) Lead and co-lead states provide technical assistance to consortium states and Tribal program, as they begin to apply the resource guide and other project resources to their CS programs	(1) A short description of the meeting information (i.e., agendas, dates, participants) for each quarterly and technical assistance call (2) A short description of the Microsoft Team Site's purpose and contents (3) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [e.g., fact check, 508 compliance]) (4) Documented lessons learned (5) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes
	4.2. Development of family-centered training materials		
	(1) Hiring of a training and e-development specialist (2) Expertise in various curriculum	(1) Comprehensive cultural competency curriculum and training materials for the project team and CS programs	(1) A short description of the curriculum features that make it a comprehensive cultural competency resource

Objectives	Inputs	Key Activities	Outcomes
	development methods (i.e. eLearning)		(2) A short description of how the curriculum can be utilized in various CS programs (3) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [i.e. fact check, 508 compliance]) (4) Documented lessons learned (5) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes
	4.3. Publication of family-centered briefs and the *Family-Centered Assessment Resource Guide*		
	(1) Initial and final findings from FCAs in lead and co-lead states (2) A fully developed FCA tool, including an FCA framework, questions, and instructions	(1) CGI develops project website, which will contain the components and materials of the resource guide and CGI leads coordination of pieces across project partners (2) CT develops two briefs; one sharing findings and lessons learned and one on the history of CS programs in the US (3) CT works with the lead and co-lead states to determine which assessment findings to	(1) A short description of the two FCA briefs (2) A short description of the the resource guide (3) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [i.e. fact check, 508 compliance])

Objectives	Inputs	Key Activities	Outcomes
		include in these briefs and which examples to include in the resource guide (4) CT revises the project conceptual model such that it can be adapted and applied to other state and Tribal CS programs and to be included in the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Toolkit (5) CT solicits feedback from lead and co-lead states and subject-matter experts on draft briefs and the resource guide; CT incorporates feedback (6) CT shares updates with all project members and the consortium	(4) Documented lessons learned (5) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes
	4.4 Dissemination of project resources to national audiences		
	(1) CS-focused conferences and a webinar (2) Website development and design skills (3) Updates of newly developed project resources	(1) Lead and co-lead states develop presentation materials and submit to conferences and a webinar (2) Lead and co-lead states conduct presentations (3) CGI develops a project website for MN to host all grant resources and shares updates with all project members (4) MN publishes all project resources on the project website; project members offer resources to be included on the website	(1) A short description of any conference presentations and conferences attended (2) A short description of the project website and its contents (3) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [i.e. fact check, 508 compliance])

Objectives	Inputs	Key Activities	Outcomes
		(5) MN provides necessary updates after the project ends	(4) Documented lessons learned (5) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes
5. Manage the project to ensure integrated and seamless collaboration across partners	**5.1. Sharing of family-centered competencies and behaviors to uphold family-centered principles within the project team**		
	(1) The IDI assessment (2) Hiring an IDI vendor (3) Facilitation and discussion around behavior expectations	(1) MN identifies a vendor to perform the IDI assessment (2) All project members participate in the IDI assessment and training (informed by the IDI assessment and PAC feedback to ensure basic DEI competence (3) The vendor will establish DEI norms and behavior expectations for the MN CS workforce to be shared with other state CS programs	(1) A short description of the IDI assessment and training (2) A short description of the identified norms and expectations to foster a strong culture of teamwork (3) A summary of management of key activities (in scope, done within allotted project schedule time, partner reviews and feedback incorporated, dissemination processes completed [i.e. fact check, 508 compliance, readability and user friendliness, distributed to multiple outlets]) (4) Documented lessons learned (5) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes
	5.2. Development and implementation of a robust project performance monitoring plan		
	(1) Draft of project performance plan	(1) CT develops and shares a draft of the	(1) A final project performance plan,

Objectives	Inputs	Key Activities	Outcomes
	(2) A review, revision, and approval process among MN, CGI, and CT (3) Periodic check-in calls between MN and CGI, MN/CGI and their contractors to collect evaluation processes and outcome measures (4) Communication with OCSS	performance plan with CGI and MN DCYF; CGI and MN DCYF review the plan, with project partners' input; CT revises and submits the final plan to CGI and MN (2) MN and CGI share the final plan with all project partners for execution (3) Project partners provide MN/CGI and CT periodic updates on processes and outcomes aligned with the plan (4) CT completes a project performance report (5) MN shares the final performance report with project partners (6) A public-facing report summarizes key processes and lessons learned from the performance review and implications for replication of the FCA work across other states	including clearly defined processes and outcomes (2) The project performance plan, evaluation processes, outcomes, and, if applicable, any updates, are shared among project members to track processes and outcomes (3) A final project performance report describes project success and lessons learned and is shared with project partners (4) Documented lessons learned (5) Assessment of internal/outside factors that affected outcomes

Note: FCA = family-centered assessment; CS = child support; CT = Child Trends; RIA = Research in Action; NFI = National Fatherhood Initiative; PAC = Parent Action Council

Appendix B. Monthly pulse survey questions

1. What is your name?
2. What grant activities did you do this month?
3. Were any of these activities different from what you initially planned? If so, explain what happened and why. For example, describe any planned activities you revised or didn't complete or any additional accomplishments. Explain the processes that led to these changes.
4. Did the activities meet the original timeline planned? If yes, describe the factors that helped you implement those on time. If no, describe factors that caused your schedule change, as well as your revised timeline.
5. Did your project encounter any internal or external challenges? How were they addressed? Was there something your project team or partners could have done differently? Is there anything they can do to help move your goal forward?
6. Are there any strengths or positive experiences you would like to report on? (If anything is being done or working exceptionally well, we would like to make sure we continue doing it.)
7. Were any required internal and/or external quality control processes completed for this activity (internal reviews, stakeholder engagement, partner reviews, activities to prep for dissemination)? If yes, please describe what you did, what feedback you received, and what you did to address the feedback.
8. Did you have any “aha moments” in this reporting period? For example, did you learn anything new that can help you improve your communication and engagement strategies, with project partners or stakeholders? Did you learn any lessons that might help others implement similar work in this field?
9. Any other feedback you want to provide?