Assets for Independence Program
Performance Management Initiative – Building Consensus

Summary of Research and Findings

Prepared by the Southern Good Faith Fund
October 2005

Contents

Background / Introduction

The Assets for Independence (AFI) program at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services is working to find ways to better measure the performance of the AFI program for several reasons.

First, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is working with each Federal agency as part of the annual budget development process to assess Federal programs as to how they achieve concrete and measurable results. As part of the FY 2006 budget development process, OMB engaged the AFI program in the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) process. This process found that 1) there is a great need for Individual Development Accounts (IDAs), 2) the AFI program is not duplicative of Federal, State, Local, or private efforts, 3) the program design is working, 4) the independent evaluations are of sufficient scope and quality, and 5) the program has good management. The PART also raised several challenges. The AFI program needs to 1) develop annual and long-term performance measures focused on outcomes, 2) establish baselines, ambitious targets, and timeframes for measures, 3) commit, along with grantees, to those measures and to working toward them, 4) demonstrate adequate progress in achieving performance goals, 5) demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost-effectiveness, and 6) indicate through independent evaluations that the program is effective and achieving results.

Second, the AFI program knows that the IDA field has a desire to better document its performance for a range of reasons. The IDA field has been growing for over a decade now, and many lessons have been learned through the American Dream Demonstration, other private initiatives, state-funded efforts, and the AFI program. While new programs continue to form each year, there is a maturity in the field that makes discussions about performance measures possible. Competition for state, federal, and private funding is growing more fierce, and an increasing demand for outcomes and impact by these funders makes a strong case for developing performance measures as well. And as the field looks to the future and explores strategies for taking IDAs to scale, performance and cost efficiencies take on even more significance.

To help achieve all of these objectives, the AFI program and its grantees have engaged in a process to identify performance indicators for the AFI program and ways to measure those indicators. The AFI program has four objectives for this effort:

1. To learn from the work that is being done and has already been done by AFI grantees and other stakeholders in the IDA field related to performance measures
2. To engage in an open and inclusive process to identify a range of performance indicators and ways to measure them that would have several sub-objectives including:

- Peer learning and sharing about what can be measured and how to do it
- Relevance to the work of the field in terms of program design, communications, fundraising, etc.
- Helping the field to communicate about the impact of IDAs on program participants and the communities in which programs work
- Building support for IDAs through the communication of this impact

3. To use this open process to reach consensus on a limited set of indicators on which all AFI grantees would report that acknowledges the limited operating and administrative funds provided by AFI and is manageable given these limited resources
4. To provide AFI grantees with the resources they need to collect data on and report to HHS on these performance measures

To achieve these objectives, the AFI program is engaged in a three step process that will involve planning, a discussion group, and implementation. The planning phase has involved interviews with a range of stakeholders in the IDA field, a review of performance measures used in the field and proposed by researchers and programs, and input from all AFI grantees on the measures that they currently use and/or are thinking about using. The work of this phase is summarized in this document.

The next phase will involve the convening of a discussion group of key stakeholders that is representative of the field in terms of geography, race and ethnicity, and type of grantee and that includes individuals from both research and program backgrounds. OCS will host the group to gather additional input on possible indicators and identify ways to measure those indicators and/or challenges for measuring them. There will be opportunity for input and feedback from the field that may include the use of the AFI and IDA Network listservs, posting proposed ideas on the AFI website, and the monthly AFI grantee conference calls. With this input from grantees and others, OCS will issue guidance on a short list of indicators that all AFI Program grantees will use to report to OCS and manage their AFI Projects.

The final phase will be implementation of the chosen performance indicators. The AFI program will provide tools and training to help grantees learn how to measure and report on the indicators. Training is likely to include web and phone conferencing and in-person sessions and will also likely include written guides. And any new measures will be added as a new feature to the on-line AFI^2 Program Management Tool.

Purpose of the AFI Program

The purposes of the AFI program, as established in the AFI legislation, make a good starting point for a discussion on program performance measures. Section 403 of the law outlines the following purposes.

The purposes of this title are to provide for the establishment of demonstration projects designed to determine:

1. the social, civic, psychological, and economic effects of providing to individuals and families with limited means an incentive to accumulate assets by saving a portion of their earned income;

2. the extent to which an asset-based policy that promotes saving for postsecondary education, homeownership, and microenterprise development may be used to enable individuals and families with limited means to increase their economic self-sufficiency; and

3. The extent to which an asset-based policy stabilizes and improves families and the community in which the families live.

Summary of Research from Planning Phase

During the planning phase of this project, Southern Good Faith Fund interviewed about 40 stakeholders in the field and reviewed a range of documents including internal management and funder reports from individual programs; state and federal reporting requirements; evaluation summaries from state, federal, and private initiatives; and reports on proposed measures that could be collected. The list of stakeholders interviewed is Appendix A, and the materials reviewed is Appendix B. A feedback form was distributed to all AFI grantees to provide analysis on the types of measures that are used by these grantees and/or that they have considered using.

The results from this research effort are summarized below in the following sections: 1) general reactions and challenges, 2) data currently collected in the AFI annual report and for the report to Congress, and 3) data identified as currently being collected or being considered for collection in the grantee questionnaire.

General Reactions and Challenges

In general, the reaction by interviewees about performance measures for AFI grantees was positive. The following are highlights of the points made:

- This is a good idea. The field needs it. We have wanted to do more but have struggled to find the time to focus on it.
- Getting AFI grantees to report on common measures is a great idea.
- It makes sense to have consistent measures. AFI will be in trouble if we just focus on asset purchases.
- It is good to address this topic and move forward. The law says it needs to be addressed.
- The more we know the better.
- Current AFI reports don’t help individual programs or OCS.
- It is good that practitioners are leading this effort
- Many people thought that AFI was easy and then realized how hard it was. Knowing performance measures up front might make organizations take the program more seriously.

- Common measures will give programs a sense of what to shoot for and to allow the AFI program to see where programs really are.
- This is a very worthwhile activity. With the American Dream Demonstration, we talked about performance measures but decided it was too early. Today, groups are more mature.
- Having data also helps to raise more funds by making the business case.

Interviewees also had general suggestions about how to approach the task of developing and implementing performance measures. The following is a summary of those points:

- Adopt measures without targets first so we can make sure they can be measured.
- Collect data on the measures for a while before you set the targets.
- Use measures for which data is readily available.
- Use measures that are credible and have meaning.
- Use measures over which grantees have control.
- Pick measures that have validity in a variety of programs.
- Have a menu of measures from which grantees can pick, especially related to asset purchases.
- Do not focus on standards for the field as AEO has done for microenterprise programs, especially given the move to integrating IDAs with existing programs as products rather than as their own stand-alone programs.
- Consider outcomes and costs and their interrelation.
- Focus on outcomes rather than outputs, but be realistic about what can really be impacted. For example, AFI cannot change the national homeownership rate.
- Start by thinking about long-term change and then scale back to benchmark measures that are short term and quantifiable.
- Add an outcomes section to the AFI project builder with the information on logic models.

And finally, interviewees raised several challenges for implementing AFI performance measures:

- Grantees may use only 15 percent of their grants for operating and administrative costs. This will be one more requirement for their already stretched resources.
- The measures have to be "doable." If they are not, HHS will not get the data that it needs.
- Standardizing outcomes across a variety of programs will be difficult. The measures may need to allow for variety within outcomes based on the goals of program or the audience served by the program. For example, for immigrants it might be establishing credit rather than repairing credit, or some programs mandate monthly savings while others allow self-determination on frequency of savings.
- If long-term outcomes are the goal of this effort, it will be tough to identify short-term benchmarks for grantees on these long-term outcomes.
- Given the variation in resources that organizations bring to their grants, will we be comparing apples and oranges in term of outcomes?

- Make sure that the process for developing the measures is not top down. Grantees need to have ownership of the measures.

Data Collected in Annual Report and Congressional Report

AFI grantees currently have two sets of reporting requirements. The first is an annual report that is focused solely on narrative summaries related to the following topics: major activities and accomplishments, challenges, dissemination activities, other activities, and activities planned for the next reporting period.

The second is the annual Report to Congress. This fall, AFI grantees are participating in this report for the third year. Questions are grouped in the following categories: AFI project structure, AFI project features, AFI account holder characteristics, reserve funds, AFI account holder savings, and AFI account holder withdrawals. A list of data elements required for the Congressional Report is provided as Appendix C.

Data Currently Collected or Being Considered for Collection (from Grantee Feedback Form)

In August 2005, a feedback form was sent to all AFI grantees to identify the data they are currently collecting, the data they are not collecting but would consider collecting, and the data they would not want to collect. Grantees were given a month to complete the form. They were also provided with opportunities to learn more about the form and the overall project at three AFI Academies held in Baltimore, Chicago, and Oakland in August and two AFI grantee conference calls in September. A total of 114 grantees submitted answers to the form; 234 grantees attended the Academies, and 50 grantees participated in the calls. A list of organizations submitting the form is presented in Appendix D. The data included on the feedback form was based on stakeholder interviews and the document review mentioned above.

The results of the feedback form as presented as Appendix E. Some key highlights in terms of the scope and size of the programs submitting the form are as follows:

- Most AFI grantees have relatively small programs. Just over half of grantees who responded (52 percent) have 50 or fewer AFI account open right now; 70 percent of grantees have 100 or fewer accounts.
- The presence of non-AFI accounts is minimal. Half of the grantees who responded do not offer non-AFI accounts, 25 percent have 25 or fewer non-AFI accounts open now, and the remaining 25 percent have more than 25 non-AFI accounts open now.
- Homeownership is the most popular allowable asset purchase (94 percent of AFI grantees), followed by higher education (87 percent), small business (84 percent), and transfer of accounts to a dependent for education (32 percent).
- In terms of program goals, over 90 percent of grantees listed asset purchases, regular savings habits, increase in knowledge about financial products and services, changes in behavior related to savings and budgeting, and credit

repair/establishment. Net worth (81 percent), community stability (77 percent), and community involvement (66 percent) were listed less frequently

- Only 38 percent classify their IDA program as a stand alone program, while 43 percent say it is part of a broader program such as a microenterprise or housing program

Grantees were asked to review a list of over 100 potential performance measures including both output and outcome measures. They were asked to check one of three boxes for each measure: 1) we currently collect data about this item; 2) we do not currently collect data about this item but would consider collecting it; and 3) we would not want to collect data about this item.

The following measures are already collected by 75 percent or more of grantees:[1]

- Number of accounts opened (98%)[2]
- Total amount provided as matches for participant savings (95%)
- Total number of participants per asset goal (93%)
- Total number of participants making asset purchases by type (93%)
- Number of accounts closed for reasons other than asset purchase (92%)
- Number of participants reaching savings goal (92%)
- Number of individuals who completed economic skills classes and asset specific classes (91%)
- Number of participants making approved withdrawals for asset purchases (91%)
- Income at account opening (91%)
- Total savings deposits (84%)
- Total assets at account opening (84%)
- Total debt at account opening (81%)
- Ask the following as part of a pre- and/or post- test: have savings account other than IDA (80%) and have checking account (79%)
- Net worth or net financial assets at account opening (78%)

[1] During Conference Calls for grantees, a question was raised about whether or not the grantee had to have this data in a database to respond affirmatively that they are collecting the data or if they just needed to have it in a file or on paper somewhere. It was clarified that the latter would be sufficient but all grantees may not have heard this clarification.
[2] Some of the measures listed on the feedback form are required by AFI already. However, some of the grantees filling out the form are new this year and may not realize yet that the data elements are required.

Another set of measures are already collected by between 50 percent and 75 percent of grantees:

- Percent of participants that opened accounts and made asset purchases (69%)
- Total number of unapproved withdrawals (68%)
- Value of public assistance at account opening (67%)
- Number of businesses started (67%)
- Number of businesses expanded (64%)
- Total sales price of homes purchased (63%)
- Number of participants with regular savings patterns (62%)
- Average savings account balance (61%)
- Average monthly value of savings deposits (56%)
- Average number of deposits per participant per year (55%)
- Total mortgage amount of homes purchased (55%)
- Average number of participants making at least one deposit per month (54%)
- Credit score at account opening (52%)
- Average length of time to meet savings goals (52%)
- Average dollar value of approved withdrawals (51%)
- Number of participants receiving down payment assistance (50%)
- Ask the following as part of a pre- and/or post- test: are current on bills (65%), develop and use a budget and/or spending plan (63%), save regularly (55%), have obtained credit report and understand it (50%)

In order to build on the capacity that already exists and to the limit the burden on already under-funded grantees, it is likely that performance measures drawing from the above two lists will receive the greatest support from grantees. However, in general, most grantees were open to collecting the overwhelming majority of the measures. The following is a list of those measures that are either being collected or would be considered by 70 percent or more of the grantees. The first number is those who are collecting the data, and the second is those who would consider it.

- Average number of months in which deposits are made per year per participant (47%/42%)
- Total amount of down payment assistance received (42%/50%)
- Average dollar value of unapproved withdrawals (39%/43%)
- Average length of time to make asset purchase by type (39%/58%)
- Number of participants using direct deposit or automatic allotment to make savings deposits (38%/54%)
- Total tuition and fees leveraged for education (36%/50%)
- Total value of assets purchased for business (35%/50%)
- Income at asset purchase (34%/60%)
- Credit score at asset purchase (33%/61%)
- Use of resources like food banks, utility payment assistance, and so forth at account opening (30%/54%)
- Total debts at asset purchase (28%/65%)
- Loans and grants leveraged for education (25%/54%)
- Cost per account (25%/64%)

- Still in home one year after asset purchase (24%/67%)
- Total assets at asset purchase (24%/64%)
- Number of loans leveraged for businesses (23%/57%)
- Total dollar value of loans leveraged for businesses (23%/59%)
- Savings as a percent of monthly income (22%/58%)
- Number of participants receiving subsidized interest on mortgages leveraged (22%/60%)
- Net worth or net financial assets at asset purchase (21%/71%)
- Value of public assistance at asset purchase (18%/68%)
- Completed certificate or degree in higher education program (18%/64%)
- Still in business one year after asset purchase (17%/66%)
- Number of jobs created or retained by businesses (17%/62%)
- Consumer debt-service ratio lower than .1 at account opening (13%/62%)
- Still in home two years or later after asset purchase (13%/59%)
- Use of resources like food banks, utility payment assistance, and so forth at asset purchase (11%/66%)
- Annual debt-service ratio lower than .3 at account opening (10%/62%)
- Consumer debt-service ratio lower than .1 at asset purchase (8%/64%)
- Obtained job as a result of the certificate or degree (7%/70%)
- Relative costs of serving different populations (7%/70%)
- Total assets at one year after asset purchase (6%/74%)
- Income one year after asset purchase (5%/77%)
- Total debts one year after asset purchase (4%/75%)
- Net worth or net financial assets one year after asset purchase (4%/72%)
- Credit score one year after asset purchase (3%/70%)
- Ask the following as part of a pre- and/or post- test: use ATM or debit card (31%/58%), use direct deposit into either a checking or savings account (43%/50%), use check cashing service or payday lender (22%/68%), participate in employer's retirement program or other retirement account (39%/53%), have received/are receiving credit counseling/help with credit report (36%/58%), can evaluate credit card rates, fees, and terms (30%/62%), have health insurance (49%/44%), have automobile insurance (25%/59%), have renter's insurance (14%/69%)

Those measures that received the least support were those that involved following participants for a year or two years after asset purchase. To highlight the measures for which it would be difficult to find support, the following list shows all those measures where 30% or more grantees said they would not want to collect the data:

- Annual debt service ratio lower than .3 two years or later after asset purchase (50%)
- Use of resources like food banks, utility payment assistance, and so forth at two years or later after asset purchase (48%)
- Consumer debt-service ratio lower than .1 two years or later after asset purchase (47%)
- Value of public assistance two years or later after asset purchase (44%)
- Change in value of home two years or later after asset purchase (41%)
- Annual debt service ratio lower than .3 one year after asset purchase (40%)
- Credit score two years or later after asset purchase (40%)
- Total assets two year or later after asset purchase (37%)
- Total debt two years or later after asset purchase (37%)
- Consumer debt-service ratio lower than .1 one year after asset purchase (37%)

- Net worth or net financial assets two years or later after asset purchase (36%)
- Social connectedness and/or decrease in social isolation (36%)
- Involvement in caring for or helping others (36%)
- Involvement in formal political processes – voting, working on campaigns, running for office (36%)
- Use of resources like food banks, utility payment assistance, and so forth at one year after asset purchase (35%)
- Property taxes generated by home purchases (35%)
- Involvement in neighborhood/community affairs (34%)
- Still in business two years or later after asset purchase (33%)
- Income two years or more after asset purchase (33%)
- Value of public assistance at one year after asset purchase (31%)
- Income earned at any point after graduation from higher education program (31%)
- Change in value of home one year after asset purchase (31%)
- Annual debt service ratio lower than .3 at asset purchase (30%)

Issues for the Discussion Group

OCS would like insights from the Discussion Group concerning the input provided by grantees on possible measures, standard definitions for those measures, and strategies for identifying relevant baselines and targets for the measures.

The above analysis provides a window into the possibilities for performance measures for the AFI program. The largest opportunities seem to draw on data that is or could be collected at account opening and at asset purchase. These are two points in the process of most programs where contact is made with the participants and at least some data is already collected. The very fact that the programs have something that the participant wants – to open their account or make their asset purchase – facilitates data collection. Any measure that would require collection one or two years after asset purchase is more problematic given the limited resources that AFI provides for operating and administrative costs.

Determining how best to calculate each of the measures may be the most difficult task. Some measures may be ruled out because the data is largely self-reported by participants and is difficult to verify. Net worth and net financial asset are examples of such measures. Pre and post tests of behavior and knowledge changes are another example. In other cases, many grantees may be collecting data on a certain measure, but they may use different sources and/or calculate the measure in different ways. Value of public assistance is such as example. Another issue is cost. While some measures like credit score can be documented using comparable measures, there is a cost to the program for pulling credit reports.

Finally, as was suggested by several individuals during the interviews, it will be difficult to set baseline measures and performance targets during the first several years of this effort. Unless these measures are based on several years of data, they will be pretty much a shot in the dark.

Appendix A

Individuals Interviewed

Deborah Page Adams, Associate Professor, University of Kansas School of Social Welfare, Overland Park, KS

Lina Alfieri-Stern, Program Director, IDA Collaborative of Louisiana, New Orleans, LA

George Bailey, MIS Consultant, ISED Solutions, Coralville, IA

Denise Barrett, Program Officer, Foundation for the Mid South, Jackson, MS

Rita Bowen, Senior Program Manager, Corporation for Enterprise Development, Astoria, NY

Lois Carson, Janet Hough, and Katherine Latta., Community Action Project of Riverside County, Riverside, CA.

Marisa Castuera, Pathways Out of Poverty, Oakland, CA

Cramer, Reid, Research Director, Asset Building Program, New American Foundation, Washington, DC.

Emily DeMaria, Director, Community Impact Initiatives, United Way of America, Alexandria, VA

Steven Dow, Executive Director, Community Action Project of Tulsa County, Tulsa, OK

Bob Friedman, General Counsel, CFED, San Francisco, CA.

Paul Garro, Northeast Independence District, San Antonio, TX

Inger Giuffrida, Assets Alliance, Norman, OK

Marie Hawe, IDA Training and Technical Assistance/Connecticut IDA Clearinghouse, CTE, Inc., Stamford, CT

Barclay Jones, Vice President, Assets for Family Success, Mile High United Way, Denver, CO

Glenn Kamber, ROMA Clearinghouse, Alexandria, VA

Dan Kornelis, Housing Director, Forsyth County, Winston-Salem, NC

Jan Losby, ISED Solutions, Gulfport, MS

Ben Mangan, Executive Director, EARN, San Francisco, CA

Michelle Meiser, Allston Brighton CDC, Allston, MA

Lisa Mensah, Executive Director, Aspen Institute, Initiative on Financial Security, New York, NY

Greg Mills, Senior Associate, Abt Associates, Cambridge, MA

Eric Muschler, Director, Michigan IDA Partnership, Livonia, MI

Mary Niebling, Community Economic Development Director, Central Vermont Community Action Council, Barre, VT

Kim Pate, Director, Field Development, Corporation for Enterprise Development, Washington, DC

Karl Pnazek, CAP Services,

Dory Rand, Supervising Attorney, Community Investment, Sargent Shriver National Center Poverty Law, Chicago, IL

Carl Rist, Director, CFED South, Durham, NC.

Margot Rollins, Peninsula Foundation,

Pam Salsedo, Director, CC-MATCH, Oakland, CA

Michael Sherraden, Director, Center for Social Development, Washington University, St. Louis, MO.

Irene Skricki, Program Office, Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD

John Thompson, IDA Project Manager, United Way of Metro Atlanta, Atlanta, GA

Woody Widrow, Director, Texas IDA Network, Austin, TX

Linda Woods, CASA of Oregon,

Margaret Miley, MIDAS, Allston, MA

Appendix B

Materials Reviewed

Anderson, Steve; Scott, Jeff; Zhan, Min. (2004). Financial Links for Low-Income People (FLIIP) Final Evaluation Report. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign School of Social Work.

Assets for All Alliance. Data Form for Target Summary.

Assets for All Alliance. Year Five MOU: September 2003-December 2004, Target Summary Report for August 2004.

Central Vermont Community Action Council. Vermont IDA Programs – Outcome Measures.

EARN. (2004). EARN Q1 Summary, 2004. San Francisco, CA: EARN.

McBride, Amanda Moore; Hanson, Stacie Lintvedt; Beverly, Sondra; Schreiner, Mark; Sherraden, Michael; and Johnson, Lissa. (2004). Asset Building: Increasing the Capacity for Performance Measurement and Effects. St. Louis, MO: Washington University's Center for Social Development.

Miller, Maurice Lim; Castuera, Marisa; Chao, Michelle; Sadowski, Katherine. Pathways Out of Poverty, Early Lessons of the Family Independence Initiative, The First Two Years of Operation, 2001-2003. Oakland, CA: Family Independence Initiative.

Office of Management and Budget. (2003). Performance Measurement Challenges and Strategies.

Office of Management and Budget. (2004). Presentation on the Program Assessment Rating Tool at the AFI Grantees Conference in New Orleans, LA.

ROMA Clearinghouse. (2004). Guide to Organizing and Reporting National Indicators of Community Action Performance.

Appendix C

Data Elements for Congressional Report

AFI Account Holder Characteristics

- Number of individuals who attended an AFI orientation or informational meeting
- Number of individuals who submitted an application to become an AFI participant
- Number of individuals who enrolled in the AFI project
- Number of individuals who opened an AFI account
- Gender of AFI account holders
- Race/ethnicity of AFI account holders
- Age group of AFI account holders at the time of enrollment
- Marital status of AFI account holders at the time of enrollment
- Employment status of AFI account holders at the time of enrollment
- Education attainment of AFI account holders at the time of enrollment
- Number of AFI account holders by location type (major urban, minor urban, rural, or remote)
- Number of adults in the household of the AFI account holder at the time of enrollment
- Number of children in the household of the AFI account holder at the time of enrollment
- Number of AFI account holders by reported earned income at the time of enrollment
- Number of AFI account holders who reported that they owned an automobile at the time of enrollment
- Number of AFI account holders who reported that they owned a home at the time of enrollment
- Number of AFI account holders who reported that they owned a business at the time of enrollment
- Number of AFI account holders who reported that they received TANF at the time of enrollment
- Number of AFI account holders who reported that they had ever received EITC funds at the time of enrollment
- Number of AFI account holders who had ever owned a checking account prior to opening an AFI IDA account
- Number of AFI account holders who had ever owned a savings account prior to opening an AFI IDA account
- Number of AFI account holders who had ever used direct deposit prior for their paychecks to opening an AFI IDA account
- Intended use of AFI IDA at the time of enrollment

AFI Account Holder Savings

- Total number of AFI IDA accounts ever opened
- Total number of AFI IDA accounts that were ever closed
- Total amount that AFI IDA participants deposited in their accounts

- Number of AFI IDA account holders who use automatic allotment/deposit procedures

AFI Account Holder Withdrawals

- Total number of withdrawals, by purpose (home, education, business, transfer to family member’s IDA)
- Total number of participants who made withdrawals, by purpose
- Total amount of fund withdrawn from AFI IDA account for the asset purchase, by purpose
- Total amount of AFI grant funds disbursed as matching funds for the asset purchase, by purpose
- Total amount of non-federal cash contributions disbursed as matching funds for the asset purchase, by purpose
- Total number of emergency withdrawals
- Total number of participants who made emergency withdrawals
- Total amount of funds withdrawn from AFI IDAs (not including matching funds) for emergency uses
- Total number of voluntary withdrawals/terminations
- Total number of participants who made voluntary withdrawals/terminated their participation
- Total amount of funds withdrawn from AFI IDAs (not including matching funds) for voluntary withdrawals/terminations

Appendix D

Organizations Responding to the Grantee Feedback Form

Action for a Better Community, inc.
Alternatives Federal Credit Union
Alternatives Federal Credit Union
ALU LIKE, Inc.
Assemblies of God Financial Services
Belmont Shelter Corp.
Broward County Board of County Commissioners
Butler County Home Ownership Corporation
Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation
Camden County Council on Economic Opportunity, Inc.
CAP Services, Inc.
Capital Area Asset Building Corp.
CASA of Oregon
Catholic Charities
Central Arkansas Development Council
Chicanos Por La Causa
City of Los Angeles
City of San Antonio
City of Tucson
Coastal Enterprises, Inc.
Community Action Agency
Community Action Council of South Texas
Community Action New Mexico
Community Action Partnership of Ramsey and Washington Counties
Community Action Program of Evansville & Vanderburgh County, Inc.
Community Action Program, Inc. of Taylor County
Community Development Corporation of Long Island
Community Housing Development Corporation of North Richmond
Community Service Network, Inc.
Cook Inlet Tribal Council, Inc.
Co-Opportunity Inc.
Co-opportunity, Inc.
Covenant Community Capital Corporation
CT Department of Labor
CTE, Inc.
Dickinson CAP
District 7 HRDC
Durham Regional Community Development Group
EARN
Economic and Community Development Institute

Economic Opportunity Agency of Washington County, Inc.
El Paso Collaborative for Community and Economic Development
Empower New Haven
Family Housing Advisory Services, Inc.
Family Services Center
First State Community Loan Fund
FiveCAP Inc.
Foundation Communities
FreshMinstries
Fresno County EOC
Goodwill Industries of San Antonio
Gulf Coast Community Services Association
Illinois Community Action Association
Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority
International Institute of Boston
JEDI
Ky. Comm. E.O.C.
Learning Exchange
Local Development Corporation of East NY
Lower East Side Peoples FCU
M.C.D.C.
Mahube Community Council, Inc.
Mesa Community Action Network, Inc.
Michigan Neighborhood Partnership
Michigan State University
Mile High United Way
Missouri Association for Community Action
Mount Hope Housing Company, Inc.
NC Department of Labor
Neighborhood Housing Development Corporation
NEW CENTURY IDA
New Mexico Association of Community Action Agencies
New Mexico Association of Community Action Agencies
NH Community Loan Fund
NJ Department of Community Affairs
Non-Profit Assistance Corporation
Northwest New Mexico Community Development Corporation
Oakland Livingston Human Service Agency
Ohio CDC Association
Pa Dept of Community and Economic Development
Pacific Gateway Center
Partners Fro Self Employment, Inc d.b.a. Micro-Business, USA
Penquis Community Action Program
People's Community Development Corporation
Pikes Peak Community Action Agency
Potter County Human Services

SENDCAA
South Arkansas Community Development
South Central Community Action Program, Inc.
Southern Good Faith Fund
Stark County Out of Poverty Partnership, Inc.
Student Alternatives Program
The Center for Women and Families
The Urban League of the Upstate
Total Action Against Poverty in the Roanoke Valley
Tuscaloosa Housing Authority
United Way of Greater Los Angeles
United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta
United Way of Palm Beach County
United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania
United Way of Treasure Valley
Upper Cumberland Human Resource Agency
Upper East Tennessee Human Development Agency
Utah Issues Center for Poverty Research And Action
WECO Fund, Inc.
Wesst Corp
West Central Minnesota Communities Action, Inc.
Westchester Housing Fund
Western Carolina Community Action
WI Women's Business Initiative Corporation
Wisconsin Community Action Program Association (WISCAP)
Women's Opportunities Resource Center (subgrantee of PA DCED)
YWCA of Rochester & Monroe County

-

Appendix E

Summary Results from Grantee Feedback Form

Background				
1.	Name of person submitting form	114 Respondents		
2.	Date submitted	114 Respondents		
3.	Name of the grantee organization	114 Respondents		
4.	Grantee organization's address. (Street, Address, Locality and State)	114 Respondents		
5.	Number of AFI grants this organization administers	114 Respondents		
6.	AFI grant number(s)	114 Respondents		
Caseload -- AFI IDA Accounts			**Response Percent**	**Response Total**
What is the estimated number of AFI IDA accounts the grantee organization has open now? (Please do not include those that have been closed for any reason.)		0 – 25	38.1 %	43
		26 – 50	14.2%	16
		51 – 75	8%	9
		76 – 100	9.7%	11
		101 – 125	7.1%	8
		126 – 150	3.5%	4
		151 – 175	3.5%	4
		176 – 200	2.7%	3
		200 or more	13.3%	15
How many AFI IDA accounts has the grantee organization ever closed for asset purchases? (Please provide an estimate.)		0 – 25	57.5%	65
		26 – 50	14.2%	16
		51 – 75	7.1%	8
		76 – 100	5.3%	6
		101 – 125	4.4%	5
		126 – 150	1.8%	2
		151 – 175	0.9%	1
		176 – 200	1.8%	2
		200 or more	7.1%	8

Caseload -- Non-AFI IDA Accounts			
If your organization manages non-AFI IDA accounts, what is the estimated number open now? (Please do not include those that have been closed for any reason.)	We do not manage non-AFI IDAs	49.6%	56
	0 – 25	25.7%	29
	26 – 50	4.4%	5
	51 – 75	4.4%	5
	76 – 100	3.5%	4
	101 – 125	2.7%	3
	126 – 150	2.7%	3
	151 – 175	1.8%	2
	176 – 200	0%	0
	200 or more	5.3%	6
If your organization manages non-AFI IDA accounts, how many have been closed for asset purchases? (Please provide an estimate.)	0 – 25	27.4%	31
	26 – 50	1.8%	2
	51 – 75	0.9%	1
	76 – 100	3.5%	4
	101 – 125	3.5%	4
	126 – 150	1.8%	2
	151 – 175	0.9%	1
	176 – 200	0%	0
	200 or more	10.6%	12
Allowable Asset Purchases			
What asset purchases does your organization allow?	a) Home ownership	93.8%	108
	b) Small business	84.1%	95
	c) Higher education	86.7%	98
	d) Transfer account to a dependent for their education	31.9%	36
	e) Other (please specify)	19.5%	22

Goals of the Grantee Organization's Overall IDA Program	
What are the grantee organization's goals for its overall IDA program? (By "overall IDA program" we mean the combination of its AFI Project and any non-AFI IDA projects it administers.) (Please mark all responses that apply.)	a) Asset purchases 97.3% 108
	b) Regular savings habits 96.4% 107
	c) Increase in knowledge about financial products and services 93.7% 104
	d) Changes in behaviors and attitudes related to savings, budgeting, and so forth. 96.4% 107
	e) Developing relationships with financial institutions 87.4% 97
	f) Community stability 76.6% 85
	g) Community involvement 65.8% 73
	h) Credit repair / establishment 91% 101
	i) Increased net worth 81.1% 90
	j) Other – please specify 15.3% 17

Operating Budget	
What is the estimated total <u>operating budget</u> of the grantee organization's overall IDA program? By "operating budget" we mean the operating budget for administering its AFI Project(s) and any non-AFI IDA project(s). Please do not include funding for participant's IDA matches -- only include the budget for administration and program operations.	109
Classify the IDA Program	
How does the grantee organization classify its overall IDA program?	a) Stand-Alone IDA program (a program that only administers IDAs) 37.6% 41
	b) A program that is a feature or product of a broader program such as a micro-enterprise or housing program) 43.1% 47
	c) Other – please specify 22% 24

Grantee Practices and Preferences -- Collecting Data for AFI Performance Measures
(output and outcome measures and other data)

This section focuses on whether the grantee organization currently uses or would consider using particular performance measures and related data. Several measures and data elements are listed in the left-hand column in the following tables. For each, choose one of the three responses:

a) Grantee currently collects data about this item;
b) Grantee does not currently collect data about this item, but would consider collecting it;
c) Grantee would not want to collect data about this item.

If the following list does not include items or measures your organization currently uses, or if it does not reflect data that your organization currently collects, please tell us. There is space at the end of the feedback form for listing additional measures and related data.

Finally, please use the space at the end of the feedback form to share details or clarifications about any of your responses.

Potential Performance Measures and Other Items (output and outcome measures)		Grantee currently collects data about this item.	Grantee does not currently collect data about this item, but it would consider collecting it.	Grantee would not want to collect data about this item.
Enrollment				
1.	Number of accounts opened.	**98% (107)**	1% (1)	1% (1)
2.	Number of accounts closed for reasons other than asset purchase (such as emergency withdrawals, left the program, and so forth)	**92% (100)**	7% (8)	1% (1)

Economic Skills				
3.	Number of individuals who completed economic skills classes	**91% (98)**	8% (9)	1% (1)
4.	Number of individuals who completed asset specific classes	**91% (98)**	7% (8)	2% (2)

Changes in Knowledge / Behaviors, Part 1 – PRE or POST TESTS				
5.	Pre-test of knowledge or attitudes of participants before economic skills classes	**47% (51)**	44% (47)	9% (10)
6.	Post-test of knowledge or attitudes of participants after economic skills classes	45% (9)	**46% (50)**	8% (9)

Changes in Knowledge / Behaviors, Part 2 – BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES				
7. Ask any of the following questions as part of a pre and/or post-test?				
a.	Have checking account	**79% (85)**	19% (20)	3% (3)
b.	Use ATM or debit card	31% (33)	**58% (63)**	11% (12)
c.	Have savings account other than IDA	**80% (86)**	17% (18)	4% (4)
d.	Save regularly	**55% (59)**	39% (42)	6% (7)
e.	Use direct deposit into either a checking or savings account	43% (46)	**50% (54)**	7% (8)
f.	Use check cashing service or payday lender	22% (24)	**68% (75)**	8% (9)

g.	Participate in employer's retirement program or other retirement account	39% (42)	**53% (57)**	8% (9)

Changes in Knowledge / Behaviors, Part 3 -- BUDGETING				
7a. Ask any of the following questions as part of a pre and/or post test?				
h.	Develop and use a budget and/or spending plan	**63% (68)**	34% (37)	3% (3)
i.	Are current on bills	**65% (70)**	30% (32)	6% (6)

Changes in Knowledge / Behaviors, Part 4 -- CREDIT				
7b. Ask any of the following questions as part of a pre and/or post test?				
j.	Have obtained credit report and understand it	**50% (54)**	46% (50)	4% (4)
k.	Have received / are receiving credit counseling / help with credit report	36% (39)	**58% (63)**	6% (6)
l.	Can evaluate credit card rates, fees and terms	30% (32)	**62% (67)**	8% (9)

Changes in Knowledge / Behaviors, Part 5 – ASSET PROTECTION				
7c. Ask any of the following questions as part of a pre and/or post test.				
m.	Have health insurance	**49% (53)**	44% (48)	7% (8)
n.	Have automobile insurance	25% (27)	**59% (64)**	17% (18)
o.	Have renter's insurance	14% (15)	**69% (75)**	17% (19)

Savings				
8.	Total savings deposits	**84% (91)**	13% (14)	3% (3)
9.	Average dollar value of monthly savings deposits	**56% (61)**	31% (34)	12% (13)
10.	Savings as a percent of monthly income (Savings deposit / monthly gross income)	22% (24)	**58% (63)**	19% (21)
11.	Average savings account balance	**61% (66)**	30% (32)	9% (10)
12.	Number of participants with a regular savings patterns (however the grantee organizations defines it)	**62% (67)**	33% (36)	5% (5)

13.	Average number of deposits per participant per year	**55% (59)**	33% (36)	12% (13)
14.	Average number of months in which deposits are made per year per participant	**47% (51)**	42% (45)	11% (12)
15.	Average number of participants making at least one deposit per month	**54% (58)**	38% (41)	8% (9)
16.	Total amount provided as matches for participant savings	**95% (103)**	3% (3)	2% (2)
17.	Total number of participants reaching savings goal	**92% (99)**	6% (7)	2% (2)
18.	Average length of time to reach savings goal	52% (56)	43% (46)	6% (6)
19.	Number of participants using direct deposit or automatic allotment to make savings deposits	38% (41)	54% (58)	8% (9)

Asset Purchases and Withdrawals				
20.	Total number of participants per asset goal	**93% (100)**	6% (6)	2% (2)
21.	Total number of participants making approved withdrawals for asset purchases	**91% (98)**	7% (8)	2% (2)
22.	Total number of unapproved withdrawals	**68% (73)**	22% (24)	10% (11)
23.	Total number of participants making approved withdrawals	**87% (94)**	12% (13)	1%
24.	Average dollar value of approved withdrawals	**51% (55)**	42% (45)	7% (8)
25.	Average dollar value of unapproved withdrawals	39% (42)	**43% (46)**	19% (20)
26.	Total number of participants making asset purchases by type	**93% (100)**	6% (7)	1% (1)
27.	Average length of time to make asset purchase, by type	39% (42)	**58% (63)**	3% (3)
28.	Percent of participants that opened accounts and made asset purchases	**69% (75)**	29% (31)	2% (2)

Financial / Economic Indicators, Part 1 – PARTICIPANT INCOME				
29.	Income at account opening	**91% (99)**	8% (9)	1% (1)
30.	Income at asset purchase	34% (37)	**60% (65)**	6% (7)
31.	Income one year after asset purchase	5% (5)	**77% (84)**	18% (20)
32.	Income two years or later after asset purchase	2% (2)	**65% (71)**	33% (36)

Financial / Economic Indicators, Part 2 – PARTICIPANT ASSETS				
33.	Total assets at account opening	**84% (90)**	13% (14)	3% (3)

34.	Total assets at asset purchase	24% (26)	**64% (68)**	12% (13)
35.	Total assets at one year after asset purchase (including the asset purchase)	6% (6)	**74% (79)**	21% (22)
36.	Total assets two years or later after asset purchase (including the asset purchase)	2% (2)	**61% (65)**	37% (40)

Financial / Economic Indicators, Part 3 – PARTICIPANT DEBT				
37.	Total debt at account opening	**81% (87)**	18% (19)	1% (1)
38.	Total debt at asset purchase	28% (30)	**65% (70)**	7% (7)
39.	Total debt at one year after asset purchase	4% (4)	**75% (80)**	21% (23)
40.	Total debt two years or later after asset purchase	0% (0)	**63% (67)**	37% (40)

Financial / Economic Indicators, Part 4 – PARTICIPANT NET WORTH				
41.	Net worth or net financial assets at account opening	**78% (83)**	19% (20)	4% (4)
42.	Net worth or net financial assets at asset purchase	21% (22)	**71% (76)**	8% (9)
43.	Net worth or net financial assets at one year after asset purchase	4% (4)	**72% (77)**	24% (26)
44.	Net worth or net financial assets two years or later after asset purchase	0% (0)	**64% (68)**	36% (39)

Financial / Economic Indicators, Part 5 – PARTICIPANT CONSUMER DEBT				
45.	Consumer debt-service ratio lower than .1 at account opening	13% (14)	**62% (66)**	25% (27)
46.	Consumer debt-service ratio lower than .1 at asset purchase	8% (9)	**64% (68)**	28% (30)
47.	Consumer debt-service ratio lower than .1 at one year after asset purchase	2% (2)	**61% (65)**	37% (40)
48.	Consumer debt-service ratio lower than .1 at two years or later after asset purchase	0% (0)	**53% (57)**	47% (50)

Financial / Economic Indicators, Part 6 – PARTICIPANT ANNUAL DEBT				
49.	Annual debt-service ratio lower than .3 at account opening	10% (11)	**62% (66)**	28% (30)
50.	Annual debt-service ratio lower than .3 at asset purchase	6% (6)	**64% (69)**	30% (32)
51.	Annual debt-service ratio lower than .3 at one year after asset purchase	2% (2)	**58% (62)**	40% (43)
52.	Annual debt-service ratio lower than .3 two years after asset purchase	0% (0)	**50% (54)**	50% (53)

Financial / Economic Indicators, Part 7 – PARTICIPANT CREDIT SCORE				
53.	Credit score at account opening	**52% (56)**	42% (45)	6% (6)
54.	Credit score at asset purchase	33% (35)	**61% (65)**	7% (7)
55.	Credit score at one year after asset purchase	3% (3)	**70% (75)**	27% (29)
56.	Credit score two years or later after asset purchase	0% (0)	**60% (64)**	40% (43)
Financial / Economic Indicators, Part 8 – PARTICIPANT RECEIPT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE				
57.	Value of public assistance at account opening	**67% (72)**	26% (28)	7% (8)
58.	Value of public assistance at asset purchase	18% (19)	**68% (73)**	15% (16)
59.	Value of public assistance at one year after asset purchase	3% (3)	**66% (71)**	31% (34)
60.	Value of public assistance two years or later after asset purchase	0% (0)	**56% (61)**	44% (47)
Financial / Economic Indicators, Part 9 – PARTICIPANT USES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE				
61.	Use of resources like food banks, utility payment assistance, and so forth at account opening	30% (32)	**54% (58)**	16% (17)
62.	Use of resources like food banks, utility payment assistance, and so forth at asset purchase	11% (12)	**66% (71)**	22% (24)
63.	Use of resources like food banks, utility payment assistance, and so forth at one year after asset purchase	2% (2)	**64% (68)**	35% (37)
64.	Use of resources like food banks, utility payment assistance, and so forth at two years or later after asset purchase	1% (1)	**51% (55)**	48% (51)
Value of Asset Purchase / Leverage				
65.	Total sales price of homes purchased	**63% (67)**	34% (36)	4% (4)
66.	Total mortgage amount of homes purchased	**55% (59)**	40% (43)	5% (5)
67.	Number of participants receiving down payment assistance	**50% (54)**	41% (44)	8% (9)
68.	Total amount of down payment assistance received	42% (45)	**50% (53)**	8% (9)
69.	Number of participants receiving subsidized interest on mortgage leveraged	22% (24)	**60% (64)**	18% (19)
70.	Number of loans leveraged for business	23% (25)	**57% (61)**	20% (21)

71.	Total dollar value of loans leveraged for business	23% (25)	**59% (63)**	18% (19)
72.	Total value of assets purchased for business	35% (37)	**50% (53)**	16% (17)
73.	Total tuition and fees leveraged for education	36% (39)	**50% (54)**	13% (14)
74.	Loans and grants leveraged for education	25% (27)	**54% (58)**	21% (22)
75.	Income earned at any point after graduation from higher education program	5% (5)	**64% (69)**	31% (33)
Retention of Assets				
76.	Still in home one year after asset purchase	24% (26)	**67% (72)**	9% (10)
77.	Still in home two years or later after asset purchase	13% (14)	**59% (64)**	28% (30)
78.	Still in business one year after asset purchase	17% (18)	**66% (71)**	18% (19)
79.	Still in business two years or later after asset purchase	11% (12)	**56% (60)**	33% (36)
80.	Completed certificate or degree in higher education program	18% (19)	**64% (69)**	19% (20)
81.	Obtained job as a result of the degree or certificate	7% (8)	**70% (76)**	22% (24)
82.	Changes in value of home one year after asset purchase	6% (6)	**63% (68)**	31% (34)
83.	Changes in value of home two years or later after asset purchase	2% (2)	**57% (62)**	41% (44)
Community Indicators				
84.	Number of businesses started	**67% (72)**	19% (2)	14% (15)
85.	Number of businesses expanded	**64% (69)**	21% (22)	15% (16)
86.	Number of jobs created or retained by businesses	17% (18)	**62% (66)**	21% (23)
87.	Property taxes generated by home purchases	7% (8)	**58% (62)**	35% (37)
88.	Social connectedness and/or decrease in social isolation	7% (8)	**57% (61)**	36% (38)
89.	Involvement in neighborhood/community affairs	6% (6)	**61% (65)**	34% (36)
90.	Involvement in caring for or helping others	4% (4)	**60% (64)**	36% (39)
91.	Involvement in formal political processes – voting, working on campaign, running for office	1% (1)	**64% (68)**	36% (38)
Efficiency Measures				
92.	Cost per account	25% (27)	**64% (69)**	10% (11)
93.	Relative costs of serving different populations	7% (7)	**70% (75)**	23% (25)