



**DEPARTMENT
of HEALTH
and HUMAN
SERVICES**

**ADMINISTRATION FOR
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

FY 2010 Online Performance Appendix

Introduction

The FY 2010 Online Performance Appendix is one of several documents that fulfill the Department of Health and Human Services' (HHS) performance planning and reporting requirements. HHS achieves full compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 and Office of Management and Budget Circulars A-11 and A-136 through the HHS agencies' FY 2010 Congressional Justifications and Online Performance Appendices, the Agency Financial Report, and the HHS Citizens' Report. These documents are available at <http://www.hhs.gov/asrt/ob/docbudget/index.html>.

The FY 2010 Congressional Justifications and accompanying Online Performance Appendices contain the updated FY 2008 Annual Performance Report and FY 2010 Annual Performance Plan. The Agency Financial Report provides fiscal and high-level performance results. The HHS Citizens' Report summarizes key past and planned performance and financial information.

The performance measures included in this submission reflect historical practice, and will need to be reviewed by the new Administration. In some cases, performance goals, objectives, and related measures may need to be reevaluated.



MESSAGE FROM THE ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY

I am pleased to present the FY 2010 Online Performance Appendix for the Administration for Children and Families. Our core mission is to promote the economic and social well-being of children, youth, families, and communities, focusing particular attention on vulnerable populations such as children in low-income families, refugees, Native Americans, and people with developmental disabilities.

To the best of my knowledge, the performance data reported in this document is accurate, complete, and reliable.

(signed)
Curtis L. Coy
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Children and Families

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

FY 2010 ONLINE PERFORMANCE APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>FY 2010 BUDGET</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
TRANSMITTAL LETTER	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
AMERICAN REINVESTMENT AND RECOVERY ACT.....	4
SUMMARY OF TARGETS AND RESULTS TABLE	6
PERFORMANCE DETAIL (BY ACTIVITY)	7
AGENCY SUPPORT FOR HHS STRATEGIC PLAN	117
FULL COST TABLE	119
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMPLETED PROGRAM EVALUATIONS	122
DISCONTINUED PERFORMANCE MEASURES	123

AMERICAN REINVESTMENT AND RECOVERY ACT

The American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) was signed into law by President Obama on February 17, 2009. It is an unprecedented effort to jumpstart our economy, create or save millions of jobs, and make a down payment on addressing long-neglected challenges so our country can thrive in the 21st century. The Recovery Act is an extraordinary response to a crisis unlike any other since the Great Depression, and includes measures to modernize our nation's infrastructure, enhance energy independence, expand educational opportunities, preserve and improve affordable health care, provide tax relief, and protect those in greatest need.

The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) has received \$10.15 billion in total ARRA funding. The Recovery Act affects eight ACF programs. Discretionary grants will be awarded in Head Start and Early Head Start, as well as the new Strengthening Communities Fund (New Capacity Building Initiative). Formula grants will be awarded in Child Care and Development, Community Services, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, and Child Welfare programs. Additionally, states have a new flexibility for Child Support payments. All Recovery Act appropriations, with the exception of the TANF Supplemental Grants, are available for two fiscal years.

Child Care and Development Fund: The Act provides an additional \$2 billion to state, territory, tribe, and tribal organization funds for child care assistance to low-income working families. Specific amounts are reserved for quality improvement activities.

Early Head Start: The Act provides \$1.1 billion specifically for Early Head Start expansion, which will allow the program to serve an additional estimated 55,000 children and their families, nearly doubling the number of children served by the program. Up to ten percent of these funds can be used for technical assistance, and up to three percent can be used for monitoring. Report language directs HHS to work with grantees to sustain their FY 2009 awards through FY 2010.

Head Start: The Act provides \$1 billion to be allocated according to statute. Report language directs HHS to work with grantees to sustain their FY 2009 awards through FY 2010.

Community Services Block Grant: The Act provides \$1 billion to the block grant and stipulates that one percent of the funds awarded to each state be reserved for benefit enrollment coordination activities. States can serve individuals up to 200 percent of the poverty line (instead of the 125 percent specified in the program's authorizing legislation).

Strengthening Communities Fund (New Capacity-Building Initiative): The Act provides \$50 million to award capacity-building grants to non-profit organizations and state, local, and tribal government agencies to expand social services delivery to individuals and communities affected by the economic downturn.

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF): The Act provides \$5 billion to states, territories and tribes through a new Emergency Contingency Fund to respond to increases in assistance caseloads or certain types of expenditures.

- The Act establishes three criteria to access the Emergency Fund: TANF caseload increases coupled with increased spending on assistance; increased spending on one-time short term benefits; or increased spending on subsidized employment.
- Each grant amount equals 80 percent of the increase over the lesser of FY 2007 or FY 2008 federal and qualified state expenditures for each of the three categories described above.

- The total payable to a jurisdiction under the Emergency Contingency Fund and the TANF Contingency Fund combined for FY 2009 and FY 2010 cannot exceed 50 percent of its TANF annual block grant.
- In addition, the Act:
 - Temporarily modifies the caseload reduction credit calculation, which reduces a state's required work participation rate for a fiscal year by the number of percentage points its caseload declined between FY 2005 and the year prior to the current fiscal year (called the comparison year). In fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011, a state may either use the prior fiscal year as its comparison year or it may use the caseload reduction credit it qualified to receive when the comparison year was FY 2007 or FY 2008, whichever had the lower caseload. As a result, the state's required work participation rate will not increase simply because the state assisted more families during this period of increased need.
 - Provides \$319 million to extend TANF Supplemental grants, which would have expired at the end of FY 2009, through FY 2010. These grants provide additional assistance to 17 states with high population growth and/or low levels of welfare spending per poor person.
 - Authorizes states to use carry-over funds from previous years for any TANF benefit or service. Previously, states and tribes were limited in using carry-over funds only for cash assistance to families.

Child Support – States operate programs that provide assistance to families in establishing the paternity of a child, establishing and modifying child support orders and collecting child support owed to them. The federal government reimburses states for 66 percent of state costs. The federal government also pays states federal incentive payments, which are based on state performance. Effective October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2010, the Recovery Act allows states to receive federal matching funds for program costs paid for with federal incentive payments, reversing a change by a previous federal law in 2005.

Child Welfare Programs - A federal match equal to the Medicaid match rate for medical assistance payments (FMAP) is provided for state maintenance payments for foster care, adoption assistance, and guardianship assistance care under title IV-E of the Social Security Act. Beginning in FY 2010, participating tribes also will be eligible for these funds. The Recovery Act temporarily increases the FMAP rate for these title IV-E entitlement programs by approximately 6.2 percent, which will provide states with an estimated additional \$823 million in matching funds. This matching increase is effective October 1, 2008 through December 31, 2010.

More information on these and other ARRA programs can be found at www.hhs.gov/recovery.

ACF SUMMARY OF TARGETS AND RESULTS TABLE¹

Fiscal Year	Total Targets	Targets with Results Reported	Percent of Targets with Results Reported	Total Targets Met	Percent of Targets Met
2007	88	84	95%	42	50%
2008	93	42	45%	24	57%
2009	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010	105	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹ Figures in the table reflect only measures that are reported in this FY 2010 Online Performance Appendix. Measures from past years that were discontinued are not included in this count. The FY 2010 Congressional Justification and Online Performance Appendix also include 14 developmental measures, which likewise are not included in the table.

**FY 2010 ONLINE PERFORMANCE APPENDIX
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

PERFORMANCE DETAIL

DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS	8
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program	8
1. <i>Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)</i>	8
Child Care and Development Block Grant	14
2. <i>Child Care and Development Block Grant</i>	14
Children and Families Services Programs	19
3. <i>Head Start</i>	19
4. <i>Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs</i>	26
5. <i>Abstinence Education</i>	30
6. <i>Mentoring Children of Prisoners</i>	33
7. <i>Child Abuse Prevention and Child Welfare Programs</i>	38
8. <i>Developmental Disabilities</i>	64
9. <i>Native American Programs</i>	69
10. <i>Compassion Capital Fund</i>	73
11. <i>Federal Administration</i>	75
12. <i>Community Services Block Grant</i>	78
13. <i>Individual Development Accounts (Assets for Independence)</i>	80
14. <i>Family Violence Prevention and Services</i>	84
Refugee and Entrant Assistance	88
15. <i>Transitional and Medical Services</i>	88
16. <i>Matching Grants</i>	90
17. <i>Victims of Trafficking</i>	93
18. <i>Social Services/Targeted Assistance</i>	96
19. <i>Unaccompanied Alien Children</i>	99
MANDATORY PROGRAMS	102
Child Support Enforcement and Family Support Programs	102
20. <i>Child Support Enforcement</i>	102
Foster Care and Adoption Assistance	107
Social Services Block Grant	108
21. <i>Social Services Block Grant</i>	108
Promoting Safe and Stable Families	110
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	111
22. <i>Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i>	111
Child Care Entitlement	116

DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS

Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program

1. Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
1.1LT and 1A: By FY 2010, increase the reciprocity targeting index score to 96 for LIHEAP households having at least one member 60 years, and by FY 2014, increase to 5 percent over the FY 2007 actual result. ² (<i>Outcome</i>)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	Prior Result +5% ³	Aug-15
	2010	96	Aug-11
	2009	96	Aug-10
	2008	96	Aug-09
	2007	94	78 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	92	77 (Target Not Met) ⁴
	2005	84	79 (Target Not Met but Improved)
1.1LT and 1B: Maintain the reciprocity targeting index score of LIHEAP households having at least one member five years or younger. ⁵ (<i>Outcome</i>)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	Prior Result +2% ⁶	N/A
	2010	122	Aug-11
	2009	122	Aug-10
	2008	122	Aug-09
	2007	122	110 (Target Not Met)
	2006	122	112 (Target Not Met) ⁷
	2005	122	113 (Target Not Met)
1C: Increase the ratio of LIHEAP households assisted (heating, cooling, crisis, and weatherization assistance) ⁸ per \$100 of LIHEAP administrative costs. (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2010	3.95	Aug-11
	2009	3.95	Aug-10
	2008	3.88	Aug-09
	2007	3.81	3.59 (Target Not Met but Improved)

²This measure is calculated using only heating-assisted homes.

³The FY 2014 target is to increase by 5 percent over the FY 2007 actual result.

⁴Previously reported data for FY 2006 actual results have been updated as a result of updated state data submissions.

⁵This measure is calculated using only heating-assisted homes.

⁶The FY 2014 for this measure is to increase by 2 percent over the FY 2007 actual result.

⁷Previously reported data for FY 2006 actual results have been updated as a result of updated state data submissions.

⁸The accuracy of this data is questionable given that currently unduplicated counts of recipient households for all services are unavailable. Beginning in FY 2011, such unduplicated counts will be collected.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
	2006	3.74	2.95 (Target Not Met) ⁹
	2005	3.67	3.69 (Target Exceeded)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
1.1LT 1A 1.1LT 1B	State <i>LIHEAP Household Report</i> and Census Bureau's Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey	ACF obtains weighted number of LIHEAP income eligible (low income) households from the ASEC which is validated by the Census Bureau. ACF aggregates data from the states' annual <i>LIHEAP Household Report</i> to furnish national counts of LIHEAP households that receive heating assistance (including data on the number of LIHEAP recipient households having at least one member who is 60 year or older and the number of LIHEAP recipient households having at least one member who is five years or younger). The aggregation and editing of state-reported LIHEAP reciprocity data for the previous fiscal year are typically completed in July of the current fiscal year. Consequently, the data are not available in time to modify ACF interventions prior to the current fiscal year (e.g. there is a one year data lag). There are no federal quality control or audit requirements for the data obtained from the <i>LIHEAP Household Report</i> . However ACF provides to states an electronic version of the <i>LIHEAP Household Report</i> that includes formulae that protect against mathematical errors. ACF also cross checks the data against LIHEAP benefit data obtained from the states' submission of the annual <i>LIHEAP Grantee Survey</i> on sources and uses of LIHEAP funds.
1C	<i>LIHEAP Grantee Survey</i> and <i>LIHEAP Household Report</i>	Each winter, state LIHEAP grantees report on the <i>LIHEAP Grantee Survey</i> the amount of obligated LIHEAP administrative costs for the previous fiscal year. These data, along with data from the <i>LIHEAP Household Report</i> , are used to calculate the efficiency measure. The aggregation and editing of the administrative cost data for the previous fiscal year are typically completed by August of the current fiscal year. Consequently, the data are not available in time to modify interventions prior to the current fiscal year (e.g. there is a one year data lag). There are no federal quality control or audit requirements for the fiscal data obtained from the <i>LIHEAP Grantee Survey</i> . However, as with the <i>LIHEAP Household Report</i> , for the last several years ACF has made available an electronic version of the <i>LIHEAP Grantee Survey</i> that state LIHEAP grantees are using in submitting their data to ACF. The electronic version includes a number of edits that check the data for mathematical mistakes and against statutory limits in the use of LIHEAP funds.

Long term goal 1.1 directly relates to the LIHEAP statute, which mandates that LIHEAP assistance be targeted to those low income households with the highest home energy needs, i.e., vulnerable households and high-energy burden households. The reciprocity targeting index measures whether the program is serving each of these types of households at a higher rate than their prevalence in the low income target household population.

ACF implemented a federal LIHEAP outreach campaign in FY 2004 to improve the reciprocity targeting of LIHEAP vulnerable households. For example, ACF distributed a LIHEAP brochure nationwide. ACF worked with the Administration on Aging (AoA) at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to reach low income households with an elderly member. And in FY 2009, ACF's Division of Energy

⁹ Previously reported data for FY 2006 actual results have been updated as a result of updated state data submissions.

Assistance (DEA) joined the Center for Benefit Outreach and Enrollment which is funded by AoA. The purpose of the Center's work is to improve targeting of elderly households. In 2006, ACF collaborated with the Energy for Health Working Group led by the National Energy Assistance Directors' Association. Periodic teleconferences were held with experts from the public health and energy assistance fields. Since the spring of 2007, ACF has collaborated with the Head Start (HS) program to build awareness of LIHEAP to households with young children through such outreach activities as presentations at HS meetings and disseminating a semiannual email to local HS staff with seasonal energy-related tips.

ACF tracks LIHEAP's heating reciprocity annually through reciprocity targeting index scores. The results of LIHEAP's outreach efforts need to be examined with respect to external factors that may affect the final targeting index scores. For example, fluctuations in the national economy will generally affect the need for human services programs such as LIHEAP. In addition, the following factors can impact LIHEAP program performance in particular: (1) weather; (2) economic downturn(s); (3) home energy prices; (4) utility deregulation;¹⁰ (5) utility arrearages; (6) the availability and timing of federal funds and additional non-federal energy assistance funding sources (such as public service benefit programs, state funds, and private fuel funds); (7) perceptions of the program (that may produce barriers to vulnerable households' applying for assistance); and, (8) the block grant design of LIHEAP.¹¹ ACF will explore the use of standard errors of measurement to test for statistical significance in changes of targeting index scores over time, as data on LIHEAP income eligible households are based on sampling.

Regarding annual measure 1A, the baseline index score for households with at least one member 60 years or older was 79 for FY 2003. Both the FY 2004 targeting index score of 78 and the FY 2005 targeting index score of 79 indicate that there was no apparent improvement in targeting the elderly, despite outreach efforts that began in FY 2004. The FY 2006 targeting index score of 77 indicates a decrease in targeting the elderly from the previous year and does not meet the target score of 92. In FY 2007, the targeting index score rose slightly to 78, showing a trend over the past three years of a two-point spread which has consistently remained in the high seventies. These scores show that the elderly population remains at a fairly consistent level which reflects that elderly households are underserved within the total eligible population of elderly households. The expected increase in the number of low income elderly households has affected the ability of ACF to achieve its targets for elderly LIHEAP households. ACF's target is to increase the index score to 96 by FY 2010.

ACF's ability to increase targeting of households is limited because states have considerable flexibility in determining which LIHEAP eligible households to target. ACF recently conducted a study of state grantees to assess the factors affecting whether a state is a high or low performer with respect to targeting elderly households. ACF recently released on the LIHEAP web site a report with the findings from that study. In May 2009, ACF expects to release to its state grantees rankings of state-level reciprocity targeting index scores.¹² These state-level scores and rankings will allow ACF and its LIHEAP grantees to better understand which states are high and low performers in targeting two vulnerable populations, and begin to analyze why some states may fall substantially below the national target goals. ACF has not increased the target for FY 2010 (96) given that the data for FY 2006 is below the baseline targeting index score of 79.

¹⁰ Utility deregulation may also have an impact as rates increase (e.g. Maryland) and where some states consider returning to regulation (e.g. California).

¹¹ States have maximum flexibility under the block grant statutes to design and operate programs suited to each state's assessments of its citizens' needs. Consequently, the federal government has very limited control of a block grant program such as LIHEAP. For this reason, there will be wide variations in program performance due to how states design their program to reflect their own program goals which may differ from the federal performance goals.

¹² The information will be shared with states via an Information Memorandum and, at a later point, it will be published on the LIHEAP web site. Preliminary state indexes were shared individually with the states in 2008. The formatting of the ranking is being developed and the final ranking should be released this spring.

Regarding annual measure 1B, the baseline targeting reciprocity index score for households with a young child was 122 for FY 2003. The targeting index score of 115 (FY 2004), 113 (FY 2005), 112 (FY 2006), and 110 (FY 2007) represent a steady national decrease in performance from 122 (FY 2003). Though the FY 2007 result of 110 is less than the target of 122, any targeting index score over 100 indicates that the LIHEAP program is still providing effective outreach to income eligible households with a child under the age of five. The rankings of state targeting index scores that ACF has developed also include the data for young child households. One preliminary finding of the targeting study indicates that most states that performed well in targeting one vulnerable population performed poorly in targeting the other vulnerable group. ACF intends to further investigate this trend and what appears to be the need to better balance targeting efforts at the state level to significantly raise the targeting level of elderly households without decreasing the targeting performance for young child households.

In an effort to further improve outreach to such households, the program studied the structure and outreach efforts of a range of federal programs, including the State Child Health Insurance Program and the Women, Infants and Children program to determine if similar strategies may be used, in order to reach a targeted index score of 122 in FY 2010. The findings from this study were included in the December, 2008 ACF targeting report mentioned above, which ACF expects to release to its state LIHEAP grantee via an Information Memorandum in May, 2009. While the study did not result in conclusive findings of which LIHEAP targeting practices are associated with high targeting performance, the study did identify certain general practices that worked for other federal programs. The rankings of state targeting index scores that ACF has developed also include the data for young child households. One preliminary finding of the targeting study indicates that most states that performed well in targeting one vulnerable population performed poorly in targeting the other vulnerable group. ACF intends to further investigate this trend and what appears to be the need to better balance targeting efforts at the state level to significantly raise the targeting level of elderly households without decreasing the targeting performance for young child households.

The state reciprocity targeting rankings will provide accountability and feedback on which states are performing at higher levels. They provide peer technical assistance to state grantees and can serve as a management tool for self-improvement. In June 2009, ACF will present the targeting study findings and the final state-level targeting indexes and rankings at the National Energy and Utility Affordability Conference, which many of the state LIHEAP staff attend.

Starting in 2007, DEA staff held meetings with ACF staff from the Office of Head Start (OHS) and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs to share reciprocity data and explore the extent to which similar trends can be seen regarding the number of households served with either an elderly member or a young child. DEA held teleconferences with its Regional Offices to further explore these trends and what some states or regions may already be doing to prevent further decline in the reciprocity numbers. DEA plans to maintain this communication and expand it to state LIHEAP grantees in order to support coordinated action on this issue. Furthermore, DEA has arranged with OHS to share resources and expand LIHEAP outreach through OHS points of contact. These discussions helped to identify one new trend concerning the rise in the number of grandparents raising grandchildren. DEA continues to investigate this trend in more detail to determine the impact it may have on factors such as the increased household need for assistance, and the effect of new or multiple barriers to applying for assistance faced by households with more than one category of "vulnerable" member.

In March 2008, ACF distributed information to each state LIHEAP grantee concerning their state Head Start Collaboration Director contacts. The hope is that this information will lead to enhanced collaboration between the Head Start and LIHEAP programs at the state level, especially given that both programs target young child households. ACF also shared with each state LIHEAP office its own preliminary state-level targeting index and ranking.

In October, 2008, ACF received OMB approval to expand states' LIHEAP data collection to include an unduplicated count of households that receive any type of LIHEAP assistance, such as heating, cooling, crisis, or weatherization. LIHEAP grantees will be required to begin reporting the unduplicated household count for FY 2011 with the following year's state plan. This new data request will likely increase the targeting scores for both elderly households and young child households because it will more accurately reflect the total number of those households served by LIHEAP given that the current targeting index scores only reflect those households receiving heating assistance through LIHEAP. As the current data only reports on heating assistance, these new data will increase the reciprocity numbers for all types of households, including elderly and young child households. At the same time, the number of income eligibles will remain the same for a particular year.

ACF's *LIHEAP Energy Burden Evaluation Study* (July 2005) examined the performance of LIHEAP in serving high-energy burden households in FY 2001. The study used data from the Energy Information Administration's (EIA) 2001 Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS). This survey is conducted every four years. ACF funded the LIHEAP RECS Supplemental Sample for 2001 and 2005. ACF is considering funding a similar sample for the 2009 RECS.

The 2001 LIHEAP RECS Supplemental Sample provided for the first time: (1) national data to compute the benefit targeting index¹³ and the burden reduction targeting index¹⁴; (2) examination of the overlap between vulnerable eligible households and high-energy burden eligible households; and (3) the ability to develop an empirical definition of "high home energy burden." The LIHEAP statute identifies "households with the lowest incomes and highest home energy costs" as one of the groups with the "highest home energy needs." ACF defined "high energy burden" by setting an energy burden threshold; i.e., households with an energy burden that exceeds a fixed percentage of income are defined as high burden households. This approach was selected over a population share approach (which defines a certain share of the population as having a high energy burden) and a variance approach (which defines high energy burden as lying one standard deviation above the mean). The threshold was based on housing data. Therefore, high home energy burden for LIHEAP was defined as home energy burden greater than or equal to 4.3 percent of household income.

The study found the following:

- For FY 2001 the benefit targeting index score for high-energy burden households was 108. This indicates that these households received higher LIHEAP benefits than other types of LIHEAP recipients. The study also found that the burden reduction targeting index score for these households was 96. This indicates that these households have a somewhat smaller burden reduction than other types of LIHEAP recipient households. This suggests LIHEAP does not target the highest burden households with the greatest level of burden reduction. ACF shared the findings with state LIHEAP grantees, but has not received any specific findings. A crucial element is that the statute does not require states to measure energy burden, using actual energy household costs, in targeting high burden households. In addition, the statute has not established

¹³ The benefit targeting index score is computed by dividing the mean LIHEAP benefit for a target group of recipient households by the percent of LIHEAP benefits for all LIHEAP recipient households times 100. For example, if high energy burden recipient households have a mean heating assistance benefit of \$250 and the mean heating assistance benefit for all households receiving heating assistance is \$200, then the benefit targeting index is 125 (\$250 divided by \$200 times 100). A benefit targeting index score above 100 indicates that LIHEAP is providing higher benefits to a target group of households than to all LIHEAP recipient households.

¹⁴ The burden reduction targeting score is computed by dividing the percent reduction in the median home energy burden (i.e., home energy costs divided by household income) for a target group of LIHEAP households by the percent reduction in the median home energy burden for all LIHEAP households. For example, if high burden recipient households have their home energy burden reduced by 25 percent and all recipient households have their home energy reduced by 20 percent, the burden reduction index is 125 (25 percent divided by 20 percent times 100). An index score above 100 indicates that LIHEAP benefits are providing a target group of households a greater reduction in home energy burden than for all LIHEAP recipient households.

what is considered high level. The study established high energy burden empirically for the purpose of the study; not for program operation.

- About 20 percent of low income households are both vulnerable and high-energy burden households.¹⁵ Vulnerable members are those households with either an elderly member age 60 years or older or a young child age five years or younger. ACF needs to determine whether there is a practical way for LIHEAP grantees to identify LIHEAP eligible households that are both vulnerable and high-energy burden, especially for those states that rely on mail-in LIHEAP applications.

The study has led ACF to investigate whether the results will be replicated in the 2005 RECS, which included an improved sampling design and questions for the 2005 RECS LIHEAP Supplemental Sample. As the RECS 2005 data only became available in late fall of 2008, and the RECS 2009 will not go into the field until February 2010, ACF needs to analyze the RECS 2005 data in the near future.

Efficiency measure 1C focuses on increasing the ratio of the number of households receiving LIHEAP assistance (numerator) to state LIHEAP administrative costs (denominator).¹⁶ An increase in the ratio indicates an increase in program efficiency through a greater number of LIHEAP households being served at a lower administrative cost, regardless of its effects on the extent to which LIHEAP benefits increase the affordability of home energy costs. The LIHEAP statute limits LIHEAP grantees' administrative costs to 10 percent of the funds payable. Trend data for FY 2000 through FY 2005 indicate that the ratio of LIHEAP households assisted per \$100 of LIHEAP administrative costs ranged from 3.64 to 3.75. However in FY 2006, the ratio declined to 2.95, missing the target of 3.81. This decline most likely reflects the unexpected increase in LIHEAP funding late in FY 2006. In March 2006, Congress appropriated \$1 billion in supplemental LIHEAP funds that were then distributed to LIHEAP grantees. However, the appropriating legislation prohibited these funds from being used for administrative costs. For a number of states, this restriction limited new outreach initiatives. It appears that a number of state LIHEAP grantees decided to use the additional funds to increase fuel assistance and crisis assistance benefits for the households that were assisted earlier in FY 2006. This limited the overall increase in the number of new assisted households, while avoiding incurring additional administrative costs to fund new households. The FY 2007 score of 3.59 reflects a substantial improvement in program efficiency from FY 2006 and is likely due to the fact that no similar amount and timing of additional LIHEAP funds was appropriated in FY 2007 as occurred in the previous year. By FY 2010, the program seeks to improve efficiency by raising the target ratio to 3.95.

¹⁵ Energy burden is defined by the statute as the share of annual household income that is used to pay annual energy bills. For example, if a household has a gross annual energy bill of \$1,000 and a gross annual income of \$10,000, the household's gross energy burden is 10 percent of income. In our 2001 Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) study, responding households report gross annual income, but annual energy bills for a household were obtained from the household's energy suppliers. ACF defines the household's net energy burden as the share of annual household income that is used to pay annual energy bills net of the household's LIHEAP grant. For example, if a household has a gross annual energy bill of \$1,000 and LIHEAP benefit of \$250, the household's net energy bill is \$750. If the household's annual income is \$10,000, the household's net energy burden is 7.5 percent of income. In the 2005 RECS LIHEAP Supplement sample, LIHEAP assistance amounts were obtained for households from state LIHEAP administrative data. For the most part, states do not collect actual data on home energy costs, but instead use proxy data from 2005. The RECS has only recently become available.

¹⁶ This measure does not indicate whether the adequacy of LIHEAP services is impacted by the provision of more efficient services.

Child Care and Development Block Grant

2. Child Care and Development Block Grant

Measure	FY	Target	Result
2.1ILT: Reduce the percentage of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) families with children that are exempt from employment participation because child care is unavailable to 1 percent by FY 2009. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2009	1%	Mar-11
2A: Maintain the proportion of children served through Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) child care funding as compared to the number of children in families with income under 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Level. ¹⁷ <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	32%	Mar-12
	2009	32%	Mar-11
	2008	32%	Mar-10
	2007	32%	30% (Target Not Met) ¹⁸
	2006	32%	34% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	32%	33% (Target Exceeded)
2B: Increase the proportion of regulated centers and family child care homes that serve families and children receiving child care subsidies. <i>(Efficiency)</i>	2010	70%	Mar-12
	2009	69%	Mar-11
	2008	68%	Mar-10
	2007	67%	68.6% (Target Exceeded) ¹⁹
	2006	66%	68.2% (Target Exceeded) ²⁰
	2005	65%	71.2% (Target Exceeded)

¹⁷ This measure estimates the average monthly number of children receiving child care subsidies from all federal sources (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Child Care and Development Fund [CCDF], and Social Services Block Grant), compared on an annual basis to an estimate of the average monthly number of children who may be eligible for child care subsidies. Under CCDF law, states have substantial flexibility to establish their own rules regarding eligibility for child care subsidies within broad federal guidelines. This estimate of potentially eligible children does not take into account state-specific eligibility thresholds and other requirements families must meet to receive child care subsidies.

¹⁸ The FY 2007 actual results for this outcome measure are preliminary and will be finalized in summer of 2009.

¹⁹ The FY 2007 actual results for this outcome measure are preliminary and will be finalized in summer of 2009.

²⁰ Data for this measure is taken from an annual licensing study of child care programs conducted by the National Association for Regulatory Administration and the National Child Care Information Center. The study methodology was revised in 2006 and the survey was not conducted. Therefore, ACF used the FY 2005 denominator or "total number of regulated providers" to calculate the FY 2006 actual result for this measure. However, the survey has since resumed and the FY 2007 study was published in February 2009. ACF has used the FY 2007 data to calculate the FY 2007 actual result for this measure.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
<u>2.2LT</u> : Increase the percentage of young children (ages three to five not yet in kindergarten) from families under 150 percent of poverty receiving non-parental care showing three or more school readiness skills from 32 percent in FY 2001 to 42 percent in FY 2011. (Outcome)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	42% (FY 2011)	Mar-13
<u>2C</u> : Increase by 10 percent the number of regulated child care centers and homes nationwide accredited by a recognized early childhood development professional organization. ²¹ (Outcome)	2010	Prior Result +10%	Jun-11
	2009	Prior Result +10%	Jun-10
	2008	12,692	Jun-09
	2007	15,217	11,538 (Target Not Met) ²²
	2006	14,411	13,834 (Target Not Met but Improved) ²³
	2005	13,076	13,101 (Target Exceeded) ²⁴
<u>2D</u> : Increase the number of states that have implemented state early learning guidelines in literacy, language, pre-reading, and numeracy for children ages three to give that align with state K-12 standards and are linked to the education and training of caregivers, preschool teachers, and administrators. ²⁵ (Outcome)	2009	35	Dec-09
	2007	28	32 (Target Exceeded)
	2005	N/A	22 (Historical Actual)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
2.1LT	National Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Database	Data are validated via single state audits.
2A	State monthly case-level report administrative data (ACF-801) and Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) expenditure data.	The Child Care Bureau Information System (CCBIS) is a web portal that receives and processes CCDF child care aggregate and case level data from the 50 states, the District of Columbia, territories, and tribes. It allows federal staff to access data obtained from the tribal annual report, state annual aggregate report, and state monthly case-level report. All data received via the CCBIS are stored in national databases. Further, CCB gave ACF Regional offices access to the CCBIS to track grantee data submissions and further enhance data quality.

²¹ This measure is based on data collected each calendar (not fiscal) year.

²² The CY 2007 actual result is 17 percent under the CY 2006 actual result.

²³ The CY 2006 actual result is 6 percent over the CY 2005 actual result.

²⁴ The CY 2005 actual result is 10 percent over the CY 2004 actual result.

²⁵ This measure is biennially reported due to the constraints on data availability, and is collected each calendar (not fiscal) year.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
2B	Administrative Data (ACF Forms 800 and 801, Aggregate Reports) and the National Child Care Information Center	The National Association for Regulatory Administration (NARA) and the National Child Care Information Center (contracted by the Child Care Bureau) conduct the annual licensing study of child care programs. NARA sends a survey to all state child care licensing agencies requesting the total number of licensed programs. The organization conducts follow-up calls with non-responding states to ensure data from all 50 states are collected. Calls are also made to state licensing agencies when data provided are inconsistent with past history for clarification.
2.2LT	National Household Education Survey (NHES)	NHES, which provides indicators of school readiness among a nationally representative sample of children ages three to five from child care settings, is utilized to look at a subset of children comparable to those served through CCDF (children in non-parental care who are below 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Level). The Bureau will explore state-specific and other data sources to validate the information from NHES regarding the degree to which children in low-income working families enter school equipped with the skills needed to succeed.
2C	The following independent bodies are nationally-recognized sources of information about provider accreditation and certification: National Association for Family Child Care, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), and the National Afterschool Association (formerly known as National School-Age Care Alliance).	The Child Care Bureau contacts the three national accrediting organizations at the beginning of each calendar year to obtain the most complete and accurate number of centers and family child care homes accredited in the previous year. Any changes in accrediting criteria or data collection methods are identified and noted if applicable to this performance measure.
2D	Biennial CCDF Report of State Plans; National Child Care Information Center.	The CCDF State Plan preprint was revised to require states to provide information about their progress in implementing the program components related to early learning. On a biennial basis, the information for this measure will be available through state plans.

The Child Care Bureau (CCB) has worked extensively and in collaboration with states for several years to develop appropriate and achievable program goals and measures. Regarding annual measure 2A, CCB aims to maintain the proportion of children served by the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) child care funding at 32 percent as compared to all potentially eligible children (whose families are under 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Level). This measure is calculated by dividing the estimated average monthly number of children receiving child care through these funding streams by an estimate of the average number of children who may be eligible for child care subsidies.²⁶ CCB did not meet its target for FY 2007; preliminary data show 30 percent of potentially CCDF eligible children were served. Based on preliminary data, the total estimated number of children served decreased from 2.5 to 2.4 million

²⁶ This measure estimates the average monthly number of children receiving child care subsidies from all federal sources (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Child Care Development Fund, and Social Services Block Grant), compared on an annual basis to an estimate of the average monthly number of children who may be eligible for child care subsidies. Specifically, the denominator includes the average monthly number of children ages 0 to 12 (including disabled teenagers) with family income under 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Level whose parents/guardians are working or in school (any number of hours). The denominator is computed by the Urban Institute's TRIM3 microsimulation model and is based on the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey data.

children between FY 2006 and FY 2007. At the same time, the total number of potentially eligible children under 150 percent of poverty increased, from 7.5 million in FY 2006 to nearly 8 million in FY 2007. The goal of this measure is to maintain the proportion of children served at 32 percent through FY 2010. To meet the FY 2009 target, the program is seeking to improve program administration and conduct error rate reviews to improve program efficiency and maximize the number of eligible low-income children served. Because of the unknown number of families using unpaid child care arrangements or who may not need child care subsidies, these estimates are not estimates of “take-up rates” among families who are eligible and have expressed a need for child care assistance. Instead, they show the extent to which CCDF, TANF, and SSBG funds serve the broad pool of children and families whose age, income, and work status indicate a possible need for child care subsidies.

CCDF received an additional \$2 billion in discretionary funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). In determining future performance targets for FY 2009 and FY 2010, this context has been considered. This measure is calculated based on the number of potentially eligible children whose families are below 150 percent of the federal poverty line (which may go up under the current economic conditions), relative to the number of children who receive child care subsidies (which also may go up based on additional funding from ARRA), therefore future targets for FY 2009 and FY 2010 have not been revised.

Efficiency measure 2B demonstrates the level of access low-income families have to different child care options. The rate compares the number of regulated providers who serve children receiving CCDF subsidies in a fiscal year to all regulated centers and family child care homes. In FY 2007, CCB exceeded its target of 67 percent; final data show 69 percent of regulated centers and family care homes served families and children receiving child care subsidies. In the last few years, CCB has consistently exceeded its targets for this measure in part due to targeted technical assistance and other efforts working with grantees to improve access to child care across all provider types for families receiving CCDF subsidies. This efficiency measure is an indicator of the extent to which CCDF is well-administered and provides timely, stable funding for providers. Stable, affordable child care arrangements can lead to cost savings by reducing expenditures on cash assistance and other forms of government assistance as parents are able to find and keep employment – and become self-sufficient. Cost savings can also be achieved through reduced spending on efforts to recruit and retain providers, as well as training providers on how to navigate the subsidy system and comply with state health and safety regulations.

Annual measure 2B recognizes that a lack of appropriate child care can be a barrier to employment and self-sufficiency for many families. The proportion of regulated centers and homes caring for subsidized families and children indicates how efficiently the program is being administered, and thus its effectiveness in supporting parental employment by bolstering access to child care. Individual child care providers are not obligated to serve families receiving subsidies through CCDF. For example, if the reimbursement rates paid by a state are too low or if providers have difficulty getting paid or collecting co-payments from families, providers may choose not to serve subsidized families. Increasing the number and type of providers accessible through the subsidy system enables recipient families to better select the child care that fits their work and family needs, especially families working non-traditional hours and rotating schedules. CCB hopes to broaden the measure to include unregulated providers once there is adequate data available. For FY 2010, CCB aims for the proportion of regulated centers and family care homes serving family and children receiving child care subsidies to be at least 70 percent. As previously mentioned, the current economic conditions and the impact of ARRA funds have been considered in setting future performance targets for annual measure 2B. As the ARRA funding will expand child care services, it is possible that the proportion of regulated centers and family child care homes participating in the CCDF program may go up to accommodate the increased number of families receiving child care subsidies. The impacts of ARRA funding on future performance will continue to be monitored.

Annual measure 2C is an indicator of quality improvement calculated by aggregating data on the number of accredited child care providers reported by three early childhood professional development organizations – the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the National Association for Family Child Care (NAFCC), and the National Afterschool Association (NAA). Accreditation of child care facilities has been linked to better outcomes for children, and is increasingly accepted as a marker of good quality care. In CY 2007, CCB did not meet its target of 10 percent improvement for measure 2C: 11,538 child care centers and homes were accredited. In September 2006, new NAEYC Early Childhood Program Standards and Accreditation Criteria became effective, which raised the standards for accreditation. The decline in the number of accredited child care homes and centers in CY 2007 was largely attributable to the continuing impact of these changes including the ability of providers to be responsive to the new criteria and increased workload with conducting assessments. The new system has had an impact on this performance measure because NAEYC accredits a larger proportion of child care facilities than do the other two national accrediting organizations. Additionally, states indicate that an increasing number of providers are now being accredited through state-recognized systems. CCB is exploring options for collecting this state-specific information. By FY 2010, CCB expects to increase the number of regulated child care centers and homes by at least 10 percent over the FY 2008 actual result. To meet this target, CCB will continue to provide technical assistance and guidance to states regarding the use of CCDF quality improvement funds to support accreditation for child care centers and homes. A growing number of states have already developed Quality Rating Systems that assess the quality of providers for purposes such as consumer education and differential subsidy reimbursement, often based on national accreditation standards.

Results for annual measure 2D reflect the federal government's ability to influence state policies related to school readiness. Research indicates that learning, including early language acquisition, begins during infancy through nurturing relationships with parents and caregivers. In addition, preschool children who enter school with strong linguistic, cognitive, and social skills are much better prepared to succeed in kindergarten and beyond. The link between caregiver behaviors and outcomes for children is well-established in research. This measure assesses the degree to which states have established guidelines to be used as the basis for caregiver education and training. It is calculated by reporting an aggregate number of states reporting implementation of early learning guidelines aligned with state K-12 standards and linked to professional development training in their biennial CCDF State Plans. ACF has used the biennial CCDF planning process to work with states toward the development and implementation of early learning guidelines related to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors children need when they enter kindergarten. As a result of this effort, in CY 2007, CCB exceeded its target (28 states) for this measure. A total of 32 states have implemented early learning guidelines linked to professional development and education of caregivers. Increasing the number of states that have implemented these guidelines will help to ensure that young children enter kindergarten with the skills they need to succeed in school. Through continuing technical assistance, training, and guidance to states, CCB expects to increase this result to 35 by CY 2009. As data is reported biennially, there is no target for FY 2010.

Children and Families Services Programs

3. Head Start

Measure	FY	Target	Result
3.1LT and 3A: Increase the percentage of programs in which children on average can identify 10 or more letters of the alphabet. ²⁷ (Outcome)	2007	96%	94.8% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	94%	93.5% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2005	Set Baseline	91.8% (Baseline)
3.2LT: Increase the percentage of programs that achieve average fall to spring gains of at least 12 months in word knowledge (PPVT). ^{1,28} (Outcome)	2010	N/A	N/A
3.3LT: Increase the percentage of programs that achieve average fall to spring gains of at least four counting items. ^{1,2} (Outcome)	2010	N/A	N/A
3.4LT: Increase the percentage of programs in which children make prescribed gains on a measure of social skills. ¹ (Outcome)	2010	N/A	N/A
3.5LT: Increase the percentage of children completing the Head Start program rated by parent as being in excellent or very good health to 83 percent by FY 2010. The baseline is 77 percent in FY 1998. (Outcome)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	85% (FY 2013)	Jan-14
3.6LT and 3B: Increase the percentage of Early Head Start children completing all medical screenings to 91 percent by FY 2010. (Outcome)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	95% (FY 2014)	Jan-15
	2010	91%	Jan-11
	2009	89%	Jan-10
	2008	87%	85.7% (Target Not Met)
	2007	85%	85.2% (Target Exceeded) ²⁹
	2006	83%	82.8% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2005	Set Baseline	82.1% (Baseline)

²⁷ The National Reporting System (NRS) was operational in FY 2007, during the relevant period on which ACF is reporting. However, per the Improving Head Start Act of 2007, the NRS was discontinued. For future years, ACF plans to develop new measures to replace current measures that rely on NRS data. Targets beyond FY 2007 are no longer relevant and have not been included.

²⁸ This long term objective is also a performance indicator in the FY 2007 – 2012 HHS Strategic Plan.

²⁹ The FY 2007 actual result for this measure has been updated as a result of revised analysis of the data for that year.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
3.7LT: Increase the percentage of parents of children in their pre-kindergarten Head Start year who report reading to child three times per week or more, as measured in the spring of their pre-kindergarten Head Start year, to 85 percent by FY 2013. The baseline is 68.4 percent in FY 1998. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	85% (FY 2013)	Jan-14
3.8LT: Increase to 55 percent the percentage of classrooms with lead teachers scoring 73 or higher (unweighted) on an observational measure of teacher-child interaction by FY 2010, and increase to 58 percent by FY 2013. The baseline is 51 percent in FY 2004. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	58% (FY 2013)	Jan-14
	2010	55%	Jan-11
3C: Increase the percentage of teachers with AA, BA, Advanced Degree, or a degree in a field related to early childhood education. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	Prior Result +2PP	Jan-11
	2009	75%	Jan-10
	2008	73%	74.7% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	71%	74.2% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	65%	71.6% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	65%	69% (Target Exceeded)
3D: Reduce the percent of grantees with repeat deficiencies through the provision of targeted technical assistance. ³⁰ <i>(developmental)</i> <i>(Outcome)</i>	2009	Set Baseline	Jan-10
	2006	N/A	25 grantees (Historical Actual) ³¹
3E: Decrease the number of grantees with deficiencies in early childhood development. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	Prior Result -10%	Jan-11
	2009	5 grantees ³²	Jan-10
	2008	21 grantees	6 grantees (Target Exceeded)
	2007	23 grantees	5 grantees (Target Exceeded) ³³

³⁰ The purpose of this measure is to respond to the 2005 GAO report that cited grantees with repeat financial deficiencies. The goal of this measure is to capture data on grantees that have repeat financial deficiencies as monitored through triennial Office of Head Start monitoring review data. The FY 2005 – 2006 data found 25 grantees had one or more deficiencies in financial management; therefore the next monitoring data for FY 2008 – 2009 will allow the percentage of repeated grantees with deficiencies to be calculated from this original pool of 25 grantees. Targets for this measure will be developed following the first year of baseline data in FY 2009.

³¹ The FY 2006 data for measure 3D creates the denominator from which the FY 2009 actual result will be calculated, as the measure language addresses those grantees with repeat deficiencies.

³² The FY 2009 target for this measure has been revised as a result of recent data trends to maintain rigor.

³³ The FY 2007 data for measure 3E show a significant change from previous years as a result of changes made to the monitoring instrument in this domain. These changes required reviewers to incorporate more information from actual classroom observations and to focus more on curriculum implementation, ongoing child assessment practices, and individualizing for children. Should the next year of results continue to show this data trend, future targets will be reassessed to maintain rigorous goals.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
	2006	Set Baseline	26 grantees (Baseline)
3F: Decrease under-enrollment in Head Start programs, thereby increasing the number of children served per dollar. (Efficiency)	2010	Prior Result -0.1PP	Jan-11
	2009	1.4%	Jan-10
	2008	1.5%	1.3% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	2.8%	1.5% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	3.6%	0.7% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	4%	2.8% (Target Exceeded)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
3.1LT 3A 3.2LT 3.3LT 3.4LT	National Reporting System (NRS)	Per the Improving Head Start Act of 2007, the NRS was discontinued. The NRS was a nationwide assessment of all four-year-old children in Head Start, and incorporates components of scientifically validated, reliable, and respected measures of child outcomes such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) and the Woodcock-Johnson Applied Problems scale. Assessment of children in the NRS was done by assessors trained to consistently implement the instrument consistently; quality assurance studies indicated that the test's fidelity was strong across assessors, with little variation in execution. Individual child and program-level information was collected in a Computer Based Reporting System, and the information in this system was linked to the assessment results, which were recorded on standardized forms and sent directly to the NRS contractor for analysis. Fail-safes in the implementation of the instrument, the collection of the test results, and the analysis of the data ensured the validity and accuracy of the data reported.
3.5LT 3.7LT 3.8LT	Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES)	FACES was launched as a part of the Head Start Program Performance Measures Initiative. The goal of this initiative, and of FACES, was to provide solid data from a representative sample on the characteristics, experiences, and outcomes for children and families served by Head Start. The FACES study uses scientifically established methods to collect data that can be used to analyze Head Start's quality. All the measures used in FACES to measure child outcomes and program quality (including the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), the Woodcock-Johnson Applied Problems scale, and the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS)) have been assessed for validity and reliability, and are well-respected in the field of child development. The use of new cohorts every three years allows the program to have continual access to up-to-date information about program performance and quality.
3.6LT 3B 3C 3F	Program Information Report (PIR)	Data collection for the PIR is automated to improve efficiency in the collection and analysis of data. Head Start achieves a 100 percent response rate annually from 2,600 respondents. The Office of Head Start also engages in significant monitoring of Head Start grantees through monitoring reviews of Head Start and Early Head Start grantees, which examine and track Head Start Program Performance Standards compliance at least every three years for each program. Teams of ACF Regional Office and Central Office staff, along with trained reviewers, conduct more than 500 on-site reviews each year. The automated data system provides trend data so that the team can examine strengths and weaknesses in all programs.
3D 3E	Office of Head Start Monitoring Reviews	The validity of the Office of Head Start's monitoring reviews is ensured by the comprehensive and objective nature of the instrument (a checklist with over 1600 clear, discrete elements) as well as high standards for reviewers. In addition, all monitoring review data is sent to the central ACF office, where it is examined for consistency with reviewer guidance.

Long term objectives 3.1 - 3.4 and annual measure 3A were developed to meet the goal of monitoring the progress of individual grantees in improving children's school readiness, established during Head Start's CY 2002 program assessment. These measures were based on data from the National Reporting System (NRS). Following requirements in the Improving Head Start Act of 2007, the NRS has been discontinued. ACF is in the process of developing new performance measures to replace those that relied on the NRS. Discussion of the development of new performance measures will include review of the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences 2008 report on developmental outcomes and assessments for young children.

Regarding long term objectives 3.5 and 3.6, an important part of the Head Start program's mission is the provision of comprehensive services, including educational services, social services, parent involvement activities, and health and mental health services. The long term measures gauge the performance of the Head Start program in both linking children to appropriate health services and educating parents about their children's health. The goal of long term objective 3.5 is to increase the percentage of children completing the Head Start program rated by parent as being in excellent or very good health to 83 percent by FY 2010. The goal of long term objective 3.6 is to increase the percentage of Early Head Start children completing all medical screenings to 91 percent by FY 2010.

Annual measure 3B was introduced in CY 2006 as a result of the Head Start program assessment. For the 2007-2008 program year, 85.7 percent of Early Head Start children completed all medical screenings expected for their age. This result represents continued improvement upon the results from FY 2004 (81 percent), FY 2005 (82.1 percent), FY 2006 (82.8 percent) and FY 2007 (85.2 percent), but falls short of the 2008 target of 87 percent. Yet, a greater percentage of Early Head Start children are receiving medical screenings each year and potentially experiencing an improved quality of life. The Office of Head Start will continue to use data from the annual Head Start Program Information Report (PIR) to identify Early Head Start programs with lower levels of medical screening completion and direct technical assistance to them to support their improvement in this area. These actions will contribute to overall performance improvement in order to achieve the FY 2010 target of 91 percent. The Early Head Start program received an additional \$1.1 billion in funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) primarily to increase enrollment. As existing programs expand and new programs are funded there may be challenges initially in establishing the partnerships needed to promptly complete medical screenings for the increased number of enrolled children. However, the new and expanding Early Head Start programs will receive guidance and technical assistance to support their performance in this area. Since this measure is expressed as a proportion of the total number of Early Head Start children, future performance targets have not been changed at this time.

Regarding long term objective 3.7, the Head Start FACES Study has demonstrated a link between frequency of parental reading and children's competence and improvement in early literacy activities. Therefore, setting a program goal of supporting parent reading helps take literacy activities from the classroom into the home learning environment and emphasizes the primary role of parents in children's learning. The baseline for this measure (68.4 percent of parents) was based on data from the first FACES cohort (spring 1998). The target of 85 percent of parents by FY 2013 represents an ambitious yet feasible goal for Head Start parent involvement in children's early literacy. The target for this measure was based upon a two percent improvement every three years, which corresponds to an additional 18,000 Head Start children being read to by their parents three or more times a week. Two important factors influenced the targets. First, Head Start parents are often experiencing literacy problems of their own—thus Head Start is working with the parents to improve their reading skills at the same time that they are educating parents about the importance of reading to their children and working with the children on early literacy skills in the classroom. Second, nationally, 85 percent of all parents from all income levels report reading to their

child (age one to five) three or more times a week³⁴, which may provide a realistic “ceiling” to what might be expected even under optimal circumstances.

Regarding long term objective 3.8, the Head Start FACES Study indicates that teacher-child interaction is a demonstrated measure of classroom quality, and may be linked to children’s school readiness outcomes. This measure requires that the program maintain a high average lead teacher score on an observational measure of teacher-child interaction, as determined by the FACES Study. The goal of this long term objective is to increase to 55 percent or higher the percentage of classrooms with lead teachers scoring 73 or higher (unweighted) on an observational measures of teacher-child interaction by FY 2010.

Regarding annual measure 3C, Head Start grantees are required to develop plans to improve the qualifications of staff. Head Start has shown a steady increase in the number of teachers with an AA, BA, or advanced degrees in early childhood education and has met the current requirements of the Head Start Act. The recently enacted Head Start reauthorization requires that all Head Start teachers have at least an AA degree or higher with evidence of the relevance of their degree and experience for early childhood education by October 1, 2011. The PIR showed that in 2008, 74.7 percent of Head Start teachers had an AA degree or higher, exceeding the target of 73 percent. More Head Start teachers have degrees than ever before, and are better equipped to deliver quality instruction to Head Start children. Of the 56,425 Head Start teachers in FY 2008, 42,126 have an AA degree or higher; of these degreed teachers, 18,952 have an AA degree, 19,921 have a BA degree, and 3,253 have a graduate degree. Not included in the percentage are an additional 10,493 teachers with a Child Development Associate (CDA) or state credential (no degree) and 832 teachers who do not have a degree but are enrolled in Early Childhood Education (ECE) degree programs. The total FY 2008 figure represents an increase of 416 degreed teachers over the previous year. By FY 2009, the program expects to reach the goal of 75 percent of teachers with at least an AA degree through continued program support and by FY 2010, improve by two percentage points over the FY 2009 actual result. The Head Start program received an additional \$1 billion under ARRA to, among other activities, expand services and provide cost of living allowances (COLAs) of 4.9 percent to all existing Head Start grantees. It is possible that providing COLAs may allow grantees to attract more highly educated job candidates for Head Start staff, and thus improve performance for FY 2009 and FY 2010. This possible impact has been taken into consideration in determining future year targets for annual measure 3C.

In April of 2008 the Office of Head Start (OHS) made available to grantees the opportunity to apply for \$5 million in Head Start training and technical assistance funding related to meeting new staff qualifications requirements. This funding can assist staff with costs related to acquiring a college degree or a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential. In September of FY 2008, OHS made new competitive grant awards to increase career development opportunities for Head Start teaching staff seeking associate and baccalaureate degrees in early childhood education. Ten five-year grant awards, totaling \$3 million per year, were made to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Tribally Controlled Land Grant Colleges and Universities.

Annual measure 3D indicates the extent to which targeted technical assistance helps grantees make the systemic changes they need to prevent being cited for repeat deficiencies during onsite monitoring reviews. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, “Head Start: Comprehensive Approach to Identifying and Preventing Grantee Financial Management Weaknesses,” found that 53 percent of grantees with financial management findings were cited again in the grantee’s next review. Technical assistance providers work with grantees to correct deficiencies and to ensure that all management, financial, reporting, and programming systems comply with all applicable federal regulations. The FY 2006 monitoring data found 25 grantees had one or more deficiencies in financial management; the next

³⁴ Urban Institute, National Survey of America’s Families

triennial monitoring of this original pool of grantees in FY 2009 will allow the percentage of repeated deficiencies to be calculated. The FY 2006 data for measure 3D creates the denominator from which the rate for “repeat” deficiencies will be calculated. Ambitious targets for the reduction of “repeat” deficiencies will be established once the baseline rate is established in FY 2009.

Regarding annual measure 3E, the Head Start education and early childhood development performance standards require that grantees provide for the development of each child’s cognitive and language skills, including supporting emerging literacy and numeracy development (Section 1304.21(a)(4(IV))). Additionally the standards require that the child development and education approach provide for the development of cognitive skills by encouraging each child to organize his or her experiences, to understand concepts, and to develop age appropriate literacy, numeracy, reasoning, problem solving and decision-making skills for a foundation for school readiness and later school success (1304.21(c)(ii)). Grantees are also required to conduct ongoing assessment of each enrolled child. Compliance with these requirements is examined during triennial OHS monitoring reviews. The FY 2006 baseline of 26 grantees with deficiencies in early childhood development was based upon the results of 481 triennial and first-year OHS monitoring reviews completed in FY 2006. Proposed targets for subsequent years represent 10 percent reductions per year in the number of grantees with deficiencies in early childhood development services. Results for this measure showed a significant improvement from the 2006 baseline, with only 6 grantees found to have deficiencies in this domain in FY 2008. This far exceeded the FY 2008 target of 21 grantees with deficiencies in this domain. Significant changes were introduced to the monitoring instrument for this domain in FY 2007. In the two years since the instrument was revised the actual number of programs with deficiencies is far lower than the targets originally projected. The target for FY 2009 has been revised to five in order to maintain rigorous goals for improvement through continued program support and technical assistance. By FY 2010, the program expects to reduce this result by 10 percent from the FY 2009 actual result.

The goal of efficiency measure 3F is to decrease national under-enrollment to ensure that the maximum number of children are served and that federal funds are used appropriately and efficiently. Since Head Start grantees range in size from super-grantees with multiple delegate agencies serving 20,000 children to individual centers that serve as few as 15 children, a national under-enrollment rate better captures the under-enrollment than the proportion of grantees that meet under-enrollment targets. An un-enrolled space or “vacancy” in Head Start is defined as a funded space that is vacant for over 30 days. Using this definition, a vacancy of 31 days is counted the same as a vacancy of 250 days. This is important to understand in order not to misinterpret under-enrollment rates and overstate the cost to taxpayers of funding unfilled spaces. The reasons for under-enrollment vary. Sometimes a grantee’s under-enrollment problem is temporary in nature (e.g. children are being displaced from a particular facility), or more permanent (e.g. changing community demographics, inadequate outreach to new or changing populations of low-income families). By decreasing the national total of under-enrolled children, OHS will ensure the most appropriate use of allocated funds.

ACF has also undertaken specific efforts to improve and standardize how grantees report enrollment so that measures of under-enrollment accurately reflect efficiency. Whereas prior to FY 2005, grantees reported enrollment data annually after the program year, ACF developed a website in FY 2005 that enabled grantees to report enrollment every three months. Per the 2007 reauthorization of the Head Start Act, ACF will now collect online enrollment data on a monthly basis from all Head Start grantees.

Head Start programs are required to maintain waiting lists to ensure that vacant positions can be filled quickly. However, there are a number of reasons that it is difficult to fill vacancies quickly. First, some Head Start programs may not be fully effective at enrolling certain populations, for example, Hispanic families. Additionally, low-income families are often highly mobile, and eligible families on the waiting list may have moved and no longer reside in the Head Start service area. Furthermore, as state pre-

kindergarten programs grow in some areas, parents may choose to send their children to those programs. Although Head Start programs try to design service hours and locations to meet the needs of the community, some families may have work requirements that do not fit the hours of operation of Head Start (for example, shift work) and thus may not be able to take advantage of Head Start services. Regardless of the possible reasons, OHS has consistently maintained that Head Start programs are required and expected to fill each funded space. Technical assistance is available to programs to help develop strategies for reducing chronic under-enrollment problems. The most recent data available indicate that, during the 2007-2008 program year, Head Start grantees had, on average, not enrolled 1.3 percent of the children they were funded to serve, exceeding the FY 2008 target of 1.5 percent. This represents approximately 12,700 children who could have been served using the Head Start funds appropriated and awarded to grantees. Based on the consistent and significant improvements over the baseline (4.4 percent in FY 2004), targets for FY 2008 and FY 2009 were revised to remain ambitious. By FY 2010, the program expects under-enrollment in Head Start programs to be 0.1 percentage point less than the FY 2009 actual result through continued program support and technical assistance. As previously mentioned, the Head Start program received additional funding under ARRA to (among other activities) expand enrollment. It is possible that due to the expansion of the Head Start program, future performance in FY 2009 and FY 2010 for this measure would be affected. This potential impact has been taken into consideration in determining future year targets for efficiency measure 3F.

4. Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs

Measure	FY	Target	Result
4.1LT and 4A: Increase the proportion of youth living in safe and appropriate settings after exiting ACF-funded Transitional Living Program (TLP) services to at least 85 percent by FY 2010, and to a maintenance rate of 86 percent by FY 2014. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	86% (FY 2014)	Dec-14
	2010	85%	Dec-10
	2009	85%	Dec-09
	2008	85%	86% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	84%	86% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	83%	82% (Target Not Met)
	2005	80%	82% (Target Exceeded)
4.2LT and 4B: Improve funding efficiency by increasing the proportion of youth who complete the Transitional Living Program (TLP) by graduating or who leave ahead of schedule based upon an opportunity to at least 55 percent; by FY 2014, increasing to a maintenance rate of 60 percent. <i>(Outcome and Efficiency)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	60% (FY 2014)	Dec-14
	2010	55%	Dec-10
	2009	53.6%	Dec-09
	2008	51.6%	59.7% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	49.6%	57.5% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	47.6%	50% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	45.6%	47.9% (Target Exceeded)
4C: Increase the proportion of Transitional Living Program (TLP) youth who are engaged in community service and service learning activities while in the program. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	Prior Result +2%	Dec-10
	2009	35%	Dec-09
	2008	34%	42.3% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	33%	42.1% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	32%	32.3% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	30%	31% (Target Exceeded)
4D: Increase the proportion of youth	2009	Set Baseline	Dec-09 ³⁵

³⁵ The original baseline for this developmental measure was intended for FY 2008; however as these results only represent six months of data, the FY 2008 actual result should be considered

Measure	FY	Target	Result
who are prevented from running away through Basic Center Programs (BCP) in-home/off-site services as a percentage of all youth receiving such services, including those who must be fully admitted to shelter despite such preventive efforts. <i>(developmental)</i> <i>(Outcome)</i>	2008	N/A	95.6% (Historical Actual) ³⁶

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
4.1LT 4A 4.2LT 4B 4C 4D	National Extranet Optimized Runaway and Homeless Youth Management Information System (NEORHYMIS)	RHYMIS incorporates numerous business rules and edit checks, provides a hot-line/help desk and undergoes continuous improvement and upgrading. Extensive cleanup and validation of data take place after each semi-annual transfer of data from grantee systems into the national database. A new version 2.0 (NEORHYMIS, the National Extranet Optimized RHYMIS) was released in December, 2004. Historically, the reporting response rate of grantees has exceeded 97 percent every year.

Regarding long-term objective 4.1 and annual measure 4A, the “safe and appropriate exit rate” is the percentage of Transitional Living Program (TLP) youth who are discharged during the year and find immediate living situations that are consistent with independent living.³⁷ In FY 2008, the program sustained an 86 percent safe exit rate, surpassing the target of 85 percent. The program sustained its substantial performance gains in FY 2007 after being below most targets since FY 2002. These improvements were achieved by continuing the strategies that succeeded in FY 2007: communicating to grantees the importance of (1) staying connected with youth as they transition out of program residencies, (2) providing follow-up and after care, (3) encouraging youth to finish the program and meet their developmental goals instead of dropping out, (4) tracking exiting youth more closely and staying connected, (5) reporting accurately and updating youth records to reduce the number of youth whose exit situations are unknown, and (6) analyzing data to discover patterns and opportunities. These objectives were communicated to grantees through conferences, technical assistance providers, conference calls, and the direct efforts of federal staff. Another significant factor was the creation of two national centers for technical assistance and training, instead of the ten regional networks previously tasked. The above strategies will be continued each year because the program continually adds new grantees, and most grantees experience frequent staff turnover. By FY 2010, the program expects to maintain this high level of performance with an 85 percent safe exit rate.

Regarding long-term objective 4.2 and annual measure 4B, the program completion rate is derived from the number of exiting TLP youth who have completed their program according to plan plus those who finish early with a positive opportunity, divided by all TLP youth who exited, including youth who leave with no plan, drop out, or are expelled. In FY 2006, the measure first passed the 50 percent mark; by reaching 57.5 percent in FY 2007, this measure has remained above 50 percent. The FY 2008 result of 59.7 percent sustained and improved upon the FY 2007 surge. The percent of youth who complete their residencies reflects both effectiveness and efficiency of grantees in keeping youth focused on their plans. Youth who complete their transitional plans and programs are usually better equipped for independent

³⁶ The corresponding BCP 'safe and appropriate' exit rate for youth who entered the shelter directly, without preventive services, was lower at 91.5 percent, which is slightly above the fairly consistent 89-90 percent rate for BCP in previous years.

³⁷ TLP “safe exits” include 28 specific living situations after discharge reported through RHYMIS, including “other,” but excluding “to the street,” “to a homeless shelter” or “unknown.” The TLP rate is more stringent than BCP (see 4D), for which a temporary placement in another youth shelter is often part of the re-entry process. This is why the BCP rate of around 90 percent has exceeded TLP’s rate over the years.

living with skills and knowledge gained in the program, while dropouts or expellees may not be as well prepared. Moreover, dropouts or expellees may have encumbered resources that could have helped more committed youth. Program completion and longer tenures, particularly longer than 60 days, have a pattern of association with educational and employment progress and also are linked with safer exits. It may be significant that a steady increase in performance on annual measure 4B over the last several years has generally preceded by one year the gradual improvements in the safe exit rate. Grantees have been encouraged to identify potential dropouts, to stay engaged with youth even after they have decided to leave, to help them plan safe and appropriate exits, and to recognize how some individuals need respites or time-outs in order to reconnect with his or her goals and recommit to the program. Successful performance should also result from some of the same factors discussed under annual measure 4A. Future targets will be based on annual two percent increases in the target rate since the FY 2004 baseline. By FY 2010, the program expects to achieve the goal of 55 percent.

Annual measure 4C, regarding positive youth development, is the percent of all of exiting TLP youth who have participated in Community Service Learning (CSL) events or activities. CSL can strengthen a youth's sense of civil identity and how he or she is part of something greater than self through helping others. After five years of mixed performance, this measure leapt dramatically from 32.3 percent in FY 2006 to 42.1 percent in FY 2007. The FY 2008 result of 42.3 percent maintains this progress. Making a meaningful contribution to the community can be a powerful stimulant to self-efficacy and pro-social attitudes.³⁸ Intensive service learning programs, often school-based, are included in this measure, but the program encourages grantees to improvise, streamline, and innovate as part of a broader concept of "community service learning." Youths' participation in planning and reflection on the significance of the activity are vital ingredients. As with the other measures, the intentional and energetic role of regional Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) staff was essential to spreading ideas about new ways of engaging young people's altruism and community identity. Technical assistance materials on CSL were created and distributed. Future targets continue to increase annually, and the program expects to surpass the FY 2009 target of 35 percent, and by FY 2010, increase by two percent over the previous year's actual result. Success should result from continued communications about this strategy for positive youth development.

Developmental measure 4D, regarding effective risk prevention, will use FY 2008 and FY 2009 for baselines. (Grantees only reported these data during the last six months of FY 2008, after they were added to the reporting requirements.) This measure is a specialized version of the safe and appropriate exit rate, focusing on Basic Center Program (BCP) youth who receive "preventive services" (i.e. services geared toward prevention of youth running away). These youth constitute approximately 10 percent of all youth who exit BCP services. These youth, and their families, may receive a range of preventive services, or it may be determined that separation from the family is in the youth's best interest, such as abuse or neglect by parents or guardians and sometimes severe behavioral or conduct disorders afflicting the child. This might necessitate out-of-home placement or temporary residence at the shelter while arrangements are made. None of the various preventive services, including alternative or shelter placement, are classified as negatives, since any one of them, or a combination, may be right for the youth. In many cases, children still connected with their families receive the same services (counseling, etc.) as children placed in the shelter. Individuals (related or not) within the household may also receive services such as conflict mediation, basic life skills, interpersonal skill building, educational advancement, job attainment skills, mental and physical health care, parenting skills, financial planning, and referral to sources of other needed services. Positive performance is based on the percent of youth who participate in preventive services and ultimately find a safe and appropriate living situation, whether remaining in the home or not. The denominator includes all youth receiving the preventive services, and the numerator excludes any of this group of youth who in effect abandon the services and choose the

³⁸ National Research Council and the Institute of Medicine, Committee on Community-Level Programs for Youth, November, 2004.

“street” or disappear altogether (i.e., “unsafe exits” as defined for BCP; see footnote under 4A). Youth who enter the shelter directly without such advance services are not part of this measure.

As already noted, nearly ten percent of the BCP youth exiting during FY 2008 were treated with preventive efforts before admission to the shelter (if that became necessary). Data elements documenting such cases were added to a new version of NEORHYMIS released mid-fiscal year in May, 2008. This group of cases achieved a prevention-related safe exit rate of 96 percent, which is considerably above the overall BCP safe exit rate of approximately 90 percent over the last four or five years. Youth who entered the shelters directly (i.e. not receiving such services) during the six months of data collection had a 91.5 percent safe exit rate. Meanwhile, nearly three percent exited very precariously (into the “street”), while less than one percent exited to the “street” after preventive services. The overall “precarious exit” rate (the opposite of safe exits) was cut in half among youth who received preventive services. Targets will be set after an additional 12 months of data collection and assessment for a baseline in FY 2009. Grantee attention will be drawn to this factor through messaging, technical assistance, and its presence in the NEORHYMIS data collection instrument.

In FY 2007 an independent research firm with considerable experience in studying homelessness designed an evaluation of long term outcomes for youth in the TLP programs. This evaluation will be implemented at multiple sites over the next several years. OMB clearance is expected for the survey in calendar year 2009. This study will teach us more about how youth fare during program residency and for six months and twelve months after they exit from TLP. It should suggest which housing, services and program models benefit long-term well-being and maturation.

5. Abstinence Education

Measure	FY	Target	Result
5.1LT and 5A: Decrease the proportion of students grades 9-12 that have ever had sexual intercourse to 44.5 percent by 2009 and to 1 percent below the CY 2009 actual result by CY 2013. ³⁹ (Outcome)	2009	44.5%	Jun-11
	2007	45%	47.8% (Target Not Met)
	2005	45.5%	46.8% (Target Not Met)
5.2LT and 5B: Decrease the rate of births to unmarried teenage girls (i.e. births per 1,000 women) ages 15-19 to 33.0 by CY 2008, and decrease this rate by 1.0 under the CY 2008 actual result by CY 2014. (Outcome)	2009	Prior Result -0.4	Feb-12
	2008	33	Feb-11
	2007	33.4	Feb-10
	2006	33.8	36.2 (Target Not Met)
	2005	34.2	34.5 (Target Not Met but Improved)
5C: Decrease the cost of program delivery per youth per hour. (Efficiency)	2007	Set Baseline	May-09
	2006	N/A	\$21 (Historical Actual) ⁴⁰
	2005	N/A	\$54 (Historical Actual) ⁴¹
5D: Increase the proportion of youth who have never had sexual intercourse and remain abstinent following participation in an abstinence education program. (developmental) ⁴² (Outcome)	2009	N/A	Dec-10
5E: Increase the proportion of youth who have had sexual intercourse but have discontinued having sex following participation in the abstinence education program. (developmental) (Outcome)	2009	N/A	Dec-10

³⁹ This measure is based on data collected every other year. Next data available data will be from CY 2009.

⁴⁰ This is the cost for new 2006 CBAE grantees. This cost is not inclusive of Title V grantees.

⁴¹ Data for FY 2005 are limited to cost per youth, not cost per youth per hour; additionally, only data for Title V grantees is available (i.e. data for Community Based Abstinence Education [CBAE] are not available). Therefore, this statistic is considered a partial interim statistic.

⁴² This developmental measure and developmental measure 5E are currently awaiting approval from OMB for the core measure survey instrument, which will provide data for these outcomes.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
5.1LT 5A	Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS)	The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) administers the YRBSS which includes a national school-based survey. This survey is conducted every two years and provides data representative of U.S. high school students. The YRBSS has been designed to determine the prevalence of health-risk behaviors among high school students, including sexual behaviors. The YRBSS also was designed to monitor progress toward achieving national health objectives. One of the survey items asks students, "Have you ever had sexual intercourse?" and students can choose a "Yes" or "No" response.
5.2LT 5B	National Vital Statistics System (NVSS)	The CDC administers the NVSS which is a compilation of data obtained from the registration of vital events, including all birth certificates, in the United States. Within the CDC, the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) works with states to obtain the data and provide the statistical information of the NVSS. Information on births, such as age of mother, is reported by the mother. Mother's marital status is captured only at the time of birth by a direct question in the birth registration process in 48 states and DC (Michigan and New York use an inferential procedure to determine marital status).
5C	Annual Title V and CBAE grantees reports	In grant applications, grantees are required to submit a reasonable plan for collecting data and submitting annual progress reports, including electronic reporting forms A-D, that demonstrate they can validate and report data in a timely fashion. Program staff analyze reports for anomalies.
5D 5E	Annual CBAE grantee core measure survey evaluation reports	The program office has developed a core measure survey instrument to measure sexual initiation and discontinuation. The questions were developed with the input of experienced evaluators in the field and have been developed to test for consistency, validity and linkage from pre-test, post-test and follow-up test. Grantees will be administering the survey instrument to a representative sample of their youth involved in CBAE programming at specific time intervals at pre-test, post-test and follow-up test. The results of the surveys will be aggregated into evaluation reports and reported in the online data collection system which will be monitored and analyzed by program staff.

There are no performance targets for FY 2010 and later, as the Community Based Abstinence Education has been proposed in the FY 2010 Budget for elimination after FY 2009.

Regarding long-term objective 5.1 and annual measure 5A (sexual activity), the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey (YRBSS) data meaningfully reflect the program purpose which is to promote abstinence from sexual activity. Recent data from the YRBSS demonstrate a statistically significant decline in sexual activity among American youth from 1995 to 2001. Although estimates of the percentage of youth who had engaged in sexual intercourse rose slightly from 2001 to 2007, these differences are not statistically significant. By FY 2009, the program expects to decrease the proportion of students in grades 9-12 that have ever had sexual intercourse to 44.5 percent.

Regarding long-term objective 5.2 and annual measure 5B (unmarried teen birth rate), the National Vital Statistics System (NVSS) data meaningfully reflect the purpose of the Abstinence Education program because the state grant program is required to focus on those groups that are most likely to bear children out-of-wedlock. Legislation authorizing these abstinence education programs was first passed in the mid-1990's. Data from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) shows that in CY 1995 the birth rate was 43.8 births per 1,000 unmarried girls ages 15-19. In CY 2005 the rate was 34.5 for that age group. The unmarried teen birth rate increased from CY 2005 to CY 2006.

Regarding efficiency measure 5C, data reported by 40 states (i.e. Title V grantees) from 2005 suggests that the median cost per youth served was \$54. From 2006 onward, this measure considers median cost per youth *per hour*. In 2006, data reported by CBAE grantees indicate that the median cost per youth per hour was \$21. From FY 2007 onward, the program will calculate data for youth served by both Title V and CBAE as it becomes available. Decreasing cost per youth means greater funding efficiency and, ultimately, program reach and impact. Due to the adjustment in measure calculation, a new baseline and new targets will be set once the FY 2007 figure is computed.

Regarding annual measure 5D, the program established a program specific measure to determine the proportion of youth who have never had sexual intercourse and remain abstinent following an abstinence education program. As appropriate, collection of data for this program specific measure will begin when approved.

Regarding annual measure 5E, the program established a program specific measure to determine the proportion of youth that have had sexual intercourse but have discontinued following participation in an abstinence education program. As appropriate, collection of data for this program specific measure will begin when approved.

6. Mentoring Children of Prisoners

Measure	FY	Target	Result
6.1LT and 6A: Increase the proportion of mentoring matches that endure at least 12 months to 35 percent by FY 2008, and by FY 2014 increase by 2 percent over the previous year's actual result. ⁴³ (Outcome)	2010	Prior Result +2%	Dec-10
	2009	32.3%	Dec-09
	2008	35% ⁴⁴	31.7% (Target Not Met)
	2007	60%	34.4% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	30%	28.4% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2005	Set Baseline	20% (Baseline)
6.2LT and 6B: Increase the proportion of mentees in active mentoring relationships that have already been sustained more than 12 months to 22 percent by FY 2010, and to 40 percent by FY 2014. (Outcome)	Out-Year Target	40% (FY 2014)	Dec-14
	2010	22%	Dec-10
	2009	22%	Dec-09
	2008	22%	29.8% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	20%	33% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	18%	26.3% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	16%	19% (Target Exceeded)
6C: Increase the number of children of prisoners in one-to-one matches with caring adults who have been trained and screened by the Mentoring Children of Prisoners (MCP) program and its local and national partners. (Outcome)	2010	Prior Result +2%	Dec-10
	2009	125,000	Dec-09
	2008	109,000	110,813 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	75,000	70,425 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	69,000	40,118 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2005	36,000	14,000 (Target Not Met but Improved)
6D: Increase the proportion of youth that consider their mentoring relationship to be of "high quality."	2010	Prior Result +2%	Dec-10
	2009	90%	Dec-09

⁴³ Percentages are measured in the final quarter of the year among grantees who have received MCP funding for at least twelve months. The numerator does not include stable and continuing matches in the caseload that reached the 11 month point or less during the final quarter. The number of cases lasting just under 12 months or longer is much higher and includes many cases begun by grantees within the first year of operation.

⁴⁴ When the program was first initiated, preliminary data was insufficient for setting appropriate targets for annual measures 6A and 6B. Targets have been reassessed based on several years of performance data.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
<i>(Outcome)</i>	2008	89%	95% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	87%	90% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	Set Baseline	85% (Baseline)
6.3LT and 6E: Relative stabilization or improvement of intermediate outcomes among a sample of children of prisoners as measured after at least 12 months in one-to-one mentoring relationships in the MCP program. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	Issue report (FY 2014)	Sep-14
	2010	Begin data analysis	Sep-10
	2009	Begin follow up surveys	Sep-09
	2008	Administer baseline survey	Completed (Target Met)
	2007	Site selection and training of survey administrators	Completed (Target Met)
	2006	Research design and survey instruments developed	Completed (Target Met)
	2005	Develop research design	Completed (Target Met)
6F: Increase the proportion of MCP Program matches that endure beyond three months to 80 percent of all matches. ⁴⁵ <i>(Efficiency)</i>	2010	Prior Result +2%	Dec-10
	2009	83%	Dec-09
	2008	82%	72.5% (Target Not Met)
	2007	80%	74% (Target Not Met)
	2006	75%	78.4% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	Set Baseline	63% (Baseline)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
6.1LT 6A 6.2LT 6B 6C 6F	ACF Online Data Collection System (OLDC)	Quarterly reports are analyzed by program and support staff. Edit checks and validation rules are being built into the system based on error analysis and detection of issues. Dedicated contract technical support staff provide guidance to users or refer questions to the program.
6D	Relationship Quality Survey	A validated and reliable relationship measuring tool, developed by Rhodes, Reddy, Roffman, and Grossman, assesses mentee satisfaction with the relationships; the extent to which mentors have helped mentees cope with problems; how happy mentees feel (or don't feel) when they are with their mentors; and whether there is evidence of trust in the mentoring relationships.

⁴⁵ This measure has been inverted, so that the intent is stated directly. Previously the goal was to reduce the number of very short term cases that terminate in three months or less. The new language calls for increasing the cases that continue beyond three months. This measure's calculation includes only matches terminating or continuing in the final quarter of the year.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
6E	Surveys administered in national mentoring evaluation	Data will be collected by sampling, interviews, and onsite research over a period of several years beginning in FY 2007. This is not an annual, recurring measure. Well-validated research methodologies will be utilized to ensure adequate sample selection, to address issues of attrition and bias, and to assure a valid comparison with benchmark groups.

Fiscal year 2008 was a banner performance year for the Mentoring Children of Prisoners (MCP) program. Most notably, MCP surpassed the FY 2008 target of mentoring 109,000 children, with 110,813 matches achieved (including 3,008 matches from the voucher demonstration project) by the end of FY 2008, an increase of over 32 percent from the previous year (see discussion of annual measure 6C). Since the first years of the program, the Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) has focused on program expansion and reaching as many children as possible. However, FYSB also focuses on the quality of mentoring relationships as well as quantity. Ninety-five percent of MCP youth rate their relationships positively (see discussion of annual measure 6D). “Longevity,” or duration, of relationships is also a vital indicator of relationship quality. The program’s performance was mixed in the three “longevity” measures, missing targets for annual measures 6A and 6F but exceeding the target for annual measure 6B. As the program continues to expand rapidly, new cases are added throughout the year. Thus, some intact mentoring relationships cannot be counted as reaching the 12 month mark simply because the mentor and child were matched less than 12 months ago. This effect will continue as long as the program keeps growing.⁴⁶

Since improvement in two out of three of the longevity-related measures has not continued from FY 2007 to FY 2008, FYSB plans a renewed emphasis upon all aspects of quality. It is encouraging to note that average pre-match training hours, which prepare mentors to sustain positive and lasting relationships, grew from 6.4 hours in FY 2007 to 7.3 hours in FY 2008. The national training and technical assistance resource was re-competed in 2008 (and a new awardee began work in October 2008) to help maintain the focus on preparation and address how to keep relationships viable as long as may be possible or appropriate.

Regarding long-term objective 6.1 and annual measure 6A, in FY 2008, 31.7 percent of MCP matches endured at least 12 months, missing the target of 35.0 percent. The FY 2008 result also fell below the previous year’s result of 34.4 percent, though it outperformed the FY 2006 result of 28.4 percent. Relationships that endure are evidence of a lasting bond and possibly a long term relationship. Research shows that relationships that last at least six months are associated with the most positive youth benefits.⁴⁷ This is a challenging goal because MCP relationships involve volunteer mentors who have met their commitments after twelve months and may or may not seek to renew the sometimes challenging relationships. Some mentees drop out of the program or are in transient or unstable families and move away or lose contact. The decline in year-to-year performance on this measure may also be the result of more recent grantees starting operations that year than in FY 2007. Overall, FY 2008 had far fewer “veteran” programs having been in operation 24 or 36 months. In FY 2007, less than 50 percent of all grantees were in operation only 12 months; in FY 2008, 65 percent of grantees had operated only 12 months. (None of the programs in FY 2008 had operated less than twelve months, so all grantees were included in the calculation). By FY 2010, the program expects to increase performance on this measure by two percent over the FY 2009 actual result.

⁴⁶ It should also be noted that 648 cases, or 2.6 percent of the total, had lasted more than 6 and up to/including 11 months and then ceased during the final quarter. Adding these cases, which include many which ended amicably and not detrimentally and were beneficial to the child, would raise the FY 2008 result to 34.3 percent, which is very close to the 35.0 percent target.

⁴⁷ Rhodes, J. (2002). Stand by Me, The Risks and Rewards of Mentoring Today's Youth. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Dr. Rhodes is one of the pre-eminent researchers and evaluators of mentoring programs.

Regarding long-term objective 6.2 and annual measure 6B, in FY 2008 the percentage of cases lasting longer than 12 months reached 29.8 percent, exceeding the 22.0 percent target, but not improving upon the FY 2007 level of 33.0 percent. The program expects to improve this result and exceed the FY 2009 target. Performance in both annual measures 6A and 6B improved from FY 2005 through FY 2007, but may have reached its maximum point. As discussed above, this measure somewhat underestimates the longevity of MCP relationships because ongoing mentoring relationships established less than 12 months ago cannot be counted. However, 94 percent of FY 2008 cases lasting twelve months or longer (the 6B group) lasted beyond thirteen months. This trend is very favorable, since the twelve month milestone is only a measurement point and, ideally, mentoring relationships last beyond that point. By FY 2010, the program expects to exceed the goal of 22 percent for this measure.

Annual measure 6C is based on the number of children of prisoners in relationships with caring adult mentors under conditions that conform to the evidence-based standards of the MCP program (e.g., one-to-one relationships, regular contact, sustaining matches to endure more than 6 months, careful screening and diligent training and supervision of mentors). Creating and supporting these matches are the primary tasks of MCP grantees. Since its inception, the MCP program has matched mentors for 110,813 children of prisoners. This was accomplished through both the grant program and the voucher demonstration project (Caregiver's Choice), which was established in the 2006 Reauthorization. The cooperative agreement to implement the voucher project was only awarded in the last days of FY 2007. Caregiver's Choice was mandated to distribute 3,000 vouchers in the first year of operation, and 3,008 matches were created within this statutory timeframe (these matches are included in the 6C results).

The MCP program continues to make matches at a rapidly increasing rate. The match rate increased in FY 2008 over FY 2007 as a result of continuing to drive performance at all levels. Additionally, intensive technical assistance and support from federal staff continued to support the more than 215 grantees nationwide. The program continues to assist faith- and community-based organizations new to the federal grants process to overcome challenges to success. Some organizations were brand new and/or delivering mentoring services for the first time in FY 2007 and required considerable effort from program staff and technical assistance providers. Starting up a new local program requires building infrastructure, developing a strategic plan, and establishing partnerships within the community. The increasing number of MCP matches means that more at-risk youth are building relationships with mentors who provide positive examples and creating meaningful relationships. The program expects to meet the FY 2009 target of 125,000 matches, and improve by two percent over the FY 2009 actual result in FY 2010.

Regarding annual measure 6D, the primary objective of the MCP program is to promote positive, healthy mentoring relationships. These relationships are expected to promote successful outcomes, as demonstrated by research on mentoring. A child's positive assessment of a mentoring experience (along with the duration of the relationship) is strongly associated with positive outcomes. ACF trains grantees to conduct surveys using the "Relationship Quality Instrument." Beginning in the summer of 2006, grantees first administered the annual survey to a subset of young people and submitted results through the ACF Online Data Collection system, and did so again in 2007 and 2008. Survey respondents were youth aged nine years and older in relationships with the same mentor that had lasted nine months or longer as of July 1st of the given year. MCP youth responded to fifteen statements, such as:

- My mentor has lots of good ideas about how to solve a problem.
- My mentor helps me take my mind off things by doing something with me.
- When I'm with my mentor, I feel disappointed.

Positive answers to this survey pointing to high quality relationships have been shown, when field-tested in similar mentoring programs, to be linked with more positive outcomes for youth, including increased

self-confidence and scholastic competence. The majority of the youth involved in mentoring relationships through the MCP program respond with positive scores, indicating quality relationships with their mentors. In FY 2008, 95 percent of mentees surveyed responded with an overall average score of three or above (on a scale of 1 to 4), improving on the previous year's result of 90 percent. This result is also a significant improvement over the FY 2007 result of 76 percent. The notable increase came as a result of an intense effort from the federal office to train grantees and offer ongoing technical assistance. Efforts included a webinar and workshop at the annual national conference. The program expects to improve this rate by two percent over the FY 2009 actual result in FY 2010 by continuing to focus on training and support and sponsoring national and regional technical assistance conferences.

Regarding long-term objective 6.3 and annual measure 6E, an independent comparison-based, difference-in-difference evaluation has been designed to reveal the program's effect upon individual child outcomes, such as school attendance and performance, risk reduction and youth development. After being in a mentoring relationship at least twelve months, children will be surveyed again and results from MCP youth will be compared with similarly at-risk youth who were assigned to a control group (i.e. not matched with mentors) in the recent Public Private Ventures/Big Brothers Big Sisters school mentoring program impact study.⁴⁸ This study will use instruments compatible with the other school mentoring program (i.e. the instruments will have most of the same survey elements). The MCP evaluation is intended to assess whether there are baseline and outcome differences between the sample of MCP participants and the controls in the school mentoring study sample (475 children).

Other information about program design, demographics, and other factors will also enrich the findings. In FY 2008, the project conducted intake surveys among the 415 newly-matched children in the sample. In FY 2009, follow-up surveys will be administered as each case passes its 12-month anniversary. Research findings are expected circa December 2010. The knowledge gained will be used to strengthen mentoring services by promoting practices which appear to contribute to the success of relationships in fostering positive long term outcomes.

Regarding efficiency measure 6F, in FY 2008, 72.5 percent of matches endured beyond three months, missing the target of 82 percent. In the final quarter of FY 2008, there were only 408 cases that lasted three months or less in a total active caseload of 25,114 cases; thus, three-month cases were less than 1.6 percent of the active caseload. All matches which ceased ahead of schedule were only 6 percent of the active caseload in the final quarter of FY 2008. Matches which end within the first three months represent a significant investment loss, because costs are associated to a large degree with outreach, recruiting, screening, training and preparing mentors before the initiation of matches. More importantly, cessations that are premature are potentially harmful to a child because he or she may lose trust or feel guilty or abandoned.⁴⁹ By effectively matching adults and children and providing supportive activities, grantees protect their investment and strengthen the odds of continuation by families and by mentors. The current targets for the measure are ambitious: by FY 2010, the program expects to improve by at least two percent over the FY 2009 actual result. It is estimated that, in mentoring programs, "One half of all volunteer [mentoring] relationships dissolve within a few months."⁵⁰ ACF provides considerable technical assistance to support the mentor and the mentoring match to prevent relationships from dissolving unnecessarily.

⁴⁸ In other words, MCP matches will be compared with another study's control group; thus, this MCP study uses a comparison group, not a control group.

⁴⁹ Please note that children in these matches are usually rematched with a new mentor as soon as possible.

⁵⁰ Rhodes, 2002, *op cit*.

7. Child Abuse Prevention and Child Welfare Programs

The child welfare programs are organized to reflect a continuum of services beginning from identification and prevention of abuse to permanency and child well-being. Please note that several performance measures are used for more than one program. Where appropriate, those programs are listed in parentheses following the measure language. A crosswalk of performance measures by program is also provided at the conclusion of this section for easy reference.

THE CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT ACT (CAPTA) STATE GRANTS AND COMMUNITY-BASED CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION (CBCAP)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
7.1LT: Nine states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome Measure 1: “Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect” by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016. To be in substantial conformity with this measure, states must achieve desired outcomes in 95 percent of reviewed cases as well as meet national standards for rates of maltreatment recurrence and the absence of abuse and/or neglect in foster care. (CAPTA, Child Welfare Services, Foster Care) (Outcome)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	9 states (FY 2016)	Oct-16
	2010	9 states	Oct-10
7A: Decrease the rate of first-time victims per 1,000 children, based on National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) reporting of the child maltreatment victims each year who had not been maltreatment victims in any prior year. (CBCAP) (Outcome)	2010	Prior Result -0.2	Oct-11
	2009	Prior Result -0.2	Oct-10
	2008	7.17	Oct-09
	2007	7.26	7.37 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	6.46	7.42 (Target Not Met) ⁵¹
	2005	6.66	7.29 (Target Not Met) ⁵²
7B: Decrease the percentage of children with substantiated or indicated reports of maltreatment that have a repeated substantiated or indicated report of maltreatment within six months. ⁵³ (CAPTA) (Outcome)	2010	Prior Result -0.2%	Oct-11
	2009	7%	Oct-10
	2008	7%	Oct-09
	2007	7%	6.8% (Target Exceeded)

⁵¹ The actual result for FY 2006 has been updated as a result of revised state data.

⁵² The actual result for FY 2005 has been updated as a result of revised state data.

⁵³ This measure language has been updated to clarify that this measure includes victims of child abuse or neglect for whom the report disposition is “indicated” as well as substantiated. This measure has always included such children in the data reporting, but the language did not clearly reflect this fact.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
	2006	7%	7.8% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2005	7%	8.7% (Target Not Met)
7C: Improve states' average response time between maltreatment report and investigation, based on the median of states' reported average response time in hours from screened-in reports to the initiation of the investigation. (CAPTA) (Outcome and Efficiency)	2010	Prior Result -5%	Oct-11
	2009	Prior Result -5%	Oct-10
	2008	75.05 hrs	Oct-09
	2007	62.23 hrs	79.00 hrs (Target Not Met)
	2006	63.65 hrs	60.00 hrs (Target Exceeded) ⁵⁴
	2005	45.60 hrs	67.00 hrs (Target Not Met)
7D: Increase the percentage of Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) total funding that supports evidence-based and evidence-informed child abuse prevention programs and practices. (CBCAP) (Efficiency)	2010	Prior Result +3PP	Aug-11
	2009	Prior Result +3PP	Aug-10
	2008	33%	Aug-09
	2007	30%	30% (Target Met)
	2006	Set Baseline	27% (Baseline)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
7.1LT	Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) final reports, Program Improvement Plans (PIPs), and PIP status tracking information	CFSR information is subject to several forms of data validation. Statewide data information, used as part of the initial review and the tracking of PIP progress, is collected through the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) and Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS), which each have extensive validation procedures discussed later in this section. Information collected during the onsite portion of the CFSR is subject to rigorous quality assurance procedures. States submit quarterly progress reports on PIP implementation which are carefully reviewed by ACF staff to assess the completeness and accuracy of the information. The Children's Bureau also has a database (maintained by a contractor) that tracks all key milestones for CFSR reviews.
7A 7B 7C	National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS)	States report child welfare data to ACF through the NCANDS. Each state's annual NCANDS data submission undergoes an extensive validation process which may result in revisions to improve data accuracy. To speed improvement in these data, ACF funds a contractor to provide technical assistance to states to improve reporting and validate all state data related to outcome measures. The Children's Bureau, in ACF, and the NCANDS project team are working with states through national meetings, advisory groups, and state-specific technical assistance to encourage the most complete and accurate reporting of these data in all future submissions. All of these activities should continue to generate additional improvements in the data over the next few years.

⁵⁴The FY 2006 actual result for measure 7C has been revised due to updated state data submissions.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
7D	State Annual Reports	States are required to submit an Annual Report addressing each of the CBCAP performance measures outlined in Title II of CAPTA. One section of the report must “provide evaluation data on the outcomes of funded programs and activities.” The 2006 CBCAP Program Instruction adds a requirement that the states must also report on the OMB performance measures reporting requirements and national outcomes for the CBCAP program. States were required to report on this new efficiency measure starting in December 2006. The three percent annual increase represents an ambitious target since this is the first time that the program has required programs to target their funding towards evidence-based and evidence-informed programs, and it will take time for states to adjust their funding priorities to meet these new requirements.

The Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) program assists states in their efforts to prevent child abuse and neglect and to promote healthy parent-child relationships by developing, operating, expanding, and enhancing community-based prevention-focused programs and activities designed to strengthen and support families. This federal program provides critical seed money used by states to leverage funding from other sources. ACF estimates that federal CBCAP funds comprise about 10 – 20 percent of the states’ total funds for child abuse and neglect prevention, based on the reported prevention expenditures the states submit as leveraged claims. Because each state co-mingles CBCAP funds and funds from many other sources, it is hard to identify precisely how much of an impact these co-sponsored primary prevention efforts can be attributed specifically to CBCAP. Nevertheless, federal funding provides an opportunity for federal leadership on prevention issues.

Long term objective 7.1 (state improvement in child welfare outcomes), assesses whether states have been successful in improving their performance as a result of state Child and Family Service Reviews (CFSRs) process. Please see the following section (Child Welfare Services etc.) for a detailed discussion of the CFSR and Program Improvement Plan (PIP) process.

Annual measure 7A tracks the rate of first-time child maltreatment victims (maltreatment victims who have not been maltreatment victims in any prior year) per 1,000 children. The annual targets for improvement are based on an annual reduction of 0.20 in the rate of first-time victims through FY 2010. It is important to note that continually achieving consistent reductions in the annual rate of first-time maltreatment victims will be difficult, though it remains the goal of the program to reduce this rate in order to protect more children from maltreatment. The reported rate has also been affected by some fluctuation in the number of states reporting data each year. The reported performance information showed an increase in the rate of first time victims from 7.08 in FY 2003 to 7.42 in FY 2006. However, for FY 2007 the rate of first time victims again declined to 7.37, a decrease of .05 compared to FY 2006.

Annual measure 7B (repeat child maltreatment) evaluates whether the program has been successful in decreasing the percent of children with substantiated or indicated reports of repeat maltreatment. From FY 2005 to FY 2007, the national rate of repeat maltreatment has fallen from 8.1 percent to 6.8 percent, which shows slightly better performance than the FY 2007 target rate of 7 percent. ACF hopes to continue to make progress in reducing repeat maltreatment by continuing to assess state performance in this area as part of the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSRs) and, where necessary, by working with states to improve their performance through Program Improvement Plans (PIPs). By FY 2010, the program expects to reduce the rate of repeat maltreatment by 0.2 percent from the previous actual result.

Annual measure 7C (maltreatment report-to-investigation response time) is based on the median⁵⁵ of all states' average "response time," defined as the hours between the log-in call alleging maltreatment and the initial contact with the alleged victim or other person, where appropriate. This outcome/efficiency measure reflects the timeliness of state and local child protective services (CPS) agencies' initiation of an investigation in response to reports of child abuse or neglect. (The CAPTA state grant program is intended to improve CPS systems in areas including the screening, assessment and investigation of reports of abuse and neglect.) In FY 2006, the median response time decreased to 65.5 hours from 67 hours in FY 2005, narrowly missing the target of 63.65 hours. In FY 2007, however, the reported average response time increased to 79 hours. In part, this increase may reflect a clarification in the definition of response time emphasizing that a response has occurred when a worker makes face-to-face contact with the alleged victim, when this is appropriate, or with another person who can provide information essential to the disposition of the investigation or assessment. ACF will continue to work with states to improve the accuracy and completeness of the data, as well as to improve actual performance in ensuring that states respond to reports of abuse and neglect in a timely manner. Reducing the response time between maltreatment report and investigation improves the likelihood of identifying children in need of services in a timely manner and preventing additional maltreatment. By FY 2010, the program expects to improve response time by at least five percent under the previous year's actual result.

The most efficient and effective programs often use evidence-based and evidence-informed practices. CBCAP developed an efficiency measure (measure 7D) to gauge measure progress towards programs' use of these types of practices. Currently, the Children's Bureau and its National Resource Center for CBCAP are working closely with the states to promote more rigorous evaluations of their funded programs. Over time, the program expects to increase the number of effective programs and practices that are implemented, thereby maximizing the impact and efficiency of CBCAP funds. For the purposes of this efficiency measure, the Children's Bureau defines evidence-based and evidence-informed programs and practices along a continuum, which includes the following four categories of programs or practices: Emerging and Evidence Informed; Promising; Supported; and Well-Supported. Programs determined to fall within specified program parameters will be considered to be implementing "evidence-informed" or "evidence-based" practices (EBP), as opposed to programs that have not been evaluated using any set criteria. The funding directed towards these types of programs (weighted by EBP level) will be calculated over the total amount of CBCAP funding used for direct service programs to determine the percentage of total funding that supports evidence-based and evidence-informed programs and practices. A baseline of 27 percent was established for this measure in FY 2006. The target of a three percentage point annual increase in the amount of funds devoted to evidence-based practice through FY 2010 was selected as a meaningful increment of improvement that takes into account the fact that this is the first time that the program has required grantees to target their funding towards evidence-based and evidence-informed programs, and it will take time for states to adjust their funding priorities to meet these new requirements. In FY 2007, the target was met, with 30 percent of CBCAP funds directed toward evidence-based or evidence-informed child abuse prevention practices and programs. ACF is committed to continuing to work with CBCAP grantees to invest in known evidence-based practices, while continuing to promote evaluation and innovation, so as to expand the availability of evidence-informed and evidence-based practice over time.

⁵⁵ ACF is using the median of the all states' average reported response times, as this measure of central tendency is less affected by any individual state's reported response time which is an outlier (much higher or lower) compared to the other states' reported average response times.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES, PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES (PSSF), AND FOSTER CARE

Measure	FY	Target	Result
7.1LT: Nine states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome Measure 1: “Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect” by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016. To be in substantial conformity with this measure, states must achieve desired outcomes in 95 percent of reviewed cases as well as meet national standards for rates of maltreatment recurrence and the absence of abuse and/or neglect in foster care. (CAPTA, Child Welfare Services, Foster Care) (Outcome)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	9 states (FY 2016)	Oct-16
	2010	9 states	Oct-10
7.2LT: Five states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome Measure 1: “Children have permanency and stability in their living situation” by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016. To be in substantial conformity with this measure, states must achieve desired outcomes in 95 percent of reviewed cases as well as meet national standards for: rates of timeliness and permanency of reunification, timeliness of adoptions, achieving permanency for children in foster care, and the rate of placement stability in foster care. (Child Welfare Services, Foster Care) (Outcome)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	5 states (FY 2016)	Oct-16
	2010	5 states	Oct-10
7.3LT: Twenty states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor “Case Review System” by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016. Systemic factors measure a state’s capacity to achieve safety and permanence for children and well-being for children and their families. This measure examines state effectiveness in five separate aspects of the Case Review System. (Child Welfare Services, Foster Care) (Outcome)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	20 states (FY 2016)	Oct-16
	2010	20 states	Oct-10
7.4LT: Nine states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with Safety	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	9 states (FY 2016)	Oct-16

Measure	FY	Target	Result
Outcome Measure 2: “Children are maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate” by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016. To be in substantial conformity with this measure, states must achieve desired outcomes in 95 percent of reviewed cases. (PSSF) (Outcome)	2010	9 states	Oct-10
7.5LT: Ten states will be in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome Measure 2: “The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children” by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016. To be in substantial conformity with this measure, states must achieve desired outcomes in 95 percent of reviewed cases. (PSSF, Foster Care) (Outcome)	Out-Year Target	10 states (FY 2016)	Oct-16
	2010	10 states	Oct-10
7.6LT: Three states will be in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1: “Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs” by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016. To be in substantial conformity with this measure, states must achieve desired outcomes in 95 percent of reviewed cases. (PSSF, Foster Care) (Outcome)	Out-Year Target	3 states (FY 2016)	Oct-16
	2010	3 states	Oct-10
7.7LT: Thirty-five states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor “Service Array” by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016. Systemic factors measure a state’s capacity to achieve safety and permanence for children and well-being for children and their families. This measure examines whether states have in place throughout the state services to assess the strengths and needs of children and families and to provide an array of services that can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the child welfare agency. (PSSF) (Outcome)	Out-Year Target	35 states (FY 2016)	Oct-16
	2010	35 states	Oct-10
7E: Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out Program Improvement Plan (PIP) will be penalty free on Safety Outcome Measure 1: “Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect.” In order for a state to be	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-10
	2009	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-09
	2008	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (44 states) (Target Exceeded)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
designated penalty free it must address all findings identified in its most recent Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) by completing all agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. (Child Welfare Services, Foster Care) (Outcome)	2007	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (30 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2006	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (20 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2005	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (11 states) (Target Exceeded)
<u>7F</u> : Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on Permanency Outcome Measure 1: "Children have permanency and stability in their living situation." In order for a state to be designated penalty free it must address all findings identified in its most recent CFSR by completing all agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. (Child Welfare Services, Foster Care) (Outcome)	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-10
	2009	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-09
	2008	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	91% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (40 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2007	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	97% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (29 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2006	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (20 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2005	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (11 states) (Target Exceeded)
<u>7G</u> : Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on the systemic factor "Case Review System." In order for a state to be designated penalty free it must address all findings identified in its most recent CFSR by completing all agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. (Child Welfare Services) (Outcome)	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-10
	2009	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-09
	2008	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	98% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (43 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2007	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (30 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2006	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (20 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2005	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (11 states) (Target Exceeded)
<u>7H</u> : Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on Safety Outcome Measure 2: "Children are maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate." In order for a state to be designated penalty free it must address	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-10
	2009	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-09
	2008	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (44 states) (Target Exceeded)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
all findings identified in its most recent CFSR by completing all agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. <i>(PSSF) (Outcome)</i>	2007	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (30 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2006	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (20 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2005	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (11 states) (Target Exceeded)
<u>7I</u> : Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on Permanency Outcome Measure 2: "The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children." In order for a state to be designated penalty free it must address all findings identified in its most recent CFSR by completing all agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. <i>(PSSF, Foster Care) (Outcome)</i>	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-10
	2009	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-09
	2008	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	98% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (43 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2007	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (30 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2006	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (20 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2005	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (11 states) (Target Exceeded)
<u>7J</u> : Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on Well Being Outcome 1: "Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs." In order for a state to be designated penalty free it must address all findings identified in its most recent CFSR by completing all agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. <i>(PSSF, Foster Care) (Outcome)</i>	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-10
	2009	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-09
	2008	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (44 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2007	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (30 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2006	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (20 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2005	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (11 states) (Target Exceeded)
<u>7K</u> : Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on the systemic factor "Service Array." In order for a state to be designated penalty free it must address all findings identified in its most recent CFSR by completing all	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-10
	2009	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-09
	2008	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (44 states) (Target Exceeded)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. <i>(PSSF) (Outcome)</i>	2007	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (30 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2006	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (20 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2005	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (11 states) (Target Exceeded)
<u>7L</u> : Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on the systemic factor "Staff Training." In order for a state to be designated penalty free it must address all findings identified in its most recent CFSR by completing all agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. <i>(Foster Care) (Outcome)</i>	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-10
	2009	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-09
	2008	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (44 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2007	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (30 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2006	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (20 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2005	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (11 states) (Target Exceeded)
<u>7M</u> : Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free for the systemic factor "Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment and Retention." In order for a state to be designated penalty free it must address all findings identified in its most recent CFSR by completing all agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. <i>(Foster Care) (Outcome)</i>	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-10
	2009	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-09
	2008	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (44 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2007	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (30 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2006	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (20 states) (Target Exceeded)
	2005	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (11 states) (Target Exceeded)
<u>7N</u> : Reduce the time needed to approve state Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) Program Improvement Plans (PIPs). <i>(Child Welfare Services, PSSF) (Efficiency)</i>	2010	Prior Result -0.5	Oct-10
	2009	11.2 months	Oct-09
	2008	Set Baseline	11.7 months (Baseline)
<u>7O</u> : Increase the percentage of children	2010	Prior Result +2PP ⁵⁶	Oct-11

⁵⁶ The FY 2010 target for annual measure 7O is to increase by two percentage points (PP) over the FY 2009 actual result.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
who exit foster care within two years of placement either through guardianship or adoption. (<i>PSSF, SSBG</i>) (<i>Outcome</i>)	2009	38%	Oct-10
	2008	36%	Oct-09
	2007	35%	42.2% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	35%	39.7% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	35%	38.8% (Target Exceeded)
<u>7P</u> : For those children who had been in care less than 12 months, maintain the percentage that has no more than two placement settings. (<i>Child Welfare Services</i>) (<i>Outcome</i>)	2010	80%	Oct-11
	2009	80%	Oct-10
	2008	80%	Oct-09
	2007	80%	84.4% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	80%	83.4% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	80%	82.8% (Target Exceeded)
<u>7Q</u> : Decrease the percent of foster children in care 12 or more months with no case plan goal (including case plan goal "Not Yet Determined"). (<i>Child Welfare Services, PSSF, Foster Care</i>) (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2010	Prior Result -0.5PP	Oct-11
	2009	5.4%	Oct-10
	2008	5.9%	Oct-09
	2007	6.4%	4.8% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	6.9%	7.6% (Target Not Met)
	2005	7.4%	8.3% (Target Not Met)
<u>7R</u> : Decrease improper payments in the title IV-E foster care program by lowering the national error rate. (<i>Foster Care</i>) (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2010	5.50% ⁵⁷	Oct-10
	2009	6.00% ⁴²	Oct-09
	2008	3.25%	6.42% (Target Not Met) ⁵⁸
	2007	7.57%	3.30% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	8.49%	7.68% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	10.02%	8.6% (Target Exceeded)
<u>7.8LT and 7S</u> : Increase the adoption rate from 9.19 percent in FY 2003, to 10.0	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	10.5% (FY 2013)	Oct-14

⁵⁷ New FY 2009 and FY 2010 targets established, based on new methodology and submitted to OMB via ASRT.

⁵⁸ The FY 2007 Foster Care error rate is not comparable to previous years' rates due to a change in the estimation methodology requested by OMB.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
percent in FY 2008, and 10.5 percent in FY 2013. (<i>Foster Care, Adoption Opportunities, Adoption Incentives, Adoption Assistance</i>) (<i>Outcome</i>)	2010	10.2%	Oct-11
	2009	10.1%	Oct-10
	2008	10.0%	Oct-09
	2007	9.9%	10.0% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	9.85%	9.91% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	Set Baseline	10.26% (Baseline)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
7.1LT 7.2LT 7.3LT 7.4LT 7.5LT 7.6LT 7.7LT 7E, 7F, 7G, 7H, 7I, 7J, 7K, 7L, 7M, 7N	Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) final reports, Program Improvement Plans (PIPs), and PIP status tracking information	CFSR information is subject to several forms of data validation. Statewide data information, used as part of the initial review and the tracking of PIP progress, is collected through the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCANDS) and the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS), which each have extensive validation procedures discussed later in this section. Information collected during the onsite portion of the CFSR is subject to rigorous quality assurance procedures. States submit quarterly progress reports on PIP implementation which are carefully reviewed by ACF staff to assess the completeness and accuracy of the information. The Children's Bureau also has a database (maintained by a contractor) that tracks all key milestones for CFSR reviews.
7O 7P 7Q 7.8LT 7S	Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS)	States report child welfare data to ACF through AFCARS. All state semi-annual AFCARS data submissions undergo extensive edit-checks for validity. The results of the AFCARS edit-checks for each of the six-month data submissions are automatically generated and sent back to each state, to help the state to improve data quality. Many states submit revised data to ensure that accurate data are submitted, often for more than one prior submission period. The Children's Bureau conducts several AFCARS compliance reviews each year, which typically result in a comprehensive AFCARS Improvement Plan (AIP). States' Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems (SACWIS) are undergoing reviews to determine the status of their operation and the system's capability of reporting accurate AFCARS data. To speed improvement in these data, the agency funds the National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology. This Resource Center provides technical assistance to states to improve reporting to AFCARS, improve statewide information systems, and to make better use of their data. Finally, ACF has recently implemented the AFCARS Project that includes a detailed review of all aspects of AFCARS by federal staff and participation of the field in identifying possible changes to improve the system. All of these activities should continue to generate additional improvements in the data over the next few years.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
7R	Regulatory title IV-E Foster Care Eligibility Reviews conducted by the Children’s Bureau in each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico	Data validation occurs on multiple levels. Information collected during the onsite portion of the review is subject to quality assurance procedures to assure the accuracy of the findings of substantial compliance and reports are carefully examined by the Children’s Bureau Central and Regional Office staff for accuracy and completeness before a state report is finalized. Through the error rate contract, data is systematically monitored and extensively checked to make sure the latest available review data on each state is incorporated and updated due to rulings by the Departmental Appeals Board and payment adjustments from state quarterly fiscal reports. This ensures the annual error rate estimates accurately represent the state’s fiscal reporting and performance for specified periods. The Children’s Bureau also has a database (maintained by the contractor) that tracks all key milestones for the state eligibility reviews.

The Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) is the comprehensive, results-focused process used to monitor state performance in delivering child welfare services. The CFSR was developed in response to the Social Security Amendments of 1994 which mandated the development of a review process to determine whether states are in “substantial conformity” with the requirements of titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act (which include the Child Welfare Services and Promoting Safe and Stable Families programs, as well as Foster Care and Adoption Assistance). The Act also required that any financial penalties or withholding of funds be commensurate with the degree of nonconformity and that states be given an opportunity for corrective action and access to assistance prior to the imposition of penalties. Given the comprehensive nature of the reviews, CFSR findings are critical to the performance measurement of many of the federal child welfare programs.

The CFSR assesses outcome achievement across three broad domains of safety, permanency, and well-being, divided into seven outcome measurements. The reviews assess state activities associated with protecting children from abuse and neglect; maintaining children safely in their own homes whenever possible and appropriate; ensuring that children who are placed in foster care have stability in their living arrangements and move to a permanent home in a timely manner; preserving family connections and relationships; providing families involved with the child welfare system an opportunity to enhance their capacity to provide for their children’s needs; and ensuring that children involved with child welfare receive services to address their educational and health needs. The reviews also assess state performance on seven systemic factors (see Table 7.1).

Table 7.1: Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) Outcomes and Systemic Factors
Safety, Permanency and Well Being Outcomes
Safety 1: Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect
Safety 2: Children are maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate
Permanency 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situation
Permanency 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children
Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs
Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs
Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and health needs
Systemic Factors
Statewide Information System
Case Review System
Quality Assurance System
Staff Training
Service Array
Agency Responsiveness to the Community
Foster & Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment and Retention

Through the CFSR, a determination is made on whether a state is in substantial conformity with each of the seven outcomes and seven systemic factors. Substantial conformity is determined separately for each outcome and systemic factor. Therefore, a state may be in substantial conformity with some, but not all, of the 14 areas that are assessed. Determinations of substantial conformity for systemic factors are based on information from statewide assessments and interviews with state and community stakeholders in order to determine whether the requirements of the state plan are in place and functioning. Determinations of substantial conformity for outcomes are based on case review findings and, for some outcomes, state performance on national data indicators.

During the first round of the CFSR (conducted from FY 2001-FY 2004), for a state to be found in substantial conformity on an outcome, 90 percent of child welfare cases reviewed onsite had to have that outcome rated as a “strength” and the state had to meet the national standard for any applicable national data indicators associated with the outcome (two of the seven outcomes - Safety 1 and Permanency 1 - have national data indicators associated with them). For example, in evaluating Safety Outcome 1, “Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect,” the reviewers examine a sample of cases onsite. As part of the evaluation of each case, reviewers determine whether the investigation of reports of child maltreatment were initiated in a timely manner and whether there were any instances of repeat maltreatment in the case. In addition, statewide data relating to recurrence of maltreatment and abuse or neglect of children in foster care are examined to determine if the state’s performance meets national standards. During the second round CFSR (being conducted from FY 2007 – FY 2010), for a state to be found in substantial conformity on any of the seven outcomes, at least 95 percent of the cases reviewed must be rated a strength and the state must meet the standards for national data indicators.

Any outcome or systemic factor on which a state is found not in substantial conformity is required to be addressed through a Program Improvement Plan (PIP). At the conclusion of the PIP, a determination is made on whether all actions required by the PIP were completed and whether agreed upon improvements in quantifiable outcomes or goals were met. It is often necessary to wait an additional year to review outcome data that does not overlap the period of time that the PIP was in effect. If actions are completed and quantifiable outcomes and goals achieved, then the state is determined to be “penalty free” for that

outcome or systemic factor. However, if the state fails to improve in any of the required areas, a financial penalty is assessed. As of the end of FY 2008, 52 states had completed program improvement plans.⁵⁹ Final decisions had been made for 44 of those states, and 39 of these states were determined to be “penalty-free” because the states had successfully reached their PIP goals on all seven outcomes and seven systemic factors.

Annual measures 7E – 7M focus on increasing the number of states which are found each year to be “penalty free” on specific outcomes and systemic factors assessed through the CFSR, with a goal of having at least 90 percent of states (47 out of 52 states and jurisdictions, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) “penalty free” once all PIPs from the first round CFSRs are closed out. Performance on these measures through the end of FY 2008 has been impressive, with 100 percent of the 44 states that had final evaluations of closed-out PIPs being found penalty free on annual measures 7E, 7H, 7K, 7L, and 7M. In addition, 98 percent of the 44 states that had final evaluations of closed-out PIPs were found penalty free on annual measures 7G, 7I and 7J and 91 percent of the states were found penalty free on measure 7F relating to Permanency Outcome 1, “Children have permanency in their living situation.” In order to improve performance on these measures, the Children’s Bureau continues to provide extensive technical assistance to states through a network of National Child Welfare Resource Centers, national and regional trainings and meetings, and other methods to assist states in developing and implementing program improvement strategies. Technical assistance will continue to be provided as states prepare for and participate in the second round of the CFSR.

While annual measures 7E – 7M focus on the degree to which states have shown improvement through successful completion of PIPs, whether a state is in “substantial conformity” on the outcomes and systemic factors can only be determined upon the completion of the next full onsite review. Hence, to determine whether the first round of program improvement has resulted in an increased number of states being in substantial conformity, it is necessary to complete a second round of onsite CFSRs, projected to be completed by FY 2010. Long term objectives 7.2 – 7.7 will examine the degree to which there have been improvements in the number of states that are found in substantial conformity with specified outcomes and systemic factors, as measured through the second round of the CFSR process.

In setting targets for these long-term measures, ACF considered: (1) the number of states that were in substantial conformity during the first round; (2) progress that has been made through the PIPs; and (3) the higher standards in effect for the second round of reviews. As previously mentioned, the standard for achieving substantial conformity during the second round onsite review has been raised from 90 percent of cases rated a “strength” to 95 percent of cases. In addition, national standards for data indicators are being changed, with the standards of performance on safety being raised and new composite measures relating to permanency being used for the first time. For example, ACF has set a target that by the end of FY 2010, nine states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity on Safety Outcome Measure 1: “Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect” (up from six states in round one) and five states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome Measure 1 “Children have permanency and stability in their living situation” (up from zero states in round one). Given the high standards of the reviews, these are ambitious targets.

In addition to the long term and annual measures assessing state performance on the CFSR, ACF has also developed an efficiency measure that measures improvements in the timely development and approval of CFSR PIPs (measure 7N). After the first round of onsite reviews, particularly in the first years, there was significant variability in the amount of time needed to negotiate and approve state PIPs. Overall, between FY 2001 and FY 2004, the approval time ranged from a low of five months from issuance of the final

⁵⁹ Compiled findings from the initial 52 CFSRs, reports of individual state reviews and copies of state Program Improvement Plans (PIPs) are posted on the Children’s Bureau website at: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/cwmonitoring/index.htm>.

report to approval of the PIP to a high of 19.2 months. The median time from report issuance to PIP approval during the first round of reviews was 10 months. With both states and the federal government having the experience of the first round of reviews and with the ready availability of technical assistance to help the states in developing high quality PIPs, it is expected that the amount of time needed to develop and approve PIPs will decrease after the second round of reviews. By expediting the approval process, states will be able to more quickly implement systemic changes that will ultimately improve the safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes of children and families. In FY 2008, the baseline for measure 7N, measuring the timeliness of PIP approval during the second round of CFSRs, has been set at 11.7 months. ACF is committed to decreasing the time needed to approve PIPs, while continuing to hold states to high standards in the development of quality PIPs that lead to meaningful and sustained improvements in child welfare services and outcomes. In FY 2010, ACF expects to decrease the length of time needed to approve CFSR PIPs by 0.5 months from the previous year's actual result.

Complementing the measures that draw on CFSR results are measures assessing national performance on a number of other key indicators. Annual measure 7O is a combination of two former measures of timely exits to permanency: exits via guardianship alone and exits via adoption alone. ACF believes that these two outcomes are comparable in their relationship to permanency; thus since CY 2006, ACF tracks both in one measure, i.e. exits from foster care to either guardianship or adoption within two years of placement. In FY 2007, 42.2 percent of children exiting to either adoption or guardianship did so within two years of placement, exceeding the FY 2007 target of 35 percent. This increase shows continued improvement over the FY 2006 performance of 39.7 percent. Therefore, a greater number of children are exiting care to a permanent living arrangement in shorter periods of time and not remaining in care for an extended period of time. Continued improvement on this measure is also likely to be supported by passage of the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoption Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-351), which, among other provisions, created an option for states to operate a Guardianship Assistance Program under title IV-E of the Social Security Act beginning in FY 2009. The law also increased incentive amounts payable to states under the Adoption Incentives Program, which may also lead to improved performance. For FY 2010, ACF has set a goal of increasing the percentage of children by two percentage points over the previous year's actual result.

Annual measure 7P relates to children who have been removed from their homes and placed in foster care; this trauma can be aggravated further when a child is moved from one placement setting to another while in care. It is therefore in the best interest of the child to keep the number of placement settings to a minimum. ACF expects that at least 80 percent (the 2007 actual is just over 84 percent) of the children in foster care will experience no more than two placement settings during their first year in care through FY 2010. ACF is providing technical assistance to the states to improve placement stability for children in care, and states are employing a number of strategies, including increasing the use of relatives as placement resources and improving training and support for foster parents to improve retention and prevent placement disruptions.

Regarding efficiency measure 7Q, federal law requires that every child in foster care have a case plan that specifies the permanency goal for the child (e.g., reunification or adoption) and details the types of services the child and parents will receive to facilitate achievement of that goal. Despite this requirement, a significant proportion of cases in recent years have been reported as having no case goal or "case plan goal not yet determined" even when children have been in care for a year or more. Because identifying an appropriate goal is a crucial first step in moving a child to permanency, this efficiency measure seeks to decrease the percentage of cases reported as lacking a case plan goal. Specifically, the measure is computed from the number of children in foster care for 12 or more months with either a missing or "Not Yet Determined" case goal divided by the total number of children who were in foster care at least 12 months or more. In FY 2007, only 4.8 percent of the children in care for one year or more lacked a case plan goal. This result improved upon the FY 2007 target of 6.4 percent and showed substantial

improvement over FY 2006 actual performance when 7.6 percent of children in care for one year or more were reported as having no case plan goal. By increasing the proportion of cases with a case plan goal developed in a timely manner, ACF is helping to ensure that there is a focus on moving children from foster care to a permanent home, whether through reunification, adoption or guardianship. By FY 2010, the program expects to reduce the FY 2009 actual result by at least 0.5 percentage points.

Efficiency measure 7R focuses on reducing erroneous payments in the title IV-E foster care program. The Children's Bureau calculates a national payment error rate and develops an improvement plan to strategically reduce, or eliminate where possible, improper payments under the program. State-level data generated from the title IV-E eligibility reviews are used to calculate the error rate. Eligibility reviews are routinely and systematically conducted by the Children's Bureau in each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico to ensure that foster care maintenance payments are made only for program-eligible children. The eligibility review determines a state's level of compliance in meeting the federal eligibility requirements and validates the accuracy of a state's claim for reimbursements of foster care payments. Each eligibility review specifies the number of cases in error, underlying error causes and amount of payment in error determined from the examination of a sample drawn from the state's overall title IV-E caseload for an identified six-month period under review. The fiscal accountability promoted by these reviews leads to reductions in case errors and program improvements. Since FY 2000, the Children's Bureau has systematically conducted more than 130 regulatory foster care reviews, with over 12,000 foster care cases reviewed.

In early FY 2005, the Children's Bureau determined the baseline estimate of a national error rate as part of its ongoing efforts to ensure the proper use of title IV-E foster care maintenance funds and to assess the success of ongoing efforts to reduce improper payments in the title IV-E Foster Care program. The national error rate is determined by using the data collected in the most recent foster care eligibility review conducted for each state during the review cycle and extrapolating from individual case-level data on errors and improper payments from each state review sample for a specified period under review. Due to the regulatory three-year cycle of title IV-E foster care eligibility reviews, the national error rate estimate is based on a three-year rolling estimate ("rolling" because as new state reviews are conducted, the new review data will replace the case improper payment data from the state's previous review). Using this methodology, the Children's Bureau annually establishes targets for future improper payment levels that incorporate the latest available review data on each state, develops strategies for reaching the targets and monitors progress in reducing improper payments. The estimated composite baseline IV-E payment error rate of 10.33 percent was based on data obtained from fiscal years 2002-2004. For FY 2005, the estimated national error rate (based on the three year average from fiscal years 2003-2005) was 8.6 percent, for FY 2006 the error rate was 7.68 percent, and for FY 2007 the error rate was 3.30 percent, representing a reduction of over two-thirds since establishing the baseline.

The reported error rate for FY 2008, however, is not comparable to previous years, as this year's update reflects a transition to a refined methodology for estimating state improper payments. While the previous methodology extrapolated the average improper payments per case for the sample to the number of cases in the state, the refined methodology extrapolates the dollar error rate of the sample (i.e., sample Period Under Review [PUR] improper payments divided by sample PUR total payments) to the total PUR payments for the state. By agreement with OMB, ACF has retained the supplemental review data necessary to support this shift since 2004 when OMB approved the program's proposed estimation methodology. Using this new methodology, for FY 2008, the Foster Care estimated national payment error rate is 6.42 percent. This represents an increase over the FY 2007 error rate due in part to the revised methodology and in part to an increase in eligibility errors for several large states reviewed in FY 2008. While higher than the FY 2007 error rate, the FY 2008 error rate remains lower than rates reported in fiscal years 2004 - 2006 under the previous methodology. As a result of the new methodology and the actual performance in FY 2008, ACF has adjusted out-year targets. For FY 2009, ACF expects to lower

the error rate from 6.42 percent to 6 percent. Through ongoing reviews and work with states to develop program improvement plans when they are found not to be in substantial compliance, by FY 2010, ACF expects to reduce improper payments to 5.50 percent.

Long term objective 7.8 and related annual measure 7S (adoption rate) were developed through a program assessment as an appropriate measure of success in moving children toward adoption, taking into account the size of the pool of children in foster care for whom adoption is the appropriate goal. This change from number of adoptions to an adoption rate is particularly salient since the total number of children in foster care has declined from 567,000 in care on the last day of FY 1999 to approximately 496,000 children in care as of the last day of FY 2007. As a result, while the annual number of adoptions from the public child welfare system continues at a high level of over 50,000 (as compared to the 26,000 adoptions reported in FY 1995), since FY 2002, the annual number of adoptions has leveled off, while the adoption rate has continued to increase. The number of adoptions in FY 2007 totaled approximately 51,000 and the adoption rate achieved was 10 percent, exceeding the target of 9.9 percent, meaning that more children who are unable to return to their own families are exiting care to stable, permanent adoptive homes. By FY 2010, ACF expects to continue to improve this result by reaching an adoption rate of 10.20 percent. The Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 is also likely to support continued improvements in this measure by increasing incentives available to states under the Adoption Assistance Program and by gradually increasing the population of children eligible for title IV-E adoption assistance.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) provides an additional \$806 million in funding that will be used to increase the federal medical assistance payments (FMAP) rate by 6.2 percentage points. These payments are provided for state maintenance payments for foster care, adoption assistance, and guardianship assistance under title IV-E of the Social Security Act. Beginning in FY 2010, tribes will also be eligible for these funds. This matching rate increase is effective October 1, 2008 through December 31, 2010. Since states have discretion over how to spend the freed up dollars resulting from the increased federal match under ARRA, it is unclear what impacts this change may have on performance on the Foster Care program performance measures.

ADOPTION OPPORTUNITIES, ADOPTION INCENTIVES, AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

Measure	FY	Target	Result
7.8LT and 7S: Increase the adoption rate from 9.19 percent in FY 2003 to 10.0 percent in FY 2008 and 10.5 percent in FY 2013. (Foster Care, Adoption Opportunities, Adoption Incentives, Adoption Assistance) (Outcome)	Out-Year Target	10.5% (FY 2013)	Oct-14
	2010	10.2%	Oct-11
	2009	10.1%	Oct-10
	2008	10.0%	Oct-09
	2007	9.9%	10.0% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	9.85%	9.91% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	Set Baseline	10.26% (Baseline)
7.9LT: By 2009, 75 percent of Adoption Opportunities grantees will have their findings applied to practice, and 80 percent by FY 2014. The baseline is 60 percent in FY 2006. (Adoption Opportunities) (Outcome)	Out-Year Target	80% (FY 2014)	Oct-15
	2009	75%	Oct-10
	2006	Set Baseline	60% (Baseline)
7.10LT: By 2009, 75 percent of Adoption Opportunities grantees will have their findings provide the impetus for policies being enacted or amended, and 80 percent by FY 2014. The baseline is 67 percent in FY 2006. (Adoption Opportunities) (Outcome)	Out-Year Target	80% (FY 2014)	Oct-15
	2009	75%	Oct-10
	2006	Set Baseline	67% (Baseline)
7.11LT: Decrease the number of children with Title IV-E Adoption Assistance who experience a displaced adoption. ⁶⁰ (developmental, Adoption Assistance) (Outcome)	2010	N/A	N/A
7.12 LT and 7T: Decrease the gap between the percentage of children nine and older waiting to be adopted and those actually adopted by 15 percentage points between FY 2006 and FY 2015. ⁶¹ (Adoption Incentives) (Outcome)	2010	10.7%	Oct-11
	2009	12.2%	Oct-10
	2008	13.7%	Oct-09
	2007	15.2%	16.8% (Target Not Met)
	2006	16.7%	16.4% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	Set Baseline	15.7% (Baseline)
7U: Maintain or decrease the average	2010	Prior Result -2%	Oct-11

⁶⁰ A displaced adoption occurs when an adopted child enters foster care.

⁶¹ Based on data available as of September 2005.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
administrative claim per IV-E Adoption Assistance child. (<i>Adoption Assistance, Adoption Incentives</i>) (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2009	Prior Result -2%	Oct-10
	2008	\$1,504	Oct-09
	2007	\$1,535	\$1,802 (Target Not Met)
	2006	\$1,566	\$1,674 (Target Not Met)
	2005	\$1,598	\$1,560 (Target Exceeded)
7V: Reduce the cost per adoptive placement for the Adoption Opportunities Program. (<i>Adoption Opportunities</i>) (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2010	Prior Result -5%	Jan-11
	2009	\$13,930	Jan-10
	2008	\$13,013	\$14,663 (Target Not Met)
	2007	\$11,868	\$13,698 (Target Not Met)
	2006	Set Baseline	\$12,493 (Baseline)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
7.8LT 7S 7.11LT 7.12LT 7T	Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS)	States report child welfare data to ACF through the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS). All state semi-annual AFCARS data submissions undergo extensive edit-checks for internal reliability. The results of the AFCARS edit-checks for each of the six-month data submissions are automatically generated and sent back to each state, to help the state to improve data quality. Many states submit revised data to insure that accurate data are submitted, often for more than one prior submission period. The Children's Bureau conducts several AFCARS compliance reviews each year, which typically result in a comprehensive AFCARS Improvement Plan (AIP). States' Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems (SACWIS) systems are undergoing reviews to determine the status of their operation and the system's capability of reporting accurate AFCARS data. To speed improvement in these data, the agency funds the National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology. This Resource Center provides technical assistance to states to improve reporting to AFCARS, improve statewide information systems, and to make better use of their data. Finally, ACF has recently implemented the AFCARS Project that includes a detailed review of all aspects of AFCARS by federal staff and participation of the field in identifying possible changes to improve the system. All of these activities should continue to generate additional improvements in the data over the next few years.
7.9LT 7.10LT	Children's Bureau Performance Management On-line Tool	The Children's Bureau and the Child Welfare Information Gateway will provide technical assistance and resource information to all grantees so that they understand the criteria for their data reporting. Data submitted semi-annually will be check for validity by Children's Bureau staff and cross referenced with grantees' semi-annual reports.
7U	Form IV-E-1 used by states to submit financial claims	Federal staff in the ACF Regions carefully review claims information submitted by the states each quarter and may ask for additional information to verify claims, when necessary.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
7V	AdoptUsKids tracking system; PM-OTOOL, the Children's Bureau's performance measurement online tool for discretionary grantees	The Collaboration to AdoptUsKids makes available to states a national photolisting website featuring children awaiting adoptive placements. State officials enter information on individual children featured on the site. When removing a child from the site, the state official is required to enter information on the reason for removing the child from the photolisting (e.g., placement in an adoptive home). This information is captured in a monthly tracking report, prepared by the AdoptUsKids grantee and submitted to the Federal Project Officer. The monthly reporting of data allows both the project staff and federal staff to carefully monitor trends in the use of the site and its success in facilitating the placement of children awaiting adoption and to provide technical assistance to states, as needed.

Long-term objectives 7.9 and 7.10 pertain to Adoption Opportunities grantees. At the end of every Adoption Opportunities grant project, each grantee produces both a narrative report of findings (e.g. activities, evaluation) and a dissemination plan for these findings. Grantees also report information for these two long-term goals using the recently implemented performance measurement on-line tool (PM-OTOOL).

Adoption Opportunities grantees report a count of projects that have applied findings to practice for long-term objective 7.9, including such activities as:

- follow up with individuals or organizations that requested materials (e.g., presentations, final report, training materials, protocols, etc.) from the grantee about a project;
- follow up with individuals or organizations that asked permission about or showed interest in replicating or piloting a project; and
- the application of their findings to practice at conferences, in the professional literature, in newsletters, in the media.

Adoption Opportunities grantees report a count of projects that have applied findings to policy for long-term objective 7.10, including such activities as:

- speaking with advocacy groups it has worked with to enact policies;
- speaking with legislators or other policy-making bodies with which it has worked; and
- the application of its findings to policy discussions at conferences, in the professional literature, in newsletters, in the media.

By FY 2009, the Children's Bureau expects 75 percent of Adoption Opportunities grantees will have their findings applied to practice and that 75 percent will have their findings provide the impetus for policies being enacted or amended; by FY 2014, the Children's Bureau expects these results increase to 80 percent.

Regarding long-term objective 7.11 (displaced adoption), ACF created a developmental measure to assess the number of adoptions that fail, thus resulting in a child's re-entry into foster care. Adoptive displacement occurs when a child who has been previously adopted from foster care re-enters foster care. The current AFCARS contains data on children entering the foster care system who have been previously adopted. However, a substantial amount of data are missing, and the data do not permit a distinction between those children who were receiving title IV-E adoption assistance and those who were not. The Children's Bureau is currently conducting an intensive and detailed review of AFCARS. Addressing the availability of data for this measure will be a high priority in the review, and ACF will implement a solution by the end of FY 2009 to allow measurement against this long term goal.

Long-term objective 7.12 and annual measure 7T (decreasing the gap between those waiting, and those actually adopted) was created to evaluate progress of the Adoption Incentives program in reducing the gap between the percentage of children nine and older waiting to be adopted and those actually adopted. The most recent AFCARS data shows a slight increase in the gap between the percentage of children nine and older waiting to be adopted and those actually adopted from 16.4 percent in FY 2006 to 16.8 percent in FY 2007. While the target for decreasing the gap was missed in FY 2007, ACF remains committed to increasing the adoptions of older children in foster care and to decreasing the gap in the percentage of children nine and older waiting to be adopted and those actually adopted. ACF launched a national ad campaign, which produced a series of Public Service Announcements (PSAs) featuring strategic messages about adoption, the most recent one focusing on the adoption of teens from foster care. As of February 2009, over 10,000 children previously featured on the AdoptUsKids website now live with adoptive families. This initiative averages nearly three million visits to the AdoptUsKids website per month in addition to phone and email inquiries regarding children on the site. While the AdoptUsKids initiative is funded by Adoption Opportunities and Special Needs Adoption Programs, it also supports performance on this Adoption Incentives indicator. In addition, Congress reauthorized the Adoption Incentives program in October 2008. The Reauthorization made a number of improvements that had been sought by ACF, including doubling the amount of the per child incentive for children age nine and older. This increase along with ongoing emphasis on finding permanent homes for older youth in care should help to improve performance on these measures over time. By FY 2014, the Children's Bureau expects to improve performance on this measure by decreasing the gap to 10.7 percent.

Efficiency measure 7U sets annual targets to demonstrate improved efficiency through a gradual reduction in the average administrative claim per IV-E Adoption Assistance child. This is calculated by dividing the total administrative computable claims by the average monthly number of children receiving Adoption Assistance maintenance payments. The annual targets reflect an ambitious decline of two percent from the prior year's average administrative cost per child. In light of the fact that more children are receiving IV-E adoption assistance each year, this measure captures the more efficient administration of the program through lower administrative costs per child. Following several years of declining administrative costs from fiscal years 2001 – 2005, in FY 2006 and again in FY 2007, the average administrative costs claimed per IV-E Adoption Assistance child increased from \$1,560 in FY 2005 to \$1,802 in FY 2007. ACF will be looking into the reasons behind these increases and will continue to seek to reduce average claims in future years. By FY 2010, the Children's Bureau expects to decrease the average administrative claim per IV-E Adoption Assistance child by at least two percent under the previous year's results.

Regarding efficiency measure 7V, the Adoption Opportunities Program funds state and local agencies, as well as national and community-based organizations, to undertake activities that eliminate barriers to the adoption of children in foster care. Projects funded through this program report program-specific data including the number of children served who receive adoptive placements. This measure is calculated by dividing the amount of funds appropriated for the Adoption Opportunities program by the number of adoptive placements for children served by the funded projects. In FY 2007, the estimated cost per adoptive placement was \$13,698, a slight increase from the FY 2006 baseline of \$12,493. The increase in cost per adoptive placement reflects the fact that fewer children were placed by Adoption Opportunities grantees relative to the total grant amount. Overall, the Adoption Opportunities grantees placed 2,167 children in permanent homes in FY 2006 and 1,960 children in FY 2007. In FY 2008, the Children's Bureau worked with Adoption Opportunities grantees to improve the placement rate of children by providing technical assistance to grantees and by continuing to promote the adoption of children in foster care through the AdoptUsKids initiative, which is also supported in part by the Adoption Opportunities program. By FY 2010, the Children's Bureau expects to reduce the cost per adoptive placement by at least five percent under the previous year's result.

As previously noted, ARRA provides an additional \$806 million in funding that will be used to increase the federal medical assistance payments (FMAP) rate by 6.2 percentage points. These payments are provided for state maintenance payments for foster care, adoption assistance, and guardianship assistance under title IV-E of the Social Security Act. Since states have discretion over how to spend the freed up dollars resulting from the increased federal match under ARRA, it is unclear what impacts this change may have on performance on the Adoption Assistance program performance measures.

THE CHAFEE FOSTER CARE INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM

Measure	FY	Target	Result
7W: Increase the percentage of Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) youth who avoid high-risk behaviors which might otherwise lead to criminal investigations and incarceration. <i>(developmental)</i> <i>(Outcome and Efficiency)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	Set Baseline	Sep-12
7X1: Promote efficient use of CFCIP funds by increasing the number of jurisdictions that completely expend their allocations within the two-year expenditure period. <i>(Outcome and Efficiency)</i>	2010	Prior Result +2% (until maintenance goal of 52 states/juris. is achieved)	Aug-12
	2009	Prior Result +2% (until maintenance goal of 52 states/juris. is achieved)	Aug-11
	2008	Prior Result +2% (until maintenance goal of 52 states/juris. is achieved)	Aug-10
	2007	50 of 52 states/juris.	Aug-09
	2006	N/A	47 of 52 states/juris. (Historical Actual)
	2005	N/A	44 of 52 states/juris. (Historical Actual)
7X2: Promote efficient use of CFCIP funds by decreasing the total amount of funds that remain unexpended by states at the end of the prescribed period. <i>(Outcome and Efficiency)</i>	2010	Prior Result -10%	Aug-12
	2009	Prior Result -10%	Aug-11
	2008	Prior Result -10%	Aug-10
	2007	\$1,704,200	Aug-09
	2006	N/A	\$2,130,275 (Historical Actual)
	2005	N/A	\$1,458,758 (Historical Actual)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
7W	National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD)	States will report data to ACF through the NYTD. All state data submissions will undergo extensive edit-checks for internal reliability.
7X1 7X2	Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) annual grant close-out reports	Data are maintained by the Office of Grants Management (OGM) for ACF.

The Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) under section 477 of the Social Security Act will develop a full set of performance measures once the National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD) is implemented and finalized. The final rule to implement the new data collection was published on February 26, 2008. The NYTD is designed to meet statutory requirements for data collection and performance measurement. The statute requires the Secretary to develop outcome measures, identify data

elements to track, and develop and implement a plan to collect the needed information. The NYTD will measure the following six outcomes: financial self-sufficiency, educational attainment, positive connections with adults, homelessness, high-risk behavior, and health insurance coverage. Although the program cannot develop outcome performance measures until the NYTD is implemented, the program has established an interim efficiency measure and a developmental efficiency measure to support the President's Management Agenda initiative on Budget-Performance Integration. The Children's Bureau expects to establish a baseline for measure 7W in FY 2012.

Efficiency measure 7X aims to increase the efficiency of the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) operations through the timely and total expenditure of grant funds pursuant to section 477 (d)(3) of the Social Security Act (the Act). The Foster Care Independence Act (FCIA) authorized an increase in funds available to states from \$70 million to \$137.9 million. Under the new law, state allocations were increased by more than 100 percent in some cases. For example, prior to CFCIP, Alaska received less than \$14,000 in independent living funds; under the new law, the state's allocation is \$500,000, the small-state minimum. Early in the initial implementation of the CFCIP, some states experienced difficulties expending Chafee dollars. The resource infusion created challenges for states, specifically in the areas of enhancing their infrastructure and meeting the 20 percent match requirement.

In accordance with Section 477(d)(3) of the Act, states have two years within which to expend funds awarded for each fiscal year. Meeting this expenditure deadline is an important milestone to ensure that these funds reach the youth who need them. An analysis of close-out tables for fiscal years 2003 and 2004 prepared by the Office of Grants Management indicate that 10 states/jurisdictions did not expend their total allocations in FY 2003 and approximately \$935,861 was not expended within the required time period. Since the states have two years within which to expend their funds, final information on close-out status is not available until the second quarter of the second year after funds are awarded. For FY 2005, the number of states fully expending their grants improved (rising from 42 [81 percent] to 44 [85 percent] states and jurisdictions), but the dollar amount left unexpended by eight states was higher in FY 2005 (\$1,458,758) than the previous year's total of unexpended funds (\$935,861). For FY 2006, the number of states fully expending their grants continued to improve with 47 out of 52 states (90 percent) fully expending their grant awards. However, the dollar amount left unexpended again increased, compared to the previous year, with approximately \$2,130,275 unexpended for FY 2006. Approximately 70 percent of that amount was attributable to only one state, which lapsed a significant portion of its grant when it changed its approach to providing Chafee services from providing services with agency staff to contracting out service provision. However, now that the transition in service approach has been completed, that state expects to use all of its Chafee funds.

Increasing the number of states and jurisdictions expending their grants and decreasing the amount of funding left unexpended will ensure that more of the limited dollars allocated by state and federal funding are reaching and serving youth aging out of foster care who are in critical need of services. While some states may not be able to fully expend 100 percent of their Chafee allocation due to unforeseeable reasons (e.g., inability to meet matching requirements), ACF's goal is to maximize the amount of funds all states will expend within the allotted time period. The Children's Bureau employs several methods to encourage the timely expenditure of grant funds including providing technical assistance to states on allowable costs and services and meeting match requirements under CFCIP. The Children's Bureau and its technical assistance providers will continue to work with states on this issue in order to reach the FY 2010 goal of increasing the number of states expending CFCIP funds by two percent over the previous year's result and decreasing the amount of unexpended state funds by 10 percent under the previous year's result.

The following chart displays the crosswalk of the performance measures for each child welfare program:

Performance Measures	Child Welfare Program								
	CAPTA	CBCAP	CW Services	PSSF	Foster Care	Adopt Opp	Adopt Incent	Adopt Assist	CFCIP
7.1 Long Term Objective: Nine states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity on Safety Outcome Measure 1: "Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect" by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016.	X		X		X				
7A. Decrease the rate of first-time victims per 1,000 children, based on National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) reporting of the child maltreatment victims each year who had not been maltreatment victims in any prior year. (Outcome)		X							
7B. Decrease the percentage of children with substantiated or indicated reports of maltreatment that have a repeated substantiated or indicated report of maltreatment within 6 months. (Outcome)	X								
7C. Improve states' average response time between maltreatment report and investigation, based on the median of states' reported average response time in hours from screened-in reports to the initiation of the investigation. (Outcome and Efficiency)	X								
7D. Increase the percentage of Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) total funding that supports evidence-based and evidence-informed child abuse prevention programs and practices. (Efficiency)		X							
7.2 Long Term Objective: Five states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome Measure 1: "Children have permanency and stability in their living situation" by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016.			X		X				
7.3 Long Term Objective: Twenty states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor "Case Review System" by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016.			X		X				
7.4 Long Term Objective: Nine states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity on Safety Outcome Measure 2: "Children are maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate" by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016.				X					
7.5 Long Term Objective: Ten states will be in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome Measure 2: "The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children" by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016.				X	X				
7.6 Long Term Objective: Three states will be in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1: "Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs" by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016.				X	X				
7.7 Long Term Objective: Thirty-five states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor "Service Array" by the end of FY 2010 and FY 2016.				X					
7E. Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out Program Improvement Plan (PIP) will be penalty free on Safety Outcome Measure 1: "Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect." (Outcome)			X		X				
7F. Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on Permanency Outcome Measure 1: "Children have permanency and stability in their living situation." (Outcome)			X		X				
7G. Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on the systemic factor "Case Review System." (Outcome)			X						
7H. Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on Safety Outcome 2: "Children are maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate." (Outcome)				X					
7I. Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free for Permanency Outcome 2: "The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children." (Outcome)				X	X				

	Child Welfare Program								
	CAPTA	CBCAP	CW Services	PSSF	Foster Care	Adopt Opp	Adopt Incent	Adopt Assist	CFCIP
Performance Measures									
7J. Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free for Well Being Outcome 1: "Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs." (Outcome)				X	X				
7K. Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free for the systemic factor "Service Array." (Outcome)				X					
7L. Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free on the systemic factor "Staff Training." (Outcome)					X				
7M. Each fiscal year, an increasing number of states with a closed out PIP will be penalty free for the systemic factor "Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment and Retention." (Outcome)					X				
7N. Reduce the time needed to approve state Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) Program Improvement Plans (PIPs). (Efficiency)			X	X					
7O. Increase the percentage of children who exit foster care within two years of placement either through guardianship or adoption. (Outcome)				X					
7P. For those children who had been in care less than 12 months, maintain the percentage that had no more than two placement settings. (Outcome)			X						
7Q. Decrease the percentage of foster children in care 12 or more months with no case plan goal (including case plan goal "Not Yet Determined"). (Efficiency)			X	X	X				
7R. Decrease improper payments in the title IV-E foster care program by lowering the national error rate. (Efficiency)					X				
7.8 Long Term Objective: Increase the adoption rate from 9.19 percent in FY 2003 to 10.0 percent in FY 2008 and 10.5 percent in FY 2013.					X	X	X	X	
7S. Increase the adoption rate. (Outcome)					X	X	X	X	
7.9 Long Term Objective: By 2009, 75 percentage of Adoption Opportunities grantees will have their findings applied to practice.						X			
7.10 Long Term Objective: By 2009, 75 percentage of Adoption Opportunities grantees will have their findings provide the impetus for policies being enacted or amended.						X			
7.11 Long Term Objective: Decrease the number of children with Title IV-E Adoption Assistance who experience a displaced adoption. (developmental)								X	
7.12 Long Term Objective: Decrease the gap between the percentage of children 9 and older waiting to be adopted and those actually adopted by 15 percentage points between FY 2006 and FY 2015.							X		
7T. Decrease the gap between the percentage of children nine and older waiting to be adopted and those actually adopted. (Outcome)							X		
7U. Maintain or decrease the average administrative claim per IV-E Adoption Assistance child. (Efficiency)							X	X	
7V. Reduce the cost per adoptive placement for the Adoption Opportunities Program. (Efficiency)						X			
7W. Increase the percentages of Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) youth who avoid high risk behaviors which might otherwise lead to criminal investigations and incarceration. (Outcome and Efficiency)									X
7X(1). Promote efficient use of CFCIP funds by (1) increasing the number of jurisdictions that completely expend their allocations within the 2-year expenditure period. (Outcome and Efficiency)									X
7X(2). Promote efficient use of CFCIP funds by decreasing the total amount of funds that remain unexpended by states at the end of the prescribed period. (Outcome and Efficiency)									X

8. Developmental Disabilities

Measure	FY	Target	Result
8.1LT and 8A: Increase the percentage of individuals with developmental disabilities reached by the Councils who are independent, self-sufficient and integrated into the community by one tenth percent each year beginning in FY 2010 through FY 2014. ⁶² <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	Prior Result +0.1%	Jul-11
	2009	Prior Result +0.1%	Jul-10
	2008	12.47%	Jul-09
	2007	14.03%	12.46% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	13.64%	12.05% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2005	13.42%	11.27% (Target Not Met)
8B: Increase the percentage of individuals who have their complaint of abuse, neglect, discrimination, or other human or civil rights corrected compared to the total assisted. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	Prior Result +1%	Jul-11
	2009	Prior Result +1%	Jul-10
	2008	92.9%	Jul-09
	2007	93%	92% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	92%	91% (Target Not Met)
	2005	91%	91% (Target Met)
8C: Increase the percentage of trained individuals actively working to improve access of individuals with developmental disabilities to services and supports. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	Prior Result +1%	Jul-11
	2009	Prior Result +1%	Jul-10
	2008	90.9%	Jul-09
	2007	94.1%	90% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	93.5%	85% (Target Not Met but Improved) ⁶³
	2005	93.13%	71% (Target Not Met but Improved)
8D: Increase the percentage of individuals with developmental disabilities receiving the benefit of services through activities in which professionals were involved who	2010	Prior Result +1%	Oct-10
	2009	37.4%	Oct-09
	2008	40.4%	37% (Target Not Met)

⁶² This performance measure is also an indicator in the FY 2007 – 2012 HHS Strategic Plan.

⁶³ Data on this measure for FY 2006 was originally reported as 90.0 percent, but has been updated as a result of improved validation processes.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
completed University Centers of Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDDs) state-of-the-art training within the past 10 years. ⁶⁴ (Outcome)	2007	Set Baseline	40% (Baseline)
8E: Increase the number of individuals with developmental disabilities reached by the Councils who are independent, self-sufficient and integrated into the community per \$1,000 of federal funding to the Councils. ⁶⁵ (Efficiency)	2010	Prior Result +1%	Jul-11
	2009	Prior Result +1%	Jul-10
	2008	8.48	Jul-09
	2007	7.66	8.40 (Target Exceeded)
	2006	7.16	7.58 (Target Exceeded) ⁶⁶
	2005	7.61	7.09 (Target Not Met)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
8.1LT 8A 8C 8E	Program Performance Reports (PPRs) of State Councils on Developmental Disabilities (SCDDs)	Outcome data for each fiscal year are reported in annual PPRs, submitted in January of the following fiscal year. SCDDs submit PPRs through the On Line Data Collection (OLDC) system. Verification and validation of data occur through ongoing review and analysis of annual electronic reports, technical assistance site visits, and input from individuals with developmental disabilities, their families, and others. The Administration on Developmental Disabilities (ADD) works with individual grantees, along with a technical assistance contractor, to gain insight into the causes of anomalies and variations in data. ADD requires grantees to take corrective actions to ensure that data are valid.
8B	Program Performance Report (PPRs) of Protection and Advocacy (P&A) Systems	Outcome data for each fiscal year are reported in PPRs submitted in January of the following fiscal year. Protection and Advocacy Systems (P&As) submit PPRs through the On Line Data Collection (OLDC) system. Verification and validation of data occur through ongoing review and analysis of annual electronic reports, technical assistance site visits, and input from individuals with developmental disabilities, their families, and others.
8D	National Information Reporting System (NIRS)	All UCEDDs have data management staff who received training and technical assistance from ADD staff on the measure, and how to collect data for the measure. ADD developed policies on data collection including an OMB approved annual report template that includes definitions.

There are three programs administered by the Administration on Developmental Disabilities (ADD) that directly contribute to the five outcome measures for the developmental disabilities programs. These three Developmental Disabilities programs are: State Councils on Developmental Disabilities (State Councils), Protection and Advocacy systems (P&As), and University Centers for Excellence in Developmental

⁶⁴The language of this developmental measure has been revised to better represent the expected outcomes of UCEDDs. Per the developmental nature of this measure, the language has been revised to more effectively represent the magnitude of the impact directly on persons with developmental disabilities.

⁶⁵The federal funding used in this measure is adjusted to 2005 constant dollars (i.e., inflation adjustment). Adjustment factors used were obtained from the "Inflation Calculator" on the website of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, located at www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm.

⁶⁶Inflation adjusted figure for FY 2006 is 7.82.

Disabilities (UCEDDs).

Long-term objective 8.1 and related annual measures 8A (as well as annual measures 8C and 8E) are derived from data from the State Councils.⁶⁷ The State Councils do not provide services directly, but rather review and analyze the quantity and quality of services that are provided at the state and local level in order to promote the development of a comprehensive, statewide, consumer and family-centered system that provides a coordinated array of culturally-competent services and other assistance for individuals with developmental disabilities. State Councils are comprised of a majority of individuals with developmental disabilities and their families, plus representatives of major state agencies, non-governmental agencies and other concerned groups. There are Councils in 55 states and territories, each of which develops and implements a state plan with goals and objectives designed to move the state towards an effective system of supports and services for people with developmental disabilities. Council activities include, but are not limited to, program and policy analysis, demonstration of new approaches, training, outreach, community support, interagency collaboration and coordination, and public education.

Regarding annual measure 8A, in FY 2007, 556,753 individuals with developmental disabilities (12.46 percent of the national total) were independent, self-sufficient and integrated into the community as a result of Council efforts. This is an important measure, because it demonstrates the impact of the program directly on individuals with developmental disabilities. The ADD, starting with data in FY 2004, applied improved quality control procedures and later also applied improved program guidance, which resulted in improved data quality but also in a reduction of apparent performance. This performance measure in years prior to FY 2004 was elevated due to lack of quality control procedures and program guidance, and targets that had been set through FY 2007 were based on that elevated data. Because of the elevation of the targets, the result of 12.46 percent for FY 2007 did not meet the elevated target of 14.03 percent. However, the FY 2007 result improved over the previous year's result by more than three percent.

In FY 2006, ADD developed and published national guidelines and definitions for its annual measures, and provided training to State Councils on application of the definitions. This resulted in greater uniformity of reporting by State Councils and more reliable data in determining the percentage of individuals with developmental disabilities who are independent, self-sufficient, and integrated into the community as a result of Council efforts. The ongoing data quality improvements are expected to be fully in effect for the FY 2010 results, by which time the program expects to have improved by at least 0.1 percent over the previous year's result. The ADD continues to analyze changes in performance in order to better understand the trends and to improve the provision of on-going technical assistance to the Councils. In FY 2010, ADD also plans to evaluate the impact of revised reporting guidelines, which were implemented nationally in FY 2006, to ensure uniformity in reporting standards.

Regarding annual measure 8B, Protection and Advocacy systems (P&As) have the lead in the effort to pursue the safety of individuals with developmental disabilities living in the community or in institutions. There are Protection and Advocacy systems in 57 states and territories, each of which must have the authority under this program to pursue legal, administrative, and other appropriate remedies or approaches, including the authority to investigate incidents of abuse and neglect and to access client records.⁶⁸ The Protection and Advocacy systems are constantly striving to maximize success in cases of

⁶⁷ State Councils report the number of individuals with developmental disabilities receiving services and supports necessary for living in the community. This measure includes data in eight areas: employment, housing, transportation, health services, child care, recreation, quality assurance, and education. State Councils focus on three approaches to promoting life in the community: (1) capacity building and improvements within service systems; (2) changing opinions and attitudes of the public, professionals, and the business world; and (3) empowering consumers to request and obtain the services that they need.

⁶⁸ These strategies include negotiation and mediation, provision of technical assistance to other advocates and to self-advocates, attendance at administrative hearings, and finally, when necessary in a limited number of cases, pursuit of litigation.

individuals who have experienced abuse, neglect, discrimination, or other affront to their human or civil rights. Annual measure 8B is important because it demonstrates the rate of successful benefits accruing from the P&A program to individuals with developmental disabilities. The actual success rate for FY 2007 was 92 percent, narrowly missing the target of 93 percent, but improving over the previous year's result by nearly one percentage point. This result was due to several reasons. Some courts are not receptive to the needs of individuals with developmental disabilities, and at times courts do not permit P&A systems to access records of individuals with developmental disabilities (even though this access is within their legal rights), which may be needed for advocacy purposes. Secondly, most P&A systems are willing to take challenging cases, even though this may hurt performance on this measure. Challenging cases include those which could result in significant change in service policies and those on behalf of individuals who belong to unserved/underserved communities (as required by the Developmental Disabilities Act). Individuals from unserved/underserved communities include minority individuals (such cases require culturally competent advocacy), and individuals living in rural areas where infrastructure is lacking and communication is difficult, both of which decrease the odds of a successful outcome. Third, some individuals with specific developmental disabilities (e.g., communication or intellectual disabilities) may have difficulty in working with an attorney in support of their own cases.

The ADD continues to analyze its tracking of the percentage of individuals who have their complaint of abuse, neglect, discrimination, or other human or civil rights corrected in order to measure the appropriateness of the performance measure, particularly with respect to how the effectiveness of the P&A systems is measured across the spectrum of different populations served. For FY 2010, the program expects to increase the result by one percent over the previous year. This target is expected to be met through technical assistance provided to the P&A systems, especially strategies for dealing with challenging issues in courts, and strategies for representing people from unserved/underserved communities. Technical assistance also deals with issues of representing individuals with specific developmental disabilities (e.g. communication or intellectual disabilities) who are unable to assist well in their own cases.

Regarding annual measure 8C, the target of 94.1 percent was nearly reached for FY 2007 and further, is an improvement of five percentage points over FY 2006. In FY 2007, 90 percent of the total number of individuals trained by State Councils actively worked to improve the access of individuals with disabilities to services and supports. This increase over the previous year continues an annual trend of improvement that is credited to technical assistance, with a focus on the need for follow-up efforts by Councils to look at individual's post-training systems advocacy activities that demonstrate the true impact of the Councils' efforts. This annual measure tracks community-based efforts to promote availability of services and supports necessary to individuals with developmental disabilities living in the community.⁶⁹ This measure comprises data from State Councils, and the measure for this goal – ratio of individuals with developmental disabilities and family members active in systems advocacy, compared to individuals with developmental disabilities and family members trained in systems advocacy – is still being analyzed for possible future revision. For example, ADD has been working to make the definition of individuals “actively working” more uniform across states, and ADD is considering examination of number of persons trained over the past one, five, and 10 years. Moreover, ADD continues to analyze changes in performance in order to better understand the trends. This will result in more reliable data and data projections. By FY 2010, the program expects to increase the percentage of individuals trained and actively working to improve access of individuals with developmental disabilities to services and supports by at least one percent over the previous year's result.

Annual measure 8D was established during the CY 2003 program assessment. In contrast with a previous measure on UCEDDs, ADD has broadened its information collection to more accurately reflect the work

⁶⁹ As required under the Olmstead Supreme Court decision.

of the UCEDDs.⁷⁰ In FY 2007, baseline data for this measure was established at 40 percent. This measure is based on survey data collected by the UCEDDs from professionals they had trained one year ago, five years ago, and ten years ago, and the measure is calculated by establishing a best-fit model to estimate the data for each year over the ten year period. This measure will continue to be evaluated over time to determine its robustness as well as its accuracy. In FY 2008, ADD pursued several steps to improve data collection methods for this measure to increase the amount of and ensure the accuracy of the data being collected. ADD provided technical assistance to grantees that did not report data for this measure or had limited data to report. ADD provided feedback to the national network of UCEDDs on performance and discussed the need to improve the return rate on the surveys. Finally, ADD formed a working group that will examine the data collection methods for this measure. ADD will continue to track grantees to ensure that their data reports improve in the coming years, and has already established improved data management and analysis methods to improve data quality, and resultant measure quality. By FY 2010, the program expects to increase the percent of individuals with developmental disabilities receiving the benefit of services from professionals who completed UCEDD training by at least one percent over the previous year's result. To this end, ADD will continue to provide the UCEDD network with technical assistance to improve their performance through its technical assistance contract. There will be several targeted technical assistance events this year, including sessions that focus on marketing the UCEDD and developing research agendas.

Regarding efficiency measure 8E, the State Councils program is a force within state governments for systems change and capacity building, as well as providing training to individuals with developmental disabilities and their family members to prepare them to participate in the process of policy making, since they often have a deeper appreciation of their own needs than do professionals in the field. Sitting on each State Council are individuals with developmental disabilities, family members, representatives of state agencies and service providers, and also representatives of the federally funded P&As and University Centers. At the end of each fiscal year, each State Council reports on its achievements during the past 12 months that involved use of the federal funding provided by ADD. In order to maximize the efficacy and efficiency of these efforts, ADD provides policy support as well as technical assistance. This efficiency measure reflects performance data reported to ADD on existing annual reports from the states. The ADD collected data for this efficiency measure from the State Councils in FY 2006, finding 7.82 individuals with developmental disabilities reached per \$1,000 federal funding (2005 constant dollars) to the Councils. The target shown for each successive year is one percent increase over the previous year. Thus, the target for FY 2008 is one percent more than the FY 2007 actual: 8.48 individuals with developmental disabilities reached per \$1,000 federal funding (2005 constant dollars) to the Councils. The ADD met and exceeded the FY 2007 target with a result of 8.40 individuals with developmental disabilities being reached per \$1,000 federal funding to the Councils. Therefore ADD is showing success by increasing the number of individuals reached per dollar of federal funding to the State Councils. As noted for measure 8A, the drop from FY 2004 to FY 2005 was due largely to efforts by ADD to reign in data quality, while the increase from FY 2006 to FY 2007 is believed to be mostly due to actual improvement, since data quality in FY 2006 was already quite good due to implementation of data standards. The ADD continues to analyze changes in performance in order to better understand the trends and to perfect on-going technical assistance to the State Councils. The ongoing data quality improvements are expected to be fully in effect by FY 2010, which will result in more reliable data and data projections. By FY 2010, the program expects to increase the number of individuals with developmental disabilities reached by the State Councils per \$1,000 of federal funding (2005 constant dollars) by at least one percent over the previous year's result.

⁷⁰ The UCEDDs: 1) provide interdisciplinary pre-service preparation and continuing education to students and fellows in a variety of disciplines; and 2) provide training and technical assistance to individuals with developmental disabilities, their families, professionals, paraprofessionals, policymakers, students and others in the community.

9. Native American Programs

Measure	FY	Target	Result
9.1LT and 9A: Increase the number of jobs created through Administration for Native American (ANA) funding to five percent over the baseline by FY 2010, and six percent over the baseline by FY 2014. ⁷¹ (Outcome)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	Baseline + 6% (FY 2014)	Jan-15
	2010	Baseline + 5%	Jan-11
	2009	386 ⁷²	Jan-10
	2008	363 ⁷³	427 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	N/A	481 (Historical Actual)
	2006	Set Baseline	238 (Historical Actual)
9B: Increase the number of projects involving youth in Native American communities. ⁷⁴ (Outcome)	2010	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results	Jan-11
	2009	71 ⁷³	Jan-10
	2008	72 ⁷⁴	69 (Target Not Met)
	2007	N/A	75 (Historical Actual)
	2006	N/A	68 (Historical Actual)
9C: Increase the number of intergenerational projects in Native American communities. ⁷⁵ (Outcome)	2010	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results	Jan-11
	2009	58 ⁷³	Jan-10
	2008	58 ⁷⁴	58 (Target Met)
	2007	N/A	66 (Historical Actual)
	2006	N/A	49 (Historical Actual)
9.2LT and 9D: Increase the number of community partnerships formed by ANA grantees to five percent over the	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	Baseline + 6% (FY 2014)	Jan-15
	2010	Baseline + 5%	Jan-11

⁷¹ This measure has been adjusted to show the actual number of jobs created as determined by impact evaluations for each year. Previously, the numbers reported were based on averages from impacts evaluations extrapolated to the entire grant portfolio.

⁷² The FY 2009 targets for annual measures 9A – 9D and efficiency measure 9E is a one percent increase over the average of actual results for the previous three years.

⁷³ The FY 2008 target for annual measures 9A – 9D and efficiency measure 9E is a one percent increase over the average of actual results for the previous two years.

⁷⁴ This measure has been adjusted to show the actual number of projects that involve youth as determined by impact evaluations for each year. Previously, the numbers reported were based on averages from impacts evaluations extrapolated to the entire grant portfolio.

⁷⁵ This measure has been adjusted to show the actual number of projects that involve intergenerational activities as determined by impact evaluations for each year. Previously, the numbers reported were based on averages from impacts evaluations extrapolated to the entire grant portfolio.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
baseline by FY 2010, and six percent over the baseline by FY 2014. ⁷⁶ (Outcome)	2009	1,113 ⁷³	Jan-10
	2008	990 ⁷⁴	1,347 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	N/A	1,411 (Historical Actual)
	2006	Set Baseline	549 (Historical Actual)
9E: Increase the percentage of applicants who receive ANA Training/Technical Assistance (T/TA) and go to score in the funding range. (Efficiency)	2010	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results	Sep-10
	2009	58% ⁷³	Sep-09
	2008	59% ⁷⁴	57% (Target Not Met)
	2007	N/A	66% (Historical Actual)
	2006	Set Baseline	51% (Baseline)
	2005	N/A	48% (Historical Actual)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
9.1LT 9A 9B 9C 9.2LT 9D	ANA monitoring and impact evaluation tools	ANA has developed an on-site impact evaluation tool to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of ANA-funded projects.
9E	T/TA quarterly reports, ANA application data, and application scores	ANA is in the process of developing and testing new tools to evaluate the effectiveness of ANA T/TA. Applications are scored by external, independent reviewers. The number of applicants that receive T/TA and score within the funding range is an indication of the capacity that is being built in Native American communities.

The Administration for Native Americans' (ANA) social and economic development strategy was developed to address trends indicating that when compared to all other groups of citizens in the United States, Native Americans living on reservations and in rural and urban communities rank at the bottom of nearly every social, health, and economic indicator. ANA discretionary grants provide funding for the planning, development, and implementation of short-term community-based projects (averaging one to three years), which result in the creation of jobs and long-term social and economic benefits supporting healthy children, families, and communities.

In compliance with the Native American Programs Act of 1974, each year ANA conducts impact evaluations on approximately one-third of its grant portfolio. The number of annual visits conducted fluctuates depending on the size of the active grant portfolio; ANA conducted 75 impact visits in 2006, 93 in 2007 and 87 in 2008, and each year's visit total was equal to roughly 33 percent of the total portfolio for the corresponding year. The evaluations assess the impact of ANA-funded projects on Native

⁷⁶ This measure has been adjusted to show the actual number of projects from community partnerships as determined by impact evaluations for each year. Previously, the numbers reported were based on averages from impacts evaluations extrapolated to the entire grant portfolio.

American communities and collect data from grantees through a standardized format. The standardized evaluation survey captures large amounts of data, including: the number of jobs created, the number of youth involved with projects, how many projects involve intergenerational activities, and the number of community partnerships formed.

Previously, the data for key outcomes 9A, 9B, 9C and 9D were reported using a calculation that determined average results from impact visits and extrapolated this average to the overall ANA grant portfolio. In an effort to report more accurately on ANA program performance, the data provided for annual measures 9A, 9B, 9C, and 9D reflect actual data collected during impact visits from 2006 to 2008. Therefore, the data have not been extrapolated to the overall ANA grant portfolio or adjusted by statistical methods. Instead the data reflect the actual numbers recorded from projects evaluated, which is about one-third of the total portfolio each year.

By increasing the number of jobs created through ANA-funded projects (measure 9A), communities benefit from increased employment rates and overall betterment of the lives of families and individuals. Evaluations of 87 projects ending in FY 2008 recorded the creation of 427 jobs, equating to an average of 4.9 jobs per project. For FY 2010, ANA intends to increase the number of jobs created by five percent over the baseline established in FY 2006.

Meeting the needs of Native American youth is a component of many ANA projects, and such efforts are funded through the Social and Economic Development Strategies (SEDS) program and Native Language Preservation and Maintenance program. By increasing the number of projects involving youth (measure 9B), more young people will be positively influenced by exposure to culturally-based curricula, values, and traditions. Examples of activities captured by this measure include after-school programs, youth camps, mentoring programs, and conflict-resolution workshops for youth. Of the 87 projects visited in 2008, 69 (79 percent) involved youth, similar to the results from 2006 (78 percent) and 2007 (81 percent). By FY 2010, ANA expects to increase these results by one percent over the average of the last three years. While ANA did not meet this target for grantee projects involving youth, ANA provided Community Emergency Response Training to over 160 youth through collaborative efforts with other programs.

Regarding annual measure 9C, projects involving intergenerational activities facilitate the transmission of cultural traditions from elders to youth. Many of these projects are supported through the Native Language Preservation and Maintenance program, and, more recently, SEDS projects are also bridging the generational divide and bringing youth and elders together to promote and preserve Native American cultures. Of the 87 projects visited in 2008, 58 (67 percent) involved intergenerational activities, similar to the results from 2006 (65 percent) and 2007 (71 percent). By FY 2010, ANA expects to increase these results by one percent over the average of the last three years. An increase in the number of intergenerational projects will result in greater opportunities to positively impact the lives of Native children and families by sharing traditions and cultures, and preserving Native languages

Grantees form partnerships with other tribes, organizations, and agencies to maximize ANA funds, to further advance project goals and promote sustainability. To achieve long-term objective 9.2 and annual outcome measure 9D, ANA works with grantees to encourage partnership development and ensure they maximize their leveraging potential. Impact visits to 87 projects ending in FY 2008 recorded a total of 1,347 partnerships formed. For FY 2009, ANA hopes to meet the target of increasing partnerships by one percent over the previous three years' results.

Efficiency measure 9E evaluates the effectiveness of ANA investments in Training and Technical Assistance (T/TA) services over the course of a three-year period. ANA provides T/TA at no cost to potential applicants, with the goal of helping these applicants develop and submit project proposals that

score within the “funding range.” Applications are reviewed and scored by proposal reviewers who are members of Native communities and other professionals selected based on their qualifications, experience, and expertise in ANA program areas. The funding range is then determined and typically includes projects scoring between 70 and 100.

In FY 2007 and through FY 2008, ANA awarded new T/TA provider contracts. Beginning in FY 2008, ANA was able to significantly alter the type and frequency of trainings provided to potential applicants. The T/TA providers are utilizing more efficient tools to assist potential grantees. For example, electronic technical assistance (email, telephone, etc.) and Business Development Guides are being used to increase effectiveness and decrease costs for both ANA and potential applicants.

In FY 2006, 51 percent of applicants who received T/TA went on to score in the funding range, this increased to 66 percent in FY 2007. During this period the number of applications increased and the number of applicants scoring in the funding range also increased. The target for FY 2008 (the average of FY 2006 and FY 2007, plus one percent) was 59 percent, and in that year ANA achieved 57 percent, which is still a high rate of successful applications. The high percentages in FY 2007 and FY 2008 demonstrate that over the course of the last three years, ANA has succeeded in building community capacities. By FY 2010, ANA is targeted to increase by one percent over the average of the previous three years’ results.

10. Compassion Capital Fund

Measure	FY	Target	Result
10.1LT and 10A: Increase the proportion of FBCOs increasing or diversifying revenue through the CCF Demonstration Program to 24.34 by FY 2014 to reflect an annual increase of 3 percent over the FY 2006 baseline. ⁷⁷ <i>(Outcome)</i>	2009	21.40	Apr-10
	2008	20.81	Apr-09
	2007	20.22	28.54 (Target Exceeded) ⁷⁸
	2006	Set Baseline	19.63 (Baseline) ⁷⁹
10.1LT and 10B: Increase the proportion of FBCOs increasing or diversifying revenue through the CCF Targeted Capacity Building Program to 20.76 percent by FY 2014, to reflect an annual increase of 2 percent over the FY 2006 baseline. ⁸⁰ <i>(Outcome)</i>	2009	18.97	Apr-10
	2008	18.62	Apr-09
	2007	18.26	14.41 (Target Not Met)
	2006	Set Baseline	17.90 (Baseline) ⁸¹
10.2LT and 10C: Increase the number of capacity building activities implemented by FBCOs per \$50,000 of federal assistance through the CCF Demonstration Program and Targeted Capacity Building Program funding to 3.09 percent by FY 2014. ⁸² <i>(Efficiency)</i>	2009	2.62	Apr-10
	2008	2.53	Apr-09
	2007	2.44	5.37 (Target Exceeded)
	2006	Set Baseline	2.34 (Baseline)
10D: Increase the proportion of FBCOs served through the CCF Demonstration Program that have expanded or enhanced services to those in need. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2009	33.23	Apr-10
	2008	32.59	Apr-09
	2007	Set Baseline	31.95 (Baseline)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
---------	-------------	-----------------

⁷⁷ The language of this measure has been revised for clarity and ease of understanding.

⁷⁸ The FY 2007 result for measure 10A significantly exceeds the FY 2007 target. Should this result prove to be a data trend in following years, future targets will be adjusted to maintain rigor. The FY 2007 actual has also been updated as a result of additional submissions.

⁷⁹ ACF began annual data collection for all outcome and output measures in FY 2007. Previous data for FY 2006 results include reports from grantees who completed projects in fiscal years 2004 and 2005 as well. The baseline data for FY 2006 has been updated as a result of updated grantee submissions. Future year targets have been revised to reflect this update based on the progression of an annual increase of three percent over the baseline. This revision also enables CCF to track improvements in earned not “awarded” revenue.

⁸⁰ The language of this measure has been revised for clarity and ease of understanding.

⁸¹ The baseline data for FY 2006 has also been updated as a result of updated grantee submissions. Future year targets have been revised to reflect this update based on the progression of an annual increase of two percent over the baseline.

⁸² The language of this measure has been updated as part of the OMB Measure Quality Review in order to clarify how many activities are achieved for the public investment by tracking efficiency in achieving outcomes. In addition, the denominator has been changed to \$50,000—the maximum amount of a single Targeted Capacity Building grant—in order to make the measure more meaningful to CCF grantees and program staff. Targets have been recalculated to reflect this change.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
10.1LT 10A 10B 10.2LT 10C 10D	Semi-Annual Progress Reports and Financial Reports (SF-269) from grantees	The data are reported by CCF grantees under the Demonstration and Targeted Capacity Building programs. The data reported are reviewed by CCF staff for consistency, completeness and conformance with approved grant plans. CCF staff regularly examine grantee progress in relation to approved plans.

The Compassion Capital Fund (CCF) has a primary purpose of enhancing the organizational capacity, service effectiveness, and funding opportunities for faith-based and community organizations (FBCOs). At least in part, the program can track its success by measuring the proportion of CCF-assisted FBCOs that are awarded funding from other sources and the capacity building activities achieved. With regard to the baseline data from FY 2006, all four measures have been recalculated to reflect updated information about actual grant activity and dollars drawn down. The targets in subsequent years have been adjusted appropriately. There are no targets for FY 2010 and beyond as the program has been proposed for elimination in the FY 2010 Budget.

Diversification of funding is a key factor in non-profit sustainability and in the provision of services to meet the diverse needs of individual, families, and communities. For FY 2007, annual measure 10A indicates that 28.54 percent of FBCOs assisted through intermediaries reported increased revenue or diversified revenue sources during their grant period. This is well in excess of the FY 2007 target of 20.22 percent.

Annual measure 10B indicates that 14.41 percent of FBCOs assisted by direct grants reported increased revenue or diversified revenue sources during their grant period. This is short of the FY 2007 target of 18.26 percent.

In order to increase their capacity, grassroots organizations may need to focus on one or more target areas addressed under the CCF program: leadership development, organizational development, revenue development strategies, programs and services; or community engagement. Regarding efficiency measure 10C, FY 2007 data indicate that more than 4,000 capacity building activities were achieved by FBCOs assisted through the CCF program, a ratio of 5.37 capacity building activities per \$50,000 in CCF funding. This is well in excess of the FY 2007 target of 2.44. Efforts to improve this measure were extremely successful, and the program is evaluating establishing new targets should this result prove to be a trend.

Annual measure 10D attempts to build on the controls inherent in the CCF grant structure to address CCF program efficiency. This measure focuses on the ability to use CCF dollars to build capacity among thousands of FBCOs throughout the country by means of grants awarded to a small number of intermediaries through the CCF Demonstration Program. Annual measure 10D was revised and approved by OMB in 2008. For the FY 2007 baseline, results indicate that an average of 31.95 FBCOs were served per intermediary.

11. Federal Administration

Measure	FY	Target	Result
11A: Obtain the highest level of success for each management initiative. ⁸³ (Outcome)	2010	Highest level of success in all management initiatives	Nov-10
	2009	Highest level of success in all management initiatives	Nov-09
	2008	Highest level of success in all 8 management initiatives	Highest level of success in all 8 management initiatives (Target Met)
	2007	Highest level of success in all 8 management initiatives ⁸⁴	Highest level of success in all 8 management initiatives (Target Met)
	2006	Highest level of success in all 7 management initiatives	Highest level of success in all 7 management initiatives (Target Met)
	2005	Highest level of success in all 6 management initiatives	Highest level of success in all 6 management initiatives (Target Met)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
11A	The Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management and the Assistant Secretary for Resources and Technology in the Department of Health and Human Services	Data are validated via the Assistant Secretary for Resources and Technology (ASRT), reference Office of Management and Budget (OMB) standards for success in the management initiatives for Departments.

ACF is committed to achieving results through government-wide management initiatives: In FY2008 there were Strategic Management of Human Capital, Competitive Sourcing, Expanded Electronic Government, Improved Financial Performance, Improved Budget and Performance Integration, Eliminating Improper Payments, Real Property Asset Management and Faith-Based Initiatives.

ACF continues to serve in a leadership role in the strategic management of human capital. For this initiative, ACF received the highest level of success for a total of 21 consecutive quarters. This success is a direct result of ACF's commitment to its workforce and workforce programs. ACF's accomplishments to date are as follows: transitioned 100 percent of its employees to a new performance management program (PMAP) that further linked employee performance to organizational mission and goals and improved accountability; closed competency gap in the Program and Management Analyst occupational series by funding trainings in communication (a targeted competency for Program and Management Analyst); launched a new leadership development program to build its leadership pipeline and succession planning; implemented the Career Mentoring Program for the 4th consecutive year to facilitate an environment of learning; and continued to track data to ensure a diverse workforce.⁸⁵

⁸³ The language of this measure has been modified slightly.

⁸⁴ The ACF progress rating for the eighth initiative, "Faith-Based Initiatives" was introduced in the third quarter of FY 2006.

⁸⁵ ACF uses data from the personnel system (managed by the HHS Program Support Center) to assess demographic, gender, and ethnic diversity across ACF and compare it within HHS and outside (federal-wide comparisons) to measure progress. ACF has recently also been able to overlay this information to mission critical occupations and average grade. Concerning privacy issues, these data are collected and computed without attribution to individuals and without inquiry of employees by ACF.

ACF has successfully maintained the highest level of success for competitive sourcing activities in each quarter for 24 consecutive quarters. In accordance with the ACF FY 2008 Competition Plan, ACF studied 30 positions. By linking its competitive sourcing program with human capital management, ACF has exceeded its competitive sourcing goals. ACF has now studied 100 percent of its commercial inventory.

Regarding expanding electronic government, the Grants Center of Excellence (HHS/ACF COE) is an innovative Electronic Government initiative that supports multiple facets of the President's Management Agenda. ACF was selected by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to be one of only three government-wide agencies for providing e-business services to the entire federal government. Due to the Center's innovation and accomplishments, ACF has been recognized with several awards including a 2007 E-Government Institute Enterprise Architecture Award and the 2006 Presidential Award for Management Excellence. The HHS/ACF COE is an important component for several partner agencies' financial and programmatic stewardship. Because of the partner success, several new agencies selected the HHS/ACF COE for their grants management services within the past two years (including USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service, HHS Health Resources and Services Administration, Treasury Community Development Financial Institutions, and Department of Transportation). As an HHS Grants Center of Excellence, ACF continues to support the Administration on Aging (AoA), the Indian Health Service (IHS) and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS) in successfully deploying ACF's grants system.

In improving financial performance, the Department received another clean opinion on its FY 2007 audit (the ninth consecutive clean audit opinion for ACF, with no ACF-specific material weaknesses in FY 2007). ACF management has proactively participated in the development of the Unified Financial Management System (UFMS) at all levels from project governance through the provision of subject matter experts. UFMS was implemented as scheduled on October 16, 2006. Financial statements were prepared through UFMS for all of FY 2008. In addition, ACF has successfully implemented the newly revised OMB Circular A-123, which requires a more rigorous testing of internal controls.

In improving budget-performance integration, ACF has instituted a comprehensive performance management system that links agency-wide mission and goals with program priorities and resources. The agency uses outcome and efficiency performance data in managing programs and linking outcomes to investments. All ACF programs have developed logic models that link resources (such as staff and funding), activities, and outcomes, and many programs have developed new outcome and efficiency measures. ACF has completed program assessments on twenty-seven programs.

Regarding Improper Payments, ACF continues to take a proactive role in OMB/HHS improper payment initiatives, negotiating plans and deliverables with HHS and OMB for ACF's four A-11 identified programs. ACF's contribution to the Improper Payments initiative is significant both within ACF and to the overall progress the Department makes towards full implementation of this initiative.

For FY 2007, HHS reported a national improper payment rate for Foster Care and Head Start. In concert with the HHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and based on agreements with OMB, ACF is using statistically valid sampling methodologies to establish national improper payment error rates for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) programs. HHS expects to report national error rates for TANF and CCDF for the first time in the FY 2008 Performance and Accountability Report (PAR). Specifically:

TANF: In FY 2007, HHS' OIG conducted a pilot review of TANF cash assistance payments in three states. The error rates for the pilots ranged from 11.5 percent to 40 percent. The OIG is currently

completing improper payment case reviews in seven states (PA, MI, CA, ID, MN, OH, and VT). HHS expects to report a reasonable estimate of a national TANF error rate in the FY 2008 PAR and will finalize and report this rate in the FY 2009 PAR. For FY 2008, ACF reported a national estimate, rather than a national error rate, because some of the work was not completed. The program is still working to address a number of outstanding measuring and reporting issues.

CCDF: The Final Rule to require states to implement and report an error rate in the child care program was published on September 5, 2007 with an effective date of October 1, 2007. The Regulations added a subpart to the CCDF regulations that requires states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico to employ a case review process every three years to calculate a CCDF error rate in accordance with an error rate methodology. Using a stratified random sample method, one-third of the total of 52 states was selected to participate each year of a three year cycle in the error rate measurement methodology. The 18 first year reporting states (AK, AL, CA, CO, GA, IL, IN, KS, ND, NH, NV, OK, PA, PR, TX, VT, WA, and WV) will submit State Improper Authorizations for Payment Reports on or before June 30, 2008. ACF will use the improper authorizations for payment error rates and amount for each state and Puerto Rico to compute a national improper authorizations for payment rate that will be reported annually in the HHS' Performance and Accountability Report (PAR) beginning with FY 2008.

Foster Care: HHS developed a methodology for estimating a national payment error rate for the Title IV-E Foster Care Program using data gathered in the eligibility reviews, which are conducted in each state at least once every three years. For FY 2007, the Foster Care program reported an error rate of 3.3 percent, significantly down from the 10.33 percent first reported in FY 2004.

Head Start: In FY 2004, HHS developed a methodology for estimating a national Head Start payment error rate that built on the required review process. For FY 2007, Head Start reported an error rate of 1.3 percent, which is one-third of the 3.9 percent error rate reported in FY 2004.

Public Assistance Reporting Information System (PARIS): ACF continues to provide proactive leadership of PARIS. ACF sponsored a PARIS conference in March 2008 that drew significant attendance and interest from states, OMB, HHS, GAO and other federal agencies. Currently, 44 states and jurisdictions are members of PARIS and several others are exploring the possibility of joining.

Regarding real property asset management, since the establishment of the Real Property initiative in FY 2005, ACF has actively assisted HHS leadership in the establishment of metrics for HHS Leased Space program and in revisions to the PHS Facilities Manual and the HHS Real Property Human Capital Retention Study. All ACF program announcements and grants contain appropriate language regarding the requirements of the National Historic preservation Act (NHPA) to ensure proper stewardship of historic property.

ACF has been a leader across the Administration in working to remove barriers to the full participation of faith based and community organizations (FBCOs) in the federal grant making process and assist FBCOs in identifying and applying for grants. Through ACF's oversight and promotion of key programs, ACF has dramatically expanded the number of FBCOs partnering with HHS. ACF also has made significant progress in measuring the improvement in program performance by its FBCOs. An evaluation of Compassion Capital Fund grantees and sub-grantees shows increases in the capacity of participating organizations to meet the social and human services needs of the communities they serve.

12. Community Services Block Grant

Measure	FY	Target	Result
<u>12.1LT and 12A</u> : Increase the number of conditions of poverty addressed for low-income individuals, families and communities as a result of community action interventions by 20 percent over the baseline by FY 2010, and increase by 36 percent over the baseline by FY 2014. ⁸⁶ (<i>Outcome</i>)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	27.2 million (FY 2014)	Oct-15
	2010	24 million	Oct-11
	2009	Prior Result +4%	Oct-10
	2008	27 million	Oct-09
	2007	28 million	26 million (Target Not Met)
	2006	28 million	27 million (Target Not Met)
	2005	20 million	27 million (Target Exceeded)
<u>12B</u> : Reduce total amount of sub-grantee CSBG administrative funds expended each year per total sub-grantee CSBG funds expended per year. ⁸⁷ (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2010	19.00%	Oct-11
	2009	19.00%	Oct-10
	2008	N/A	Oct-09
	2007	N/A	19.11% (Historical Actual)
	2006	N/A	19.25% (Historical Actual)
	2005	N/A	19.17% (Historical Actual)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
12.1LT 12A 12B	CSBG Information System (CSBG/IS) survey administered by the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCSPP)	The Office of Community Services (OCS) and NASCSPP have worked to ensure that the survey captures the required information. The CSBG Block Grant allows states to have different program years; this can create a substantial time lag in preparing annual reports. States and local agencies are working toward improving their data collection and reporting technology. In order to improve the timeliness and accuracy of these reports, NASCSPP and OCS are providing states better survey tools and reporting processes.

Long-term objective 12.1 and annual measure 12A track the impact of seven of the twelve national Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) performance indicators on the lives of low-income individuals, families, and communities. Each indicator includes specific quantifiable achievements (subcategories) that can be directly related to reducing conditions of poverty, e.g. gainful employment, obtaining safe and stable housing, and the creation of accessible “living wage” jobs in the community. Fiscal year 2007 data indicate that almost 26 million conditions of poverty among low-income individuals, families, and

⁸⁶ The FY 2004 baseline data for this measure has been revised from 19 million to 20 million as a result of a realized rounding error. The language for this measure has been revised slightly to improve clarity.

⁸⁷ The efficiency measure for this program was revised in FY 2008 per the Measure Quality Review. Therefore targets were not established before FY 2009.

communities were reduced or eliminated as a result of community action interventions. For example, in response to emergency and safety-net services, 13 million service units (e.g. shelter, emergency medical care, food distribution) were provided and five million service units were provided for employment and family stability, including obtainment of child care, transportation, food, or health care. While this result falls short of the FY 2007 target of 28 million, this nonetheless represents 92 percent of the target.

The lower than projected outcomes are due in part to refinements in data collection and reporting on some poverty indicators, and specifically those related to housing. In addition, many community action agencies report an increased emphasis on more intensive interventions (as opposed to emergency services such as emergency food distribution). This shift in service delivery was accentuated by the elimination of the Community Food and Nutrition Program. Further, the population served with CSBG funds requires intensive services and represents multi-dimensional problems frequently requiring complex and long-term solutions. With a growing number of CSBG recipients making their primary focus to provide individuals and families with more labor intensive services needed to combat poverty, we expect that future targets will be more difficult to achieve. To accomplish future targets, the Office of Community Services (OCS) will continue its ongoing training and technical assistance efforts to states, tribes and territories. These efforts will include trainings at national conferences, grants to national associations and the community services network aimed at furthering the goals of community action, as well as continued oversight and monitoring of grantees to ensure the effective and efficient operation of the CSBG program. By FY 2010, the program expects to exceed the performance goal of 20 percent over the baseline (24 million) for this measure. CSBG received an additional \$1 billion in funding under the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) to provide supplemental funding to states, territories, and tribes. This additional funding has been taken into consideration when determining future year performance targets for annual measure 12A. Based on recent data trends, it appears that future year targets are already sufficiently ambitious given current economic conditions, and thus have not been revised.

Efficiency measure 12B is an indicator of the CSBG network's ability to provide services to low income individuals and families through an efficient and cost effective delivery system. It is a strong measure of how efficient the program is in supporting services to low-income individuals and families in comparison to administrative expenses. This measure is calculated by dividing the total amount of sub-grantee CSBG administrative funds per year (numerator) by the total amount of sub-grantee CSBG funds expended per year (denominator). Data for this measure is provided through the CSBG Information System (CSBG/IS) Survey, as published in the annual *Community Services Block Grant Statistical Report*. While states have an administrative cap of five percent, which applies to the amount of funds the state may retain for expenses at the state level, this efficiency measure is focused on assuring that sub-grantees are also efficient with administrative spending. Historical trend data for this measure is fairly stable, and shows that sub-grantees are spending between 19 and 23 percent on administrative expenses. In FY 2007, 19.11 percent of CSBG sub-grantee funds were used for administrative costs, an improvement over the previous year's result of 19.25 percent. Through FY 2010, the program expects to maintain a rate of 19 percent for this measure. As previously noted, CSBG received additional funding for services under ARRA. This impact has been taken into consideration in reviewing future year performance targets for efficiency measure 12B. However, since this measure reports on the total amount of sub-grantee CSBG administrative funds spent given total sub-grantee CSBG funds expended, future targets have not been revised. Future targets may be more difficult to achieve as significant additional administrative resources may need to be expended to roll out the additional funding on an expedited timeline.

13. Individual Development Accounts (Assets for Independence)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
13.1LT: Degree to which participants improve their economic situation, measured by income, net worth, and/or asset retention at two and five years after asset purchase. <i>(developmental)</i> <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	N/A	N/A
13A: Increase the annual amount of personal savings that were used by Assets for Independence (AFI) project participants to purchase one of the three allowable types of assets. ⁸⁸ <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	Avg of two prev years* growth factor ⁸⁹	Feb-11
	2009	Avg of two prev years* growth factor ⁹¹	Feb-10
	2008	\$5,651,588	\$5,071,659 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2007	\$5,266,608	\$4,677,620 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	\$4,866,524	\$4,587,278 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2005	Set Baseline	\$3,772,417 (Baseline)
13B: Increase the number of participants who withdraw funds for the three asset purchase goals. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	Avg of two prev years* growth factor ⁹¹	Feb-11
	2009	Avg of two prev years* growth factor ⁹¹	Feb-10
	2008	4,493 participants	4,067 participants (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2007	4,198 participants	3,629 participants (Target Not Met)
	2006	2,594 participants	3,738 participants (Target Exceeded)
	2005	Set Baseline	2,925 participants (Baseline)
13C: Maintain the ratio of total earned income saved in IDAs per grant dollar spent on programmatic and administrative activities at the end of year one of the five-year AFI project. <i>(Efficiency)</i>	2010	\$0.88	Feb-11
	2009	\$0.88	Feb-10
	2008	\$0.88	\$2.78 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	\$0.88	\$1.45 (Target Exceeded)
	2006	\$0.88	\$2.89 (Target Exceeded)
	2005	\$0.88	\$1.57 (Target Exceeded)
13D: Maintain the ratio of total earned	2010	\$5.78	Feb-11

⁸⁸ The language of this measure has been revised for increased clarity per OMB recommendation through the FY 2008 Measure Quality Review.

⁸⁹ The growth factor is the percentage growth in the number of IDAs opened in the prior year.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
income saved in IDAs per grant dollar spent on programmatic and administrative activities at the end of the five-year AFI project. (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2009	\$5.78	Feb-10
	2008	\$7.23	\$5.02 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2007	\$7.23	\$4.99 (Target Not Met)
	2006	\$7.23	\$5.78 (Target Not Met)
	2005	\$7.23	\$5.86 (Target Not Met)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
13.1LT 13A 13B 13C 13D	Annual Progress Report; Annual Data Collections for Reports to Congress; HHS Payment Management System	ACF collects data annually from grantees on participants' progress in their transition out of poverty (e.g., the number who open IDAs, the number who complete financial education training, the amount of earned income participants save in IDAs, the number of participants who withdraw savings to purchase an appreciable asset, the amount of funds withdrawn for these purposes, and so forth). ACF requires each grantee to provide a well-developed plan for collecting, validating, and reporting the necessary data in a timely fashion. In addition, grantees must agree to participate in the national program evaluation and are urged to carry out an ongoing assessment of the data and information collected as an effective management/feedback tool in implementing their project.

Long term objective 13.1 is a developmental measure. The program expects it will measure the overall impact of Assets for Independence (AFI) Individual Developmental Accounts (IDAs) on participants' economic standing and self-sufficiency. As currently planned, ACF will survey a sample of AFI Project participants at enrollment and at points after they purchase an asset with IDA savings. Data elements may include such items as income, credit score, net worth, and/or asset retention.

Annual measures 13A and 13B are two components of one outcome measure developed in coordination with AFI grantees, in response to recommendations from the CY 2004 program assessment. Annual measure 13A is the amount of savings (earned income) participants withdraw from their IDAs for purchase of any of three assets (e.g., first home, small business or post-secondary education) during the reporting period. This measure is expressed as the dollar amount withdrawn during the current year. Annual measure 13B tracks the number of participants who withdraw IDA funds to purchase these assets during the reporting period. Fiscal year 2005 serves as the baseline year. The program achieved 90 percent of the target for measure 13A in FY 2008; the target was that participants would use \$5,651,588 in IDA savings during the year for an asset purchase, while grantees reported that participants actually used \$5,071,659. While the program fell short on this target, the amount used in FY 2008 for asset purchase was more than the amount reported in FY 2007. The program achieved a similar result for measure 13B. For this measure, the program achieved 91 percent of the annual target in FY 2008. The target was that 4,493 participants would use their IDA savings during the year to finance an asset purchase, while by the end of the reporting period, a total of 4,067 had used their IDA savings for such a purchase. ACF continues to award additional grants and provide training and technical assistance to grantees and their partners to ensure that they are able to continue producing healthy increases in these outcomes. ACF is currently re-calibrating the annual expected outcomes, given knowledge being developed by the on-going program evaluation and in light of recent changes in the national economy that impact the ability of participants to save earned income and make asset purchases.

ACF calculates the annual targets for each year through FY 2010 using results from the prior two years.⁹⁰ The targets are the average of Year 1 and Year 2 IDA savings deposits used for purchases multiplied by the percentage growth in the number of IDAs opened in Year 2. For example, for FY 2008, the target is the average of savings used for purchases in 2006 and 2007 multiplied by a 22 percent growth factor.⁹¹ Annual targets for the number of participants who withdraw IDA funds are based on the same formula as above: average of the number of participants who made withdrawals in the prior two years multiplied by the annual percentage growth in IDAs. Participants access their IDA savings after regularly depositing earned income and graduating from training on purchasing and sustaining a long term asset. By the time they make a withdrawal, participants have attended general financial literacy education and asset-specific training that equips them for home ownership, business management, or education. ACF expects that participants who save in an IDA and purchase a long term asset will have better quality of life, greater amount of intergenerational economic well-being, higher educational performance, and more stable family life.

Efficiency measures 13C and 13D are components of one efficiency measure, developed with recommendations from the CY 2004 program assessment. These measures track the ratio between program outputs (amount of earned income participants deposit) and inputs (the maximum amount of AFI grant funds grantees may use for programmatic and administrative functions). The numerator is the sum of amounts deposited by participants in the grantee cohort.⁹² The denominator is 13 percent of the sum of all federal grants drawn down by grantees in the cohort.⁹³ The measure shows the amount of savings produced for each dollar of federal grant used. The measure is calculated at two different points in time: at the end of the first and fifth years of each grantee cohort's project period. ACF uses two calculations because the AFI Projects have distinct phases. In the early phases, a typical grantee allocates a larger portion of grant funds for programmatic activities while participants save a relatively small amount. Later in the project period, grantees use fewer grant funds for programmatic activities, while the cumulative amount of participant savings has grown larger. The two calculations will serve as early- and end-of-project benchmarks for future cohorts. The target is to maintain the level of efficiency.

For efficiency measure 13C, program grantees in their first year exceeded the target by a substantial amount. The target efficiency measure for this group was \$0.88 in savings for each dollar in federal funds used for program administration, while the amount achieved in FY 2008 was \$2.78 in savings for each federal grant dollar used. The program plans to evaluate future targets based on recent data trends. The program will continue to improve performance over the FY 2004 baseline by developing knowledge about how grantees can be more efficient and sharing that information with grantees. One strategy may be to encourage grantees to use more non-federal funds to support financial literacy training and other supports for participants and program administration. Grantees are allowed to use no more than 13 percent of their federal AFI grant funds for these purposes. ACF can increase the efficiency while continuing to produce strong results by encouraging grantees to use non-federal funds to support an even greater portion of these vital expenses. The program plans to continue monitoring the results of this

⁹⁰ The baseline is an average of 2004 and 2005 because that period reflects the overall results of the first grantee cohort. These grantees received grants in 1999 for their five-year projects. Nearly one-half of those grantees completed their work in December 2004. The remainder received 12-month project period extensions and, therefore, continued through December 2005.

⁹¹ The percent is the growth rate in the number of IDAs between 2006 and 2007 (for the period 2006-2007, the growth rate was 22 percent). This is not the change in dollars saved or participants withdrawing funds; rather, it is rate of growth in the number of IDAs. As the number of IDAs increases, the potential savings (measure 14A) and withdrawals (measure 14B) will also increase.

⁹² A cohort is the group of grantees that receive AFI grants in a particular fiscal year. For example, the 2001 cohort is made up of organizations that received AFI grants in FY 2001 and administered AFI Projects over the five year period 2001 – 2006.

⁹³ The 13 percent represents the portion of AFI grant funds and an equal amount of nonfederal cash contributions that grantees can manipulate to increase efficiencies. They may use these funds for programmatic and administrative functions including, for example, economic literacy training, credit counseling and repair, case management, asset purchase counseling, and access to other supportive services, staff, and so forth. The grantees have no discretion over the remaining 87 percent of the grant funds or of the equal amount of nonfederal cash required for this program. Those funds must be used to “match” participants’ IDA savings and to support data collection for the program evaluation.

measure and of other AFI performance indicators used to manage performance. As more stable data is accumulated and clear trends emerge, the program anticipates possible shifts in the baselines. By FY 2010, the program expects to maintain the goal of \$0.88 savings for this efficiency measure.

For efficiency measure 13D, program grantees at the end of their fifth year again missed their target. The FY 2008 target efficiency measure calculation for this cohort was \$7.23 in savings for each federal dollar spent on program administration. The group actually produced \$5.02 in savings for each dollar spent in FY 2008. Based on trend data, the FY 2010 target was revised to \$5.78 in order to maintain a realistic yet ambitious goal.

14. Family Violence Prevention and Services

Measure	FY	Target	Result
14.1LT and 14A: Maintain the number of federally recognized Indian Tribes that have family violence prevention programs at 200 through FY 2010; by FY 2014, increase to 205 Tribes that have such programs. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	205 (FY 2014)	Sep-14
	2010	200	Sep-10
	2009	200	Sep-09
	2008	202 ⁹⁴	202 (Target Met)
	2007	205	199 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	190	188 (Target Not Met)
	2005	205	188 (Target Not Met but Improved)
14.2LT and 14B: Increase through training the capacity of the National Domestic Violence Hotline to respond to an increase in the average number of calls per month (as measured by average number of calls per month to which the hotline responds) to 17,000 calls by FY 2010, and by FY 2014, increase by 2,000 calls over the FY 2010 actual result. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	Prior Result +2,000 ⁹⁵	Mar-15
	2010	17,000 calls ⁹⁶	Mar-11
	2009	21,300 calls	Mar-10
	2008	16,000 calls	20,800 calls (Target Exceeded) ⁹⁷
	2007	15,500 calls	19,500 calls (Target Exceeded)
	2006	15,000 calls	17,000 calls (Target Exceeded)
	2005	14,500 calls	16,500 calls (Target Exceeded)
14C: Shorten the average “wait time” (on calls to the National Domestic Violence Hotline), until the maintenance rate of 17 second is achieved, in order to increase the number of calls that are	2010	Prior Result -3% ⁹⁸	Mar-11
	2009	29.1 seconds ⁹⁹	Mar-10
	2008	21.0 seconds	30 seconds (Target Not Met) ¹⁰⁰

⁹⁴ ACF anticipates that the number of tribes with family violence prevention programs will level off at approximately 200. This is because, under the formula for the grant, funds are distributed to the tribes based on the tribal population: smaller tribes may only receive small amounts of funding per year. Some tribes opt not to pursue smaller grants and instead focus on other funding opportunities.

⁹⁵ The FY 2014 is 2,000 calls over the FY 2010 actual result.

⁹⁶ This target was established in years prior to the growth in Hotline calls.

⁹⁷ This is the number of calls received monthly by the Hotline, not the number of calls to which the hotline responds. We have historically calculated this measure as calls received, not calls answered, using this number to document Hotline call volume. Because average call length increased 24 percent from 2007 to 2008, among other factors, the number of calls answered has decreased while the Hotline call volume has increased. The number of calls answered is included in output measures under the Hotline.

⁹⁸ The FY 2010 target is to reduce the length of time by 3 percent from the previous year's actual result until a threshold of 0:17 seconds is reached.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
responded to and that provide needed information to callers. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2007	17 seconds	22 seconds (Target Not Met)
	2006	25 seconds	18 seconds (Target Exceeded)
	2005	Set Baseline	26 seconds (Baseline)
14D: Reduce the percentage of funds de-obligated to federally recognized Indian Tribes that have Family Violence Prevention Services Act (FVPSA) grants. <i>(developmental) (Efficiency)</i>	2008	Set Baseline	May-11
	2007	Set Baseline	May-10
	2006	N/A	May-09
	2005	N/A	5.5% (Historical Actual)
14E: Increase the percentage of domestic violence program clients who report improved knowledge of safety planning. <i>(developmental) (Outcome)</i>	2010	Set Baseline	May-11
	2009	N/A	May-10

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
14.1LT 14A	Family Violence Prevention Applications	Applications are processed, and tribal violence prevention program grants are awarded, via the Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) in ACF.
14.2LT 14B 14C	Administrative Data of National Domestic Violence Hotline (NDVH)	Data are maintained by the National Domestic Violence Hotline and reported to ACF. All calls are counted electronically, including calls that are responded to and calls that are “dropped” (when callers hang up). Calls are tracked for time, location, status of caller, and reason for call.
14D	Final SF-269 Financial Status Reports	Data are maintained by the Office of Grants Management, which was consulted on this measure. The Office of Grants Management utilizes data submitted by the grantees on the SF-269 Financial Status Report and analyzes the amount of funds that are drawn down by the grantee in the Payment Management System to help validate the amounts to be de-obligated.
14E	SF-PPR, Family Violence Prevention and Services Program Progress Report Form	Submission of the SF-PPR is a program requirement. The outcome measures and the means of data collection were developed with extensive input from researchers and the domestic violence field. The forms, instructions, and several types of training have been given to states.

Regarding annual measure 14A, the Family Violence Prevention and Services (FVPSA) Program provides technical assistance¹⁰¹ and information to the states and Indian Tribes in order to increase the number of Indian Tribes that receive Tribal FVPSA Formula Grants. Over the past decade, the number of Family Violence grants to Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Villages has increased gradually, as measured by long term objective 14.1 and annual measure 14A. From FY 2006 to FY 2008, the number of tribes funded increased 7.5 percent to a total of 202. By FY 2010, the program expects to maintain the number

⁹⁹ The FY 2009 target is to reduce the length of time by 3 percent from the previous year's actual result until a threshold of 0:17 seconds is reached.

¹⁰⁰ Wait time has increased due to increased call volume (15 percent in FY 2007 and 7 percent in FY 2008), increased call length (24 percent in FY 2008), and spikes in call volume of over 130 percent when the Hotline number is featured on national television.

¹⁰¹ A collaborative effort among the national resource center network and selected state domestic violence coalitions provides this technical assistance.

of tribes with family violence programs at 200 or above by increasing technical assistance support through conferences, webinars, an interactive blog, and frequent telephonic communication. Also significant will be increased monitoring of tribal grantees through regular conference calls and on-site monitoring.

Regarding annual measure 14B, staff and volunteers on the National Domestic Violence Hotline (NDVH) provide victims of domestic violence, and those calling on their behalf, crisis intervention, information about domestic violence, and referrals to local service providers. Each year, both the number of incoming calls and the number of calls responded to by advocates have increased. ACF's target to increase the capacity of the NDVH to respond to more calls-per-month was met and exceeded in FY 2008. The NDVH received an average of 20,800 calls per month, exceeding its target of 16,000. By FY 2010, the program expects to maintain this high performance and exceed the goal of 17,000 calls per month. As a result of ongoing efforts to increase public awareness and improve access for vulnerable populations, including those with limited English proficiency, each year, thousands more domestic violence victims are linked with the shelter and support services they need to increase their safety.

Efficiency measure 14C focuses on "wait time" on the National Domestic Violence Hotline (NDVH), or the time that the average caller remains on hold before NDVH staff respond to their call. In FY 2008, the average wait time at the NDVH increased to 30 seconds and the target of 17 seconds was not achieved. The NDVH is experiencing a steady increase in call volume, length, and complexity with reduced staff to handle this larger volume. The average length of calls increased 24 percent between FY 2007 and FY 2008 – from 6.79 minutes to 8.4 minutes. The number of calls requiring use of translation services provided through the AT&T Language Line also increased 20 percent over FY 2007. Additionally, the Hotline reported that response time was affected by call spikes experienced when the Hotline was featured on nationally syndicated television shows, such as the Oprah Winfrey Show and Spanish-language television. For example, on two days on which the Hotline number was aired on Oprah and on *Despierta America*¹⁰², call volume increased over 130 percent. This combination of factors has led to an increased wait time for callers. In FY 2010, the program expects to reduce the previous year's result by three percent until the maintenance rate of a 17 second wait time is reached. In fact, the wait time for the first quarter of FY 2009 has decreased to 28 seconds. Considering the steady rise in call demand, the Hotline is examining staff schedules, use of on-call staff during peak hours, and the need to expand staff to meet the growing demand for service.

Efficiency measure 14D examines the percentage of FVPSA funds deobligated from federally recognized Indian Tribes. Of FY 2005 grants awarded, 5.5 percent of funds were deobligated because some Tribes lacked the capacity to spend their formula grant in the time allowed. The need reported by Tribes for shelter and services remains substantial, but many Tribes lack the infrastructure or the community-based organizations necessary to spend the funds within the two-year window. By increasing proactive technical assistance and monitoring, the FVPSA Program will reduce the percentage of funds deobligated from tribal grantees. Pre-baseline numbers will be available in May 2009.

Annual measure 14E (formerly 14D) sought to concentrate on the maintenance of the quality of services provided to victims of family violence and their children through FVPSA grant funds. The FVPSA Program in ACF believes that a comprehensive measure is needed to track shelter outcomes rather than simpler unit-cost measures. It convened a cost-efficiency workshop, with participants representing state agencies, domestic violence coalitions, domestic violence resource centers, and researchers from institutes of higher education to design this measure. After extensive planning, the FVPSA Program introduced new performance reporting requirements (one of which results in new measure 14E) to grantees throughout FY 2008 at grantees' conferences, through grantee correspondence and guidance, and through

¹⁰² *Despierta America* is a popular Spanish-language morning show.

program announcements. ACF provided technical assistance to grantees related to developing mechanisms for collecting outcome data directly from survivors. In FY 2009, grantees will begin collecting new data. ACF will continue to offer technical assistance related to collecting data on the new outcome measures. Annual measure 14E captures one key outcome, increasing the percentage of domestic violence program clients who report improved knowledge of safety planning. This measure is correlated with other indices of longer-term client safety and well-being, and will help document improved work by FVPSA grantees and subgrantees.

Refugee and Entrant Assistance

15. Transitional and Medical Services

Measure	FY	Target	Result
15.1LT and 15A: Increase the percent of cash assistance terminations due to earned income from employment for those clients receiving cash assistance at employment entry to 61.68 percent by FY 2010 and 64.18 percent by FY 2014. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	64.18% (FY 2014)	Dec-15
	2010	61.68% ¹⁰³	Dec-11
	2009	61.07%	Dec-10
	2008	59.87%	Dec-09
	2007	58.70%	60.00% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	57.55%	62.23% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	61.78%	56.42% (Target Not Met)
15.2LT and 15B: Increase the average hourly wage of refugees at placement (employment entry) to \$8.45/hour by FY 2010 and \$8.80/hour by FY 2014. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	\$8.80 (FY 2014)	Dec-15
	2010	\$8.45	Dec-11
	2009	\$8.37	Dec-10
	2008	\$8.29	Dec-09
	2007	\$8.20	\$8.29 (Target Exceeded)
	2006	\$8.12	\$8.24 (Target Exceeded)
	2005	\$8.02	\$8.04 (Target Exceeded)
15C: For refugees receiving Refugee Cash Assistance, shorten the length of time from arrival in the U.S. to achievement of self-sufficiency. ¹⁰⁴ <i>(developmental, Transitional and Medical Assistance and Refugee Social Services) (Efficiency)</i>	2010	Set Baseline	Dec-11

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
----------------	--------------------	------------------------

¹⁰³ The FY 2010 target for measure 15A has been updated as a technical correction from the previous budget submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

¹⁰⁴ The language of this efficiency measure was updated as a result of the OMB Measure Quality Check.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
15.1LT 15A 15.2LT 15B 15C	Performance Report (ORR-6)	Data are validated by periodic desk and on-site monitoring, in which refugee cases are randomly selected and reviewed. During on-site monitoring, outcomes reported by service providers are verified with both employers and refugees to ensure accurate reporting of job placements, wages, and retentions.

Regarding annual measure 15A and related long term objective 15.1, a cash assistance termination is defined as the closing of a cash assistance case due to earned income in an amount that is predicted to exceed the state’s payment standard for the case based from employment on family size, rendering the case ineligible for cash assistance. In FY 2006, over 62 percent of cash assistance terminations were due to earned income from employment for those clients who received cash assistance at employment entry, exceeding the target of 58 percent. Future targets for this measure may be revised if future results continue at this level, and thus show a data trend. Success on this measure indicates that the Refugee Cash and Medical Assistance (CMA) program is meeting its goal of promoting economic self-sufficiency through cash and medical assistance to newly arriving refugees (who are eligible for this assistance for only up to eight months after arrival in the U.S.). By FY 2010, the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) aims to continue to maintain recent results to achieve a percentage of terminations due to earned income from employment of approximately 61.68 percent. However, due to the dampening economic conditions starting in early FY 2009, it may be more difficult to achieve targets in future years. ORR plans to reassess future year targets based on data trends as they emerge.

Annual measure 15B and the related long term objective 15.2 examine the quality of jobs obtained by refugees who have received assistance under the CMA program. FY 2006 saw a \$0.20 increase in the aggregate average wage from the FY 2005 baseline, exceeding the target by \$0.12. In FY 2006 twenty-nine states, seven California counties and the San Diego Wilson-Fish program reported higher wages than the average aggregate wage for all states (\$8.24). Success under this measure indicates that the CMA program is meeting its goal of promoting economic self-sufficiency to newly arriving refugees; by providing cash and medical assistance for a limited period of up to eight months, ORR provides assistance and incentives such as training bonuses, early employment bonuses, and job retention bonuses that help refugees move quickly into good-quality jobs. By FY 2010, ORR will work to increase the average wage to \$8.45; however, it is likely that performance on this measure will be negatively impacted by current economic conditions.

Efficiency measure 15C reflects ORR’s efforts to improve grantees’ efficiency in helping refugees and entrants terminate Refugee Cash Assistance by obtaining unsubsidized employment. ORR is currently working to revise its reporting tools to gather appropriate data to effectively measure performance in this area and hopes to establish a baseline with FY 2010 data.

16. Matching Grants

Measure	PY ¹⁰⁵	Target	Result
<u>16A</u> : Increase the percentage of refugees who enter employment through the Matching Grant (MG) program as a subset of all MG employable adults by a percent of the prior year's actual percentage outcome. (<i>Outcome</i>)	2010	Prior Result +1%	Apr-11
	2009	57.67%	Apr-10
	2008	64.40%	57.10% (Target Not Met)
	2007	72.86%	63.76% (Target Not Met)
	2006	76.47%	72.14% (Target Not Met)
	2005	74.16%	74.24% (Target Exceeded)
<u>16B</u> : Increase the percentage of refugees who are self-sufficient (not dependent on any cash assistance) within the first four months (120 days) after arrival by a percent of the prior year's actual percentage outcome. (<i>Outcome</i>)	2010	Prior Result +1%	Apr-11
	2009	62.72%	Apr-10
	2008	69.56%	62.10% (Target Not Met)
	2007	76.3%	68.87% (Target Not Met)
	2006	79.82%	75.54% (Target Not Met)
	2005	74.16%	77.50% (Target Exceeded)
<u>16.1LT and 16C</u> : Increase the percentage of refugees who are self-sufficient (not dependent on any cash assistance) within the first six months (180 days) after arrival by a percent of the prior year's actual percentage outcome to 83 percent by CY 2014. (<i>Outcome</i>)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	83% (PY 2014)	Apr-15
	2010	Prior Result +1%	Apr-11
	2009	80.5%	Apr-10
	2008	80.0%	78.30% (Target Not Met)
	2007	79.5%	80.28% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	79.0%	83.12% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	78.0%	80.54% (Target Exceeded)
<u>16D</u> : Increase the number of Matching Grant program refugees who are self-sufficient (not dependent on any cash assistance) within the first six months (180 days after arrival), per million federal dollars awarded to grantees (adjusted for inflation). (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2010	Prior Result +1%	Apr-11
	2009	390	Apr-10
	2008	420	399 (Target Not Met)
	2007	410	450 (Target Exceeded)

¹⁰⁵ Data for the Matching Grants program is based on a program year of February 1st through January 31st.

Measure	PY ¹⁰⁵	Target	Result
	2006	400	415 (Target Exceeded)
	2005	390	405 (Target Exceeded)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
16A 16B 16.1LT 16C 16D	Matching Grant Progress Report forms	Data are validated with methods similar to those used with Performance Reports. Data are validated by periodic desk and on-site monitoring, in which refugee cases are randomly selected and reviewed. During on-site monitoring, outcomes reported by service providers are verified with both employers and refugees to ensure accurate reporting of job placements, wages, and retentions.

Annual measure 16A measures the percent of employable adults that find jobs by the 120th day after they become eligible for services. In program year (PY) 2008, this measure fell short of the target with a result of 72 percent of refugees entering employment. This decrease is likely due to the significant decrease in employment outcomes in the last trimester of the year due to the economic downturn. By PY 2011, the program expects to continue to increase performance by one percent over the previous year's actual results as the job market slowly grows stronger, increasing employment opportunities.

Annual measure 16B is the preliminary measure of achieving self-sufficiency by 120 days, while 16C measures again at 180 days. Both 120 day and 180 day self-sufficiency outcomes were reduced this year due to the recession. The decrease in employment opportunities and the increase in layoffs have affected the overall self-sufficiency rate of the program participants. Agencies continue to work with clients beyond the 120 day marker (16B) and are able to increase the number of self-sufficient clients in the program (16C), but still not to the desired level. The Matching Grant program also implemented, starting in PY 2004, a performance-based award system whereby grantees receive increases or cuts in their funding (and, consequently, their caseload) based on their ability to achieve overall refugee self-sufficiency at 180 days. By PY 2011, the program expects to continue to increase the percentage of refugees who are self-sufficient within 120 days by one percent over the previous year's actual.

Long term objective 16.1 and annual measure 16C are focused on self-sufficiency at 180 days, due to the Matching Grant program's recent increased emphasis on this timeline. In PY 2008, the program fell below its target its target of 80 percent with 78.3 percent of refugees self-sufficient (not dependent on any cash assistance) within 180 days. This decrease was due to the decline in the job market due to the economic downturn. By PY 2011, the program expects to increase this high level of performance and achieve the target of increasing over the previous year's actual result by one percent as a result of continued high quality service provision and emphasis on early self-sufficiency. With regard to the long term targets for long term objective 16.1 and annual measure 16C, the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) believes that these targets are also ambitious considering the diversity of refugees currently served. Performance on all Matching Grant program measures is dependent upon the size of the families that arrive in the U.S. and subsequently enroll in the Matching Grant program. Unlike in the past 25 years when the U.S. brought in huge numbers of refugees from a limited number of countries, current refugee populations are coming from a far greater number of countries than ever before and are therefore increasingly diverse in language, culture, and the nature of their barriers to employment. Matching Grant program affiliates throughout the country have accepted the challenge of working with this increasingly diverse and hard-to-employ group of clients.

Regarding efficiency measure 16D, this measure focuses on the 180-day (six-month) self-sufficiency of

refugees in the Matching Grant program. The 180th day is, by far, the best measure of the program and results in the best accountability measure of what we get for the investment of money. ORR employed performance based awards with grantees beginning in 2005. The performance based award is calculated with a formula that weighs 120-day and final 180-day self-sufficiency markers for each agency against the overall performance for the program. This has led to a dramatic improvement in performance of the weakest performer and improved outcomes for the program overall. To calculate performance on this measure, the number of refugees who are self-sufficient at 180 days is divided by the federal award (in millions of dollars) to grantees for that year. Although ORR has consistently exceeded its goals for efficiency measures over the years, this goal was not reached in 2008 due to the economic downturn. By PY 2011, ORR expects that efficiency gains will continue to increase as in past years. The number of refugees served is directly linked to the amount of federal money awarded by ORR to grantees, since the program provides \$2,200 in federal funds for each refugee served (and grantees must match that federal money when providing services). In 2008 ORR served 29,643 people in the Matching Grant program.

17. Victims of Trafficking

Measure	FY	Target	Result
17.1LT and 17A: Increase the number of victims of trafficking certified to 600 per year by FY 2014. ¹⁰⁶ <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	600 (FY 2014)	Jun-15
	2010	Prior Result +5%	Jun-11
	2009	Prior Result +5%	Jun-10
	2008	318	Jun-09
	2007	400	303 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	300	231 (Target Not Met but Improved) ¹⁰⁷
	2005	200	230 (Target Exceeded)
17B: Increase the number of victims certified and served by whole network of grantees per million dollars invested. <i>(Efficiency)</i>	2010	Prior Result +5%	Jun-11
	2009	Prior Result +5%	Jun-10
	2008	32.1	Jun-09
	2007	40.0	30.6 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	30.0	23.6 (Target Not Met but Improved) ²
	2005	20.0	23.2 (Target Exceeded) ²
17C1: Increase media impressions per thousand dollars invested. <i>(Efficiency)</i>	2010	Prior Result +3%	Jun-11
	2009	Prior Result +3%	Jun-10
	2008	6,241	Jun-09
	2007	50,570	6,059 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	29,750	4,429 (Target Not Met)
	2005	27,000	104,600 (Target Exceeded)
17C2: Increase hotline calls per thousand dollars invested. <i>(Efficiency)</i>	2010	Prior Result +3%	Jun-11
	2009	Prior Result +3%	Jun-10
	2008	5.15	Jun-09
	2007	1.80	5.00 (Target Exceeded)

¹⁰⁶ This target has been revised based on recent data. The new target maintains rigor while taking into account the most recent data trend.

¹⁰⁷ Data have been finalized since the FY 2009 President's Budget, and the number has been updated.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
	2006	0.89	7.63 (Target Exceeded)
	2005	0.81	1.81 (Target Exceeded)
17C3: Increase website visits per thousand dollars invested. (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2010	Prior Result +3%	Jun-11
	2009	Prior Result +3%	Jun-10
	2008	3,643	Jun-09
	2007	69	3,537 (Target Exceeded)
	2006	33	6,556 (Target Exceeded)
	2005	30	17 (Target Not Met but Improved)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
17.1LT 17A 17B	HHS Database of trafficking victim certifications, based on information provided by the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and Office of Refugee Resettlement Human Trafficking program grantees	DHS provides real-time notices of awards of “continued presence” statuses, receipt of “bona fide” T-visa applications, and T-visa awards. This information triggers issuance of HHS certifications.
17C1 17C2 17C3	Public Awareness Campaign Contractors, Polaris Project (operator of the National Human Trafficking Resource Center which provides reports on the number and profile of calls to the hotline), and the ACF web team (provides information on all website hits and categories of inquiry for the Trafficking program’s webpage)	The program engages in regular monitoring of grantees and contractors providing media, hotline traffic, and website information.

The Office of Refugee Resettlement’s (ORR’s) primary responsibility under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) is to certify foreign victims of trafficking and provide benefits and services to them. The goal of long-term objective 17.1 and annual measure 17A is to achieve 500 foreign victims’ certification per year by FY 2011, which has been revised from the previous goal of 800 foreign victims per year. This target has been revised in light of the trend in data for the past three years, and is a reflection of the certification process, which by statute, involves several federal agencies.¹⁰⁸ In FY 2005, ORR certified 230 foreign victims – which exceeded the target of 200. In fiscal years 2006 and 2007, ORR certified 234 and 303 foreign victims, respectively, which fell short of the targets of 300 and 400, respectively, but improved on the previous year’s total. The number certified represents all foreign victims that the Anti-Trafficking in Persons (ATIP) program was able to certify in accordance with statutory requirements. It bears mention that the program serves a larger number of victims than those who are certified. Program funds are used to provide services to victims prior to certification and to victims who have already been certified in prior years. The program is continuing to examine ways by which additional victims may be identified and certified, including increased cooperative efforts with law enforcement entities responsible for investigating cases and improved protocols and training for the

¹⁰⁸ This measure does not adequately show the numbers of victims identified via HHS’ public awareness and education efforts for several reasons: victims may choose not to cooperate with federal law enforcement, which is a requirement for certification; many identified victims have applied for U-visas, and, U-visas have no bearing or influence upon certification; and many of the victims identified via HHS efforts are not eligible for certification because they are either Lawful Permanent Residents or U.S. Citizens and cannot meet the Continued Presence (CP) or T-visa requirements for certification.

identification and case management of trafficked children in ORR custody within the Division of Unaccompanied Children's Services (DUCS).

In light of the most recent actual data, the targets have been revised to reflect a more realistic yet rigorous performance goal. By FY 2010, the program expects to increase the number of victims certified by at least five percent over the previous year's result. From FY 2004 to FY 2005, the number of victims certified increased by four percent, followed by a very small gain in FY 2006 but a three percent gain in FY 2007; therefore the program believes that a target of five percent is ambitious. ORR anticipates that it will be able to meet future targets due to changes in the structure of the ATIP program, such as awareness campaigns, grants to expand existing outreach activities to identify trafficking victims, the reformulation of the National Human Trafficking Resource Center, and Rescue and Restore Regional Program grants to expand HHS' reach to non-traditional partners at the local level.

Efficiency measure 17B relates certification to dollars invested. Since the "Rescue and Restore" campaign was instituted in April 2004, the program has already seen major efficiency gains on this measure (as seen in the above table). From FY 2004 to FY 2005, ACF saw an increase in victims certified per million dollars from 16.0 to 23.2. The FY 2005 actual exceeded the target of 20 in FY 2005, and then improved in FY 2006 to 23.6. In FY 2007, the program again improved performance to 30.6, although it missed the target of 40.0. Identifying victims is inherently difficult due to the criminal and secret nature of the activities, required involvement of law enforcement, and the victim's inability to come forward due to fear. It is expected that these overall gains in efficiency will persist with increased communication and collaboration with our federal partners, increased leveraging of HHS-wide resources, and continued outreach, training, and technical assistance to the anti-trafficking movement. By FY 2010, the program expects to increase the number of victims certified and served per million dollars invested by at least five percent over the previous year's result.

Regarding efficiency measure 17C, the ATIP program is aggressively managed from both a performance and cost-efficiency standpoint. In response to the inadequate rate of victim identification and rescue experienced under the initial grant-based strategy, the program implemented the "Rescue and Restore" public awareness campaign and a new category of grants supporting specific, direct, on-the-street, one-on-one contact with populations among which victims of trafficking are likely to be found, while disinvesting in generic "community outreach" grants. The program has improved the precision of data and calculation methods for the three components of this efficiency measure beginning with the FY 2006 results. The media impressions component of the efficiency measure was calculated using the total number of media impressions during FY 2007 (6,677,567) per thousand dollars of funding obligated, resulting in a six percent increase from the previous year's outcome. The hotline calls component of the efficiency measure component was calculated as calls received during FY 2007 (2,148) per thousand dollars of funding obligated specifically for the hotline operations during FY 2007, with a result that far exceeded the target. The website visitors' component was calculated by dividing the total number of website visitors (229,879) by the thousand dollars of FY 2007 funds invested in the website by the program. This result exceeded the target, but represented a decrease from the FY 2006 result because of increased funding invested. By FY 2010, the program expects to increase each of these public awareness areas by at least three percent over the previous year's result as a result of funding awards to local Rescue and Restore coalitions throughout the country.

18. Social Services/Targeted Assistance

Measure	FY	Target	Result
<u>15C</u> : For refugees receiving Refugee Cash Assistance, shorten the length of time from arrival in the U.S. to achievement of self-sufficiency. ¹⁰⁹ <i>(Transitional and Medical Services and Refugee Social Services)</i> <i>(Developmental Efficiency)</i>	2010	Set Baseline	Dec-11
<u>18.1LT and 18A</u> : Increase the percentage of refugees entering employment through ACF-funded refugee employment services to 60 percent by FY 2010, and increase to 61.21 percent by FY 2014. ¹¹⁰ <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	61.21% (FY 2014)	Dec-15
	2010	Prior Result +2%	Dec-11
	2009	Prior Result +2%	Dec-10
	2008	54.06%	Dec-09
	2007	54.55%	53.00% (Target Not Met)
	2006	56.49%	54.01% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2005	51.50%	53.49% (Target Exceeded)
<u>18B</u> : Increase the percentage of entered employment with health benefits available as a subset of full-time job placements. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	66.69% (FY 2014)	Dec-15
	2010	64.08%	Dec-11
	2009	63.45%	Dec-10
	2008	62.82%	Dec-09
	2007	62.20%	63.00% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	67.24%	61.58% (Target Not Met)
	2005	57.70%	64.24% (Target Exceeded)
<u>18C</u> : Increase the percentage of 90-day job retention as a subset of all entered employment. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	74.51%	Dec-11
	2009	73.77%	Dec-10
	2008	73.04%	Dec-09
	2007	72.32%	73.00% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	77.29%	71.58% (Target Not Met)

¹⁰⁹ The language of this efficiency measure was updated as a result of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Measure Quality Check.

¹¹⁰ This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of entered employments in a year by the total national refugee and entrant caseload for employment services. This measure is also a performance indicator for the FY 2007- 2012 HHS Strategic Plan.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
	2005	76.20%	74.29% (Target Not Met but Improved)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
15C 18.1LT 18A 18B 18C	Performance Report (Form ORR-6)	Data are validated by periodic desk and on-site monitoring, in which refugee cases are randomly selected and reviewed. During on-site monitoring, outcomes reported by service providers are verified with both employers and refugees to ensure accurate reporting of job placements, wages, and retentions.

For performance detail related to efficiency measure 15C, please refer to the Transitional and Medical Assistance section.

Long term objective 18.1 reflects the emphasis of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) on improving grantees' ability to assist refugees in entering employment. States (including states providing services under the Wilson-Fish program) with an entered employment rate (EER) of less than 50 percent are expected to achieve an annual increase of at least five percent over the prior year's actual percentage outcome. States with an EER greater than 50 percent are expected to achieve an annual increase of at least three percent over the prior year's performance. States that reach a high employment and self-sufficiency rate of 85 percent among employable refugees may choose to maintain their target levels rather than increase them. Although there are no monetary punishments or rewards, ORR has implemented a number of strategies and incentives aimed at challenging states to improve performance for targets that were not achieved. ORR publishes state performance results in the Annual Report to Congress and ORR teams negotiate the targets and provide technical assistance and monitoring to the states to achieve mutually acceptable goals.

Annual measures 18A through 18C reflect states' annual progress toward refugee and entrant self-sufficiency, including entered employment, job retention, and job quality. Though these measures are used to gauge performance for the entire program, each state is also expected to set individual targets toward these measures. When setting targets, states are asked to aim to improve upon the previous year's actual performance. While there are no national performance requirements or formal-comparison of states, each state's actual annual performance is compared with that state's projected targets to calculate the level of achievement and to ensure that states strive for continuous improvement in their goal-setting process from year to year. Starting in FY 1996, states (and California counties) have submitted an end-of-year report to ORR comparing projected annual targets with actual outcomes achieved for each of the measures. States include a narrative to explain increases or decreases in performance due to local conditions that may have affected performance during the year. This includes unemployment rates in the state, labor market conditions, or other factors, such as unanticipated reduction in refugee arrivals or sudden increase in arrivals at the end of the fiscal year.

Annual measures 18A through 18C are calculated based on the number of refugees enrolled in employability services. Employability services include services intended to help refugees to become self-sufficient in the shortest time possible and to retain self-sufficiency. Once a refugee is enrolled in employability services, an individual employment plan is established between the refugee and a case worker. According to ORR regulations, the individual employability plan is intended to lead to the earliest possible employment and to discourage delay in employment or extended job search. The plan must include a definite employment goal achievable in the shortest time possible and consistent with the employability of the refugee. Once employment is achieved, the refugee's eligibility for employability

services continues, including services aimed at achieving job upgrades and retaining employment, further improving the attainment and retention of self-sufficiency.

For FY 2007, performance targets were met on two out of three measures (employment with health benefits and 90-day employment retention). For annual measure 18A, percentage of refugees entering employment through ACF-funded employment services, the target was narrowly missed (53 percent result, compared to 54.5 percent target). ORR's ability to perform well on most performance measures is in spite of the changing demographics of the U.S. Resettlement Program, which present new challenges as many populations require extended employment services in order to enter the U.S. labor market and integrate into U.S. society. Many recent arrivals have spent protracted periods of time in refugee camps in countries of first asylum, have experienced intense trauma, and they have limited work skills. Many of the African refugees cannot read and write in their own language and require intensive English as a Second Language (ESL) prior to employment.

The target for annual measure 18A of increasing the percent of refugees entering employment through ACF-funded refugee employment services fell short of the FY 2007 target by one-and-a-half percentage points with an actual result of 53 percent in FY 2007. By FY 2010, the program aims to continue to increase performance by two percent over the previous year's result by improving ORR's collaboration with states and Wilson-Fish agencies to better communicate ORR priorities and to share knowledge of best practices that can be transferred across programs. This endeavor includes increasing ORR monitoring activities in which program challenges are followed up with technical assistance and further monitoring. ORR is also intending to work more closely with technical assistance providers to ensure effective guidance to states and Wilson-Fish agencies. ORR plans to work with states and Wilson-Fish agencies to improve data collection procedures and reporting processes.

The target for annual measure 18B of increasing the percent of entered employment with health benefits available as a subset of full-time placements exceeded the FY 2007 target of 62.20 percent with an actual result of 63 percent in FY 2007, reflecting ORR grantees' success in assisting refugees with finding high quality jobs. One of the key factors in determining a refugee's ability to become self-sufficient is their level of proficiency in English. The degree to which refugees improve their English proficiency has a direct correlation to their success in obtaining employment and ultimately becoming self-sufficient through earned income. Many of the activities funded by ORR focus on providing English Language Training (ELT), including occupational and vocational English language training, to refugees in conjunction with employment and employment services. ORR is striving to improve the level of full-time jobs attained by refugees by providing ELT, specialized job training, on-the-job training, and short-term skills training targeted to local job markets, as well as supportive services such as transportation, interpretation, and child care services. Attainment of these services will more strongly position the refugees for improved job placements and upgrades, therefore increasing the percentage of those jobs which offer health benefits. By FY 2010, the program aims to increase performance on this measure to 64.08 percent by communicating the importance of integration activities, including English language training, to states and Wilson-Fish agencies so that quality employment is more attainable for refugees.

The third target of increasing the percentage of refugees retaining employment after 90 days exceeded its target of 72.3 percent, with a result of 73 percent. This result reflects ORR grantees' success in helping grantees not only find, but keep jobs. By FY 2010, the program aims to continue to increase performance over the previous year's result to 74.51 percent by promoting integration activities and sharing knowledge of best practices with states and Wilson-Fish agencies so that refugees will be better equipped to reach self-sufficiency.

19. Unaccompanied Alien Children

Measure	FY	Target	Result
19.1LT and 19A: Reduce time between Department of Homeland Security/Immigration and Customs Enforcement (DHS/ICE) notification to Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) of Unaccompanied Alien Child (UAC) apprehension and ORR placement designation in a care provider facility to 2.5 hours by FY 2012 and maintain this goal through FY 2014. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	2.50 hours (FY 2014)	Mar-15
	2010	Prior Result -2%	Mar-11
	2009	3.89 hours	Mar-10
	2008	2.90 hours ¹¹¹	4.1 hours (Target Not Met)
	2007	2.90 hours	17.4 hours (Target Not Met)
	2006	Set Baseline	3.1 hours (Baseline)
	2005	N/A	6.0 hours (Historical Actual) ¹¹²
19.2LT and 19B: Increase the percentage of UAC that receive medical screening or examination within 48 hours. ¹¹³ <i>(Developmental Outcome)</i>	2010	Prior Result +1%	Mar-11
	2009	Prior Result +1%	Mar-10
	2008	Set Baseline	88.9% (Baseline)
	2007	N/A	77.6% (Historical Actual)
	2006	N/A	75.5% (Historical Actual) ¹¹⁴
19C: Maintain the percentage of runaways from UAC shelters at 1.5 percent. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	1.5%	Mar-11
	2009	1.5%	Mar-10
	2008	1.5%	1.55% (Target Not Met)
	2007	1.5%	1.5% (Target Met)
	2006	Set Baseline	1.7% (Baseline) ¹¹⁵
19D: Increase the percentage of “closed” corrective actions. <i>(Efficiency)</i>	2010	Prior Result +2%	Mar-11
	2009	Prior Result +2%	Mar-10
	2008	88.2%	May-09

¹¹¹ The FY 2008 target for this measure has been revised to be contingent upon the FY 2006 result, due to the anomalous nature of the FY 2007 results on this measure. Comparison against the FY 2006 result will give a better sense of the program’s success on this measure in FY 2008 and is, in fact, a more ambitious target than one contingent upon FY 2007 results.

¹¹² This figure has been revised due to updated reporting capabilities, which allow for more accurate data collection.

¹¹³ The program expects to set targets for this measure beginning in FY 2010, based on the FY 2008 results.

¹¹⁴ Results revised based on the fact that the original FY 2006 results did not account for the fact that medical screenings would not occur outside of business hours. The results were recalculated after disregarding weekend hours.

¹¹⁵ Data have been finalized since the FY 2009 President’s Budget, and the number has been updated.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
	2007	55.7%	86.5% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	Set Baseline	53.0% (Baseline)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
19.1LT 19A 19.2LT 19B	The Division of Unaccompanied Children's Services (DUCS) Tracking and Management System (TMS)	DUCS collects grantee-related performance information including: Quarterly Program Progress Reports on program adjustments and progress toward meeting performance goals and objectives of the UAC Cooperative Agreement; Monthly Statistical Reports (arrivals, departures, releases, and immigration case disposition); Daily grantees' electronic updates and case file information (admission information - admission date, time, and type; and Discharge Information - discharge date, time, type, and detail). DUCS also conducts annual program monitoring and site visits as needed for the purpose of ensuring that the grantee's service delivery and financial management meet the requirements and standards of the DUCS program. TMS will provide close to real-time statistics on discharges, capacity availability, and UAC pending placement by DHS post referral. Data collected by grantees through TMS will be carefully tracked and verified by DUCS and grantees will be provided with detailed guidance to ensure consistent reporting.
19C 19D	Significant Incident Reports and DUCS' TMS	DUCS conducts programmatic on-site monitoring of grantees on an annual and as needed basis for the purpose of ensuring that the grantee's service delivery program meets the requirements and standards of the program.

The goal of measure 19A is to reduce the amount of time from Department of Homeland Security (DHS) referral of an unaccompanied child to the Division of Unaccompanied Children's Services (DUCS) placement designation. This measure is representative of the "placement" aspect of the Unaccompanied Alien Children (UAC) program. The Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) makes placement designations to care provider facilities for UAC referred by DHS officials. Timeliness of this designation is crucial to allow DHS to arrange transportation to the designated placement facilities, which may be located outside of the district of initial apprehension, and to ensure DHS has personnel ready to escort the UAC during transport. For much of the year, placement designations are made within several hours of notification by DHS. This time increases on the weekend and non-regular business hours. The most significant delays occur during periods of high migration influx, natural disasters, or an emergency decrease in capacity at another facility. This measure directly correlates to DUCS' bed space capacity – timely designations cannot be made unless bed space is available. Reducing the time between DHS referral and DUCS' placement designation, especially during influx periods, will reflect DUCS' improved strategic planning, capacity development, and ability to respond during emergency situations. A baseline of 3.1 hours was established in FY 2006, which improved over the previous year's result of six hours. In FY 2007, the time between notification and placement increased to 17.4 hours. The increase from FY 2006 to FY 2007 is the result of an atypical increase in placement time in the summer months following the emergency closure of a large UAC facility in Texas. Once additional emergency beds had been located, referral times dropped to levels closer to the FY 2006 level. In FY 2008, DUCS referral times returned near previous fiscal year averages to 4.1 hours, yet it fell short of the 2.9 hour target. The program has set a rigorous and ambitious target of a five percent annual reduction in time between notification and placement through FY 2009. By FY 2010, the program expects that the program will achieve the target of reducing time between notification and placement by at least two percent from the previous year's result.

The goal of annual measure 19B is to increase the access of UAC to needed health care services. Via this measure, DUCS proposes to measure the percentage of UAC who receive medical screening/examination within 48 business hours after admission to a DUCS-funded care provider facility.¹¹⁶ This measure is a response to the Flores Settlement Agreement minimum standards, which state that UAC are to be medically examined within 48 business hours of admission, excluding weekends and holidays. A goal of 48 hours represents a realistic performance goal for all DUCS-funded facilities. Because of the need for facilities to use private medical providers, 48-hours from admission is a reasonable period of time within which to complete a medical screening without delaying medical care.¹¹⁷ DUCS Tracking and Management System (TMS) was expanded in the 4th quarter of FY 2006 to capture medical screening date and time. To meet targets, DUCS provides ongoing targeted technical assistance to support the care providers' compliance with this measure. DUCS also encourages facilities to be innovative in identifying means to achieve this goal. Preliminary data for FY 2008 indicate that 88.9 percent of children receive screening within 48 business hours of placement in ORR facilities.

The goal of annual measure 19C is to maintain a low percentage of runaways from the UAC program, which reflects the success of care providers to provide programs with engaging programs, nurturing environments, quality programmatic services, highly trained staff, and appropriate security measures. A baseline of 1.7 percent was established using FY 2006 data, and the FY 2008 target of 1.5 percent was nearly met. Only 1.6 percent of UACs ran away. As stated in the language of the measure, the target percentage of runaways from the program is 1.5 percent through FY 2010. DUCS is focusing on improving the quality of services at the shelters, on improving physical security ("no climb" fences) and improved staffing and staffing oversight at the shelters, and timely approvals of reunification requests with family and other sponsors.

The goal of annual measure 19D is to increase the efficiency of DUCS to improve the overall quality of UAC shelters through monitoring, guidance, training, and technical assistance. DUCS avails itself to facilities as needed and particularly during and directly after monitoring with an effort to reduce the number of corrective actions, or to respond as promptly as possible to the corrective actions issued. Therefore, this measure allows DUCS to monitor its efficiency in using training, technical assistance, and guidance/monitoring activities to improve program performance as measured by the length of time facilities needed to close corrective actions. After monitoring a DUCS-funded facility, DUCS prepares a report, citing program deficiencies that require a corrective action. Beginning in FY 2007, the facility is given 30 days in which to respond to the report and inform DUCS which deficiencies and non-compliance areas have been corrected. It is expected that as the UAC program grows and DUCS staff carries out more monitoring visits and becomes more skilled in program evaluation and technical assistance, there will be an increase in the percentage of corrective actions that are "closed" within 30 days. A baseline of 53 percent was established for FY 2006; the FY 2007 target was far exceeded, with 86.5 percent of corrective actions being closed within 30 days. It is expected that by FY 2010, the program will increase the percentage of "closed" corrective actions by at least two percent over the prior year's result.

¹¹⁶ UAC that have received a medical screening at another DUCS-funded facility (i.e. transfers) are not required to have a second screening done upon admission to the new DUCS-funded facility.

¹¹⁷ Including prior to the initial medical examination, anytime there is a medical emergency or another need for immediate care, DUCS-funded facilities take UAC to an emergency room immediately.

MANDATORY PROGRAMS

Child Support Enforcement and Family Support Programs

20. Child Support Enforcement

Measure	FY	Target	Result
<u>20.1LT</u> : Increase annual child support distributed collections up to \$26 billion by FY 2008 and up to \$33 billion by FY 2013. <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	\$33B (FY 2013)	Nov-14
	2008	\$26 B	Nov-09
<u>20A</u> : Maintain the paternity establishment percentage (PEP) among children born out-of-wedlock. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	94%	Nov-11
	2009	94%	Nov-10
	2008	95%	Nov-09
	2007	95%	98% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	98%	98% (Target Met)
	2005	98%	98% (Target Met)
<u>20B</u> : Increase the percentage of IV-D (child support) cases having support orders. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	77%	Nov-11
	2009	77%	Nov-10
	2008	75%	Nov-09
	2007	73%	78% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	72%	77% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	71%	76% (Target Exceeded)
<u>20C</u> : Maintain the IV-D (child support) collection rate for current support. ¹¹⁸ <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	62%	Nov-11
	2009	62%	Nov-10
	2008	61%	Nov-09
	2007	61%	61% (Target Met)
	2006	62%	60% (Target Not Met)
	2005	61%	60% (Target Not Met but Improved)
<u>20D</u> : Maintain the percentage of paying cases among IV-D (child support) arrearage cases. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	62%	Nov-11
	2009	62%	Nov-10

¹¹⁸ This measure is a performance indicator for the FY 2007- FY 2012 HHS Strategic Plan.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
	2008	61%	Nov-09
	2007	61%	61% (Target Met)
	2006	64%	61% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2005	63%	60% (Target Not Met)
<u>20.2LT and 20E</u> : Increase the cost-effectiveness ratio (total dollars collected per \$1 of expenditures) to \$4.63 by FY 2008 and up to \$5.00 by FY 2013. (<i>Efficiency</i>)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	\$5.00 (FY 2014)	Nov-15
	2010	\$4.77	Nov-11
	2009	\$4.70	Nov-10
	2008	\$4.63	Nov-09
	2007	\$4.56	\$4.73 (Target Exceeded)
	2006	\$4.49	\$4.58 (Target Exceeded)
	2005	\$4.42	\$4.58 (Target Exceeded)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
20.1LT 20A 20B 20C 20D	Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) Form 157	States currently maintain information on the necessary data elements for the above performance measures. All states were required to have a comprehensive, statewide, automated Child Support Enforcement system in place by October 1, 1997. Fifty-three states and territories were Family Support Act-certified and Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act-certified (PRWORA) as of July 2007. Certification requires states to meet automation systems provisions of the specific act. Continuing implementation of these systems, in conjunction with cleanup of case data, will improve the accuracy and consistency of reporting. As part of OCSE's review of performance data, OCSE Auditors review each state's and territory's ability to produce valid data. Data reliability audits are conducted annually. Self-evaluation by states and OCSE audits provide an on-going review of the validity of data and the ability of automated systems to produce accurate data. Each year OCSE Auditors review the data that states report for the previous fiscal year. The OCSE Office of Audit has completed the FY 2007 data reliability audits. Since FY 2001, the reliability standard has been 95 percent.
20.2LT and 20E	OCSE Forms 34A and 396A	Please see previous description of data validation.

The Child Support Enforcement (CSE) Program has made considerable progress towards ensuring that child support payments are collected and distributed promptly, so that these payments are a reliable source of income for children and families. Securing support from non-custodial parents on a consistent and continuing basis may reduce families' need for public assistance, thus reducing government spending. During FY 2007, almost \$25 billion in child support was collected and distributed, a 3.8 percent increase over the amount collected and distributed during FY 2006.

In addition, the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) has continued to implement provisions of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA). These provisions prioritize collection of medical child

support, strengthen existing collection and enforcement tools, reduce federal expenditures, and allow states the option to provide additional support to the families who need it most. The DRA sought to increase collections by expanding passport denial, improving processes for identifying proceeds from insurance settlements, and requiring mandatory review and adjustment of support orders. Additionally, as of FY 2008, the DRA reduces the federal match rate for genetic testing from 90 percent to 66 percent, and adds an annual user fee of \$25 for child support cases with collections who have never received Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) assistance. These provisions are expected to reduce overall program expenditures and possibly reduce the rate of growth of collections.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) temporarily changes the child support authorization language to allow states to use federal incentive payments provided in accordance with Section 458 of the Social Security Act as their state share of expenditures eligible for federal match. This authorization, which is effective October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2010, temporarily suspends a provision of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA) that eliminated federal match for state expenditure of incentive payments. This change will make approximately \$1 billion in new resources available to state CSE agencies. However, the actual costs will be determined based on state expenditure claims. These Recovery Act funds will provide states with resources to help stabilize their budgets to avert layoffs and prevent designated cutbacks in the child support program as a result of the DRA. ARRA funds will also be used to sustain and strengthen existing support enforcement strategies and to make sure that child support continues to be a reliable source of income for children and families.

Annual measure 20A (paternity establishment) compares paternitys established during the fiscal year with the number of non-marital births during the preceding fiscal year. The statute allows states to measure a state-wide Parentage Establishment Percentage (PEP). In FY 2007, OCSE exceeded its target of 95 percent by achieving a paternity establishment percentage of 98 percent. Exceeding the target rate of 95 percent in FY 2007 required states to increase paternity establishment for new out-of-wedlock births, since states have already been so successful at establishing paternity in backlogged cases. ACF has implemented early interventions to increase the PEP rate through expanding hospital-based paternity establishment programs and partnering with birth record agencies, pre-natal clinics, and other entities, and through encouraging voluntary acknowledgments, in accordance with the requirements of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA). In FY 2007 there were almost 640,000 IV-D paternitys established or acknowledged and nearly 1.1 million in-hospital and other paternitys acknowledged. Overall, paternity was established or acknowledged for 1.7 million children, a 1.7 percent increase from the previous year. In collaboration with partners and stakeholders, OCSE is also exploring a variety of activities to help individuals better understand their parental responsibilities, including funding grants to educate non-custodial parents and distributing brochures about the child support program.

The PEP targets for FY 2008 and FY 2009 were reduced to 95 percent and 94 percent respectively, with the goal of maintaining 94 percent through FY 2010. This decrease does not reflect a decline in performance expectations, but rather, these targets have been lowered to account for the fact that states have already cleaned up their caseloads by establishing paternity orders for older children.

Annual measure 20B (child support orders) compares the number of IV-D cases with support orders established (which are required to collect child support) with the total number of IV-D cases. In FY 2007, over 12 million cases had support orders established out of a total 15.8 million IV-D cases (78 percent), which is five percentage points above the target of 73 percent for FY 2007. Over 1.3 million of these 12 million cases were new child support orders. The child support order establishment rate of 78 percent reflects an increase of one percentage point over the previous year, when approximately 11.9 million support orders were established out of 15.8 million IV-D cases. The targets for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 increase by two percentage points each year, to reach a target rate of 77 percent in FY 2009 and

maintain this rate through FY 2010.

State staffing levels have decreased slightly while IV-D caseloads with support orders continue to increase slightly; thus, increasing the number of support orders established may require more effort. PRWORA provided states with new tools to establish an order more quickly, such as administrative authority to require genetic testing, ability or authority to subpoena financial and other information, and the ability to access a wide array of records. More states are voluntarily shifting from establishing court-based orders to establishing administrative-based orders.¹¹⁹ In addition, OCSE supports various programs and initiatives that support the establishment of child support orders through the Federal Parent Locator Service, a service that provides a host of systems and applications for federal and state agencies to utilize to increase support orders and collections.

Annual measure 20C (child support collection rate), a proxy for the regular and timely payment of support, compares total dollars collected for current support in IV-D cases with total dollars owed for current support in IV-D cases. The total amount of child support distributed as current support in FY 2007 was \$19 billion, an increase of 4.2 percent over FY 2006. The total amount of current support due in FY 2007 was over \$30 billion. This provided a collection rate for current support of 61 percent, which met the target for FY 2007. OCSE will maintain the 61 percent collection rate target in FY 2008 due to DRA impacts such as the elimination of federal match on incentives payments, and aims to increase this rate to 62 percent by FY 2010. Expenditures and collections are closely related in child support, and OCSE expects that this will result in current support collections increasing at a decreasing rate compared to pre-DRA levels. Nevertheless, OCSE will work to eliminate the gap between the current support collection target and the actual performance by focusing on new and improved enforcement techniques, such as the expanded passport denial program. In addition, OCSE launched a new national initiative in FY 2007 called PAID: Project to Avoid Increasing Delinquencies. This initiative placed special emphasis on activities that result in increasing collections of current support and reducing arrears. These activities include:

- Focusing federal technical assistance on efforts that address root causes of nonpayment of support (e.g., establishing appropriate orders and early intervention upon nonpayment).
- Capitalizing on states' best practices through training, technical assistance, and cross-regional meetings.
- Increasing awareness and encouraging use of data findings in program and policy decisions.
- Targeting automation opportunities such as electronic Income Withholding Orders (e-IWO), Level of Automation Guidance through technical assistance site visits, and other outreach efforts.

In addition, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated that the DRA would result in lower spending on the child support program which would lead to lower collections. The ARRA legislation will help to prevent such program spending cuts that would likely have an impact on child support collections.

Annual measure 20D (child support arrears payment rate) compares the total number of IV-D cases paying any amount toward arrears to the total number of IV-D cases with arrears due. There were 11.3 million cases with arrearages due in FY 2007, and over 6.9 million of these cases had collections in FY 2007 representing a two percent increase over FY 2006. This figure also represents 61 percent of paying cases among IV-D arrearage cases, which met the target for FY 2007. The targets for FY 2008 and FY 2009 have been set at 61 and 62 percent respectively, and maintain the goal of 62 percent through FY

¹¹⁹ Administrative procedure is a method by which support orders are made and enforced by an executive agency rather than by courts and judges as in the court procedure.

2010. Obtaining payment of arrears is often difficult, which makes achieving these targets all the more challenging. States must collect both current support and any accrued arrearages. Typically when non-custodial parents cannot keep up with both current support and arrears payments, the amount owed towards arrears is the most likely to go unpaid. Nevertheless, OCSE continues to succeed in efforts to assist states in reducing the growth of arrears with initiatives such as the PAID initiative, mentioned above, which focuses on activities to increase current collections and reduce arrears.

In addition, child support enforcement agencies are systematically utilizing tools other than wage withholding to enforce these orders. Arrears management involves setting appropriate orders initially, modifying orders promptly when family circumstances change, and immediately intervening when current support is not paid. Another approach is to target certain groups of debtors, who are low-income and are most likely to accumulate the debt, for interest amnesty or debt compromise programs. Research indicates that the key factors that can increase arrears involve states assessing interest on a routine basis (two-thirds of states assess interest on arrears either routinely or intermittently); setting child support orders that are too high for low-income obligors (usually because orders were default or used imputed incomes for the non-custodial parent); and not using all available enforcement tools. The child support program wants this support to be a reliable source of income for children, and since arrears may impede payment of current support, this issue will continue to receive focused attention.

Efficiency measure 20E calculates efficiency by comparing total IV-D dollars collected and distributed by states with total IV-D dollars expended by states for administrative purposes; this is the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act (CSPIA) cost-effectiveness ratio (CER). In FY 2007, the national ratio was \$4.73 which exceeded the target of \$4.56. The formula for determining the CER is the total collections distributed (\$24.8 billion), plus the collections forwarded to other states for distribution (\$1.47 billion), and fees retained by other states (\$925 thousand), divided by the administrative expenditures (\$5.6 billion), less the non-IV-D administrative costs (\$24 million). Data from FY 2007 show that a record high of \$24.9 billion was collected for child support, representing a 31 percent increase since FY 2001 and a four percent increase from the previous fiscal year, benefiting 15.7 million families in FY 2007. A tool that states have used to increase collections is the tax refund and administrative offset, from which \$1.7 billion in delinquent child support was collected in calendar year 2007, a 5.8 percent increase over the previous year. Tax offsets are based on intercepts of federal tax refunds while administrative offsets are based on intercepts of certain federal payments such as vendor and miscellaneous payments¹²⁰ and federal retirement payments. ACF will continue to focus on increased efficiency of state programs through approaches such as automated systems of case management and enforcement techniques described earlier. By FY 2010, OCSE expects to reach the target of \$4.77 collected per \$1 of expenditures.

Furthermore, the above mentioned CSE activities and performance objectives related to establishing, enforcing, collecting and distributing child support align with the economic goals of ARRA by securing child support income to help families purchase goods and services. The child support enforcement program reaches many lower-income families who are more likely to spend the child support money quickly to meet basic household needs. This funding also comes at a critical time for states, as the elimination of the federal match, coupled with the current economic downturn, would have required states to implement cutbacks increasing the likelihood of more families receiving less child support and needing public assistance. Ultimately, these funds will allow state CSE agencies to maintain program operations and overall performance and meet or exceed performance objectives to deliver lasting positive outcomes for children and families.

¹²⁰ Administrative offset include both recurring and one-time payments. Types of payments that can be intercepted include payments to private vendors who perform work for a government agency and relocation and travel reimbursements owed to federal employees.

Foster Care and Adoption Assistance

Please see Child Abuse Prevention and Child Welfare Programs section for performance measures and analysis.

Social Services Block Grant

21. Social Services Block Grant

Measure	FY	Target	Result
21A: Decrease administrative costs as a percent of total costs. (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2010	9%	Dec-11
	2009	9%	Dec-10
	2008	9%	Dec-09
	2007	9%	5% (Target Met) ¹²¹
	2006	N/A	5% (Historical Actual)
	2005	N/A	7% (Historical Actual)
7Q: Increase the percentage of children who exit foster care within two years of placement either through guardianship or adoption. (<i>PSSF, SSBG</i>) (<i>Outcome</i>)	2010	Prior Result +2%	Oct-11
	2009	38.0%	Oct-10
	2008	36.0%	Oct-09
	2007	35.0%	42.2% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	N/A	39.7% (Historical Actual)
	2005	N/A	38.8% (Historical Actual)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
21A	SSBG post-expenditure reports	ACF assists states in improving SSBG data collection and reporting by asking states to regularly validate their data and by providing technical assistance where practical. Moreover, the data from the state post-expenditure reports are entered into a database and validated to identify errors or inconsistencies.

¹²¹ Should the FY 2007 result prove to be a trend, future targets will be evaluated to maintain rigor.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
70	Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS)	States report child welfare data to ACF through the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS). All state semi-annual AFCARS data submissions undergo extensive edit-checks for internal reliability. The results of the AFCARS edit-checks for each of the six-month data submissions are automatically generated and sent back to each state, to help the state to improve data quality. Many states submit revised data to insure that accurate data are submitted, often for more than one prior submission period. The Children's Bureau conducts several AFCARS compliance reviews each year, which typically result in a comprehensive AFCARS Improvement Plan (AIP). Also, states' Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems (SACWIS) are undergoing reviews to determine the status of their operation and the automated system's capability of meeting the SACWIS requirement to report accurate AFCARS data. To speed improvement in these data, the agency funds the National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology. This Resource Center provides technical assistance to states to improve reporting to AFCARS, improve statewide information systems, and to make better use of their data. Finally, ACF has recently implemented the AFCARS Project that includes a detailed review of all aspects of AFCARS by federal staff and participation of the field in identifying possible changes to improve the system. All of these activities should continue to generate additional improvements in the data over the next few years.

Efficiency measure 21A encourages effective administration of the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) by tracking total state administrative expenditures as a proportion of total SSBG expenditures. SSBG reporting rules require that states submit post-expenditure reports detailing the types of activities and services funded with SSBG funds, and characteristics of the recipients of services. In the reports submitted by states for FY 2007, the average of 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico showed that five percent of SSBG funds were spent for administrative costs. Each year, a state determines how funds are used. The Office of Community Services (OCS) will continue technical assistance efforts that aim to keep administrative costs to no more than nine percent, as well as appropriately identifying expenditures that may be miscategorized as administrative costs to other activities and services.

OCS has worked hard to bring down the overall percent of administrative costs through such means as increased technical assistance and reviewing post-expenditure reports. Thus, in FY 2007, the program decreased administrative costs as a percent of total costs to five percent, a significant improvement over the FY 2005 result of seven percent. This reduction in administrative costs in FY 2007 means that a greater percentage of funding was expended for direct services, and thus reached a greater number of recipients. By FY 2010, the program expects to do better than the target of nine percent. Should the most recent result of five percent prove to be a data trend, the program will evaluate out-year targets in order to maintain ambitious performance targets. States are more familiar with the process of reporting expenditures by specific SSBG service category, rather than combining expenditures associated with providing a specific service into the "administrative" spending category. This measure identifies the sum effort of all states to reduce administrative costs in order to assure that SSBG funds social services for children and adults to as great an extent as possible.

ACF has been re-examining measurement of success for SSBG based on recommendations from the CY 2005 program assessment. In previous fiscal years, SSBG had multiple output measures: these included counts of children receiving support for day care, adults receiving special services for the disabled, and adults receiving home care, all supported with SSBG funds. ACF is currently in the process of developing a new outcome measure for SSBG using pre- and post-expenditure data that states will begin reporting on for FY 2010.

For performance detail related to annual measure 70, please refer to the Child Abuse Prevention and Child Welfare Programs section. This annual measure has been included as part of the SSBG section because it supports the following SSBG statutory goal: *“Preventing or remedying neglect, abuse or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interest, or preserving, rehabilitating or reuniting families.”* Further, of the 30 service categories allowable for SSBG fund expenditures, Foster Care Services represents one of the largest, accounting for 15 percent of SSBG expenditures in FY 2006.

Promoting Safe and Stable Families

Please see Child Abuse Prevention and Child Welfare Programs section for performance measures and analysis.

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

22. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
<u>22.1LT and 22A</u> : Increase the percentage of state work participation rates that meet or exceed requirements. ¹²² (<i>Efficiency</i>)	2007	Set Baseline	May-09
	2006	N/A	94% (Historical Actual)
	2005	N/A	95% (Historical Actual)
<u>22.2LT and 22B</u> : Increase the percentage of adult TANF recipients who become newly employed to 38 percent by FY 2009, and increase by 1.6 percentage points over the FY 2009 actual result by FY 2014. ¹²³ (<i>Outcome</i>)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	FY 2009 actual result +1.6PP ¹²⁴	Oct-15
	2010	38.4%	Oct-11
	2009	38.0%	Oct-10
	2008	37.0%	Oct-09
	2007	36.0%	35.8% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	35.0%	35.6% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	44.0%	34.3% (Target Not Met)
<u>22.3LT and 22C</u> : Increase the percentage of adult TANF recipients/former recipients employed in one quarter that were still employed in the next two consecutive quarters by three percentage points over the FY 2009 actual result by FY 2014. (<i>Outcome</i>)	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	FY 2009 actual result +3PP ¹²⁵	Oct-15
	2010	Prior Result +1PP	Oct-11
	2009	65%	Oct-10
	2008	63%	Oct-09
	2007	62%	64.4% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	61%	64.7% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	68%	64.4% (Target Not Met but Improved)
<u>22.4LT and 22D</u> : Increase the percentage rate of earnings gained by employed adult TANF recipients/former recipients between a base quarter and a second subsequent quarter by 1.5	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	FY 2009 actual result +1.5PP ¹²⁶	Oct-15
	2010	Prior Result +0.5PP	Oct-11
	2009	40.9%	Oct-10

¹²² The language of this measure was updated with the input of OMB as part of the FY 2008 Measure Quality Review.

¹²³ This measure is a performance indicator for the FY 2007 – 2012 HHS Strategic Plan.

¹²⁴ The FY 2014 target is a 1.6 percentage point increase over the FY 2009 actual result.

¹²⁵ The FY 2014 target is a 3 percentage point increase over the FY 2009 actual result.

¹²⁶ The FY 2014 target is a 1.5 percentage point increase over the FY 2009 actual result.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
percentage points over the FY 2009 actual result by FY 2014. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2008	40.8% ¹²⁷	Oct-09
	2007	40.7%	36.6% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2006	38.8%	33.8% (Target Not Met)
	2005	29.0%	35.5% (Target Exceeded)
<u>22E</u> : Increase the rate of case closures related to employment, child support collected, and marriage. <i>(Outcome)</i>	2010	21.2%	Oct-11
	2009	21.0%	Oct-10
	2008	20.8%	Oct-09
	2007	20.4%	23.2% (Target Exceeded)
	2006	20.3%	21.6% (Target Exceeded)
	2005	19.8%	20.1% (Target Exceeded)
<u>22.5LT and 22F</u> : Increase the number of children living in married couple households as a percentage of all children living in households to 74 percent by CY 2010, and maintain this rate through CY 2014. ¹²⁸ <i>(Outcome)</i>	<i>Out-Year Target</i>	74% (CY 2014)	N/A
	2010	74%	Jan-12
	2009	73%	Jan-11
	2008	72%	Jan-10
	2007	71%	May-09 ¹²⁹
	2006	70%	68% (Target Not Met)
	2005	70%	69% (Target Not Met)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
22.1LT 22A	TANF Administrative Data	Data are validated via single state audits.

¹²⁷ The targets for FY 2006 and FY 2007 reflect an ACF ten percent improvement goal by FY 2007 from the 37 percent base for this measure. ACF has increased the target for FY 2008 and FY 2009 by one tenth of one percent each because the FY 2007 target is a significant and ambitious increase from the FY 2006 target and actual results.

¹²⁸ This measure is a performance indicator for the FY 2007 – 2012 HHS Strategic Plan. This measure is based on data collected each calendar (not fiscal) year. This measure was previously labeled as annual measure 22G.

¹²⁹ Data for FY 2007 has not yet been made available by the Census Bureau.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
22.2LT 22B 22.3LT 22C 22.4LT 22D	National Directory of New Hires (NDNH)	Beginning with performance in FY 2001, the above employment measures – job entry, job retention, and earnings gain – are based solely on performance data obtained from the NDNH. Data are updated by states, and data validity is ensured with normal auditing functions for submitted data. Prior to use of the NDNH, states had flexibility in the data source(s) they used to obtain wage information on current and former TANF recipients under high performance bonus (HPB) specifications for performance years FY 1998 through FY 2000. ACF moved to this single source national database (NDNH) to ensure equal access to wage data and uniform application of the performance specifications.
22E	TANF Data Report database comprised of state TANF reports submissions	Data are validated via single state audits.
22.5LT 22F	Census survey data	Annual supplemental Census survey data provide reliable state and national estimates for this measure. Using expanded sampling by the Census Bureau allows ACF to measure the extent to which children are living in married couple households. Through this measure, ACF will indirectly track state TANF efforts in the area of healthy marriage. ACF will continue to work with states and other partners in developing or enhancing data collections systems to capture marriage-related information and facilitate future research.

The TANF measures, taken together, assess state success in moving recipients from welfare to work and self-sufficiency. Full success requires not only getting recipients into jobs, but also keeping them in those jobs and increasing their earnings in order to reduce dependency and enable families to support themselves. Long-term objective/efficiency measure 22A demonstrates the success of states in reducing dependency on welfare and promoting work with fixed federal resources. This efficiency measure includes both the overall and two-parent work participation rates. By statute, states are required to meet specific work participation rates each year. States must engage 50 percent of their overall caseload in eligible work activities, and 90 percent of their two-parent families in eligible work activities. This efficiency measure compares states' actual overall and two-parent rates to the required rates in a specific year. States may have a lower required rate after the caseload reduction credits are taken into account. All states and territories must meet an overall caseload work participation requirement. However, since not all states serve two-parent families, not all states and territories have a required two-parent work participation requirement.

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) established the TANF work participation rate targets for states for FY 1997 through FY 2002. These targets remained at the FY 2002 level until reauthorization occurred in FY 2006, when the future targets were revised. From FY 1998 through FY 2002, all states met the all-families work participation rates. For FY 2004, two states, Indiana and Mississippi, were initially cited for not meeting their target rates. In the appeal of the proposed penalties, there were adjustments in the rates and/or caseload reduction credits which resulted in both states meeting their FY 2004 target rates. For FY 2005 and FY 2006, only Indiana did not meet its target participation rate and the state was cited for a work participation penalty of nearly \$20 million. (It is noted that Indiana has one of the smallest caseload reduction credit offsets of any state.)

The TANF program was reauthorized under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA) in February 2006. Under DRA, the work participation rate calculation was modified to include adults in families that were previously excluded from the rate, i.e., families in the Separate State Maintenance of Effort Programs and

some “Child Only Families.” In addition, the caseload reduction credit was recalibrated.¹³⁰ The FY 2007 performance results will be the baseline number for the new efficiency measure (22A), and performance targets for this new measure will be developed in consultation with OMB. Note that states that fail to meet the 50 percent requirement of the all-family work rate (adjusted by the caseload reduction credit) are subject to a work participation penalty. A state that fails to meet a participation rate has 60 days to submit a request for a reasonable cause exception, and HHS has defined a limited number of circumstances under which states may demonstrate reasonable cause. States may also submit a corrective compliance plan to correct the violation and insure continued compliance with the participation requirements. If a state achieves compliance with work participation rates in the time frame that the plan specifies, then a penalty is not imposed. ACF will work with states that do not meet the participation requirements to assist them in achieving compliance and meeting their required rates.

Under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), an additional \$5 billion in funding was appropriated for the TANF program Emergency Contingency Fund, as well as \$319 million in funding for supplemental funding to states that experience high population growth and/or had low historic welfare spending per poor person. In addition to this added funding, ARRA temporarily modified the caseload reduction credit calculation, which reduces a state's required work participation rate for a fiscal year by the number of percentage points its caseload declined between FY 2005 and the year prior to the current fiscal year (called the comparison year). In fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011, a state may either use the prior fiscal year as its comparison year or it may use the caseload reduction credit it qualified to receive when the comparison year was FY 2007 or FY 2008, whichever had the lower caseload. As a result, the state's required work participation rate will not increase simply because the state assisted more families during this period of increased need. The potential impact of this provision will be considered in determining future year performance targets for efficiency measure 22A, pending the establishment of the baseline (FY 2007 actual results).

Regarding annual measure 22B (job entry), states have been able to move TANF recipients to work; in FY 2007, 35.8 percent of recipients became employed. Several factors have contributed to the steady increase in job entries, including the employment focus of PRWORA, ACF's commitment to finding innovative and effective employment tools through research, the identification and dissemination of information on the effects of alternative employment strategies and a range of targeted technical assistance efforts. While these approaches have been helpful in the past, it is not clear how much the weak economy may affect future performance on this measure. Although the actual results narrowly missed the FY 2007 target of 36 percent, the improvement over the prior year performance means that a higher proportion of adult TANF recipients or former recipients became employed and began working toward self-sufficiency in FY 2007 than in FY 2006.

The employment targets for FY 2001 through FY 2003 reflect performance estimates before ACF implemented the use of a single data source, National Directory of New Hires (NDNH), for the work performance measures. Of the three employment measures presented here (22B, 22C, and 22D), only measure 22B – job entry – appears to be significantly affected by the use of the NDNH. This is also a long-term objective, 22.2, with a goal to reach 38.4 percent by FY 2010. As a result of the participation rate changes made in DRA, the program expects that states will make sure that more recipients are working and placed in work activities. Subsequently, new targets for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 were made during the program assessment in CY 2005. The TANF regulations resulting from DRA defined each of the countable work activities for the first time, and the definitions were created to ensure that all activities enhance the job readiness of clients. Although we expect these changes to lead to increased efforts to transition recipients into the workforce, this will be more difficult given the challenging labor

¹³⁰ State work participation rate targets are adjusted downward by the percent that the state TANF caseload declines from the base year of FY 2005.

market in many states. As a result, ACF anticipates that it may be difficult to meet our goal of increasing the number of adult TANF recipients that enter the workforce.

The annual job retention rate (annual measure 22C) was 64.4 percent in FY 2007, which exceeded the target of 62 percent. This means that more current and former TANF adult recipients retained jobs, which is a key component to achieve self-sufficiency. When setting targets prior to FY 2006, ACF did not take into consideration the dampening effect of the caseload reduction credit, which significantly reduced state work participation rate targets. For FY 2002 through FY 2006, an average of 57 percent of adult TANF recipients have been reported as not engaging in any work or work preparation activities. As a result of the changes made in DRA and the final regulations issued, the program anticipates employment retention rates to be higher. However, the significant downturn in the economy and its impact on the labor market may make it more difficult for welfare recipients and former recipients to maintain employment. The program has set a target for FY 2010 of achieving a one percentage point increase over the FY 2009 actual result for job retention, although this will be more difficult to meet given current economic conditions.

The earnings gain rate (annual measure 22D) is calculated by dividing the earnings of employed TANF recipients (and former recipients¹³¹) in a third quarter by the earnings of TANF recipients in a first quarter, provided they were employed in the first and third quarters.^{132, 133} Since converting to the NDNH for employment data, ACF has shown improved performance on this measure. Although the target of 40.7 percent was missed in FY 2007, TANF recipients and former recipients showed an increase in earnings of 36.6 percent between two successive quarters. This performance was significantly higher than the 33.8 percent earnings increase in FY 2006. This increase means that current and former TANF recipients increased earnings significantly over time, but that the increase over two successive quarters grew at a slower rate than was set for the target. The target established for FY 2007 was based on the FY 2004 baseline performance using the existing earnings gain measure. The FY 2006 and FY 2007 targets are based on a 10 percent improvement goal set by ACF. Because the effective participation rates for states are higher post-DRA, ACF expects that more recipients will be working or will be placed in work activities that lead to employment. Although the program expected that the earnings gain would improve and that performance goals would be met in the future, including the FY 2010 target to increase by half a percentage point over the FY 2009 actual result, this may be difficult given that there are fewer opportunities to advance in the current labor market .

The TANF measures, taken together, help to assess how successful states are in moving recipients from welfare to work and self-sufficiency. Full success requires not only getting recipients into jobs, but also keeping individuals in those jobs and increasing their earnings in order to enable families to support themselves. Annual measure 22E tracks the rate of case closures related to employment, as well as marriage and the receipt of child support, which generally reflect the earnings of others. The baseline for this measure is 18.8 percent in FY 2003, and ACF exceed our targeted 20.4 percent in FY 2007 by achieving a rate of 23.2 percent. ACF projects that the rate of closures will level off in FY 2007 before increasing in fiscal years 2008 and 2009 as a result of states' implementation of DRA. States have also been encouraged to gain access to the NDNH to uncover employment that was previously unknown to the agency, and this may result in more cases being closed due to employment. Caseload closures data provide information on the number of families leaving TANF, but do not indicate the number of families that are more self-sufficient as a result of employment or other income. However, these effects may be

¹³¹ "Former recipients" includes only those that received TANF in the first quarter but left the rolls in either the second or third quarter.

¹³² This rate is calculated for all quarters: thus, employed recipient earnings in quarter one are compared with employed earnings in quarter three, employed recipient earnings in quarter two are compared with employed earnings in quarter four, employed recipient earnings in quarter three are compared with employed earnings in quarter one of the following year, etc.

¹³³ The rate is compiled for each year by averaging the gains by quarters one, two, three and four from the previous year's quarters three and four and the current year's quarters one and two.

offset by current caseload trends and economic conditions that may cause this measure to be lower than anticipated.

Regarding annual measure 22F, research indicates that children who grow up with married parents are less likely to experience poverty, engage in high-risk behavior, or suffer from emotional or developmental problems.¹³⁴ Over time, these children have higher levels of educational attainment, employment opportunity and earning potential. ACF is exploring the development of measures to capture other aspects of healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood in addition to the marital status of the families in which children live, as captured by measure 22F. The baseline for annual measure 22F is 69 percent in FY 2005. The targets for this population measure in the out years are ambitious; the movement in this population measure has only changed within a very narrow percent band since data on this measure started to be collected in 2002. ACF anticipates that the healthy marriage activities funded under DRA, which was passed in FY 2005, will eventually have a positive impact on this performance measure. In FY 2006, 68 percent of children lived in married couple households, narrowly missing the target of 70 percent. The program faces several challenges in meeting this target. Many are related to the fact that the data for this measure is for the entire population and not just those served by TANF, and also that states have flexibility in serving clients under the TANF program and the healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood grant programs. This makes it difficult for ACF to directly influence the number of children living in married couple households. ACF is developing measures to capture other aspects of healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood in addition to the marital status of families in which children live, and these measures will be used by our grantees. The goal of these indicators is to better target our measurement of actual participants and service recipients. By FY 2010, the program aims to increase to 74 percent the number of children living in married couple households.

Child Care Entitlement

Please see Child Care and Development Block Grant section for performance measures and analysis.

¹³⁴ Waite, L.J., & Gallagher, M. (2000). *The Case for Marriage: Why Married People are Happier, Healthier, and Better Off Financially*. New York, NY: Broadway Books.

**ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
LINK TO HHS STRATEGIC PLAN**

The following chart displays the relationship between HHS and ACF strategic goals:

HHS Strategic Goals	ACF Strategic Goals			
	Increase economic independence and productivity for families.	Improve healthy development, safety, and well-being of children and youth	Improve the health and prosperity of communities and Tribes.	Manage resources to improve performance.
GOAL 1: Health Care Improve the safety, quality, affordability and accessibility of health care, including behavioral health care and long-term care.				
1.1 Broaden health insurance and long-term care coverage.				
1.2 Increase health care services availability and access.				
1.3 Improve health care quality, safety and cost/value.				
1.4 Recruit, develop and retain a competent health care workforce.				
GOAL 2: Public Health Promotion and Protection, Disease Prevention and Emergency Preparedness Prevent and control disease, injury, illness and disability across the lifespan, and protect the public from infectious, occupational, environmental and terrorist threats.				
2.1 Prevent the spread of infectious diseases.				
2.2 Protect the public against injuries and environmental threats.				
2.3 Promote and encourage preventive health care, including mental health, lifelong healthy behaviors and recovery.				
2.4 Prepare for and respond to natural and man-made disasters.				X
GOAL 3: Human Services Promote the economic and social well-being of individuals, families and communities.	X	X	X	X
3.1 Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan.	X		X	X
3.2 Protect the safety and foster the well being of children and youth.		X		X
3.3 Encourage the development of strong, healthy and supportive communities.	X		X	X

	ACF Strategic Goals			
	Increase economic independence and productivity for families.	Improve healthy development, safety, and well-being of children and youth	Improve the health and prosperity of communities and Tribes.	Manage resources to improve performance.
3.4 Address the needs, strengths and abilities of vulnerable populations.	X	X	X	X
GOAL 4: Scientific Research and Development Advance scientific and biomedical research and development related to health and human services.				
4.1 Strengthen the pool of qualified health and behavioral science researchers.				
4.2 Increase basic scientific knowledge to improve human health and human development.				
4.3 Conduct and oversee applied research to improve health and well-being.				
4.4 Communicate and transfer research results into clinical, public health and human service practice.				

SUMMARY OF FULL COST TABLE
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
(Budgetary Resources in Millions)

HHS Strategic Goals and Objectives	FY 2008	FY 2009 ARRA	FY 2009	FY 2010
1: Health Care Improve the safety, quality, affordability and accessibility of health care, including behavioral health care and long-term care.				
1.1 Broaden health insurance and long-term care coverage.				
1.2 Increase health care service availability and accessibility.				
1.3 Improve health care quality, safety, and cost/value.				
1.4 Recruit, develop, and retain a competent health care workforce.				
2: Public Health Promotion and Protection, Disease Prevention, and Emergency Preparedness Prevent and control disease, injury, illness and disability across the lifespan, and protect the public from infectious, occupational, environmental and terrorist threats.				
2.1 Prevent the spread of infectious diseases.				
2.2 Protect the public against injuries and environmental threats.				
2.3 Promote and encourage preventive health care, including mental health, lifelong healthy behaviors and recovery.				
2.4 Prepare for and respond to natural and man-made disasters.				
3: Human Services Promote the economic and social well-being of individuals, families and communities.				
3.1 Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan.				
Child Support Enforcement (CSE)	\$4,335.0		\$4,381.0	\$4,643.0
100%	4,335.0		4,381.0	4,663.0
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	17,133.0	\$5,000.0	17,135.0	17,123.0
100%	17,133.0	5,000.0	17,135.0	17,123.0
Individual Development Accounts (IDA)	25.0		25.0	25.0
100%	25.0		25.0	25.0
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)	2,573.0		5,103.0	3,653.0
100%	2,573.0		5,103.0	3,653.0
Child Care	4,988.0	2,000.0	5,054.0	5,055.0
98.9%	4,933.1	1,978.0	4,998.4	4,999.4

HHS Strategic Goals and Objectives (cont.)	FY 2008	FY 2009 ARRA	FY 2009	FY 2010
3.2 Protect the safety and foster the well being of children and youth.				
Head Start	\$6,920.0	\$2,100.0	\$7,158.0	\$7,284.0
100%	6,920.0	2,100.0	7,158.0	7,284.0
Child Welfare	\$7,879.0		\$8,245.0	\$8,416.0
99.24%	7,819.1		8,182.3	8,352.0
Home Visitation	0.0		0.0	124.0
100%	0.0		0.0	124.0
Youth Programs	279.0		255.0	283.0
100%	279.0		255.0	283.0
3.3 Encourage the development of strong, healthy and supportive communities.				
Community Services	\$757.0	\$1,050.0	\$805.0	\$798.0
100%	757.0	1,050.0	805.0	798.0
Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)	1,701.0		1,701.0	1,701.0
7.5%	127.6		127.6	127.6
3.4 Address the needs, strengths and abilities of vulnerable populations.				
Disaster Human Services Case Management	\$0.0		\$0.0	\$2.0
100%	0.0		0.0	2.0
Refugee and Entrant Assistance	668.0		647.0	755.0
82%	547.8		530.5	619.1
Native American Programs	48.0		50.0	50.0
100%	48.0		50.0	50.0
Developmental Disabilities	186.0		190.0	191.0
85.5%	159.0		162.5	163.3
Domestic Violence	127.0		132.0	133.0
100%	127.0		132.0	133.0
4: Scientific Research and Development Advance scientific and biomedical research and development related to health and human services.				
4.1 Strengthen the pool of qualified health and behavioral science researchers.				
4.2 Increase basic scientific knowledge to improve human health and human development.				
4.3 Conduct and oversee applied research to improve health and well-being.				
4.4 Communicate and transfer research results into clinical, public health and human service practice.				
Full Cost Total	\$47,621.0	\$10,150.0	\$50,881.0	\$50,239.0

Methodology

The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) calculates full cost by allocating its Federal Administration indirect costs¹³⁵ proportionately among program areas on the basis of direct (FTE). ACF has been using the same indirect cost methodology since FY 1998 and ACF has received eight consecutive clean CFO audit opinions on its financial statements. ACF uses the Staff Resource Survey to determine indirect cost elements. ACF offices complete this survey, noting the total number of staff working directly on program activities and the total number of staff not working directly on program activities (such as planning, administrative, and front office staff). Offices are instructed to include fractions of staff for those working in more than program area as well as ACF staff detailed into the office from another ACF office; offices are asked not to include contractors or detailees outside of the office. The survey respondents are notified that since auditors will review this process, all offices must be prepared to provide documentation explaining how the numbers were calculated. The survey results in two groupings: FTEs working directly on program activities, and FTEs not working directly on program activities. For the first group, FTEs are directly linked to each program area. For the second group, ACF distributes FTEs from each office to the program areas, proportionate to the percentage of staff in each office working directly in each program area. Lastly, the FTEs (both from the first and second groups) allocated to each of the program areas are summed, and divided by the total FTEs funded by Federal Administration dollars. The resultant proportion is multiplied by Federal Administration funding, and added to the program area funding (see table above).

ACF links performance measures to full costs by estimating the percentage of costs for which a program area's performance measures account. To make these estimates, ACF compares the performance measures with the legislative goals of the programs, using the programs' logic models as a framework to map the links between resources, activities, and outcomes.

¹³⁵ E.g., salaries and benefits for staff not working *directly* on one of the fourteen program activities.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMPLETED PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Further detail on the findings and recommendations of the following program evaluations completed during FY 2008 can be found at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/pic/performance/> including program improvement results from the evaluation (dates in parenthesis correspond to Policy Information Center [PIC] publication dates):

Abuse, Neglect, Adoption and Foster Care Research:

- Estimates of Supplemental Security Income Eligibility for Children in Out-of-home Placements (03/10/08)
- Evaluation of the Early Start to Emancipation Preparation Tutoring Program: LA County (08/20/08)
- Evaluation of the Life Skills Training Program: LA County (08/20/08)
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being, Brief 10: From Early Involvement with Child Welfare Services to School Entry (09/30/08)
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being, Brief 11: Adolescents Involved with Child Welfare, A Transition to Adulthood (09/30/08)
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being, Brief 14: Need for Adoption Among Infants Investigated for Child Maltreatment (09/30/08)

Child Care Research:

- Evaluation of Child Care Subsidy Strategies: Findings from Experimental Test of Three Language/Literacy Interventions in Child Care Centers in Miami-Dade County (09/30/08)
- National Study of Child Care for Low-Income Families (10/01/07)

Head Start Research:

- Migrant and Seasonal Head Start Research Design Development Project (06/11/08)
- Oral Health Promotion, Prevention and Treatment Strategies for Head Start Families: Early Findings from the Oral Health Initiative Evaluation Volume I and II (09/01/08 and 09/29/08)

Strengthening Families and Healthy Marriage Research:

- Implementation of the Building Strong Families Program (01/07/08)
- Piloting a Community Approach to Healthy Marriage Initiatives in Three Sites: Chicago, Boston, and Jacksonville (09/12/2008)

Welfare and Employment Research:

- Assets for Independence Act Evaluation, Impact Study (02/28/08)
- The Employment Retention and Advancement Project: A Comparison of Two Job Club Strategies: The Effects of Enhanced Versus Traditional Job Clubs in Los Angeles (08/02/08)
- The Employment Retention and Advancement Project: Results from the Valuing Individual Success and Increasing Opportunities Now (VISION) Program in Salem, Oregon (01/02/08)
- Welfare Time Limits: An Update on State Policies, Implementation, and Effects on Families (04/01/08)
- Teaching Self-Sufficiency: An Impact and Benefit Cost Analysis of a Home Visitation and Life Skills Education Program (09/30/08)

An Assessment of the Compassion Capital Fund Targeted Capacity Building Program: Findings from a Retrospective Survey of Grantees (06/28/08)

DISCONTINUED PERFORMANCE MEASURES TABLE

Child Welfare - Foster Care

Measure	FY	Target	Result
Maintain the percentage of children who exit the foster care system through reunification within one year of placement. <i>(Outcome) (Foster Care)</i>	2008	68.0%	Oct-09
	2007	68.0%	67.0% (Target Not Met)
	2006	68.0%	67.5% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2005	68.0%	67.4% (Target Not Met)
Decrease the percentage of children who exit foster care through emancipation. <i>(Outcome) (Foster Care)</i>	2008	7.0%	Oct-09
	2007	7.0%	9.4% (Target Not Met)
	2006	7.0%	9.3% (Target Not Met)
	2005	5.0%	8.5% (Target Not Met)