# DEPARTMENT of HEALTH and HUMAN SERVICES

## ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

*FY 2011 Online Performance Appendix*

**Introduction**

The FY 2011 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 2011 Congressional Justifications and Online Performance Appendices, the Agency Financial Report, and the HHS Summary of Performance and Financial Information. These documents are available at http://www.hhs.gov/budget/.

The FY 2011 Congressional Justifications and accompanying Online Performance Appendices contain the updated FY 2009 Annual Performance Report and FY 2011 Annual Performance Plan. The Agency Financial Report provides fiscal and high-level performance results. The HHS Summary of Performance and Financial Information summarizes key past and planned performance and financial information.

**MESSAGE FROM THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY**

I am pleased to present the FY 2011 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)
Carmen R. Nazario
Assistant Secretary
for Children and Families

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

## FY 2011 ONLINE PERFORMANCE APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| FY 2011 BUDGET | PAGE |
|---|---|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| TRANSMITTAL LETTER | 2 |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | 3 |
| SUMMARY OF TARGETS AND RESULTS TABLE | 4 |
| PERFORMANCE DETAIL (BY ACTIVITY) | 5 |
| AGENCY SUPPORT FOR HHS STRATEGIC PLAN | 109 |
| FULL COST TABLE | 111 |
| SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMPLETED PROGRAM EVALUATIONS | 114 |
| DISCONTINUED PERFORMANCE MEASURES | 116 |

## ACF SUMMARY OF TARGETS AND RESULTS TABLE[1]

| Fiscal Year | Total Targets | Targets with Results Reported | Percent of Targets with Results Reported | Total Targets Met | Percent of Targets Met |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2006 | 69 | 69 | 100% | 40 | 58% |
| 2007 | 81 | 80 | 99% | 49 | 61% |
| 2008 | 86 | 81 | 94% | 46 | 57% |
| 2009 | 92 | 27 | 29% | 22 | 81% |
| 2010 | 99 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2011 | 91 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

[1] Figures in the table reflect only measures that are reported in this FY 2011 Online Performance Appendix. Performance measures that have been discontinued are not included in this count. The FY 2011 Online Performance Appendix also includes eight developmental measures and one qualitative measure, which likewise are not included in the table.

# FY 2011 PERFORMANCE APPENDIX
# ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

## PERFORMANCE DETAIL


**DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS** ..... **6**

Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program ..... 6
*1. Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)* ..... *6*
Child Care and Development Block Grant ..... 11
*2. Child Care and Development Block Grant* ..... *11*
Children and Families Services Programs ..... 17
*3. Head Start* ..... *17*
*4. Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs* ..... *23*
*Community-Based Abstinence Education* ..... *26*
*6. Mentoring Children of Prisoners* ..... *27*
*7. Child Abuse Prevention and Child Welfare Programs* ..... *31*
*8. Developmental Disabilities* ..... *59*
*9. Native American Programs* ..... *64*
*Compassion Capital Fund* ..... *67*
*11. Federal Administration* ..... *68*
*12. Community Services Block Grant* ..... *71*
*13. Individual Development Accounts (Assets for Independence)* ..... *74*
*14. Family Violence Prevention and Services* ..... *78*
Refugee and Entrant Assistance ..... 81
*15. Transitional and Medical Services* ..... *81*
*16. Matching Grants* ..... *83*
*17. Victims of Trafficking* ..... *86*
*18. Social Services/Targeted Assistance* ..... *89*
*19. Unaccompanied Alien Children* ..... *92*

**MANDATORY PROGRAMS** ..... **95**

Child Support Enforcement and Family Support Programs ..... 95
*20. Child Support Enforcement* ..... *95*
Foster Care and Adoption Assistance ..... 101
Social Services Block Grant ..... 101
*21. Social Services Block Grant* ..... *101*
Promoting Safe and Stable Families ..... 103
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) ..... 104
*22. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)* ..... *104*
Child Care Entitlement ..... 108

# DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS

## *Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program*

### *1. Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)*

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1LT and 1A: Increase the recipiency targeting index score for LIHEAP households having at least one member 60 years or older.[1] *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | Prior Result +5%[2] (2014) | Aug-15 |
| | *2011* | Prior Result + 2% | Aug-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result + 2%[3] | Aug-11 |
| | *2009* | 96 | Aug-10 |
| | *2008* | 96 | 76 (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 94 | 78 (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 92 | 77 (Target Not Met) |
| 1.1LT and 1B: Maintain the recipiency targeting index score of LIHEAP households having at least one member five years or younger.[4] *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | Prior Result +2%[5] (2014) | N/A |
| | *2011* | 110 | Aug-12 |
| | *2010* | 110[6] | Aug-11 |
| | *2009* | 122 | Aug-10 |
| | *2008* | 122 | 110 (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 122 | 110 (Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | 122 | 112 (Target Not Met) |
| 1.1LT and 1C: Increase the ratio of LIHEAP households assisted (heating, cooling, crisis, and weatherization assistance)[7] per $100 of LIHEAP administrative costs. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result + 1% | Aug-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result + 1%[8] | Aug-11 |
| | *2009* | 3.95 | Aug-10 |
| | *2008* | 3.88 | 3.04 (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 3.81 | 3.59 (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 3.74 | 2.95 (Target Not Met) |

[1] This measure is calculated using only heating-assisted homes.
[2] The FY 2014 target is to increase by 5 percent over the FY 2007 actual result.
[3] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been updated based on recent data trends.
[4] This measure is calculated using only heating-assisted homes.
[5] The FY 2014 for this measure is to increase by 2 percent over the FY 2007 actual result.
[6] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been updated based on recent data trends.
[7] The 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 from the states.
[8] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been updated based on recent data trends.

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1LT<br>1A<br>1.1LT<br>1B | State *LIHEAP Household Report* 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 *LIHEAP Household Report* 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 years 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 recipiency data for the previous fiscal year are typically completed in August of the following fiscal year. Consequently, the data are not available in time to modify ACF interventions prior to the current fiscal year (i.e. there is almost a one-year data lag). There are no federal quality control or audit requirements for the data obtained from the *LIHEAP Household Report*. However ACF provides to states an electronic version of the *LIHEAP Household Report* 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 *LIHEAP Grantee Survey* on sources and uses of LIHEAP funds. |
| 1C | *LIHEAP Grantee Survey* and *LIHEAP Household Report* | Each winter, state LIHEAP grantees report on the *LIHEAP Grantee Survey* the amount of obligated LIHEAP administrative costs for the previous fiscal year. These data, along with data from the *LIHEAP Household Report*, 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 following fiscal year. Consequently, the data are not available in time to modify interventions prior to the current fiscal year (i.e. there is almost a one-year data lag). There are no federal quality control or audit requirements for the fiscal data obtained from the *LIHEAP Grantee Survey*. However, as with the *LIHEAP Household Report*, ACF has provided to states an electronic version of the *LIHEAP Grantee Survey* in submitting their data to ACF. The electronic version includes a number of edits that check the data for mathematical mistakes and 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 recipiency targeting index can measure whether the program is serving each of these types of households at a higher rate than their prevalence in the low income household population.

ACF tracks LIHEAP's heating recipiency for elderly and young child households annually through recipiency targeting index scores. These targeting measures are ratios that show to what extent the targeted household type is served by LIHEAP, compared with the incidence of the targeted group within the total income eligible population. The results of LIHEAP's outreach efforts are subject to external factors that may affect the 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) home energy prices; (3) utility deregulation;[9] (4) utility arrearages; (5) 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); (6) perceptions of the program (that may produce barriers to vulnerable households'

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

applying for assistance); (7) low income demographic trends; and (8) the block grant design of LIHEAP.[10] Currently, there is no simple way to analyze the impact of such factors on LIHEAP recipiency targeting performance.

Regarding annual measure 1A, targeting to households with seniors, the FY 2007 recipiency targeting index value rose slightly to 78, while the index over the past three years has consistently remained in the high 70s. In FY 2008, the program achieved an actual targeting index value of 76, despite the program serving a larger number of elderly households. The reason behind the actual index result declining is that the number of income eligible elderly households also increased in FY 2008, which offset the gains of serving more elderly households. ACF's target is to increase the index value by two percent over the prior year's result by FY 2011. The reason for the change is to be more in line with the actual data trends in recent years.

In FY 2009, ACF's Division of Energy Assistance (DEA) joined the Center for Benefit Outreach and Enrollment which is funded by the Administration on Aging (AoA). The purpose of the Center's work is to improve targeting and coordination of benefits to elderly households. ACF also reported in December 2008 on the findings of its study to assess the factors affecting whether a state is a high or low performer with respect to targeting elderly households.[11]

Regarding annual measure 1B, targeting to households with young children, the targeting index value has decreased from 113 in FY 2005 to 110 in FY 2008. The FY 2008 result reflects that the program maintained a consistent level of targeting performance from the prior year which is the first break in a downward decline in index values since the baseline year. Though the FY 2008 actual result of 110 is less than the target of 122, any targeting index value over 100 indicates that the LIHEAP program is still providing effective breadth of outreach to income eligible households with a child under the age of five. ACF has assessed and adjusted the target for FY 2011 to be based on the prior result, plus two percent. The reason for switching to prior result, plus some percentage increase, is a reflection of actual index values in recent years.

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 recipiency data on young child households 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 ACF Regional Offices to further explore these trends and what some states or regions may already be doing to prevent further decline in the recipiency numbers. 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 expectation 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.

In an effort to further improve outreach to elderly and young child households, the program conducted a

[10] 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.

[11] For report, see: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/liheap/targeting_report.html

study on targeting LIHEAP assistance to vulnerable households. This included examining the structure and outreach efforts of a range of federal programs, such as the State Child Health Insurance Program and the Women, Infants and Children program to determine if similar strategies may be used to improve targeting performance. 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. One preliminary finding of the targeting study indicates that, of the states sampled, most performed well in targeting one vulnerable population but performed poorly in targeting the other vulnerable group. ACF intends to further investigate this finding and what appears to be the need to better balance targeting efforts at the state level.

In May 2009, ACF reported on its state rankings of recipiency targeting index values for FY 2006.[12] These state-level rankings will allow ACF and its LIHEAP grantees to better understand which states are high and low performers in targeting elderly and young child households, and begin to analyze why some states may fall substantially below the national target goals. ACF will provide updated state-level rankings annually. The state recipiency targeting rankings provide accountability and feedback on which states are performing at higher levels. They can provide the opportunity for peer technical assistance to state grantees and can serve as a management tool for self-improvement. In June 2009, ACF presented the targeting study findings and the state-level targeting indexes and rankings at the National Energy and Utility Affordability Conference, which many of the state LIHEAP directors attended.

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, regardless of whether it is for heating, cooling, crisis, or weatherization. LIHEAP grantees will begin reporting the unduplicated household count for FY 2011 in order to provide for comprehensive measurement of program recipiency targeting. This new data request will likely increase the targeting scores for both elderly households and young child households because it will reflect the total number of those households served by all forms of LIHEAP assistance. The current targeting index scores only reflect those households receiving heating assistance through LIHEAP. For example, the total unduplicated count will allow households receiving cooling assistance to be included in the total count for the first time. As states that provide cooling assistance tend to serve a large share of elderly households, it is expected that the recipiency targeting measure will likely increase for elderly households because both more elderly households and more total households served are expected to be counted. The unduplicated count will not affect the ratio of LIHEAP income eligible targeted households to total income eligible households because that data are derived from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey. An illustration of how the recipiency targeting measures are calculated is as follows: the number of young child households served is divided by the number of all households served by LIHEAP. That ratio is then divided by the ratio of dividing the number of LIHEAP income eligible young child households by the number of all LIHEAP income eligible households.

ACF has convened a work group of state grantees that has been working for the last year on developing proposed LIHEAP outcome measures to replace or supplement measures 1A and 1B. The work group met November 3-5, 2009 to finalize its plan and intends to submit its complete proposal in December, 2009. The work group has agreed upon a strategy for gaining state support of the new measures. In the meantime, ACF will continue to use the above performance measures.

Efficiency measure 1C focuses on increasing the ratio of the number of households receiving LIHEAP assistance (numerator) to state LIHEAP administrative costs (denominator). As calculated, the measure assumes that the overlap of households receiving more than one type of LIHEAP assistance is constant

[12] ACF provided the information to states in LIHEAP -IM-2009-09 in May 2009 (see http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/liheap/guidance/information_memoranda/indexim2009.html).

from one year to the next. An increase in the ratio potentially indicates an increase in program efficiency through a greater number of LIHEAP households being served at a lower administrative cost. The LIHEAP statute limits LIHEAP grantees' administrative costs to 10 percent of the funds payable. This measure does not indicate whether the sufficiency of LIHEAP services is impacted by the provision of more efficient services. Data for the measure will improve when states provide an unduplicated count of households receiving any type of LIHEAP assistance in FY 2011.

In FY 2006, the ratio of LIHEAP households assisted per $100 of LIHEAP administrative costs declined to 2.95, missing the target of 3.81. In March 2006, Congress appropriated $1 billion in supplemental LIHEAP funds that were then distributed to LIHEAP grantees and the appropriating legislation prohibited these funds from being used for administrative costs. For a number of states, this restriction limited new outreach initiatives and 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.

However, the FY 2007 value of 3.59 reflects a substantial improvement in program efficiency from FY 2006. The change is likely due to the fact that no similar amount or timing of additional LIHEAP funds was appropriated in FY 2007 as occurred in the previous year. In FY 2008, the index value decreased to 3.04. It appears there is a relationship between sizable decreases in the value achieved with those fiscal years that have substantial increases in contingency funding. ACF is exploring possible rationales to explain this relationship to determine if supplemental contingency funding and/or the timing of such release(s) are predominantly used to provide existing recipients with added benefits rather than serve a larger proportion of new applicants. This analysis will be enhanced to analyze FY 2009 during which a dramatic increase in funding occurred and was released in one lump sum at the beginning of that fiscal year.

By FY 2011, the program seeks to improve efficiency by raising the target ratio by one percent over the previous year's result. This is in recognition of the finite limitation of improving efficiency of program administration while operating under a ten percent administrative spending cap. ACF has also been examining the leveraging application rate and successful methods states have used to leverage resources under the Leveraging Incentive Program.

## 2. ***Child Care and Development Block Grant***

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.1LT: Reduce the percentage of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) families with children that are exempt from employment participation because child care is unavailable. *(Outcome)* | *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 85 percent of State Median Income.[1] *(Outcome)* | *2011* | 18% | Mar-13 |
| | *2010* | 17% | Mar-12 |
| | *2009* | 17% | Mar-11 |
| | *2008* | 17% | Mar-10 |
| | *2007* | 17% | Mar-10 |
| | *2006* | 17% | 17% (Target Met) |
| 2B: Increase the proportion of regulated centers and family child care homes that serve families and children receiving child care subsidies. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | 72% | Mar-13 |
| | *2010* | 70% | Mar-12 |
| | *2009* | 69% | Mar-11 |
| | *2008* | 68% | Mar-10 |
| | *2007* | 67% | 68.6% (Target Exceeded)[2] |
| | *2006* | 66% | 68.2% (Target Exceeded)[3] |
| 2.2LT: 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)* | *Out-Year Target* | 42% (FY 2011) | Mar-13 |

[1] This performance measure is included in the FY 2009 CCDF Recovery Act Implementation Plan. 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, and Social Services Block Grant), compared on an annual basis to an estimate of the average monthly number of children eligible for child care subsidies. This measure has been revised to include all children eligible under federal statute (i.e., less than 85 percent of State Median Income); the prior measure reflected a smaller universe of eligible children (i.e., less than 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Level). Under CCDF law, states have substantial flexibility to establish their own rules regarding eligibility for child care subsidies within broad federal guidelines. This estimate does not take into account state-specific eligibility thresholds and other requirements families must meet to receive child care subsidies.

[2] The FY 2007 actual results for this outcome measure reflect final administrative data.

[3] 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jun-12 | *2011* | Prior Result +10% | |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +10% | Jun-11 |
| | *2009* | Prior Result +10% | Jun-10 |
| | *2008* | 12,692 | 10,654 (Target Not Met)[4] |
| | *2007* | 15,217 | 11,538 (Target Not Met)[5] |
| | *2006* | 14,411 | 13,834 (Target Not Met but Improved)[6] |
| 2D: Increase the number of states that have implemented state early learning guidelines in literacy, language, pre-reading, and numeracy for children ages three to five that align with state K-12 standards and are linked to the education and training of caregivers, preschool teachers, and administrators.[7] *(Outcome)* | *2011* | 40 | Mar-12 |
| | *2009* | 35 | Mar-10 |
| | *2007* | 28 | 32 (Target Exceeded) |

| 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), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) expenditure data, and Census Bureau's Current Population Survey. | 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. |
| 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. |

[4] The actual result for CY 2008 was 8 percent less than FY 2007 actual result and 16 percent less than the FY 2008 target.
[5] The CY 2007 actual result is 17 percent under the CY 2006 actual result.
[6] The CY 2006 actual result is 6 percent over the CY 2005 actual result.
[7] 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 |
|---|---|---|
| 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 Council on Accreditation (afterschool program standards, formerly administered by the National Afterschool Association). | 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. CCB is in the process of reviewing the current measures with the aim of strengthening and developing new measures that reflect the Administration's priorities and reauthorization principles, particularly related to promoting quality child care for low-income families.

The Department (DHHS) recently established a number of High Priority Performance Goals with indicators for FY 2010 and the subsequent fiscal years. These new performance goals, which are cross-program and high-priority, are established to supplement the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) specific measures described in this Performance Appendix. Due to the Administration's strong commitment to the CCDF program, as evidenced by the significant investment made by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and the FY 2011 request and efforts to improve quality, the CCDF program is included in two of the new High Priority Performance Goals. One of these high priority goals specifically calls for an increase in the number of low-income children receiving support for access to high quality early care and education settings. As an indicator for this goal, CCB aims in FY 2010 to increase the average monthly number of children served through CCDF by an average of 10,000 and to sustain services for approximately 100,000 children who would not have been served without the critical investment made by ARRA. In addition, HHS has put forward an additional priority performance goal to improve the quality of early care and education programs for low-come children. As an indicator for this goal, the CCB proposes to expand the number of states with Quality Rating Improvement Systems (QRIS) that meet high quality benchmarks as defined by CCB and in coordination with the Department of Education. QRIS provides pathways and support for child care providers to move up to higher standards of quality and increases' parents' knowledge and understanding of the child care options available to them.

Annual measure 2A has been modified to reflect a new denominator, which includes eligible children from families with incomes below the federal statutory threshold of 85 percent of State Median Income (SMI). The prior measure reflected a smaller universe of children from families with incomes below 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Level. In the revised measure 2A, CCB aims to maintain the proportion of children served by CCDF, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) child care funding at 18 percent as compared to all eligible children whose families are under the federal statutory income threshold of 85 percent of SMI in FY 2011. 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 eligible for child care subsidies in families with incomes below 85 percent of SMI.[8] States have flexibility to establish more restrictive eligibility policies within broad federal guidelines; therefore this measure is an estimate of potentially eligible children under federal rules. Annual measure 2A is an indicator of the extent to which eligible children under the most inclusive family eligibility limits under federal law are being served throughout the states.

The targets and results for measure 2A have been changed to reflect this revised universe of eligible children. Based on historical actual data, in FY 2006, 17 percent of eligible children in families with incomes below 85 percent of SMI were served. The total estimated average monthly number of children served (the numerator) was 2.5 million children and an estimated 14.6 million children (the denominator) were estimated to be eligible for child care subsidies during an average month in FY 2006 based on 85 percent of SMI. Historical actual data for FY 2007 and FY 2008 are expected to be available in January of 2010. CCB has established a goal of 18 percent for FY 2011. CCDF received an additional $2 billion in one-time discretionary funding under ARRA, which is required to be liquidated by the end of FY 2011. Additionally, the President's FY 2011 budget would provide increased resources for the program in FY 2011. In determining future performance targets for FY 2010 and FY 2011, this context has been considered. The number of children who receive child care subsidies may stabilize or slightly increase due to these increased resources; however due to difficult economic circumstances ACF expects that growth in the total number of eligible children could outpace or negate any increase in the number of children served, which makes increasing the target difficult. To meet the target, the program will continue to improve program administration and provide technical assistance on eligibility processes to ensure program efficiency and maximize the number of eligible low-income children served.

Performance and 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

[8] 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 assumes that children are eligible if they are under age 13 (or are age 13-18 and have special needs), do not have income that can be disregarded for eligibility purposes, live in households where all residing parents work at least 1 hour per week, and live in families with incomes under 85 percent of State Median Income (SMI), regardless of their poverty status. The denominator is computed by the Urban Institute's TRIM3 microsimulation model and is based on the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey-ASEC data.

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. 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. ARRA funding may improve performance under this measure by supporting child care services and by encouraging more centers and child care homes to participate in the voucher program. At the same time, the recession may negatively affect providers. CCB will continue to monitor the impacts of the economy and ARRA funding on future performance. For FY 2011, CCB aims for the proportion of regulated centers and family care homes serving family and children receiving child care subsidies to be at least 72 percent. ACF has increased the target in light of the Administration's planned efforts to promote performance under this measure through efforts to improve provider payment processes and to encourage the expansion of centers and family child care homes in underserved communities.

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 Council on Accreditation (afterschool standards formerly administered by the National Afterschool Association).[9] 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 2008, CCB did not meet its target of 10 percent improvement for measure 2C: 10,654 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 the last two years is 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 or awarded quality ratings through state-recognized systems. CCB is exploring options for collecting this state-specific information. By CY 2011, CCB expects to increase the number of accredited child care centers and homes by at least 10 percent over the CY 2010 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 and related efforts, such as the development of Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS). A growing number of states have already developed QRIS that is often linked to national accreditation standards that assess the quality of providers for purposes such as consumer education and differential subsidy reimbursement rates. HHS plans to build on these state efforts to improve the quality of care. The President's proposed Early Learning Challenge Fund will support effective innovative approaches to promote early learning for young children, including the development of evidence-based quality rating systems structured with progressive levels of quality, which may be used across early learning settings

[9] NAA transferred its accreditation process to the Council on Accreditation (COA) effective September 1, 2008. CCB will monitor the impact of the transfer on this measure (annual measure 2C).

and programs.

Results for annual measure 2D reflect, in part, 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 and 40 by CY 2011. As data is reported biennially, there is no target for CY 2010.

## *3. Head Start*

| Measure[1] | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3.5LT: Increase the percentage of children completing the Head Start program rated by parent as being in excellent or very good health. The baseline is 77 percent in FY 1998. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 85% (FY 2013) | Jan-14 |
| 3.6LT and 3B: Increase the percentage of Early Head Start children completing all medical screenings. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 95% (FY 2014) | Jan-15 |
| | *2011* | 92% | Jan-12 |
| | *2010* | 91% | Jan-11 |
| | *2009* | 89% | 87.4% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2008* | 87% | 85.7% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2007* | 85% | 85.2% (Target Exceeded)[2] |
| | *2006* | 83% | 82.8% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| 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. The baseline is 68.4 percent in FY 1998. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 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. The baseline is 51 percent in FY 2004. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 58% (FY 2013) | Jan-14 |
| | *2010* | 55% | Jan-11 |
| ± | *2011* | 100%[3] | Jan-12 |
| | *2010* | 85%[4] | Jan-11 |

[1] Long term goals 3.1 – 3.4 and annual measure 3A are discontinued per the elimination of the National Reporting System (NRS). Please reference the Discontinued Measures section at the end of this document for a listing of these performance measures.
[2] The FY 2007 actual result for this measure has been updated as a result of revised analysis of the data for that year.
[3] The FY 2011 target for this measure reflects the requirement of the 2007 Reauthorization of Head Start that, by October 1, 2011, all Head Start teachers must have at least an AA degree in early childhood education or a related field with pre-school teaching experience or have a BA degree and been admitted into the Teach for America program.
[4] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been updated given the updated FY 2011 target per the 2007 Reauthorization of Head Start.

| Measure[1] | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *2009* | 75% | 77.1% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | 73% | 74.7% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 71% | 74.2% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 65% | 71.6% (Target Exceeded) |
| 3D: Reduce the percent of grantees with repeat deficiencies through the provision of targeted technical assistance.[5] *(developmental) (Outcome)* | *2009* | Set Baseline | Feb-10 |
| | *2006* | N/A | 25 grantees (Historical Actual)[6] |
| 3E: Decrease the number of grantees with deficiencies in early childhood development. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result -10% | Feb-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result -10% | Feb-11 |
| | *2009* | 5 grantees[7] | Feb-10 |
| | *2008* | 21 grantees | 6 grantees (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 23 grantees | 5 grantees (Target Exceeded)[8] |
| | *2006* | Set Baseline | 26 grantees (Baseline) |
| 3F: Decrease under-enrollment in Head Start programs, thereby increasing the number of children served per dollar. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result -0.1PP | Jan-12 |
| | *2010* | 0.8% (Prior Result -0.1PP) | Jan-11 |
| | *2009* | 1.4% | 0.9% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | 1.5% | 1.3% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 2.8% | 1.5% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 3.6% | 0.7% (Target Exceeded) |

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

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

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

[8] 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 | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 3.5LT<br>3.7LT<br>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<br>3B<br>3C<br>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<br>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. |

The Department (DHHS) recently proposed a number of High Priority Performance Goals and indicators for FY 2010 and subsequent fiscal years involving both the Head Start and Child Care programs. One of these high priority goals calls for an increase in the number of low-income children receiving support for access to high quality early care and education settings. As an indicator for this goal, Head Start aims to increase the number of children served through Head Start by 14,000 and increase the number of children served through Early Head Start by 50,000. In addition to increasing the number of children served, HHS has put forward an additional priority performance goal to improve the quality of early care and education programs for low-come children. As milestones for this goal, the Office of Head Start (OHS) plans to advance recompetition among Head Start grantees, implement revised program performance standards, and promote community efforts to integrate early childhood services.

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 2008-2009 program year, 87.4 percent of Early Head Start children completed all medical screenings expected for their age. This result represents continued improvement upon the results from FY 2005 (82.1 percent), FY 2006 (82.8 percent) FY 2007 (85.2 percent), and FY 2008 (85.7 percent) but falls short of the FY 2009 target of 89 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 2011 target of 92 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 week[9], 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 exceeded the FY 2009 target. 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, thus the goal for FY 2011 is to reach 100 percent. The PIR showed that in 2009, 77.1 percent of Head Start teachers had an AA degree or higher, exceeding the target of 75 percent. More Head Start teachers have degrees than ever before, and are better equipped to deliver quality instruction to Head Start children. Of the 55,898 Head Start teachers in FY 2009, 43,077 have an AA degree or higher; of these degreed teachers, 18,664 have an AA degree, 20,589 have a BA degree, and 3,824 have a graduate degree. Not included in the percentage are an additional 10,178 teachers with a Child Development Associate (CDA) or state credential (no degree) and 699 teachers who do not have a degree but are enrolled in Early Childhood Education (ECE) degree programs. The total FY 2009 figure represents an increase of 951 degreed teachers over the previous year. The program expects to improve by at least 5.9 percentage points over the FY 2009 result through continued program support in FY 2010. 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

[9] Urban Institute, National Survey of America's Families

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. In June of 2009 all Head Start programs were provided the opportunity to apply for one-time technical assistance funds (available through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)) for the purpose of meeting the statutory qualification requirements for teachers and teaching assistants in Section 648A of the Head Start Act.

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 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 baseline number 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 2011, the program expects to reduce this result by 10 percent from the FY 2010 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 2008-2009 program year, Head Start grantees had, on average, not enrolled 0.9 percent of the children they were funded to serve, exceeding the FY 2009 target of 1.4 percent. This represents approximately 7,700 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 2011, the program expects under-enrollment in Head Start programs to be 0.1 percentage point less than the FY 2010 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. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 86% (FY 2014) | Dec-14 |
| | *2011* | 85% | Dec-11 |
| | *2010* | 85% | Dec-10 |
| | *2009* | 85% | 86% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | 85% | 86% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 84% | 86% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 83% | 82% (Target Not Met) |
| 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. *(Outcome and Efficiency)* | *Out-Year Target* | 60% (FY 2014) | Dec-14 |
| | *2011* | 56% | Dec-11 |
| | *2010* | 55% | Dec-10 |
| | *2009* | 53.6% | 53.2% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2008* | 51.6% | 59.7% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 49.6% | 57.5% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 47.6% | 50.0% (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. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +2% | Dec-11 |
| | *2010* | 40% (Prior Result +2%) | Dec-10 |
| | *2009* | 35% | 39.0% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | 34% | 42.3% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 33% | 42.1% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 32% | 32.3% (Target Exceeded) |
| 4D: Increase then maintain at 96[1] percent the proportion of youth who are prevented from running away through Basic Center Programs (BCP) in-home/off-site services as a percentage of | *2011* | 96% | Dec-11 |
| | *2010* | 96% | Dec-10 |
| | *2009* | Set Baseline | 96.4% (Baseline) |

[1] The maintenance rate of 96 is the average of the FY 2008 and FY 2009 actual results.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| all youth receiving such services. *(Outcome)* | *2008* | Pre-Baseline | 95.6%[2] (Historical actual) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 4.1LT<br>4A<br>4.2LT<br>4B<br>4C<br>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. |

Long-term objective 4.1/annual measure 4A is the safe and appropriate exit rate, 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.[3] During FY 2009, the program sustained an 86 percent safe exit rate, surpassing the target of 85 percent. The program held onto its substantial performance gains in FY 2007 after being below targets over a number of years 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 through conferences, technical assistance providers, conference calls, and the direct efforts of federal staff. Another factor was the second year of operations by two new national resource centers co-located at the University of Oklahoma, one for technical assistance and one for training, instead of the ten regional networks in place prior to FY 2008. The above strategies will be continued each year as the program adds new grantees or experiences staff turnover, which is common in community-based organizations. Through FY 2011, the program expects to maintain an 85 percent safe exit rate.

Long-term objective 4.2/annual measure 4B is the program completion rate. It is based on the number of exiting TLP youth who have completed their programs and transitional living plans plus those who were able to leave early with a positive opportunity. The universe for this measure is <u>all</u> exiting TLP youth, including youth who leave the program with no plan, drop out, or are expelled. In FY 2006, the measure first reached the 50 percent mark and achieved 57.5 percent in FY 2007. The FY 2009 result was 53.2 percent, within a fraction of the target for the year. One possible reason for the decline is that a higher proportion of TLPs operating during FY 2009 (just under 50 percent) were new starts, compared to FY 2008, which included just over 40 percent new starts. While the number of youth served in new starts varies from year to year, the substantially lower concentration of more experienced grantees providing services during FY 2009 may have caused the decline in the completion rate from the previous year. The percent of youth who complete their residencies as planned reflects both the effectiveness and efficiency

[2] The FY 2008 pre-baseline result for annual measure 4D represents partial year data for the last six months of FY 2008 only.

[3] 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 one reason why the BCP rate has exceeded TLP's rate over the years. Additionally, the preponderance of older youth in TLP affects the average tenure of youth in residencies, because older youth may be more inclined to "go it alone" and fend for themselves.

of grantees in keeping youth focused on their futures. Not surprisingly, RHYMIS data has shown that improvements in education and employment status improve after tenures of at least 60 days, generally advantaging youth who are committed to their plans over a longer term, while dropouts or expellees usually do not remain in the program as long and thus may not be as well prepared. Naturally, youth who complete their transitional plans and programs also have stayed in the program longer. (In FY 2009, the average tenure for program completers, including early completions was 7.2 months, while the tenure for dropouts and expulsions averaged 3.8 months, with similar disparities in FY 2008, 8.2 months compared to 5.5 months.) Moreover, dropouts or expellees may have been unready or less committed. For this reason, the Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) encourages formal assessments of youth before they enter the residencies to determine the suitability of the often rigorous TLP experience to the needs and capacities of an individual youth. While 3,930 youth entered TLP services in FY 2009, many more (5,129) had to be turned away or referred elsewhere due to lack of residential resources. Program completion and longer tenures tend to lead to safer exits. 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 their goals and recommit to the program. Several new RHYMIS data elements were added in mid-2008 to measure the extent of pre-residential assessments and other services, respites, and time-outs. Numerous services such as counseling, skill-building, or assessment can be provided to youth eligible for TLP, although not yet admitted. FYSB will review the first full year of data (FY 2009) to learn more about non-residential alternatives to full residency. However, as early as FY 2007, FYSB project officers were intentionally encouraging grantees to decrease dropping out and widen service and aftercare options for potential expellees through non-residential means. That year produced a dramatic increase in program completion rates over FY 2006 and earlier. Future targets will be based on annual two percent increases in the target rate since the FY 2004 baseline. By FY 2011, the program expects to achieve a 56 percent completion rate.

Annual measure 4C incorporates a proxy for positive youth development: the percentage of all of exiting TLP youth who have participated in Community Service Learning (CSL) events or activities. CSL is intended to strengthen a youth's civil identity and his or her sense of being 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 2009 result of 39.0 percent remains well above the FY 2006 level.. Making a meaningful contribution to the community can be a powerful stimulant to self-efficacy and pro-social attitudes.[4] 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 encouragement to reflect on the meaning of the activity are vital ingredients. As with the other measures, the intentional and energetic role of regional FYSB staff has been essential in spreading ideas about engaging young people's altruism and community identity. FYSB leadership and project officers encouraged the creation of CSL experiences for youth who might benefit. (Not all youth do so.) Technical assistance materials on a wide variety of CSL designs were created and distributed at meetings and conferences and by the technical support service for RHYMIS (which grantees frequently access). By FY 2011, the program expects a continuing trend of two percent increases over the previous year's actual result. Since CSL may not be appropriate for all youth in all situations, FYSB does not plan ever-increasing target levels.

Annual measure 4D is about risk prevention. Because this data element was added to RHYMIS mid-FY 2008, the baseline is derived from the average of FY 2008 and FY 2009 results, or 96.0 percent. FYSB's goal is to maintain this already high FY 2008-2009 success rate. This measure is a specialized version of the safe and appropriate exit rate for Basic Center Program (BCP) youth who receive (often non-residential) preventive services (i.e. services geared toward prevention of youth running away and other

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

crises). In FY 2009 about 14 percent of youth exiting from BCP were diverted from running away and did not need to enter the shelter unless for respite in a neutral space during a family-based intervention. In this BCP subgroup, the safe and appropriate placement/discharge rate was higher than for the fully residential cases. Some of these youth may not have remained in or returned to their homes, but were placed in alternative settings in their best interests, such as foster care. These non-sheltered youth and their families received a range of preventive and supportive services, such as conflict mediation and counseling aimed at interpersonal skill building, basic life skills, educational advancement, employment, 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 such services and ultimately find a safe and appropriate living situation, whether remaining in the home or not. The universe of annual measure 4D includes all youth receiving the preventive services, and the measure is calculated after excluding any of this group who in effect abandon the services and choose the street or disappear altogether (i.e., unsafe exits as defined for BCP; see footnote under 4A).

The exit status of youth who enter the shelter directly without such advance services provide a useful comparison: the youth receiving special services tend to have more favorable discharge results, with a 96.4 percent safe exit rate. The corresponding FY 2009 BCP rate for youth who entered the shelter directly, without preventive services, was 92.1 percent, and it was 92.6 percent for all BCP youth. All three rates are above the 90-91 percent average rate for all BCP youth over a number of recent years. The overall precarious exit rate (which would include running away from both the BCP and the family) was more than cut in half among youth who received preventive services compared to those who did not. In a population as diverse as runaway youth, a selection bias is not unlikely between those who seek help (often with family involvement) before leaving home altogether and those who come to the shelter as runaways or throwaways[5] after already suffering through chronic or escalating crises. However, successful performance in this measure can demonstrate that preventive, non-residential intervention can protect youth from crises like running away at least as well as fulltime shelter occupancy. BCP programs are required by statute to do community outreach, and these results show that non-residential services, as well as marketing, information-sharing or community partnering, can be part of an outreach strategy with immediate and positive results for youth and families in at-risk situations.

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. FYSB's goal is to gain approval for this evaluation during FY 2010. This study will observe how youth fare during program residency and during six and twelve months after they exit from TLP, in terms of health, housing, educational completion, employments, risk moderation, and other factors. These outcomes will be compared to the experiences, demographics, TLP services received and other characteristics to determine if there are patterns linking such factors with better or poorer outcomes after program exit.

## *Community-Based Abstinence Education*

Please see the Discontinued Measures Section for performance measures related to this program, which was eliminated in the FY 2010 appropriation.

[5] "Throwaways" are youth who are abandoned by guardians or coercively expelled from their place of residence.

## 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.[1] *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +2% | Dec-11 |
| | *2010* | 40.1% (Prior Result +2%) | Dec-10 |
| | *2009* | 32.3% | 39.3% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | 35% | 31.7% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 60% | 34.4% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 30% | 28.4% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| 6.2LT and 6B: Increase the proportion of mentees in active mentoring relationships that have already been sustained more than 12 months. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 40% (FY 2014) | Dec-14 |
| | *2011* | 24% | Dec-11 |
| | *2010* | 22% | Dec-10 |
| | *2009* | 22% | 36.3% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | 22% | 29.8% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 20% | 33% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 18% | 26.3% (Target Exceeded) |
| 6D: Increase then maintain at 95 percent the proportion of youth that consider their mentoring relationship to be of "high quality." *(Outcome)* | *2011* | 95% | Dec-11 |
| | *2010* | 95% | Dec-10 |
| | *2009* | 90% | 95.4% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *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 | *2010* | Perform data analysis and issue report | Dec-10 |
| | *2009* | Conduct follow up surveys | Jan-10 |

[1] Percentages are measured in the final quarter of the year among grantees who have received MCP funding for at least twelve months, which includes all grantees in FY 2009. The numerator does not include stable and continuing matches in the caseload that reached the 11 month point or less during the final quarter.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| prisoners as measured after at least 12 months in one-to-one mentoring relationships in the MCP program. *(Outcome)* | *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) |
| 6F: Increase the proportion of MCP Program matches that endure beyond three months to 80 percent of all matches that end prematurely or ahead of schedule. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result +2% | Dec-11 |
| | *2010* | 83.3% (Prior Result +2%) | Dec-10 |
| | *2009* | 83.0% | 81.7%[2] (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2008* | 82.0% | 72.5% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 80.0% | 74.0% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | 75.0% | 78.4% (Target Exceeded) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 6.1LT<br>6A<br>6.2LT<br>6B<br>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. |
| 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 2009 was a successful performance year for the Mentoring Children of Prisoners (MCP) program, administered by the Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB). MCP achieved 161,607 matches (including 8,130 matches from the voucher demonstration project). The MCP program focuses on increasing the volume, the sustainability, and the quality of mentoring relationships for children of prisoners and provides a wide range of support for these objectives. A new MCP Training and Technical Assistance Center was established in 2008, and began work in early FY 2009. Regional and national conferences were held and numerous site visits conducted. More than 95 percent of MCP youth rated their relationships positively. The sustainability and longevity of relationships are also vital indicators of

[2] Matches lasting three months or less were only 1.3 percent of the entire 4th quarter active caseload. "Prematurely" generally means "did not last the full 12 month commitment."

relationship quality, and the program's performance in this dimension was above targets and better than all previous years' results.

Long-term objective 6.1 and annual measure 6A reached 39.3 percent in FY 2009, improving significantly over FY 2008 by increasing the proportion of MCP matches that endured at least 12 months. Performance exceeded the FY 2009 target of 32.3 percent. Research shows that relationships that last at least six months are associated with the most positive youth benefits.[3] Relationships that endure a year or more are evidence of a strong and possibly long term bond. Some mentees drop out of the program or are in transient or unstable families and thus lose contact with the grantee, but programs must also work hard to find and retain volunteer mentors. In FY 2011, the program will work to increase performance on this measure to 40.1 percent (two percent over the FY 2009 actual result).

Long-term objective 6.2 and annual measure 6B, based on the percentage of cases lasting longer than 12 months, reached 36.3 percent in FY 2009, exceeding the 22.0 percent target. This is the longest-living group of cases, and includes the 12-month-only cases in measure 6A. By FY 2011, the program expects to maintain the new highs for 6A and 6B. This is challenging because volunteer mentors have met their commitments after 12 months and may or may not seek to renew these sometimes challenging relationships.

As the program continues to expand rapidly, new cases are added throughout the year. Thus, many intact mentoring relationships with long lives ahead of them are not counted in this measure because the mentor and child were started their match less than a full 12 months in the past. For example, 10- and 11-month matches are not included in the percentage. The offsetting effect between expansion of the caseload and duration of matches will continue as long as the program keeps growing. Consequently, the duration factor may be at or approaching its optimum output as long as new matches are being added at a robust rate.

Intensive technical assistance, oversight and support from federal staff help sustain 214 grantees nationwide. Many of the faith- and community-based MCP organizations are new to the federal grants process and need help with many challenges. Starting up a new local program requires building infrastructure, hiring staff, developing a strategic plan, and establishing partnerships within the community.

The primary objective of the MCP program is to promote positive, healthy mentoring relationships. Their quality, from the child's perspective, is measured by 6D. These relationships are expected to promote successful outcomes. The research on mentoring demonstrates that a child's positive assessment of a mentoring experience and its longevity, stability and/or dependability are strongly associated with positive outcomes. ACF grantees are trained to conduct annual surveys using the "Relationship Quality Instrument." Beginning in the summer of 2006, grantees have administered the survey to a subset of young people and submitted results through the ACF Online Data Collection system. Survey respondents are youth aged nine years or older in relationships with the same mentor that had lasted nine months or longer as of July 1 of each year. In phone interviews MCP youth respond 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.

Field tests in similar mentoring programs have shown that a child's satisfaction with the quality of his or

[3] 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.

her mentoring experience is linked with more positive outcomes, including increased self-confidence and scholastic competence.[4] In FY 2009, 95.4 percent of the 7,108 MCP children who were surveyed (responding on a Likert scale of one for least satisfaction to four for greatest) reported an average satisfaction of three or more, sustaining the FY 2008 average.

Long-term objective 6.3/annual measure 6E refers to FYSB's independent longitudinal evaluation of MCP. The evaluation utilizes a comparison-based, difference-in-difference design to discover the program's effect upon individual child outcomes, such as school attendance, academic performance, risk reduction, and youth development. Youth were surveyed at baseline and again at least one year later. 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.[5] The MCP study uses instruments compatible with the school mentoring program and is intended to assess baseline and outcome differences, if any, between the sample of MCP participants and the controls in the school mentoring study sample.

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 were administered after cases passed the 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.

In FY 2009, efficiency measure 6F reached 81.7 percent, slightly missing the target of 83 percent, but exceeded the FY 2008 result. In the final quarter of FY 2009 in a total active caseload of 31,300 cases, there were only 403 cases that ended after three months or less. Thus, very short-lived cases were less than 1.3 percent of the active caseload. Moreover, 81.7 percent of all matches that ended ahead of schedule (i.e., prematurely) endured beyond three months. Mentoring experts estimate that, in mentoring programs, "[o]ne half of all volunteer [mentoring] relationships dissolve within a few months."[6] The 2,203 matches which ceased "ahead of schedule" were only 7 percent of the active caseload in the final quarter of FY 2009, and many of these may have lasted more than six months or almost a year. Matches which end within the first three months represent a significant investment loss, because mentoring costs are largely generated by outreach to families and the recruitment, screening, training and preparation of mentors before the matches even begin. More importantly, premature cessations are potentially harmful to a child if he or she loses trust or feels guilty or abandoned.[7] By carefully matching adults and children and providing supportive activities, grantees protect the start-up investment and strengthen the odds in favor of continuing relationships. By FY 2011, the program expects an improvement of at least two percent over FY 2010's result.

In order to continue to achieve high performance on all performance measures, FYSB project officers and the MCP training and technical assistance support center work closely to provide resources, tools and techniques to MCP grantees, helping them establish, support and sustain high quality mentoring relationships.

---

[4] Rhodes J., Reddy, R., Roffman, J., and Grossman J.B. (March, 2005). Promoting Successful Youth Mentoring Relationships: A Preliminary Screening Questionnaire. The Journal of Primary Prevention, 26:2, 147-167.

[5] 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.

[6] Rhodes, 2002, *op cit*.

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

## *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: One state or jurisdiction 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 nine by 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)* | *Out-Year Target* | 9 states (FY 2016) | Oct-16 |
| | *2010* | 1 state[1] | 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)* | *2011* | Prior Result -0.05 | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result -0.05[2] | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 7.16 | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 7.17 | 7.18 (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2007* | 7.26 | 7.32[3] (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 6.46 | 7.38[4] (Target Not Met) |
| 7B: Decrease the percentage of children with substantiated or indicated reports of maltreatment that have a repeated | *2011* | Prior Result -0.2% | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result -0.2% | Oct-11 |

[1] The Children's Bureau has made changes to the CFSR process that have resulted in a more consistent and strict assessment of a state's ability to meet outcome measures and systemic factors. Based on a reassessment of current data on state performance, ACF has revised the targets for FY 2010 targets for all long term CFSR goals.

[2] The FY 2010 and FY 2011 targets for measure 7A have been updated given the current economic climate and recent data trends.

[3] The actual result for FY 2007 has been updated as a result of revised state data submissions.

[4] The actual result for FY 2006 has been updated as a result of revised state data submissions.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| substantiated or indicated report of maltreatment within six months.[5] *(CAPTA) (Outcome)* | *2009* | 7% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 7% | 6.7% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 7% | 6.8% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 7% | 7.8% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| 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)* | *2011* | Prior Result -5% | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result -5% | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 62.73 hrs | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 75.05 hrs | 66.03 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 62.23 hrs | 82.04 hrs[6] (Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | 63.65 hrs | 60.00 hrs[7] (Target Exceeded) |
| 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)* | *2011* | Prior Result +3PP | Aug-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +3PP | Aug-11 |
| | *2009* | 40% | Aug-10 |
| | *2008* | 33% | 37% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 30% | 34%[8] (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | Set Baseline | 29%[9] (Baseline) |

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

[5] 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.

[6] The FY 2007 actual result for measure 7C has been revised due to updated state data submissions.

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

[8] The FY 2007 actual result for measure 7D has been revised due to updated state data submissions.

[9] The FY 2006 actual result for measure 7D has been revised due to updated state data submissions.

| 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<br>7B<br>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. |
| 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 FY 2010 and FY 2011 improvement are based on an annual reduction of 0.05 in the rate of first-time victims. It is important to note that continually achieving consistent reductions in the annual rate of first-time maltreatment victims will be difficult particularly given the current economic climate, though it remains the goal of the program to reduce this rate in order to protect more children from maltreatment. Based on the most recent submitted data, ACF has seen incremental improvement in this area with both fiscal years 2006 and 2007 data updated to reflect lower rates than originally reported. Data for FY 2008 reflect continued progress toward meeting the target of 7.17 with rates reduced to 7.18.

Annual measure 7B (repeat child maltreatment) evaluates the trend in the percentage of children with substantiated or indicated reports of repeat maltreatment. From FY 2005 to FY 2008, the national rate of repeat maltreatment has continued to fall to 6.8 percent, which represents slightly better performance than the FY 2008 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 2011, 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 median[10] 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. ACF originally reported that in FY 2007, the reported average response time increased to 79 hours. However, updated data show that the average response time in FY 2007 actually increased to 82.04 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. In FY 2008, there was a substantial drop in the average response time down to 66.03 hours, which exceeds the FY 2008 target of 75.05 hours. ACF will monitor the data in the coming year to determine if there is a trend in this direction. ACF will also continue to work with states to continue 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 2011, 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

[10] 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.

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 2011 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. Original data showed that 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. However, due to states submitting corrected information, we now know that in FY 2007 that target was met and surpassed, with 34 percent of CBCAP funds directed toward evidence-based or evidence-informed practices. ACF again surpassed the target with 37 percent of states directing their funding toward these practices in FY 2008. 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.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7.1LT: One state or jurisdiction 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 nine by 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)* | *Out-Year Target* | 9 states (FY 2016) | Oct-16 |
| | *2010* | 1 state[11] | Oct-10 |
| 7.2LT: One state or jurisdiction 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 five by 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)* | *Out-Year Target* | 5 states (FY 2016) | Oct-16 |
| | *2010* | 1 state | Oct-10 |
| 7.3LT: Three states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor "Case Review System" by the end of FY 2010, and twenty by 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)* | *Out-Year Target* | 20 states (FY 2016) | Oct-16 |
| | *2010* | 3 states | Oct-10 |
| 7.4LT: One state or jurisdiction will be in substantial conformity with Safety | *Out-Year Target* | 9 states (FY 2016) | Oct-16 |

[11] The Children's Bureau has made changes to the CFSR process that have resulted in a more consistent and strict assessment of a state's ability to meet outcome measures and systemic factors. Based on a reassessment of current data on state performance, ACF has revised the targets for FY 2010 targets for all long term CFSR goals.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome Measure 2: "Children are maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate" by the end of FY 2010, and nine by FY 2016. To be in substantial conformity with this measure, states must achieve desired outcomes in 95 percent of reviewed cases. *(PSSF) (Outcome)* | *2010* | 1 state | Oct-10 |
| 7.5LT: One state or jurisdiction 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 10 by 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* | 1 state | Oct-10 |
| 7.6LT: One state or jurisdiction 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 three by 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* | 1 state | Oct-10 |
| 7.7LT: Ten states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor "Service Array" by the end of FY 2010, and 35 by 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* | 10 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 | *2011* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | 98% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (49 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)* | *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) |
| 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." 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)* | *2011* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | 94% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (47 states) (Target Exceeded) |
| | *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) |
| 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." 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)* | *2011* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | 98% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (49 states) (Target Exceeded) |
| | *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) |
| 7H: 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 | *2011* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | 100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (50 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. *(PSSF) (Outcome)* | *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) |
| 7I: 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. *(PSSF, Foster Care) (Outcome)* | *2011* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | 98% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (49 states) (Target Exceeded) |
| | *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) |
| 7J: 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. *(PSSF, Foster Care) (Outcome)* | *2011* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | 98% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (49 states) (Target Exceeded) |
| | *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) |
| 7K: 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 | *2011* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | 100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (50 states) (Target Exceeded) |

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. *(PSSF) (Outcome)* | *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) |
| 7L: 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. *(Foster Care) (Outcome)* | *2011* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | 100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (50 states) (Target Exceeded) |
| | *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) |
| 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." 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. *(Foster Care) (Outcome)* | *2011* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free | 100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (50 states) (Target Exceeded) |
| | *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) |
| 7N: Reduce the time needed to approve state Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) Program Improvement Plans (PIPs). *(Child Welfare Services, PSSF) (Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result -0.5 | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 9.2 months | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 11.2 months | 9.7 months (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | Set Baseline | 11.7 months (Baseline) |
| 7O: Increase the percentage of children | *2011* | Prior Result +2PP | Oct-12 |

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| who exit foster care within two years of placement either through guardianship or adoption. *(PSSF, SSBG) (Outcome)* | *2010* | Prior Result +2PP | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 38% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 36% | 41.9% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 35% | 42.2% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 35% | 39.7% (Target Exceeded) |
| 7P: For those children who had been in care less than 12 months, maintain the percentage that has no more than two placement settings.[12] *(Child Welfare Services) (Outcome)* | *2011* | 80% | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | 80% | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 80% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 80% | 83.8% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 80% | 84.4% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 80% | 83.4% (Target Exceeded) |
| 7Q: Decrease the percent of foster children in care 12 or more months with no case plan goal (including case plan goal "Not Yet Determined"). *(Child Welfare Services, PSSF, Foster Care) (Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result -0.5PP | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result -0.5PP | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 5.4% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 5.9% | 3.4% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 6.4% | 2.8%[13] (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 6.9% | 7.6% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| 7R: Decrease improper payments in the title IV-E foster care program by lowering the national error rate. *(Foster Care) (Efficiency)* | *2011* | 4.25% | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 4.50%[14] | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 6.00% | 4.70% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | 3.25% | 6.42% (Target Not Met)[15] |
| | *2007* | 7.57% | 3.30% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 8.49% | 7.68% (Target Exceeded) |

[12] This performance measure is included in the FY 2009 FMAP ARRA Implementation Plan.

[13] The FY 2007 actual result for this measure has been updated as a result of updated state data submissions and a correction to the method of calculation.

[14] The FY 2010 and FY 2011 targets for this measure have been updated in consultation with OMB to be more ambitious based on recent data trends.

[15] 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7.8LT and 7S: Increase the adoption rate.[16] *(Foster Care, Adoption Opportunities, Adoption Incentives, Adoption Assistance) (Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 10.50% (FY 2013) | Oct-14 |
| | *2011* | 10.30% | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | 10.20% | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 10.10% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 10.00% | 11.02% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 9.90% | 10.00% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 9.85% | 9.91% (Target Exceeded) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 7.1LT<br>7.2LT<br>7.3LT<br>7.4LT<br>7.5LT<br>7.6LT<br>7.7LT<br>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<br>7P<br>7Q<br>7.8LT<br>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. All of these activities should continue to generate additional improvements in the data over the next few years. |

[16] This performance measure is included in the FY 2009 FMAP ARRA Implementation Plan.

| 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 2009, 52 states and jurisdictions had completed program improvement plans.[17] Final decisions had been made for 50 of those states, and 45 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 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 2009, much like the performance in FY 2008 has improved significantly, with 100 percent of the 45 states that had final evaluations of closed-out PIPs being found penalty free on annual measures, 7H, 7K, 7L, and 7M. In addition, 98 percent of the 45 states that had final evaluations of closed-out PIPs were found penalty free on annual measures 7E, 7G, 7I and 7J and 94 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, Implementation Centers, national and regional trainings and meetings, and other methods to assist states in developing and implementing program improvement strategies. Technical assistance is continuing 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. ACF has revised long term targets based on the performance of states in the second round of reviews. Although the targets have been revised, given the high standards of the reviews, these targets are still ambitious.

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 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

[17] 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.

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. Performance in this area did improve in FY 2009 with the number of months being decreased to 9.7 months. ACF expects to continue reducing the time it takes to approve PIPs and in FY 2011, 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 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. Fiscal year 2008 data show continued strong performance in this area with 41.9 percent of children exiting from foster care to guardianship or adoption doing so within two years of placement. Although slightly lower than the previous year's performance, ACF still exceeded the target of 35 percent of children exiting from foster care within two years of placement. ACF expects to see a continued trend of children exiting care to a permanent living arrangement in shorter periods 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 2011, 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 continues to see improved performance in this area. In FY 2008 83.8 percent of children experienced no more than two placement settings during their first year in care, again exceeding the 80 percent target that was set through FY 2011. 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 a previous update, ACF reported that in FY 2007, 4.8 percent of the children in care for one year or more lacked a case plan goal. However, updated data show that the actual number for FY 2007 was 2.8 percent, still well below the 6.4 percent target for that year. In FY 2008, ACF again improved upon the 5.9 percent target, with 3.4 percent of children in foster care with an undetermined 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 2011, 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 that 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. In FY 2009, ACF exceeded the 6 percent target with an error rate of 4.7 percent. Following this achievement, ACF and OMB established more ambitious out-year targets for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 (4.5 percent and 4.25 percent, respectively).

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 463,000 children in care as of the last day of FY 2008. 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. In FY 2008 the adoption rate was 11.02 percent with approximately 55,000 children adopted, again exceeding the target of 10 percent. Current performance has already surpassed the target for out-years through 2011. 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 $929 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 are also eligible to receive 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 state 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.[18] *(Foster Care, Adoption Opportunities, Adoption Incentives, Adoption Assistance) (Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 10.50% (FY 2013) | Oct-14 |
| | *2011* | 10.30% | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | 10.20% | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 10.10% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 10.00% | 11.02% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 9.90% | 10.00% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 9.85% | 9.91% (Target Exceeded) |
| 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.[19] *(developmental, Adoption Assistance) (Outcome)* | *2011* | 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.[20] *(Adoption Incentives) (Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result -2% | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result -2%[21] | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 12.2% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 13.7% | 16.2% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 15.2% | 15.6%[22] (Target Not Met but Improved) |

[18] This performance measure is included in the FY 2009 FMAP ARRA Implementation Plan.
[19] A displaced adoption occurs when an adopted child enters foster care.
[20] Based on data available as of September 2005.
[21] The FY 2010 target has been updated based on a review of the data trend for this measure.
[22] The actual result for this measure has been updated due to updated state data submissions.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *2006* | 16.7% | 16.4%<br>(Target Exceeded) |
| 7U: Maintain or decrease the average administrative claim per IV-E Adoption Assistance child. *(Adoption Assistance, Adoption Incentives) (Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result -2% | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result -2% | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | $1,757 | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | $1,504 | $1,793<br>(Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2007* | $1,535 | $1,802<br>(Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | $1,566 | $1,674<br>(Target Not Met) |
| 7V: Reduce the cost per adoptive placement for the Adoption Opportunities Program. *(Adoption Opportunities) (Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result -5% | Jan-12 |
| | *2010* | $12,511 | Jan-11 |
| | *2009* | $13,930 | $13,169[23]<br>(Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | $13,013 | $14,663<br>(Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | $11,868 | $13,698<br>(Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | Set Baseline | $12,493<br>(Baseline) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 7.8LT<br>7S<br>7.11LT<br>7.12LT<br>7T | 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. All of these activities should continue to generate additional improvements in the data over the next few years. |
| 7.9LT<br>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. |

[23] This result should be considered preliminary as not all FY 2009 data have been verified.

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 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. |
| 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 evaluating its data needs regarding this issue.

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. Updated data submissions for FY 2007 reflected a smaller gap than originally reported. Instead of a gap of 16.8 percent of those waiting adoption compared to those actually adopted, it was 15.6 percent, which was closer to the target of 15.2 percent. In FY 2008, ACF again did not achieve the target, which was 13.7 percent. Instead, the gap widened to 16.2 percent. While the target for decreasing the gap was again not achieved in FY 2008, 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 continues to use 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 November 2009, over 11,500 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. Additionally, another award category was added for those states that exceeded their highest ever adoption rate. These increases 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. In FY 2008, the figure declined by approximately 0.5 percent from $1,802 to $1,793 but the target of $1,504 was still not met. ACF will continue to seek to reduce average claims in future years. By FY 2011, 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 2008, the estimated cost per adoptive placement was $14,663, missing the target of $13,013. However, preliminary estimates for FY 2009 reflect an estimated cost per adoptive placement of $13,169 which exceeds the target of $13,390. However, data for FY 2009 are not yet completely verified and additional information submitted by

grantees may have an impact on the actual result in either direction. Overall, the Adoption Opportunities grantees placed 1,751 children in permanent homes in FY 2008 and an estimated 2,003[24] in FY 2009. 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 2011, 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 $929 million in funding that will be used to increase the federal medical assistance payments (FMAP) rate by 6.2 percentage points. The increased FMAP rate funds 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 state 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.

[24] The FY 2009 estimate for the number of children placed using Adoption Opportunities funds has not yet been verified. The number may be impacted in either direction depending upon additional data submissions by grantees and/or approval of data submissions by Federal Project Officers.

## 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. *(developmental) (Outcome and Efficiency)* | *Out-Year Target* | 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. *(Outcome and Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result +2% (until maintenance goal of 52 states/juris. is achieved) | Aug-13 |
| | *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* | 50 of 52 states/juris. | Aug-10 |
| | *2007* | 50 of 52 states/juris. | 49 of 52 states/juris[25] (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | N/A | 47 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. *(Outcome and Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result -10% | Aug-133 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result -10% | Aug-12 |
| | *2009* | Prior Result -10% | Aug-11 |
| | *2008* | $199,381 | Aug-10 |
| | *2007* | $1,704,200 | $221,534 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | N/A | $2,130,275 (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<br>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

[25] The FY 2007 result includes all states/jurisdictions that had expended 98 percent or more of their Chafee funds.

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. Since the states have two years within which to expend their funds, final information on close-out status is not available until after the close of 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. In FY 2007, the number of states fully expending their grants again improved to 49[26] out of 52 states/jurisdictions (94 percent) fully expending their grant awards. The target of 50 out of 52 was not met; however, there were two additional states that came very close to expending their full allotment. ACF anticipates that these states will be able to fully expend their funds in subsequent years. Although the target number of states/jurisdictions was not met, the total amount of unexpended dollars was reduced in FY 2007 to approximately $221,500.

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, 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

[26] ACF considers any state that has expended 98 percent or more of their Chafee funds as fully expending their allotment.

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 2011 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:

| | Child Welfare Program | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CAPTA | CBCAP | CW Services | PSSF | Foster Care | Adopt Opp | Adopt Incent | Adopt Assist | CFCIP |
| **Performance Measures** | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1 Long Term Objective: One state or jurisdiction 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 nine by 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: One state or jurisdiction 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 five by FY 2016. | | | X | | X | | | | |
| 7.3 Long Term Objective: Three states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor "Case Review System" by the end of FY 2010, and twenty by FY 2016. | | | X | | X | | | | |
| 7.4 Long Term Objective: One state or jurisdiction 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 nine by FY 2016. | | | | X | | | | | |
| 7.5 Long Term Objective: One state or jurisdiction 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 ten by FY 2016. | | | | X | X | | | | |
| 7.6 Long Term Objective: One state or jurisdiction 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 three by FY 2016. | | | | X | X | | | | |
| 7.7 Long Term Objective: Ten states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor "Service Array" by the end of FY 2010, and thirty-five by 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.[1] *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +0.1% | Jul-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +0.1% | Jul-11 |
| | *2009* | 12.69% | Jul-10 |
| | *2008* | 12.47% | 12.68% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 14.03% | 12.46% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 13.64% | 12.05% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| 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. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Jul-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +1% | Jul-11 |
| | *2009* | 93.9% | Jul-10 |
| | *2008* | 92.9% | 93% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 93% | 92% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 92% | 91% (Target Not Met) |
| 8C: Increase the percentage of trained individuals actively working to improve access of individuals with developmental disabilities to services and supports. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Jul-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +1% | Jul-11 |
| | *2009* | 92.9% | Jul-10 |
| | *2008* | 90.9% | 92% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 94.1% | 90% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 93.5% | 85% (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 completed University Centers of Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDDs) state-of-the-art training within the past 10 years. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Oct-11 |
| | *2010* | 33.3% | Oct-10 |
| | *2009* | 37.4% | 33% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2008* | 40.4% | 37% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | Set Baseline | 40% (Baseline) |
| 8E: Increase the number of individuals with developmental disabilities reached by the Councils who are independent, | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Jul-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +1% | Jul-11 |

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

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| self-sufficient and integrated into the community per $1,000 of federal funding to the Councils.[2] *(Efficiency)* | *2009* | 8.05 | Jul-10 |
| | *2008* | 8.48 | 7.97 (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 7.66 | 8.40 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 7.16 | 7.58 (Target Exceeded)[3] |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 8.1LT<br>8A<br>8C<br>8E | Program Performance Reports (PRRs) of State Councils on Developmental Disabilities (SCDDs) | Outcome data for each fiscal year are reported in annual PPRs, submitted in December following the end of the 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 Reports (PRRs) 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 | Program Performance Reports (PPRs) of University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDDs) | Outcome data for each university fiscal year (July to June) are reported in PPRs submitted in July following the end of the fiscal year being reported. University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDDs) submit PPRs through the internet-based National Information Reporting System (NIRS). All UCEDDs have data management staff who received training and technical assistance from ADD staff and technical assistance contractor 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 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.[4] The State Councils do not provide services directly, but

[2] The 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.

[3] Inflation adjusted figure for FY 2006 is 7.82.

[4] 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

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. A majority of each State Council's members are individuals with developmental disabilities and their families, plus representatives of major state agencies, non-governmental agencies and other concerned groups, including the P&A and UCEDDs. The Councils (one per state and one per territory), each develop and implement 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 2008, 577,557 individuals with developmental disabilities (12.68 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 resulted in reduction of apparent performance (i.e., the poorer quality data had higher performance numbers, so applying quality controls created the impression of poorer performance). This performance measure in years prior to FY 2004 was falsely 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. The more realistic target for FY 2008, however, was met, and it is anticipated that future targets will be met.

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, and the program anticipates the results for FY 2011 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, and this improved data quality will result in an improved target and an improved measure of program performance for FY 2011.

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.[5] The Protection and Advocacy systems are constantly striving to maximize success in cases of 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

---

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.

[5] 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.

FY 2008 was 93 percent, exceeding the target of 92.9 percent. This result was in spite of several challenges facing advocacy for individuals with developmental disabilities such as the special challenges posed by some clients and cases. The increase was largely due to use of information technology to facilitate communication between the P&As and individuals with developmental disabilities, an increased focus on cultural awareness regarding clients from unserved/underserved communities, collaboration with both traditional and non-traditional partners such as state and community self-advocacy groups, and increased training on proper reporting and data management for performance-based data.

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 2011, the program expects to further 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 and require training in advocating for themselves.

Regarding annual measure 8C, the target of 90.9 percent was exceeded for FY 2008. In FY 2008, 92 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.[6] 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. Additionally, 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 2011, 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 of the UCEDDs.[7] In FY 2007, baseline data for this measure was established at 40 percent. This measure comprises outcome levels 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 interpolated outcome levels 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, the outcome measure (37 percent) was short of the target (40.4 percent), largely due to evolving experience of this program with the measure, including experience with the survey methodologies and participation rate in collecting measure data. 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.

---

[6] As required under the Olmstead Supreme Court decision.

[7] 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.

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 examines 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. One consequence of this emphasis on data quality has been increasing survey rates of return in each of the two years since FY 2007, which translates into more reliable and precise data. Also, due to UCEDDs following up on survey results that appear to be suspiciously unrealistic (especially overly large numbers), the actual result for FY 2009 (33 percent) appears to not only miss its target of 37.4 percent, but also to be a significant reduction from the previous year's actual result of 37 percent. It is believed that this apparent reduction is an artifact of the quality control process, and that the result for the next year (FY 2010) will be reflective not only of highly precise data, but also highly accurate and stable data, and is expected to meet its target of 33.3 percent. By FY 2011, 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 engage in a variety of activities that promote systems change and capacity building. Many Councils provide leadership training to individuals with developmental disabilities and their family members to prepare them to participate in the process of policy making to ensure their perspective is included in discussions. 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 2009 is one percent more than the FY 2008 actual: 8.05 individuals with developmental disabilities reached per $1,000 federal funding (2005 constant dollars) to the Councils. The ADD did not meet the FY 2008 target with a result of 7.97 individuals with developmental disabilities being reached per $1,000 federal funding to the Councils. This slight drop in efficiency is due primarily to economic pressures in the states, which works against systems change and capacity building efforts. 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 2011, 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.

## 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.[1] *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | Baseline + 6% (FY 2014) | Jan-15 |
| | *2011* | Baseline + 5.25% | Jan-12 |
| | *2010* | Baseline + 5% | Jan-11 |
| | *2009* | 386[2] | Apr-10 |
| | *2008* | 363[3] | 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.[4] *(Outcome)* | *2011* | 1% over avg. prior 3 actual results | Jan-12 |
| | *2010* | 1% over avg. prior 3 actual results | Jan-11 |
| | *2009* | 71[2] | Apr-10 |
| | *2008* | 72[3] | 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.[5] *(Outcome)* | *2011* | 1% over avg. prior 3 actual results | Jan-12 |
| | *2010* | 1% over avg. prior 3 actual results | Jan-11 |
| | *2009* | 58[2] | Apr-10 |
| | *2008* | 58[3] | 58 (Target Met) |
| | *2007* | N/A | 66 (Historical Actual) |
| | *2006* | N/A | 49 (Historical Actual) |

[1] 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.
[2] 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.
[3] 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.
[4] 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.
[5] 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9.2LT and 9D: Increase the number of community partnerships formed by ANA grantees.[6] *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | Baseline + 6% (FY 2014) | Jan-15 |
| | *2011* | Baseline + 5.25% | Jan-12 |
| | *2010* | Baseline + 5% | Jan-11 |
| | *2009* | 1,113[2] | Apr-10 |
| | *2008* | 990[3] | 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 on to score in the funding range. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | 1% over avg. prior 3 actual results | Sep-11 |
| | *2010* | 64% | Sep-10 |
| | *2009* | 58%[2] | 68% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | 59%[3] | 57% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | N/A | 66% (Historical Actual) |
| | *2006* | Set Baseline | 51% (Baseline) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 9.1LT<br>9A<br>9B<br>9C<br>9.2LT<br>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.

[6] 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.

In compliance with the Native American Programs Act of 1974, each year ANA conducts evaluations that describe and measure the impact of ANA projects, their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for delivery of services. The evaluations 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. ANA performs 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.

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 2011, ANA intends to increase the number of jobs created by five and one quarter 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 2011, 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 2011, 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 2011, 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. In FY 2009, 68 percent of the applicants who received T/TA scored in the funding range. The high percentages in FY 2007, FY 2008 and FY 2009 demonstrate that over the course of the last three years, ANA has succeeded in building community capacities. By FY 2011, ANA is targeted to increase by one percent over the average of the previous three years' results.

## *Compassion Capital Fund*

Please see the Discontinued Measures Section for performance measures related to this program, which is pending proposed program elimination.

## *11. Federal Administration*

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11A: Obtain the highest level of success for each management initiative. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Highest level of success in all management initiatives | Nov-11 |
| | *2010* | Highest level of success in all management initiatives | Nov-10 |
| | *2009* | Highest level of success in all management initiatives | Highest level of Success in all 8 management initiatives (Target Met) |
| | *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 [1] | 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) |

| 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. |

In FY 2009 ACF demonstrated commitment to government-wide management initiatives by achieving results in: Strategic Management of Human Capital, Expanded Electronic Government, Improved Financial Performance, Improved Budget and Performance Integration, Eliminating Improper Payments, Real Property Asset Management, Commercial Services Management, and Community and Faith-Based Initiatives. Although the Department did not rate OPDIVs on the performance of these initiatives each OPDIV was required to respond to Departmental activities for certain initiatives. ACF considers its responses for each initiative consistent with maintenance of the highest level of success for each initiative.

In the strategic management of human capital, the Department required ACF (as well as other OPDIVs) to develop and present on its leadership succession planning efforts. ACF's accomplishments to date are as follows: launched a new supervisory training program, maintained a leadership development program to build ACF's leadership pipeline and succession planning; continued development of the Career Mentoring Program for the 6th consecutive year to facilitate an environment of learning; sponsored employee participation in the American University's Key Executive Leadership Program; and continued to track data to ensure a diverse workforce.[2]

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

[2] 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.

Regarding expanding electronic government, the Grants Center of Excellence (HHS/ACF COE) continued to be an innovative Electronic Government initiative. 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 2009 audit (representing the tenth consecutive clean audit opinion for ACF, with no ACF-specific material weaknesses in FY 2009). ACF's management has proactively participated in the development and implementation of the Unified Financial Management System (UFMS), at all levels from project governance through the provision of subject matter experts, and I-Procurement.

In improving budget-performance integration, ACF has utilized 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.

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. Per Executive Order (EO) M-10-05, Improving Compliance in Recovery Act Recipient Reporting, ACF is working with HHS to develop a new methodology for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program to be in full compliance with the EO. ACF's other A-11 programs are continuing to measure error rates and adjusting approaches to drive down improper payments. ACF has also provided staff to serve on OMB improper payments teams to make recommendations in compliance with the EO.

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.

As it relates to ACF's Commercial Services Management Program, ACF maintained Departmental requirements related to this program. Specifically, ACF submitted to the Department its updates for the annual 647 (b) Report to Congress. Additionally, ACF successfully complied with OMB's policy regarding the submission of the annual FAIR (Federal Activities and Inventory Report) Act Inventory.

Finally, on the Community and Faith-Based initiatives ACF's oversight and promotion of key programs (including the Strengthening Communities Fund – funded under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009) has expanded the number of faith-based and community organizations partnering with HHS.

## *12. Community Services Block Grant*

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12.1LT and 12A: Increase the number of conditions of poverty addressed for low-income individuals, families and communities as a result of community action interventions.[1] *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 27.2 million (FY 2014) | Oct-15 |
| | *2011* | 26 million | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | 30 million[2] | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 30 million | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 27 million | 29 million (Target exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 28 million | 26 million (Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | 28 million | 27 million (Target Not Met) |
| 12B: Reduce total amount of sub-grantee CSBG administrative funds expended each year per total sub-grantee CSBG funds expended per year.[1] *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | 19.00% | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | 19.00% | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 19.00% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | N/A | 18.42% (Historical Actual) |
| | *2007* | N/A | 19.11% (Historical Actual) |
| | *2006* | N/A | 19.25% (Historical Actual) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 12.1LT<br>12A<br>12B | CSBG Information System (CSBG/IS) survey administered by the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCSP) | The Office of Community Services (OCS) and NASCSP 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, NASCSP and OCS are providing states better survey tools and reporting processes. |

Long-term objective 12.1 and annual measure 12A track the impact of the 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 2008 data indicate that 29 million conditions of poverty among low-income individuals, families, and communities were reduced or eliminated as a result of community action interventions. For example, in response to emergency and safety-net services, 16 million service units (e.g. shelter, emergency medical care, food

[1] This performance measure is included in the FY 2009 CSBG ARRA Implementation Plan.

[2] The FY 2010 and FY 2011 targets for this measure have been updated to maintain rigor, given the recent data trend. The FY 2010 performance target takes into account the additional funding provided by ARRA.

distribution) were provided and 5.3 million service units were provided for employment and family stability, including obtainment of child care, transportation, food, or health care.

The higher than projected outcomes are due in part to an increase in individuals seeking assistance from the CSBG network as a result of the state of the economy. The CSBG National Performance Indicators are a tool for setting priorities and monitoring progress. Even though many agencies have increased their emphasis on more intensive interventions in recent years, members of the CSBG network were able to shift their short-term efforts to meet the pressing needs of the population. For example, 874,458 individuals with disabilities received services and were helped to maintain an independent living situation as a result of services, a 19 percent increase. Emergency and safety-net services such as food, temporary shelter, and disaster relief increased substantially in FY 2008. The number of emergency situations in which food is distributed increased 33 percent to 12,098,006. Agencies increased more than twofold their assistance to households for temporary shelter, from 225,280 to 555,897; and for disaster relief, from 30,591 to 67,192. Child and family development needs of low-income infants and children were met by agencies in FY 2008 as well. The number of infants and children that were assisted in their growth and development as a result of adequate nutrition increased 22 percent. Youth experiencing an improvement in physical health, growth, and development increased 36 percent. Agencies were able to reach higher levels of outcomes in part by leveraging increased funds from some resources, such as nearly 19 percent increase in federal Medicare/Medicaid, a nearly 12 percent increase in total state resources, 5.4 percent increase in local resources, and 8.7 percent increase in private resources. 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.

CSBG received an additional $1 billion in funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment 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. We anticipate an uptick in the number of conditions of poverty addressed due to ARRA funding for CSBG. This is particularly true for FY 2010 since outcomes will be measured based on a full 12 months that the CSBG network provided services with the infusion of ARRA funds in local communities. Fiscal year 2011 and future targets are lower because ARRA funds will not be available after FY 2010. By FY 2011, the program expects to reach the performance target of 26 million for this performance measure.

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 2008, 18.42 percent of CSBG sub-grantee funds were used for administrative costs, an improvement over the previous year's result of 19.11 percent. Through FY 2011, 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.

ACF continues to examine the measurement of success for the CSBG program in order to establish additional meaningful and measurable performance goals.

## *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. *(developmental) (Outcome)* | *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. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Avg of two prev years* growth factor [1] | Feb-12 |
| | *2010* | Avg of two prev years* growth factor[1] | Feb-11 |
| | *2009* | $5,720,214 | 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) |
| 13B: Increase the number of participants who withdraw funds for the three asset purchase goals. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Avg of two prev years* growth factor [1] | Feb-12 |
| | *2010* | Avg of two prev years* growth factor[1] | Feb-11 |
| | *2009* | 4,540 participants | 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) |
| 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. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | $2.37 | Feb-12 |
| | *2010* | $2.37[2] | 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) |
| 13D: Maintain the ratio of total earned income saved in IDAs per grant dollar spent on programmatic and | *2011* | $5.78 | Feb-12 |
| | *2010* | $5.78 | Feb-11 |

[1] The growth factor is the percentage growth in the number of IDAs opened in the prior year.
[2] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been updated due to recent data trends to maintain rigor.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| administrative activities at the end of the five-year AFI project. *(Efficiency)* | *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) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 13.1LT<br>13A<br>13B<br>13C<br>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.

The annual targets for each year through FY 2011 will be calculated using results from the prior two

years.[3] 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 2009, the target is the average of savings used for purchases in 2007 and 2008 multiplied by an 18 percent growth factor.[4] 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.[5] The denominator is 13 percent of the sum of all federal grants drawn down by grantees in the cohort.[6] 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 measure and of other AFI performance indicators used to manage performance. As more stable data is

---

[3] 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.

[4] 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.

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

accumulated and clear trends emerge, the program anticipates possible shifts in the baselines. By FY 2011, the program expects to maintain the goal of $2.37 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 target starting in FY 2009 was revised to $5.78 in order to establish a realistic yet ambitious goal that can be maintained through FY 2011.

## *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. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 205 (FY 2014) | Sep-14 |
| | *2011* | 201 | Sep-11 |
| | *2010* | 200 | Sep-10 |
| | *2009* | 200 | 214 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | 202 | 202 (Target Met) |
| | *2007* | 205 | 199 (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 190 | 188 (Target Not Met) |
| 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). *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | FY 2010 Actual Result +2,000 (FY 2014) | Mar-15 |
| | *2011* | 22,000 calls | Mar-12 |
| | *2010* | 21,635 calls | Mar-11 |
| | *2009* | 21,300 calls | 22,400 calls (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2008* | 16,000 calls | 20,800 calls (Target Exceeded)[1] |
| | *2007* | 15,500 calls | 19,600 calls (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 15,000 calls | 17,000 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 responded to and that provide needed information to callers. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result -3% until a threshold of 0:17 seconds is reached | Mar-12 |
| | *2010* | 32 seconds | Mar-11 |
| | *2009* | 29.1 seconds[2] | 33 seconds (Target Not Met)[3] |
| | *2008* | 21.0 seconds | 30 seconds (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 17 seconds | 22 seconds (Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | 25 seconds | 18 seconds (Target Exceeded) |
| 14D: Reduce the percentage of funds de-obligated to federally recognized | *2008* | Set Baseline | May-11 |
| | *2007* | Set Baseline | May-10 |

[1] 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 35 percent from 2006 to 2009, among other factors, the percent 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, and increased by 4 percent in FY 2009.

[2] 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.

[3] Wait time has increased due to increased call volume (15 percent in FY 2007, 6 percent in FY 2008 and 8 percent in FY 2009), increased call length (35percent from FY 2006 to FY 2009), and spikes in call volume of over 130 percent when the Hotline number is featured on national television.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| Indian Tribes that have Family Violence Prevention Services Act (FVPSA) grants. (*developmental*) *(Efficiency)* | *2006* | N/A | 0.06% (Historical Actual) |
| 14E: Increase the percentage of domestic violence program clients who report improved knowledge of safety planning. (*developmental*) *(Outcome)* | *2010* | Set Baseline | May-11 |
| | *2009* | N/A | May-10 |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 14.1LT<br>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<br>14B<br>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 assistance[4] 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 2009, the number of Tribes funded increased 13 percent to a total of 214. By FY 2011, the program expects to maintain the number of Tribes with family violence programs at 201 or above by increasing technical assistance support through annual conferences, webinars, an online interactive community of practice, regional peer-mentoring meetings, and frequent telephonic communication. Monitoring – both on-site and through regular conference calls – will likewise increase.

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, the number of incoming calls has increased – 32 percent from FY 2006 to FY 2009. Despite the increase in calls received, NDVH increased the number of calls responded to by advocates by four percent. ACF's target to increase the capacity of the NDVH to respond to more calls-per-month was met and exceeded in FY 2009. The NDVH received an average of 22,400 calls per month, exceeding its target of 21,300. By FY 2011, the program expects to maintain this high performance and exceed the goal of 22,000 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.

[4] In addition to intensive outreach from FVPSA Program staff, a collaborative effort among FVPSA-funded resource centers and selected state domestic violence coalitions provides technical assistance.

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 2009, the average wait time at the NDVH increased to 33 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 35 percent between FY 2006 and FY 2009 – from 6.79 minutes to 8.32 minutes. The number of calls requiring use of translation services provided through the AT&T Language Line also increased 32 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, and media coverage of high profile domestic violence incidents. Call volume spiked repeatedly in FY 2009 due to media coverage of the Rihanna/Chris Brown incident. This combination of factors has led to an increased wait time for callers. In FY 2011, 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. 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 did not spend their formula grants 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 deobligaged from tribal grantees. Fiscal year 2006 data show a dramatic improvement – a decrease to 0.06 percent. This sudden decrease may be due to increased assistance and monitoring of the Tribes, but it could also be circumstantial. To determine if the FVPSA Program has truly attained its goal of decreasing deobligations, data will be collected in the coming fiscal years and this efficiency measure will be updated as needed.[5]

Annual measure 14E concentrates 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 resulted in measure 14E) to grantees throughout FY 2008 and FY 2009 at grantees' conferences, through grantee correspondence and guidance, and through program announcements. The FVPSA program provided technical assistance to grantees related to developing mechanisms for collecting outcome data directly from survivors. In FY 2009, grantees began collecting new data. The FVPSA program 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,[6] and will help document improved work by FVPSA grantees and subgrantees.

[5] Because the project period is 2 years and the process of deobligating funds takes several months, FY 2007 data will be reported in FY 2010.

[6] Bybee, D. I., & Sullivan, C. M. (2002). The process through which a strengths-based intervention resulted in positive change for battered women over time. American Journal of Community Psychology, 30(1), 103-132.

## *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. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 64.18% (FY 2014) | Dec-15 |
| | *2011* | Prior Result + 1% | Dec-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result + 1%[1] | Dec-11 |
| | *2009* | 61.07% | Dec-10 |
| | *2008* | 59.87% | 44.00% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 58.70% | 60.00% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 57.55% | 62.23% (Target Exceeded) |
| 15.2LT and 15B: Increase the average hourly wage of refugees at placement (employment entry). *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | $8.80 (FY 2014) | Dec-15 |
| | *2011* | Prior Result + 1% | Dec-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result + 1%[2] | Dec-11 |
| | *2009* | $8.37 | Dec-10 |
| | *2008* | $8.29 | $8.82 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | $8.20 | $8.29 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | $8.12 | $8.24 (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. *(developmental, Transitional and Medical Assistance and Refugee Social Services) (Efficiency)* | *2010* | Set Baseline | Dec-11 |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 15.1LT<br>15A<br>15.2LT<br>15B<br>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. |

[1] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been adjusted to better capture data trends and to better reflect actual performance.
[2] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been adjusted to better capture data trends and to better reflect actual performance.

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 2007, 60 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 58.70 percent. 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.). The FY 2008 target of 59.87 percent was not met, 44 percent of cash assistance termination were due to earned income from employment for those clients who received cash assistance at employment entry. Future targets for this measure may be revised if future results continue at this level, and thus show a data trend. Due to the dampening economic conditions starting in FY 2008, it may continue to be difficult to achieve annual 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. Fiscal year 2008 saw a $0.18 increase in the aggregate average wage from the FY 2007, exceeding the target by $0.53. In FY 2008 thirty-two states, five California counties and the San Diego Wilson-Fish program reported higher wages than the average aggregate wage for all states ($8.82). While $8.82 per hour is a modest wage, it is nonetheless 18 percent above the federal minimum wage of $7.25 an hour. ORR provides assistance and incentives such as training bonuses, early employment bonuses, and job retention bonuses. Although the FY 2014 hourly wage target of $8.80 per hour was actually exceeded in FY 2008, it remains to be seen whether this hourly wage can be maintained in FY 2009 and beyond, given continuing adverse 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[1] | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 16A: Increase the percentage of refugees who enter employment through the Matching Grant (MG) program as a subset of all MG employable. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Apr-12 |
| | *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) |
| 16B: Increase the percentage of refugees who are self-sufficient (not dependent on any cash assistance) within the first four months (120 days) after arrival. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Apr-12 |
| | *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) |
| 16.1LT and 16C: Increase the percentage of refugees who are self-sufficient (not dependent on any cash assistance) within the first six months (180 days) after arrival. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 83% (PY 2014) | Apr-15 |
| | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Apr-12 |
| | *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) |
| 16D: 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). *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Apr-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +1% | Apr-11 |
| | *2009* | 390 | Apr-10 |
| | *2008* | 420 | 399 (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 410 | 450 (Target Exceeded) |

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

| Measure | PY[1] | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *2006* | 400 | 415<br>(Target Exceeded) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 16A<br>16B<br>16.1LT<br>16C<br>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 of 64.40 percent with an actual result of 57.10 percent of refugees entering employment. This decrease can be attributed to decrease in employment outcomes in the last trimester of the year due to the economic downturn. Looking at the average of the past three years of employment, that employment rate rises to 64.33 percent, showing a significantly higher outcome. As a method of dealing with the difficult job market and economy, local Matching Grant service providers are changing their method for finding employment for clients by expanding search areas, building relationships with different businesses and pursuing more small business owners. By PY 2011, the program hopes to return to the targeted performance level as the job market slowly grows stronger, increasing employment opportunities.

Annual measure 16B is the preliminary measure of achieving self-sufficiency (not dependent on any cash assistance) by 120 days, while 16C measures again at 180 days. Annual performance measure 16B fell below the PY 2008 target of 69.56 percent with an actual result of 62.10 percent. Annual performance measure 16C also fell below the PY 2008 target of 80.0 percent with an actual result of 78.30 percent. Both 120 day and 180 day self-sufficiency outcomes were reduced this year due to the economic recession. The decrease in employment opportunities and the increase in layoffs have affected the overall self-sufficiency rate of the program participants. The increasing unemployment of U.S. citizens who are fluent in English and have work experience has made it more difficult to employ newly arriving clients that come with varying levels of English and no U.S. work experience. Although the number of clients remaining in the program between 120 and 180 days remains high as captured in annual performance measure 16B, this additional period of service has not rendered increased numbers of self-sufficient clients. By PY 2011, the program hopes to return to the targeted performance level as employment outcomes increase, resulting in a higher percentage of clients who become self-sufficient.

Long term objective 16.1 and annual measure 16C are focused on self-sufficiency at 180 days. In PY 2008, the program fell below its target of 80 percent with 78.3 percent of refugees self-sufficient within 180 days. This decrease was due to the decline in the job market and the economic downturn. By PY 2011 ORR anticipates that the program once again be on track to reach to achieve the target of increasing over the previous year's actual by one percent. The Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) believes that the outyear targets for annual measure 16C are increasingly ambitious given the diversity of refugees currently served and the extremely difficult current economic climate. Performance on all Matching Grant program measures is dependent upon employment of Matching Grant clients to lead them to economic self-sufficiency. Although these measures are extremely difficult to reach in this time of high unemployment and recession, Matching Grant program offices 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, per million federal dollars awarded to grantees. 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 2004. 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 lead 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, the PY 2008 goal of 420 was not reached, falling just short with an actual result of 399, in great part due to the economic downturn. By PY 2011, ORR anticipates that efficiency gains will begin to increase as in past years with an increase of at least one percent over the previous year's actual result. 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 by 50 percent 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. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 425[1] (FY 2014) | Jun-15 |
| | *2011* | Prior Result +5% | Jun-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +5% | Jun-11 |
| | *2009* | 333 | Jun-10 |
| | *2008* | 318 | 317 (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2007* | 400 | 303 (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 300 | 234[2] (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| 17B: Increase the number of victims certified and served by whole network of grantees per million dollars invested. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result +5% | Jun-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +5% | Jun-11 |
| | *2009* | 34.0 | Jun-10 |
| | *2008* | 32.1 | 32.3 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 40.0 | 30.8[2] (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 30.0 | 23.9[2] (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| 17C1: Increase media impressions per thousand dollars invested.[3] *(Efficiency)* | *2007* | 50,570 | 6,059 (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 29,750 | 4,429 (Target Not Met) |
| 17C2: Increase hotline calls per thousand dollars invested. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result +3% | Jun-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +3% | Jun-11 |
| | *2009* | 10.83[4] | Jun-10 |
| | *2008* | 5.15 | 10.51[5] (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 1.80 | 5.00 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 0.89 | 7.63 (Target Exceeded) |

[1] This target has been revised based on recent data. The new target maintains rigor while taking into account the most recent data trend.
[2] Data have been finalized since the FY 2010 President's Budget, and updated accordingly.
[3] As of the end of FY 2007, ACF no longer maintains a media contract for the Trafficking program. Therefore, future targets beyond FY 2007 are not included and ACF proposes that this measure be eliminated.
[4] The FY 2009 target has been updated as a result of a technical correction to the FY 2008 actual result, as the targets are based upon previous performance.
[5] The FY 2008 actual result for this measure has been updated as a result of a technical correction in calculation. The FY 2008 results are calculated by dividing the number of hotline calls (4,147) by the grant award amount ($394,427).

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17C3: Increase website visits per thousand dollars invested. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result +3% | Jun-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +3% | Jun-11 |
| | *2009* | 1,852[6] | Jun-10 |
| | *2008* | 3,643 | 1,798[7] (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 69 | 3,537 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 33 | 6,556 (Target Exceeded) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 17.1LT<br>17A<br>17B | HHS Database of trafficking victim certifications, based on information provided by the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and nongovernmental organizations. | 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 in care of victims' service providers. |
| 17C1<br>17C2<br>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 425 foreign victims' certification per year by FY 2014, which has been revised from the previous goal. This target has been revised in light of the trend in data for the past four years, and is a reflection of the certification process that, by statute, involves several federal agencies.[8] 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 years' totals. In FY 2008, ORR certified 317 victims, falling just short of the target, but again showing improvement over 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

[6] The FY 2009 target has been updated as a result of a technical correction to the FY 2008 actual result, as the targets are based upon previous performance.

[7] The FY 2008 results have been updated as a result of a technical correction. The FY 2008 result was calculated by dividing the total number of website visits (233,518) by the information technology costs ($129,908).

[8] 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 2011, 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 42 percent, followed by a very small gain in FY 2006, a 29 percent gain in FY 2007, and a 4.6 percent increase in FY 2008. The program believes that a target of an annual increase of five percent is ambitious and reflects increasing recognition of trafficking indicators by law enforcement and other frontline intermediaries as well as increased law enforcement deterrence at borders and ports of entry. 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). Since FY 2004, ACF has seen an increase in victims certified per million dollars. The FY 2005 actual exceeded the target of 20 in FY 2005, and then improved in FY 2006 to 23.9. In FY 2007, the program again improved performance to 30.8 and the result in FY 2008 of 32.3 exceeded the FY2008 target of 32.1. Identifying victims is inherently difficult due to the criminal and secret nature of the activities, the required involvement of law enforcement as a condition for certification of adult victims, 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 2011, 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 to support and encourage the identification of victims, particularly among professionals in law enforcement, health care, legal services, social service, and faith-based organizations. Most recently the program has provided funding to "Rescue and Restore" Regional programs to reinforce ATIP program activities, including regional coalition building and street outreach with populations among which victims of trafficking are likely to be found. The program has improved the precision of data and calculation methods for the components of this efficiency measure beginning with the FY 2006 results. The hotline calls component of the efficiency measure component was calculated as calls received during FY 2008 (4,147) per thousand dollars of funding obligated specifically for the hotline operations during FY 2008, with a result that far exceeded the target. The website visitors' component was calculated by dividing the total number of website visitors (233,518) in FY 2008 per thousand dollars of FY 2008 funds invested in the website by the program. This result represented an increase in the total number of calls received, but did not meet the target because of increased funding invested. By FY 2011, the program expects to increase the results of each of these public awareness areas by at least three percent over the previous year's result pursuant to Rescue and Restore Regional programs throughout the country.

## *18. Social Services/Targeted Assistance*

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15C: For refugees receiving Refugee Cash Assistance, shorten the length of time from arrival in the U.S. to achievement of self-sufficiency. *(Transitional and Medical Services and Refugee Social Services)* *(Developmental Efficiency)* | *2010* | Set Baseline | Dec-11 |
| 18.1LT and 18A: Increase the percentage of refugees entering employment through ACF-funded refugee employment services.[1] *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 61.21% (FY 2014) | Dec-15 |
| | *2011* | Prior Result +2% | Dec-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +2% | Dec-11 |
| | *2009* | 49.98% | Dec-10 |
| | *2008* | 54.06% | 49.00% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 54.55% | 53.00% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | 56.49% | 54.01% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| 18B: Increase the percentage of entered employment with health benefits available as a subset of full-time job placements. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 66.69% (FY 2014) | Dec-15 |
| | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Dec-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +1%[2] | Dec-11 |
| | *2009* | 63.45% | Dec-10 |
| | *2008* | 62.82% | 63.00% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 62.20% | 63.00% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 67.24% | 61.58% (Target Not Met) |
| 18C: Increase the percentage of 90-day job retention as a subset of all entered employment. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Dec-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +1%[3] | Dec-11 |
| | *2009* | 73.77% | Dec-10 |
| | *2008* | 73.04% | 76.00% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 72.32% | 73.00% (Target Exceeded) |

[1] 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.
[2] The calculation of the FY 2010 target for this measure has been adjusted to better capture data trends and to better reflect actual performance.
[3] The calculation of the FY 2010 target for this measure has been adjusted to better capture data trends and to better reflect actual performance.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *2006* | 77.29% | 71.58%<br>(Target Not Met) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 15C<br>18.1LT<br>18A<br>18B<br>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 2008, performance targets were met on two out of three measures (employment with health benefits and 90-day employment retention). In FY 2008, annual measure 18A to increase the percentage of refugees entering employment through ACF-funded refugee employment services fell short of the target of approximately 54 percent with an actual result of 49 percent. 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 have limited work skills. By FY 2011, 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.

In FY 2008, annual measure 18B to increase the percentage of entered employment with health benefits available as a subset of full-time placements exceeded the target of 62.82 percent with an actual result of 63 percent, 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 his or her 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 2011, the program aims to increase performance on this measure to by one percent over the previous year's result 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 measure, 18C, to increase the percentage of refugees retaining employment after 90 days, exceeded its FY 2008 target of 73.04 percent, with an actual result of 76 percent. This result reflects ORR grantees' success in helping grantees not only find, but keep jobs. By FY 2011, the program aims to continue to increase performance over the previous year's result by one 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. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 2.50 hours (FY 2014) | Mar-15 |
| | *2011* | Prior Result -2% | Mar-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result -2% | Mar-11 |
| | *2009* | 3.89 hours | Mar-10 |
| | *2008* | 2.90 hours | 4.1 hours (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2007* | 2.90 hours | 17.4 hours (Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | Set Baseline | 3.1 hours (Baseline) |
| 19.2LT and 19B: Increase the percentage of UAC that receive medical screening or examination within 48 hours. (*Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +1% | Mar-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +1% | Mar-11 |
| | *2009* | 89.8% | Mar-10 |
| | *2008* | Set Baseline | 88.9% (Baseline) |
| | *2007* | N/A | 77.6% (Historical Actual) |
| | *2006* | N/A | 75.5% (Historical Actual) |
| 19C: Maintain the percentage of runaways from UAC shelters at 1.5 percent. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | 1.5% | Mar-12 |
| | *2010* | 1.5% | Mar-11 |
| | *2009* | 1.5% | Mar-10 |
| | *2008* | 1.5% | 1.55% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 1.5% | 1.50% (Target Met) |
| | *2006* | Set Baseline | 1.7% (Baseline) |
| 19D: Increase the percentage of "closed" corrective actions. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | Prior Result +2% | Mar-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +2% | Mar-11 |
| | *2009* | 79.9% | Mar-10 |
| | *2008* | 88.2% | 78.3% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 55.7% | 86.5% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | Set Baseline | 53.0% (Baseline) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 19.1LT<br>19A<br>19.2LT<br>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<br>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. Although the target goal of 4.1 hours was not met in FY 2008, significant improvement was made from the FY 2007 actual result of 17.4 hours. 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 2011, 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.[1] 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.[2] 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 2009 indicate that 86.5 percent of children receive screening within 48 business hours of placement in ORR facilities. By FY 2011, the program expects that 88.3 percent of children receive medical screening within the established period.

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 2011. 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 2011, the program will increase the percentage of "closed" corrective actions by at least two percent over the prior year's result to approximately 90 percent.

[1] 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.

[2] 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20.1LT: Increase annual child support distributed collections. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | $33B (FY 2013) | Nov-14 |
| | *2008* | $26 B | $26.6B (Target Exceeded) |
| 20A: Maintain the paternity establishment percentage (PEP) among children born out-of-wedlock.[1] *(Outcome)* | *2011* | 94% | Nov-12 |
| | *2010* | 94% | Nov-11 |
| | *2009* | 94% | Nov-10 |
| | *2008* | 95% | 96% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 95% | 98% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 98% | 98% (Target Met) |
| 20B: Increase the percentage of IV-D (child support) cases having support orders.[1] *(Outcome)* | *2011* | 78% | Nov-12 |
| | *2010* | 77% | Nov-11 |
| | *2009* | 77% | Nov-10 |
| | *2008* | 75% | 79% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 73% | 78% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 72% | 77% (Target Exceeded) |
| 20C: Maintain the IV-D (child support) collection rate for current support. [1, 2] *(Outcome)* | *2011* | 63% | Nov-12 |
| | *2010* | 62% | Nov-11 |
| | *2009* | 62% | Nov-10 |
| | *2008* | 61% | 62% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 61% | 61% (Target Met) |
| | *2006* | 62% | 60% (Target Not Met) |

[1] This performance measure is included in the FY 2009 CSE Recovery Act Implementation Plan.
[2] This measure is a performance indicator for the FY 2007- FY 2012 HHS Strategic Plan.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20D: Maintain the percentage of paying cases among IV-D (child support) arrearage cases.[1] *(Outcome)* | *2011* | 62% | Nov-12 |
| | *2010* | 62% | Nov-11 |
| | *2009* | 62% | Nov-10 |
| | *2008* | 61% | 63% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 61% | 61% (Target Met) |
| | *2006* | 64% | 61% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| 20.2LT and 20E: Increase the cost-effectiveness ratio (total dollars collected per $1 of expenditures). *(Efficiency)* | *Out-Year Target* | $5.00 (FY 2014) | Nov-15 |
| | *2011* | $4.84 | Nov-12 |
| | *2010* | $4.77 | Nov-11 |
| | *2009* | $4.70 | Nov-10 |
| | *2008* | $4.63 | $4.80 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | $4.56 | $4.73 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | $4.49 | $4.58 (Target Exceeded) |

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 20.1LT<br>20A<br>20B<br>20C<br>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 audit 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 2008 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 families can count on reliable child support payments, while recognizing that collection of support depends on the non-custodial parent's employment, cooperation between parents, and parents' emotional connection with their children. Child support is an important resource for children that promotes their self-sufficiency, well-being, and health from birth through adulthood. By securing support from non-custodial parents on a consistent and continuing basis, the CSE program lifts people out of poverty every

year and helps families avoid the need for public assistance. The CSE program is a solid investment, bringing families $4.80 in FY 2008 for every $1 states and the federal government spent on the program. The program continually innovates to increase its effectiveness. During FY 2008, $26.6 billion in child support was collected and distributed, a 7 percent increase over the amount collected and distributed during FY 2007. Over the years, the program has seen significant performance improvement in most of the performance areas. Between FY 1999 and FY 2008, states increased their performance in the following areas: the percent of cases with orders from 60 percent to 79 percent, cases paying past-due support from 55 percent to 63 percent, percent of current support collected from 53 percent to 62 percent, and cost-effectiveness from $3.94 to $4.80.

Since its inception in 1975, the mission of the CSE program has evolved in response to the needs of families. Over time, caseload demographics have changed; most of the families served are low-income working families and the majority of children are born outside of marriage. The emerging mission of the program is to improve child well-being by working with both parents, and the program recognizes it can only be as effective as non-custodial parents have the means to support their children. Thus, child support program partnerships with workforce services and responsible fatherhood programs that address the challenges connected with non-custodial parent's inability to pay child support can be very beneficial to children. Assisting these parents is also important because non-custodial parents who cannot provide for their children financially also tend to have less contact with their children than other parents. Such efforts are also associated with increased collections and reduced arrears.

The Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) has continued to implement provisions of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA). Certain provisions of the DRA strengthen existing collection and enforcement tools, allow states the option to provide additional support to the families who need it most, and streamline collection of medical child support. 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 in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) cases. The DRA also provided states with a set of distribution options to pay more child support to families who receive or used to receive TANF, instead of using the support payments to reimburse cash assistance. In addition, the DRA significantly reduced federal performance-related program funding, which, according to state and county reports, led to plans for staff layoffs and program cuts. In the past, programs have relied heavily on a federal match on incentives to fund program operations, and the loss of this critical funding is anticipated to have adverse impacts on the child support enforcement services provided to families, many of whom have been hardest hit by unemployment and the current economic downturn.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) temporarily suspends the DRA provision that eliminated the federal match on incentive payments. ARRA funds will provide states with resources to help stabilize their budgets and stimulate the economy by mitigating the need for staff layoffs and service cutbacks in the child support program. Under current law, this funding will only be available to states and counties through September 30, 2010. While available, ARRA funds will 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. A one-year extension of these funds is expected to maintain these efforts.

Paternity establishment is key to facilitating fathers' financial and emotional commitment to their children. Annual measure 20A (paternity establishment) compares paternities 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). The percentage of paternities established has increased over recent years, surpassing targets in 2006 and 2007. In FY 2008, OCSE exceeded its target by achieving a paternity establishment percentage of 96 percent. Achieving the target

rate of 96 percent in FY 2008 required states to increase paternity establishment for new non-marital 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 by encouraging voluntary acknowledgments, in accordance with the requirements of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA). In FY 2008 there were almost 629,000 IV-D paternities established or acknowledged and over 1.1 million in-hospital and other paternities acknowledged. Overall, paternity was established or acknowledged for 1.8 million children, a 3.1 percent increase from the previous year. In collaboration with partners, such as birthing hospitals, and stakeholders, OCSE is also exploring a variety of activities to help individuals better understand the importance of responsible fatherhood and the opportunities and responsibilities that parenthood brings, including funding grants and other activities to educate non-custodial parents about the child support program. Furthermore, the program continues to advocate voluntary paternity acknowledgement as a means to promote non-custodial parental involvement both for children's financial security and other social and emotional benefits.

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 2011. This decrease does not reflect an actual 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 backlogged cases. In addition, effective FY 2008, the DRA lowered the federal match rate for genetic testing from 90 percent to 66 percent. It is unclear what impact the reduced funding will have on performance in this area if states do not have the resources to backfill this loss of funds.

Establishing realistic child support orders is critical to collecting reliable support and avoiding the accumulation of uncollectible arrears. 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 2008, over 12 million cases had support orders established out of a total 15.7 million IV-D cases (79 percent), which is four percentage points above the target of 75 percent for FY 2007. Over 1.2 million of these 12 million cases were new child support orders. The child support order establishment rate of 79 percent reflects an increase of one percentage point over the previous year. The target for fiscal year 2009 increases by two percentage points to 77 percent and OCSE expects to maintain this rate until FY 2011 when it will increase to 78 percent.

Over the past five years, performance on the order establishment measure has exceeded the targets due largely to child support enforcement workers which is an example of how investing in the program improves child support performance. In recent years, state staffing levels have begun to decrease slightly while IV-D caseloads continue to increase slightly, thus, appropriately increasing the number of support orders established may become more of a challenge for states. In addition, during times of high unemployment, child support programs have the added responsibility of processing adjustments to support orders so that non-custodial parents can realistically make the payments in addition to establishing new orders. 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.[3] 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 improve and increase support orders and collections.

[3] 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.

The collection rate for current child support (annual measure 20C), an important 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. Over the past ten years the child support program has nearly doubled the amount of total distributed collections going from $14.3B in FY 1998 to $26.6B in FY 2008, an increase of more than 85 percent. The total amount of child support distributed as current support in FY 2008 was $19 billion, an increase of 3.3 percent over FY 2007. The total amount of current support due in FY 2008 was over $31 billion. This provided a collection rate for current support of 62 percent, which slightly exceeded the target of 61 percent for FY 2008. OCSE recently increased the percent collection rate target to 62 percent for FY 2009, is set to maintain that rate in 2010, and will increase it to 63 percent in FY 2011. In light of the current economic climate, the program anticipates potential decreases in the collection rate due to rising levels of non-custodial parent unemployment as well as current state budget constraints. OCSE also expects that the DRA funding cuts will result in reduced current support collections compared to previous years. The Congressional Budget Office also estimates that the DRA cuts will lead to lower collections. OCSE continues to work to eliminate the gap between the current support collection target and the actual performance by working with parents to ensure that they have the tools and resources they need to provide for their children, focusing on new and improved enforcement techniques, and preventing and addressing accumulated child support debt. For example, OCSE launched a new national initiative in FY 2007 called PAID: Project to Avoid Increasing Delinquencies, which places special emphasis on activities that result in increasing collections of current support and reducing arrears. PAID 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.

Child support debt remains a seminal challenge for the CSE program. Unpaid support obligations resulting from unrealistically high support obligations and existing welfare cost-recovery policies have resulted in staggering amounts of debt owed to the government to repay welfare costs. Research indicates that most of this debt will never be collected. A series of state studies conducted by the Urban Institute show that 70 percent of child support debt is owed by parents who report earning $10,000 a year or less. Only 40 percent of child support debt is likely to be collected within ten years, yet arrearages are estimated to grow by about 60 percent over the next ten years. 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 11.2 million cases with arrearages due in FY 2008, and over 7.1 million of these cases had collections in FY 2007 representing a three percent increase over FY 2007. This figure also represents 63 percent of paying cases among IV-D arrearage cases, which exceeded the target for FY 2008 for the first time since FY 2002. The target for FY 2011 has been set at 62 percent which will continue to be difficult for States, particularly in light of the downturn in the economy. 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. Initiatives such as PAID, mentioned above, are intended to proactively assist with these challenges.

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. Since arrears may impede payment of current support, this issue must continue to receive focused attention if support is to be a reliable source of income for all children to whom it is owed.

The CSE program clearly demonstrates a high return on investment. 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 2008, the national ratio was $4.80, which exceeded the target of $4.63. The formula for determining the CER is the total collections distributed ($26.6 billion), plus the collections forwarded to other states for distribution ($1.51 billion), and fees retained by other states ($1.04 million), divided by the administrative expenditures ($5.9 billion), less the non-IV-D administrative costs ($20 million). Data from FY 2008 show that a record high of $26.6 billion was collected for child support, representing a 40 percent increase since FY 2001 and a 6.9 percent increase from the previous fiscal year. A tool that states have used to increase collections is the tax refund and administrative offset, from which $2.85 billion in delinquent child support was collected in calendar year 2008, a 68.6[4] 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 payments[5] 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, administration simplifications such as treating TANF and non-TANF cases more similarly, improving collaboration with families and partner organizations, updating its medical support policies to align with anticipated reforms to children's health care coverage, and building on evidence-based innovations. By FY 2011, OCSE expects to reach the target of $4.84 collected per $1 of expenditures.

Furthermore, the above mentioned CSE activities and performance objectives work with parents to improve child wellbeing and align with the broader goals of strengthening families and supporting responsible fatherhood as well as stimulating economic recovery by transferring income to families, helping them purchase goods and services. The CSE program serves mostly lower-income families who are more likely to spend the child support money quickly to meet basic household needs. ARRA funding 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 in the child support program. While available, these funds should allow state CSE agencies to maintain program operations and overall performance and meet performance objectives to deliver lasting positive outcomes for children and families.

---

[4] The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 allowed states to certify nearly 1 million additional non-TANF debts in PY 2008 that were previously not eligible for tax refund offset. It is estimated that this resulted in at least an additional $200 million collected. The Economic Stimulus Act of 2008 provided economic stimulus payments of up to $600 ($1,200 if filing a joint return, plus additional amounts for each qualifying child), to be made to over 130 million American households. These payments were eligible for tax refund offset and resulted in an additional $863 million in collections in PY 2008.

[5] 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. *(Efficiency)* | *2011* | 6% | Dec-12 |
| | *2010* | 6%[1] | Dec-11 |
| | *2009* | 9% | Dec-10 |
| | *2008* | 9% | 4% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 9% | 5% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | N/A | 5% (Historical Actual) |
| 7O: Increase the percentage of children who exit foster care within two years of placement either through guardianship or adoption. *(PSSF, SSBG) (Outcome)* | *2011* | Prior Result +2% | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +2% | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 38.0% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 36.0% | 41.9% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 35.0% | 42.2% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | N/A | 39.7% (Target Exceeded) |

| 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. |

[1] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been updated to maintain rigor given the recent data trend.

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 7O | 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. 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 2008, the average of 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico showed that four 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 2008, the program decreased administrative costs as a percent of total costs to four percent, a significant improvement over the FY 2005 result of seven percent. This reduction in administrative costs in FY 2008 means that a greater percentage of funding was expended for direct services, and thus reached a greater number of recipients. By FY 2011, the program expects to meet or exceed the target of six percent. Future year targets for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 have been updated from nine percent to six percent to maintain rigor, given the recent data trend. Some of the improvement in performance may be attributed to the fact that 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 7O, 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 13 percent of SSBG expenditures in FY 2008.

## *Promoting Safe and Stable Families*

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

## *22. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)*

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 22.1LT and 22A: Increase the percentage of state work participation rates that meet or exceed requirements. *(developmental) (Efficiency)* | *2011* | TBD | Dec-12 |
| | *2010* | TBD | Dec-11 |
| | *2009* | N/A | Dec-10 |
| | *2008* | Set Baseline | Mar-10 |
| | *2007* | Set Baseline | 73% (Baseline) |
| | *2006* | N/A | 94% (Historical Actual) |
| 22.2LT and 22B: Increase the percentage of adult TANF recipients who become newly employed.[1] *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | FY 2009 Actual Result +1.6PP (FY 2014) | Oct-15 |
| | *2011* | FY 2009 Actual Result + 0.3PP | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | 38.4% | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 38.0% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 37.0% | 34.6%[2] (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 36.0% | 35.8% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 35.0% | 35.6% (Target Exceeded) |
| 22.3LT and 22C: Increase the percentage of adult TANF recipients/former recipients employed in one quarter that were still employed in the next two consecutive quarters. *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | FY 2009 Actual Result +3PP (FY 2014) | Oct-15 |
| | *2011* | FY 2009 Actual Result + 1.5PP | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | Prior Result +1PP | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 65% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 63% | 62.6%[2] (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 62% | 64.4% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 61% | 64.7% (Target Exceeded) |
| 22.4LT and 22D: Increase the percentage rate of earnings gained by | *Out-Year Target* | FY 2009 Actual Result +1.5PP (FY 2014) | Oct-15 |

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

[2] Although the sample size used for federal reporting is adequate for program purposes, the subsamples used for the job entry, job retention, and earnings gain measures are not large enough to ensure comparability of FY 2008 data with FY 2007 data for some states that switched from universe data in one period to sample reporting in the other (or vice versa). As a result, these states have been excluded from the calculation of the national rates for FY 2008.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| employed adult TANF recipients/former recipients between a base quarter and a second subsequent quarter. *(Outcome)* | | | |
| | *2011* | FY 2009 Actual Result +0.8PP | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | FY 2009 Actual Result +0.5PP | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 40.9% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 40.8% | 33.2%[2] (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 40.7% | 36.6% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 38.8% | 33.8% (Target Not Met) |
| 22E: Increase the rate of case closures related to employment, child support collected, and marriage. *(Outcome)* | *2011* | FY 2009 Actual Result +0.4PP | Oct-12 |
| | *2010* | 21.2% | Oct-11 |
| | *2009* | 21.0% | Oct-10 |
| | *2008* | 20.8% | 20.7% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 20.4% | 23.2% (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | 20.3% | 21.6% (Target Exceeded) |
| 22.5LT and 22F: Increase the number of children living in married couple households as a percentage of all children living in households.[3] *(Outcome)* | *Out-Year Target* | 69.8% (CY 2014) | N/A |
| | *2011* | 69.2% | Jan-13 |
| | *2010* | 69.0%[4] | Jan-12 |
| | *2009* | 73.0% | Jan-11 |
| | *2008* | 72.0% | Jan-10 |
| | *2007* | 71.0% | 68.3% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | 70.0% | 68.4% (Target Not Met) |

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

[3] This annual measure is under review pending the reauthorization of TANF. 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. Future year targets for this measure have been updated based on recent data trends.

[4] The FY 2010 target for this measure had been updated given the recent data trends.

| Measure | Data Source | Data Validation |
|---|---|---|
| 22.2LT<br>22B<br>22.3LT<br>22C<br>22.4LT<br>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<br>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 unless the rates are adjusted downward due to caseload decline since FY 2005. This efficiency measure compares states' actual overall and two-parent rates to the required rates in a specific year. 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 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 to update the base year from 1995 to 2005.[5] In FY 2007, 73 percent of state and territory work participation rates met

[5] State work participation rate targets are adjusted downward by the percent that the state TANF caseload declines from the base year.

or exceeded their required targets. This rate is lower than in prior years principally due to the DRA changes mentioned above. This FY 2007 performance result 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. In addition to this new 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 (using FY 2007 and FY 2008 actual results).

Regarding annual measure 22B (job entry), in FY 2008, 34.6 percent of recipients became employed. Several factors have contributed to the job entry of TANF adult recipients, 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.

Annual measure 22B and long-term objective 22.2LT, have the goal of increasing the rate in FY 2011 by 0.3 percentage points above the FY 2009 result. New targets for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 were established during the program assessment in CY 2005. The TANF regulations resulting from DRA defined each of the countable work activities for the first time. However, the employment entry rate for TANF recipients fell in 2008, and in light of the challenging labor market in many states, 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 62.6 percent in FY 2008, which narrowly missed the target of 63 percent. 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 2011 of achieving a 1.5 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 recipients[6]) in a third quarter by the earnings of TANF recipients in a first quarter,

[6] "Former recipients" include only those that received TANF in the first quarter of a fiscal year, but left the rolls in either the second or third quarter.

provided they were employed in the first and third quarters.[7, 8] Although the target of 40.8 percent was missed in FY 2008, TANF recipients and former recipients showed an increase in earnings of 33.2 percent between two successive quarters. This means that current and former TANF recipients increased earnings over time, but that the increase over two successive quarters was less than was set for the target. Although the program targets for FY 10 and 11 will exceed the rate attained in FY 2009, reaching these higher rates may be difficult given that there are fewer opportunities to advance in the current labor market.

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 narrowly missed the target of 20.8 percent in FY 2008 by achieving a rate of 20.7 percent. ACF had projected that the rate of closures would level off in FY 2007 before increasing in fiscal years 2008 and 2009 although the economic downturn during that period suggests that case closures may be lower than expected. However, states have also been encouraged to access the NDNH to uncover cases of employment previously unknown to the agency, and this may result in more cases being categorized as 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.

Annual measure 22F seeks to measure success in increasing the number of children living in married couple households as a percentage of all children living in households. While targets for this measure increased from 70 percent in 2006 to 73 percent in 2009, the actual percentages of children living in married couple households were 68.7 in 2005, 68.4 percent in 2006 and 68.3 percent in 2007. Data are not yet available for 2008. Note that this measure is calculated for the entire population of children, and the great majority of children do not receive benefits from, or otherwise have contact with the TANF program; accordingly, the TANF program has very limited capacity to affect this measure for the overall population of families with children. ACF is exploring the development of measures to capture other aspects of improved child well-being and responsible fatherhood.

## *Child Care Entitlement*

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

[7] 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.

[8] 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.

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

The following chart displays the relationship between HHS and ACF 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.** |
| **HHS Strategic Goals** | | | | |
| **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 2009 | FY 2010 | FY 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1: Health Care** Improve the safety, quality, affordability and accessibility of heath 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) | $4,346.0 | $4,855.0 | $4,324.0 |
| 100% | 4,346.0 | 4,855.0 | 4,324.0 |
| Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | 17,134.0 | 16,822.0 | 21,832.0 |
| 100% | 17,134.0 | 16,822.0 | 21,832.0 |
| Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| 100% | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) | 5,103.0 | 5,103.0 | 5,304.0 |
| 100% | 5,103.0 | 5,103.0 | 5,304.0 |
| Child Care | 5,054.0 | 5,055.0 | 6,655.0 |
| 98.9% | 4,998.4 | 4,999.4 | 6,581.8 |
| Developmental Disabilities | 190.0 | 193.0 | 194.0 |
| 85.5% | 162.5 | 165.0 | 165.9 |
| **3.2** Protect the safety and foster the well being of children and youth. | | | |
| Head Start | $7,158.0 | $7,282.0 | $8,274.0 |
| 100% | 7,158.0 | 7,282.0 | 8,274.0 |

| HHS Strategic Goals and Objectives (cont.) | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | FY 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Child Welfare | $8,275.0 | $8,450.0 | $8,540.0 |
| 99.24% | 8,212.0 | 8,385.8 | 8,475.1 |
| Youth Programs | 255.0 | 124.0 | 124.0 |
| 100% | 255.0 | 124.0 | 124.0 |
| **3.3** Encourage the development of strong, healthy and supportive communities. | | | |
| Community Services | $805.0 | $755.0 | $743.0 |
| 100% | 805.0 | 755.0 | 743.0 |
| 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 | $2.0 | $2.0 |
| 100% | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Refugee and Entrant Assistance | 729.0 | 745.0 | 893.0 |
| 82% | 597.8 | 610.9 | 732.3 |
| Native American Programs | 50.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 |
| 100% | 50.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 |
| Domestic Violence | 132.0 | 135.0 | 146.0 |
| 100% | 132.0 | 135.0 | 146.0 |
| **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 | $50,957.0 | $51,299.0 | $58,809.0 |

Methodology

The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) calculates full cost by allocating its Federal Administration indirect costs[1] 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

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

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.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMPLETED PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Further detail on the findings and recommendations of the following program evaluations completed during FY 2009 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:

- Evaluation of the Life Skills Training Program Los Angeles County, California (05/01/2009)
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being, Brief 3: Children's Cognitive and Socioemotional Development and their Receipt of Special Education and Mental Health Services, Research Brief (05/01/2009)
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being, Brief 4: Infants and Toddlers in the Child Welfare System, Research Brief (05/01/2009)
- Evaluation of the Early Start to Emancipation Preparation Tutoring Program Los Angeles County, California: Final Report (01/01/2009)
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being, Brief 13: Depression Among Caregivers of Young Children Reported for Child Maltreatment (11/01/2008)
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being, Brief 11: Adolescents Involved with Child Welfare: A Transition to Adulthood (11/01/2008)

Child Care Research:

- Early Childhood Assessment: Why, What and How? (12/01/2008 and 06/01/2009)
- Evaluation of Child Care Subsidy Strategies Findings from an Experimental Test of Three Language/Literacy Interventions in Child Care Centers in Miami-Dade County: Final Report (03/01/2009)

Head Start Research:

- Lessons Learned from Interventions to Address Infant Mental Health in Early Head Start: Research to Practice Brief (05/01/2009)
- Beginning Head Start: Children, Families and Programs in Fall 2006 (04/01/2009)
- Strategies for Promoting Prevention and Improving Oral Health Care Delivery in Head Start: Findings from the Oral Health Initiative Evaluation Volume I (12/01/2008)
- A Guide to Emerging Strategies for Promoting Prevention and Improving Oral Health Care Delivery in Head Start: Lessons for the Oral Health Initiative Evaluation Volume II (12/01/2008)
- I Am Moving, I Am Learning: Early Findings from the Implementation of an Obesity Prevention Enhancement in Head Start Region III (12/01/2008)

Strengthening Families and Healthy Marriage Research:

- American Community Survey: New Survey Questions Enable Measurement of Marital Transitions (04/01/2009)
- Assessment of Survey Data for the Analysis of Marriage and Divorce at the National, State, and Local Levels (04/01/2009)
- Collection of Marriage and Divorce Statistics by States (04/01/2009)
- Electronic Collection of Marriage and Divorce Statistics by States (04/01/2009)
- Effects of Employment on Marriage: Evidence from a Randomized Study of the Job Corps Program (12/01/2008)

Welfare and Employment Research:

- Transitional Jobs for Ex-Prisoners: Implementation, Two-Year Impacts, and Costs of the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) Prisoner Reentry Program (09/24/2009)
- Teaching Self-Sufficiency: An Impact and Benefit-Cost Analysis of a Home Visitation and Life Skills Education Program: Findings from the Rural Welfare-to-Work Strategies Demonstration Evaluation (12/01/2008)
- A Study of States: TANF Diversion Programs: Final Report (12/01/2008)

## 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. *(Outcome) (Foster Care)* | *2008* | 68.0% | 66.2% (Target Not Met) |
| | *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. *(Outcome) (Foster Care)* | *2008* | 7.0% | 10.4% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2007* | 7.0% | 9.4% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | 7.0% | 9.3% (Target Not Met) |
| | *2005* | 5.0% | 8.5% (Target Not Met) |

### ***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.[1] *(Outcome)* | *2007* | 96% | 94.8% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| | *2006* | 94% | 93.5% (Target Not Met but Improved) |
| 3.2LT: Increase the percentage of programs that achieve average fall to spring gains of at least 12 months in word knowledge (PPVT). [1, 2] *(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 |

[1] 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.
[2] This long term objective is also a performance indicator in the FY 2007 – 2012 HHS Strategic Plan.

### ***Mentoring Children of Prisoners***

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 + 27,500[3] | 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) |

## DISCONTINUED PERFORMANCE MEASURES: PENDING PROPOSED PROGRAM ELIMINATION

### ***Community-Based 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.[4] *(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 | $18 (Baseline) |
| | *2006* | N/A | $21 (Historical Actual)[5] |
| | *2005* | N/A | $54 (Historical Actual)[6] |

[3] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been updated to more accurately reflect performance goals based on funding levels.
[4] This measure is based on data collected every other year. Next data available data will be from CY 2009.
[5] This is the cost for new 2006 CBAE grantees. This cost is not inclusive of Title V grantees.
[6] 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.

| Measure | FY | Target | Result |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5D: Increase the proportion of youth who have never had sexual intercourse and remain abstinent following participation in an abstinence education program. *(developmental)* [7] *(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 |

## ***Compassion Capital Fund (CCF)***

| 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. *(Outcome)* | *2009* | 21.40 | Apr-10 |
| | *2008* | 20.81 | 38.13 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 20.22 | 28.54 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2006* | Set Baseline | 19.63 (Baseline) |
| 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. *(Outcome)* | *2009* | 18.97 | Apr-10 |
| | *2008* | 18.62 | 23.64 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | 18.26 | 14.41 (Target Not Met) |
| | *2006* | Set Baseline | 17.90 (Baseline) |
| 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. *(Efficiency)* | *2009* | 2.62 | Apr-10 |
| | *2008* | 2.53 | 4.41 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *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. *(Outcome)* | *2009* | 33.23 | Apr-10 |
| | *2008* | 32.59 | 45.82 (Target Exceeded) |
| | *2007* | Set Baseline | 31.95 (Baseline) |

[7] 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.