DEPARTMENT of HEALTH and HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

FY 2012 Online Performance Appendix

Introduction

The FY 2012 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 (OMB) Circulars A-11 and A-136 through the HHS agencies' FY 2012 Congressional Justifications and Online Performance Appendices, the Agency Financial Report, and the HHS Summary of Performance and Financial Information Report. These documents are available at: http://www.hhs.gov/budget/.

The FY 2012 Congressional Justifications and accompanying Online Performance Appendices contain the updated FY 2010 Annual Performance Report and FY 2012 Annual Performance Plan. The Agency Financial Report provides fiscal and high-level performance results. The HHS Summary of Performance and Financial Information Report summarizes key past and planned performance and financial information.

The Performance Appendix is a supplement to the FY 2012 Congressional Budget Justification. It includes all performance measures for the Administration for Children and Families, including performance measures discussed in the FY 2012 Congressional Budget Justification.

MESSAGE FROM THE ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY

I am pleased to present the FY 2012 Online Performance Appendix for the Administration for Children and Families (ACF). 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]

David A. Hansell
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Children and Families

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

FY 2012 ONLINE PERFORMANCE APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FY 2012 BUDGET	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
TRANSMITTAL LETTER	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
SUMMARY OF TARGETS AND RESULTS TABLE	4
ACF HIGH PRIORITY PERFORMANCE GOALS	5
PERFORMANCE DETAIL (BY ACTIVITY)	8
ACF SUPPORT FOR THE HHS STRATEGIC PLAN	118
FULL COST TABLE	121
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMPLETED PROGRAM EVALUATIONS	124
DISCONTINUED PERFORMANCE MEASURES	126

ACF SUMMARY OF TARGETS AND RESULTS TABLE[1]

The Summary of Target and Results Table provides an overview of all targets established for each corresponding fiscal year.

Fiscal Year	Total Targets	Targets with Results Reported	Percent of Targets with Results Reported	Total Targets Met	Percent of Targets Met
2007	68	68	100%	48	71%
2008	71	71	100%	43	61%
2009	76	72	95%	49	68%
2010	86	33	38%	26	79%
2011	83	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2012	79	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

[1] Figures in the table reflect only measures that are reported in this FY 2012 budget submission. Performance measures that have been discontinued are not included in this count. The FY 2012 submission also includes 19 developmental measures and one qualitative measure, which likewise are not included in the table.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
HIGH PRIORITY PERFORMANCE GOALS

Resources and Performance
(dollars in millions)

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
Head Start	$7,234	$7,235	$8,100
Child Care	5,044	5,044	6,344
Total	**$12,278**	**$12,279**	**$14,444**

Head Start

Performance Measure	FY 2009 Result	FY 2010 Result	FY 2011 Target	FY 2012 Target
Increase the number of children enrolled in Head Start.	n/a	12,390	13,000	N/A
Develop criteria for determining whether Head Start and Early Head Start grantees are failing to operate a high quality and comprehensive program. Will propose rigorous indicators for identifying underperforming programs, including evidence-based assessments of program quality, and will adopt regulations establishing the criteria and the process for reviewing grantees to determine whether they meet the criteria for an underperforming program.	n/a	Notice of proposed rule making published (9/22/10)	Final rule to be published	Make determination decisions on first cohort of grantees reviewed under the Designation Renewal System and begin recompeting grants
Implement an improved Training and Technical Assistance (T/TA) System that includes a focus on early childhood specialists and provides information to Head Start programs on evidence-based teaching and learning practices, professional development, child health, and other early childhood development and program management topics.	n/a	Awarded funds to 4 National T/TA Centers (see: http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/Head%20Start%20Program/roadmap/HHS_Announces_National_Centers.pdf)	Conduct at least 6 trainings and planning mtgs with National Centers; Convene at least 4 training mtgs with state ed specialists	Conduct at least 4 training and planning mtgs with National Centers; Convene at least 4 mtgs with state ed specialists

Early Head Start

Performance Measure[1]	FY 2009 Result	FY 2010 Result	FY 2011 Target	FY 2012 Target
Increase the number of children enrolled in Early Head Start.	n/a	42,730	48,000	N/A

[1] The performance measures related to Quality under Head Start are also applicable to Early Head Start.

Child Care

Performance Measure	FY 2009 Result	FY 2010 Result	FY 2011 Target	FY 2012 Target
Increase the average monthly number of children served through the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF).	Not Yet Available	Maintain 100,000 children and serve an additional 10,000 children (Result Not Yet Available)	Maintain 200,000 children and serve an additional 90,000 children[2]	Maintain 100,000 children and serve an additional 120,000 children[3]
Expand the number of states with Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) that meet high quality benchmarks for Child Care and other early childhood programs developed by HHS in coordination with the Department of Education.	n/a	Convened meeting of over 50 subject matter experts to inform the development of high quality benchmarks within the framework of QRIS.	Provide continuing TA services to at least 20 states/territories and intensive TA services in an additional 10 states/territories; provide public access to online systems building and planning tools.	Increase the number of states/territories meeting benchmarks of a high quality QRIS; specific targets will be established in FY 2011, once baseline data is available.

ACF has made significant progress on the achievement of both Priority Goals related to Early Childhood Education. As shown in the tables above, ACF is on track to achieve Goal 36, Access to Early Care and Education Programs for Low-Income Children, and related milestones. More specifically:

- Head Start: As of December 30, 2010, a total of 58,302 total additional Head Start and Early Head Start children were served as a result of Recovery Act funds. The Early Head Start total was 45,435, and the Head Start total was 12,867. ACF is confident we will achieve the overall goal of enrolling the full 61,000 additional slots created under the Recovery Act because the Office of Head Start (OHS) has already funded this number of slots in FY 2011. Part of the shortfall to date may be attributed to the difficulties faced by Recovery Act expansion grantees to enroll and serve children on the originally projected timeline. These difficulties include delays in licensing or in renovating facilities, or problems securing alternate space when facilities fall through. Some grantees encountered difficulties in switching to a home-based option on an interim basis until the proposed center-based program is fully operational. OHS is working extensively with these grantees to provide technical assistance to get on track.
- Child Care: Data on the number of children served by the CCDF program is available on an annual basis only. Therefore, there is no quarterly data to share at this time. The $2 billion in child care funding made available by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) is allowing states to maintain services to thousands of families who would not otherwise have been served. We expect these services to be reflected in the data once it is available. Furthermore, quarterly data reported by states on the CCDF expenditure reports (ACF-696) and the government-wide 1512 reports confirm state progress. Based on information from the expenditure reports, through September 30, 2010, states had spent enough Recovery Act child care funds on direct services to support child care services for an estimated 252,000 children.

[2] The FY 2011 target for this measure is dependent on the FY 2011 President's Budget request funding level.
[3] The FY 2012 target for this measure is dependent on the FY 2012 President's Budget request funding level.

Regarding Goal 37, Quality in Early Care and Education Programs for Low-Income Children, ACF is also on track to achieve this goal and the related milestones:

- Head Start: On September 21, 2010, ACF published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on a system of designation renewal that would sets forth a process to determine whether Head Start and Early Head Start agencies are delivering high-quality and comprehensive programs, based on data from triennial program reviews, monitoring, and a validated and reliable measure of instructional quality. The proposed rule requires that the lowest performing 25 percent of grantees be required to compete with other eligible local applicants, ensuring that the provider best qualified to provide high quality services is the Head Start and/or Early Head Start grantee in that community.

- Also on September 21, 2010, ACF announced the awarding of funds for four National Training and Technical Assistance Centers (per cooperative agreement). For additional detail, see: http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/Head%20Start%20Program/roadmap/ All four center announcements can be found at: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/grants/open/foa/office/ohs. These four centers are as follows:
    - The National Center on Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/grants/open/foa/view/HHS-2010-ACF-OHS-HC-0090
    - The National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/grants/open/foa/view/HHS-2010-ACF-OHS-HC-0087
    - The National Center on Program Management and Fiscal Operations: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/grants/open/foa/view/HHS-2010-ACF-OHS-HC-0088
    - The National Center on Quality Teaching and Learning: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/grants/open/foa/view/HHS-2010-ACF-OHS-HC-0089

- Child Care: With respect to the Child Care quality initiatives, on-line access is now available to a Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) Resource Guide at http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/qrisresourceguide and to an interactive Cost Estimation Model at http://qriscostmodel.nccic.acf.hhs.gov. In addition, a link to a compendium of research through the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, as well as other QRIS research and resources is available at http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/poptopics/qris_resources.html.

  From July through September (2010), progress on quality initiatives included three webinars with State Administrators and national organizations to gather and share information on developing benchmarks in the framework of QRIS. These webinars, in conjunction with information from the national meeting held in June, formed the basis for work that is now underway in the Office of Child Care to develop the high quality benchmarks. This work is being coordinated with a proposed revision to the Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) State Plan and new Quality Performance Report that includes data collection on quality measures, and was released for public comment in September.

More information about ACF's Priority Goals can be found at: http://performance.gov.

FY 2012 Performance Appendix
Administration for Children and Families

Performance Detail

DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS....9
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program....9
1. Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)....9
Child Care and Development Block Grant....15
2. Child Care and Development Block Grant....15
Children and Families Services Programs....20
3. Head Start....20
4. Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs....27
6. Mentoring Children of Prisoners....33
7. Child Abuse Prevention and Child Welfare Programs....38
8. Developmental Disabilities....65
9. Native American Programs....70
11. Federal Administration....74
12. Community Services Block Grant....77
13. Individual Development Accounts (Assets for Independence)....80
14. Family Violence Prevention and Services....83
Refugee and Entrant Assistance....86
15. Transitional and Medical Services....86
16. Matching Grants....88
17. Victims of Trafficking....91
18. Social Services/Targeted Assistance....94
19. Unaccompanied Alien Children....98

MANDATORY PROGRAMS....104
Child Support Enforcement and Family Support Programs....104
20. Child Support Enforcement....104
Social Services Block Grant....112
21. Social Services Block Grant....112
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)....114
22. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)....114

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.[4] *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result + 2%	Sep-13
	2011	Prior Result + 2%	Sep-12
	2010	Prior Result + 2%	Sep-11
	2009	96	76 (Target Not Met)
	2008	96	76 (Target Not Met)
	2007	94	78 (Target Not Met but Improved)
1.1LT and 1B: Increase the recipiency targeting index score of LIHEAP households having at least one member five years or younger.[5] *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result + 2%	Sep-13
	2011	110	Sep-12
	2010	110	Sep-11
	2009	122	117 (Target Not Met but improved)
	2008	122	110 (Target Not Met)
	2007	122	110 (Target Not Met)
	2007	122	110 (Target Not Met)

[4] This measure is calculated using only heating-assisted households with at least one elderly member. The FY 2009 actual result for this measure excludes data from one state that is revising its data.

[5] This measure is calculated using only heating-assisted homes with at least one young child. The FY 2009 actual result for this measure excludes data from one state that is revising its data.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
1.1LT 1A 1.1LT 1B	State *LIHEAP Household Report* and Census Bureau's Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey	ACF obtains weighted national estimated numbers of LIHEAP income eligible (low income) households from the Census Bureau's Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey. The estimates are subject to sampling variability. The latest three years of ASEC data are used to make the estimates more precise. The Census Bureau validates ASEC data. 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 September 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 at least 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.

Long term goal 1.1 (A and B) directly relates to the LIHEAP statutory mandate 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. Program targeting is successful if a group of households are served at a higher rate than the prevalence of that group in the low income household population. The LIHEAP recipiency targeting index serves as a proxy to measure the success of LIHEAP outreach efforts in providing heating assistance to two groups of vulnerable households, i.e., low income elderly households and low income young child households. In working on the long term goal, ACF's strategy has been to supplement states' LIHEAP outreach efforts with national LIHEAP outreach efforts and with federal and national collaborations.

ACF annually calculates LIHEAP recipiency targeting index scores at the national level, and more recently, at the state level as a measure of program targeting. The targeting index measures are ratios that compare the percent of LIHEAP heating recipiency households that are members of the target group to the percent of all LIHEAP income eligible households that are members of the target group. The recipiency targeting index score is calculated as follows:

- Recipiency ratio—calculate the percent of all heating assisted households that are members of a specific group (i.e., elderly or young children);
- Income eligible ratio—calculate the percent of all LIHEAP-income eligible households that are members of the target group; and
- Recipiency targeting index—divide the recipiency ratio by the income eligible ratio and multiply that result by 100 to obtain the recipiency target index for the selected group of households. (Scores above or below 100 indicate whether program targeting is more or less successful for a target group of households).

LIHEAP's outreach efforts are subject to external factors that may affect the LIHEAP recipiency targeting index scores. For example, fluctuations in the national economy will generally affect the need for human services programs such as LIHEAP, which is a non-entitlement program. In addition, the

following factors can impact LIHEAP recipiency targeting performance: (1) weather; (2) home energy prices; (3) utility deregulation; (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 applying for assistance; (7) low income demographic trends; and (8) the block grant design of LIHEAP.[6] 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 recipiency targeting index value for FY 2009 was 76; this continues the trend over the past four years of recipiency targeting index values remaining in the high 70s. ACF's target for both FY 2011 and FY 2012 is to increase the index value by two percent over the prior year's result. As LIHEAP is a block grant, it is the state's responsibility to target those households that they consider most vulnerable. ACF has worked to supplement state targeting efforts for elderly households. One consideration is the increased difficulty faced by the elderly to enroll in LIHEAP as compared to families with young children. For this reason, ACF participates in the National Center for Outreach and Benefit Enrollment that is funded by the Administration on Aging. LIHEAP is one of a five federal benefit programs that this Center is looking at to develop innovative ways to increase enrollment of the elderly in those programs.

Regarding annual measure 1B, targeting to households with young children, the targeting index value rose from 110 in FY 2008 to 117 in FY 2009, representing a statistically significant increase and the first break in a downward decline in index values since the baseline year.[7] Although the targeting of young children improved in FY 2009, the targeting index remains below the baseline targeting index score of 122. However, it is important to note that any targeting index value over 100 indicates that the LIHEAP program is still providing effective outreach to income eligible households with a child under the age of five. Last year ACF adjusted the targets for FY 2010 and FY 2011 to maintain a targeting index of 110, which was the actual targeting index score achieved in both FY 2007 and FY 2008. The target for FY 2012 is to increase by two percent over the previous year's actual result. These adjustments were made in order to reflect the trend in actual index values over recent years. However, the child recipiency target index score for FY 2009 may signal the beginning of a new trend that will need to be followed over the next several years to determine whether the target scores need to be adjusted.

The current recipiency targeting index reflects only those households that receive LIHEAP heating assistance. However, ACF received OMB approval in October 2008 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 assistance. LIHEAP grantees will begin reporting the unduplicated household counts in FY 2011. Accurate reporting will provide for a comprehensive measurement of LIHEAP program recipiency targeting. For example, the total unduplicated count will allow households receiving cooling assistance to be included in the total count for the first time. States that provide cooling assistance tend to serve a large share of elderly households. The unduplicated recipiency household count should increase the targeting scores for both elderly households and young child households because it will reflect the total number of those households

[6] States have maximum flexibility under the block grant statutes to design and operate programs suited to each state's assessment of its citizens' needs. Consequently, ACF has very limited influence on 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.

[7] The precision of the targeting indexes is affected by sampling variability of the income eligible household estimates. There would have to be a change of approximately five targeting index points for young child households from FY 2008 to FY 2009 to be statistically significant (at the 95 percent confidence interval).. A statistically significant finding indicates that a change in targeting performance indexes from one year to the next is not due to chance at the national level.

served by all forms of LIHEAP assistance. The unduplicated count should not affect the income eligible household ratio.

Except for the data on young children for FY 2009, the trend data for long term goal 1.1 (A and B) indicate the difficulty of affecting LIHEAP targeting performance nationally. Ultimately, the states have discretion in operating their programs, including the extent to which their program targets vulnerable households. As the decisions remain with the states, ACF lacks the authority to mandate a specific national LIHEAP targeting level. Nevertheless, ACF will continue to support state efforts in targeting LIHEAP assistance given that the LIHEAP statute does not prohibit ACF from doing so. ACF will refine its outreach activities with other federal and national partners. For example, staff from the Division of Energy Assistance have held meetings with ACF staff from the Office of Head Start (OHS) and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs to share LIHEAP recipiency data on young child households to explore the extent to which similar trends can be seen regarding the number of recipient households with either an elderly member or a young child. ACF is also a member of the National Center for Benefits Outreach and Enrollment (NCBOE), which is funded by the Administration on Aging.[8] Additionally, ACF will sustain recent efforts to provide state recipiency targeting index scores as feedback to states on how well they are reaching the two vulnerable populations, as described below.

In May 2009, ACF reported state rankings of heating assistance recipiency targeting index values for FY 2006.[9] In August 2010, ACF reported state rankings for FY 2007.[10] ACF will continue to provide updated state-level rankings annually.[11] These state-level rankings allow for the following:

- ACF and its LIHEAP grantees can better understand which states are consistently high and low performers in targeting heating assistance to elderly and young child households, and why this may be so.
- State recipiency targeting rankings provide accountability and feedback to the states and can be used as a performance management tool for self-improvement.
- State rankings can provide the opportunity for peer technical assistance among states.

By 2014, ACF plans to replace the recipiency targeting index proxies for health and safety outcomes for LIHEAP with actual outcome measures. The current performance measures will be tracked until the new developmental outcome measures are fully implemented and national baseline data are available in 2014, as discussed below.

In June 2008, ACF established the LIHEAP Performance Measures Planning Work Group, consisting of state LIHEAP Directors and ACF staff. The Work Group developed a logic model which identifies the long-term goal of LIHEAP as providing LIHEAP recipients with continuous, safe, and affordable home energy service. The Work Group completed its work in January 2010 when it drafted a set of over 36 potential LIHEAP performance measures that could be useful to both the states and ACF. These draft measures are grouped into one of four tiers by type of LIHEAP assistance. Performance measures in tiers

[8] NCBOE's goal is to increase economy security of the elderly and younger persons with disabilities through benefits access to five federal programs, including LIHEAP.

[9] ACF provided the information for FY 2006 to states in LIHEAP-IM-2009-09 in May 2009 (see: www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/liheap/guidance/information_memoranda/indexim2009.html).

[10] ACF provided the information for FY 2007 to states in LIHEAP-IM-2014-10 in August 2010 (see: www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/liheap/guidance/information_memoranda/im10-14.html).

[11] Unlike the national recipiency targeting indexes, state recipiency targeting indexes use income eligibility data from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). Three consecutive years of ACS data provide more reliable state-level estimates of low income households when compared to ASEC data. The latest ACS data are available in September of the following year in which the ACS is fielded.

1-3 are to be state-reported based on each state's ability to collect increasingly complex data. Tier 4 data are to be collected at the federal level.

In April 2010, ACF established a follow-up group, the LIHEAP Performance Measures Implementation Work Group, consisting of state LIHEAP Directors and ACF staff. The Work Group will be active through at least 2014 in overseeing the selection and implementation of the first Work Group's proposed LIHEAP outcome measures. Thus far, the Work Group has been engaged in the following activities:

- In summer 2010, the Work Group administered to states a LIHEAP performance measures needs assessment.
- In fall 2010, the Work Group analyzed and reported on the results of the needs assessment, developed objectives for implementing the proposed performance measures, and began creating the tools and resources to allow state grantees to measure LIHEAP program performance.
- In spring 2011, the Work Group, with the consensus of state LIHEAP grantees, will select a smaller number of the proposed measures that are manageable in developing a LIHEAP performance measurement system.
- In summer 2011, the Work Group will develop a timeframe to implement the LIHEAP performance measurement system. Milestones will be established for developing formal training, determining technical assistance (such as procedures for the states' sampling of LIHEAP households), and identifying and obtaining ACF resources to assist the states in collecting and reporting on outcome data.
- By the end of summer 2011, ACF will provide draft tier 1 and tier 2 performance measures for OMB review and comment as part of the FY 2013 congressional budget justification.

In June 2010, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report titled, *LIHEAP: Greater Fraud Prevention Controls Needed*, based on an investigation of seven state LIHEAP grantees that found instances of ineligible households or household members receiving LIHEAP benefits and fraudulent energy vendors receiving LIHEAP payments on behalf of recipients.[12] ACF considers program integrity to be a critical aspect of program management; ACF has taken the following steps in order to provide new guidance to LIHEAP grantees on addressing program integrity:

- On May 5, 2010, ACF released an Information Memorandum (IM) to all LIHEAP grantees strongly encouraging them to require social security numbers (SSNs) for all LIHEAP applicants and household members and to verify recipients' identities through external databases, such as the Social Security Administration's database(s).[13]
- On June 8, 2010, ACF released an Action Transmittal (AT) that required all LIHEAP grantees to supplement their FY 2011 LIHEAP plans (which were submitted September 1, 2010) with a Program Integrity Assessment that discusses the program integrity protocols and systems currently in place and what expected changes will be made to them in FY 2011.[14]
- ACF has and continues to hold, webinars and teleconferences with LIHEAP grantees to discuss the guidance provided.
- Lastly, ACF is establishing a work group to assist with identifying effective program integrity strategies and to develop a best-practices module that can be used by state agencies and their local program administrators.

[12] www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/liheap/guidance/information_memoranda/im10-06.html
[13] www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/liheap/guidance/action_transmittals/at10-06.html
[14] www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/liheap/guidance/action_transmittals/at10-06_1.html

ACF is currently developing the structure and goals of the work group. The work group will solicit states and tribes for participation. Through the efforts of the work group and our ongoing dialogue with states, we aim to:

- Establish a standard of interagency collaboration with the Social Services Administration to authenticate Social Security Numbers (SSN),
- Recommend a framework for using SSNs to access death registries, prisoner databases, and other systems;
- Recommend standard procedures that sufficiently address income verification; and
- Recommend that states establish procedures for verifying the authenticity of energy vendors being paid under LIHEAP, and averting fraud and improper payments when dealing with bulk fuel dealers or unregulated utilities.

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

Measure	FY	Target	Result
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 equal to or less than 85 percent of State Median Income.[1] *(Outcome)*	*2012*	18%[2]	Mar-14
	2011	18%[3]	Mar-13
	2010	17%	Mar-12
	2009	17%	17%[4] (Target Met)
	2008	17%	18%[5] (Target Exceeded)
	2007	17%	17%[6] (Target Met)
2B (new): Increase the number of states that implement Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) that meet high quality benchmarks.[7] *(Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	Oct-12
	2011	TBD	Oct-11
2C (new): Increase the number of states that implement professional development systems that meet benchmarks for providing a career path for early care and afterschool educators. *(Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	TBD
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.[8] *(Outcome)*	*CY 2011*	40	Mar-12
	CY 2009	35	38 (Target Exceeded)
	CY 2007	28	32 (Target Exceeded)
2E (new): Increase the number or percentage of low-income children receiving CCDF subsidies who are enrolled in high quality care settings. *(Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	TBD

[1] 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., equal to or 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 2012 target for this measure is dependent on the funding level requested for FY 2012 in the President's Budget Request.

[3] The FY 2011 target for this measure is dependent on the funding requested for FY 2011 in the President's Budget Request.

[4] This is a preliminary estimate that is subject to change once final data is available.

[5] This is a preliminary estimate that is subject to change once final data is available.

[6] This is a preliminary estimate that is subject to change once final data is available.

[7] This newly proposed outcome measure aligns with the HHS High Priority Performance Goal "Quality of Early Childhood Education."

[8] 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
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 Office of Child Care Information System (OCCIS) 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 OCCIS are stored in national databases. Further, the Office of Child Care (OCC) gave ACF Regional offices access to the OCCIS to track grantee data submissions and further enhance data quality.
2B (new) 2C (new) 2E (new)	ACF is proposing a revised biennial State Plan Preprint and a new quality performance report which states and territories will be required to submit on an annual basis. In the meantime, ACF will explore publicly-available data sources to facilitate tracking prior to establishment of formal reporting mechanisms.	ACF Federal Regional Office staff will review and validate the quality performance reports from CCDF Lead Agencies.
2D	Biennial CCDF Report of State Plans; National Child Care Information Center.	The CCDF State Plan preprint requires 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 performance measures described in this document reflect the priorities the Administration has established for the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program. These measures reinforce the Administration's goal of increasing the number of low-income children that are served in safe, healthy, nurturing child care settings that will promote learning, child development, and school readiness. The Office of Child Care (OCC) has deleted a number of its prior performance measures that were outdated and did not fully capture the purposes and accomplishments of the CCDF program. In their place, OCC has developed new measures that provide a more comprehensive picture of key outcomes for the CCDF program and which reflect the most current developments in the field, such as the growth in Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) and professional development systems. Some of the new measures are developmental due to the current lack of baseline data or existing data sources to track progress, but the OCC will be proposing new data reporting requirements that will allow full implementation of these measures.

The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has established a number of High Priority Performance Goals with indicators for FY 2010 and the subsequent fiscal years. 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 (Recovery Act), the FY 2011 and FY 2012 requests, and efforts to improve quality, the CCDF program is included in two of the new High Priority Performance Goals. One of these 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. In addition, HHS has put forward a priority performance goal to improve the quality of early care and education programs for low-income children. Components of both of these priority goals are included in the CCDF specific performance measures as described in this Performance Appendix.

In measure 2A, OCC 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 State Median Income (SMI) in FY 2012. 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.[9] 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.

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. Preliminary estimates show that 17 percent of eligible children received child care services in FY 2007, 18 percent received services in FY 2008 and 17 percent in FY 2009.[10] OCC has established a goal of 18 percent for FY 2012 in light of the current budget request which should allow the program to maintain services despite inflationary pressures resulting from increasing child care prices. To meet this target, the program will continue to improve program administration and provide technical assistance to ensure program integrity.

New developmental measure 2B tracks state progress toward implementing Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS), which provide information on the quality of early childhood development programs for parents. This measure is part of HHS' High Priority Performance Goals and supports the Administration's focus on serving more low-income children in high quality early care and education settings. The measure promotes states' efforts to effectively implement QRIS by increasing the number of states that meet high quality benchmarks.[11] QRIS is a mechanism by which to improve the quality of child care available in communities and increase parents' knowledge and understanding of the child care options available to them. QRIS creates pathways to higher quality for child care providers and supports movement up the pathways through training, technical assistance, and compensation and financial incentives tied to professional development. When implemented effectively, QRIS can help improve the overall quality of care available and potentially improve child outcomes as a result.

Since CCDF is a program that emphasizes parental choice, it is important to improve the overall quality of early care and education across a range of settings in order to improve choices available to low-income parents. Improving access to high quality child care enables parents to work and participate in educational and training opportunities to improve their lives. High quality early care and education programs are especially important for low-income children as they provide a place for learning and social emotional development and can help meet health and nutritional needs. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) study of Early Child Care and Youth Development

---

[9] This measure estimates the average monthly number of children receiving child care subsidies from all funding 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.

[10] These preliminary estimates are subject to change once final data is available. The estimate increased by 1 percentage point between 2007 and 2008. This change is due to a small decrease in the number of potentially eligible families—likely due to families losing their employment as a result of the economic recession.

[1] This performance measure is included in the FY 2010-2015 HHS Strategic Plan. This performance measure is also included in the Head Start American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) Implementation Plan. A similar measure based on Early Head Start teachers is also included in the Early Head Start Recovery Act Implementation Plan.

demonstrates that enrollment in high quality programs can lead to better performance in school and positive outcomes for children. QRIS has been recognized as a systematic approach for promoting quality of early childhood and afterschool programs, and it is important to track the development and implementation of QRIS across the country. As of the winter of 2010, 23 states have implemented QRIS statewide, and the majority of the remaining states are piloting or planning QRIS. The baseline for measure 2B, once established, will reflect the number of states meeting benchmarks of a high quality QRIS.

New developmental performance measure 2C tracks the extent to which states and CCDF programs are supporting the development of a highly-qualified workforce of early childhood educators through comprehensive professional development systems. Many studies point to the knowledge and skills of program staff as the cornerstone of high quality early childhood and afterschool programs. Unfortunately, the child care workforce faces a high turnover rate, which can negatively impact the quality of care, due to inadequate professional development opportunities, the lack of a defined career path, and poor compensation. This performance measure reflects the recognized importance of systematic approaches to supporting professional development that outline a career path for center-based and family-based child care providers, including a set of articulated credentials and a mechanism for tracking qualifications of all providers. Many of these professional development systems also strategically link to the Quality Rating and Improvement Systems described above. In most cases, state professional development systems include pre-service requirements (e.g., credentials, degrees, and completion of specific training) as well as in-service requirements (specific number of annual training/continuing education hours). Most professional development systems also offer financial incentives to promote improved professional development, including higher reimbursement rates linked to the CCDF child care subsidy system, bonuses, quality grants, loans, practitioner wage initiatives, scholarships, or other professional development supports. Support for child care providers in the form of training, mentoring and technical assistance are used to promote participation and help programs achieve higher levels of quality. OCC plans to develop benchmarks for professional development systems. This performance measure will enable OCC to track the number of states that have implemented professional development systems meeting these benchmarks, and to work with states to increase support for professionals working with children.

Results for annual measure 2D reflect, in part, the federal government's ability to influence state policies related to school readiness. The National Research Council's report on the science of early childhood development, "From Neurons to Neighborhoods," 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 calendar year (CY) 2009, OCC exceeded its target (35 states) for this measure. A total of 38 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, OCC expects to increase this result to 40 by CY 2011 and 42 by CY 2013. As data is reported biennially, there is no target for CY 2012.

Developmental performance measure 2E is a new outcome measure that would seek to increase the number or percentage of low-income children receiving CCDF subsidies who are enrolled in high quality care settings. As a starting point for this measure, OCC is proposing a new developmental interim measure that will track states' abilities to provide data on the quality of care received by CCDF-supported children. While this measure, in the short term, focuses on system level change, the ultimate goal is eventually to replace the measure with an outcome measure that would track the number or percentage of low-income children receiving CCDF subsidies who are enrolled in high quality early childhood development programs. Approximately eight states currently have the capacity to report child-level data on the quality of care funded by CCDF subsidies. OCC will work to increase the number of states with such data capabilities. The Recovery Act supplemental CCDF funds provide an opportunity for CCDF lead agencies to make much-needed and long-overdue investments in the child care program. Some states are using their Recovery Act funds to enhance their data management systems to enable tracking of critical child care information. A number of State CCDF Lead Agencies are also collaborating with other early childhood programs to ensure that all children served by publicly funded early learning programs are part of integrated state data systems. In addition, OCC plans to provide enhanced technical assistance and to revise the case-level CCDF administrative data report (ACF-801) to support reporting on the quality of care. By increasing the capacity to track the quality of care for children receiving subsidies, this measure supports the Administration's goals of promoting child development and parental employment by expanding high quality choices available across a range of child care settings.

3. Head Start

Measure	FY	Target	Result
3A (new): Reduce the proportion of grantees receiving a score in the low range on the basis of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). *(Developmental Outcome)*	*2013*	TBD	TBD
	2012	TBD	TBD
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
	2012	93%	Jan-13
	2011	92%	Jan-12
	2010	91%	89.4% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2009	89%	87.4% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2008	87%	85.7% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2007	85%	85.2% (Target Exceeded)
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

Measure	FY	Target	Result
3C: Increase the percentage of Head Start teachers with AA, BA, Advanced Degree, or a degree in a field related to early childhood education.[1] *(Outcome)*	*2012*	100%	Jan-13
	2011	100%	Jan-12
	2010	85%	85.0% (Target Met)
	2009	75%	83.2%[2] (Target Exceeded)
	2008	73%	80.4%[2] (Target Exceeded)
	2007	71%	79.8%[2] (Target Exceeded)
3D: Reduce the number of grantees with repeat deficiencies through the provision of targeted technical assistance.[3] *(Outcome)*	*2012*	0 grantees	Jan-13
	2011	1 grantee	Jan-12
	2010	1 grantee	2 grantees (Target Not Met)
	2009	Set Baseline	2 grantees (Baseline)[4]
3F: Decrease under-enrollment in Head Start programs, thereby increasing the number of children served per dollar. *(Efficiency)*	*2012*	Prior Result -0.1PP	Jan-13
	2011	0.6% (Prior Result -0.1PP)	Jan-12
	2010	0.8% (Prior Result -0.1PP)	0.7% (Target Exceeded)
	2009	1.4%	0.9% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	1.5%	1.3% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	2.8%	1.5% (Target Exceeded)

[1] This performance measure is included in the FY 2010-2015 HHS Strategic Plan. This performance measure is also included in the Head Start American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) Implementation Plan. A similar measure based on Early Head Start teachers is also included in the Early Head Start Recovery Act Implementation Plan.

[2] Historical data for this measure has been updated to reflect credentialing of Head Start teachers only.

[3] 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. Monitoring data from FY 2008 – 2009 determined that two grantees had repeat financial deficiencies, thus two grantees is the baseline. Instead of tracking the same grantees every three years, OHS is modifying this measure to report annually how many grantees in that year have repeat financial deficiencies from their monitoring review three years prior. For example, the results in FY 2010 will be the number of grantees who have repeat financial deficiencies from their 2007 triennial review. Modifying the measure to look at repeat financial deficiencies among all Head Start grantees annually, as opposed to focusing on the same grantees every three years, is more consistent with the purpose of the measure.

[4] Of those grantees monitored in FY 2006, 25 had deficiencies. When those same grantees were monitored three years later in FY 2009, two had repeat deficiencies.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
3.5LT 3.7LT	Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES)	FACES was launched as a part of the Head Start Program Performance Measures Initiative. The goal of this initiative, and of FACES, was to provide solid data from a representative sample on the characteristics, experiences, and outcomes for children and families served by Head Start. The FACES study uses scientifically established methods to collect data that can be used to analyze Head Start's quality. All the measures used in FACES to measure child outcomes and program quality (including the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), the Woodcock-Johnson Applied Problems scale, and the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) have been assessed for validity and reliability, and are well-respected in the field of child development. The use of new cohorts every three years allows the program to have continual access to up-to-date information about program performance and quality.
3.6LT 3B 3C 3F	Program Information Report (PIR)	The PIR is a survey of all grantees that provides comprehensive data on Head Start, Early Head Start and Migrant Head Start programs nationwide. 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 automated data system provides trend data so that the team can examine strengths and weaknesses in all programs.
3D	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 of Health and Human Services (HHS) recently proposed two 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 has funded an additional 13,000 Head Start slots and an additional 48,000 Early Head Start slots. Given the policy goal of maintaining the same level of funding in FY 2012 as is provided in FY 2011, the Office of Head Start (OHS) will work to minimize the impact on the number of children served and on the quality of Head Start services. In addition to increasing the number of children served, HHS put forward a Priority Goal to improve the quality of early care and education programs for low-come children. As a milestones for this goal, OHS plans to advance recompetition among Head Start grantees, implement revised program performance standards, and promote community efforts to integrate early childhood services. OHS has published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on recompetition, which establishes a system of designation renewal that would determine if Head Start and Early head Start agencies are delivering high-quality and comprehensive programs. The proposed rule requires that the lowest performance 25 percent of grantees be required to compete with other eligible local applicants, ensuring that the provider best qualified to provide high quality services is the Head Start and/or Early Head Start grantee in that community.

Regarding developmental annual measure 3A, research findings underscore the importance of teacher-child interactions as a demonstrated measure of classroom quality and in promoting children's social and cognitive development. In response to these research findings, HHS launched a pilot of a particular measure in FY 2009—the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), which measures teacher-child interaction in three broad domains: emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support. Building on this pilot, OHS began assessing each classroom with the CLASS instrument during onsite monitoring reviews in FY 2010. OHS is proposing an annual performance measure to track the proportion of grantees required to compete on the basis of their CLASS scores and expects this percentage of grantees to decrease over time as program quality improves. Since annual measure 3A is a developmental outcome measure, the Office of Head Start will consider its data once the cohort of

grantees is reviewed under the designation renewal system in FY 2012 and their CLASS scores are incorporated into the designation renewal evaluation[5]. Rigorous performance targets will be set at that time.

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 85 percent by FY 2013. The goal of long term objective 3.6 is to increase the percentage of Early Head Start children completing all medical screenings to 95 percent by FY 2014.

Annual measure 3B was introduced in calendar year 2006 as a result of the Head Start program assessment. For the 2009-2010 program year, 89.4 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), FY 2008 (85.7 percent) and FY 2009 (87.4), but falls short of the FY 2010 target of 91 percent. Yet, a greater percentage of Early Head Start children are receiving medical screenings each year and potentially experiencing an improved quality of life. OHS 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 2012 target of 93 percent. Additionally, the Early Head Start program received an additional $1.1 billion in funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) primarily to increase enrollment. As existing programs expanded and new programs were 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 Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) 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

[5] At the time this narrative was submitted for the FY 2012 Congressional Justification, ACF had published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, which proposes to use CLASS as part of the designation renewal determination only after the regulation becomes effective. The proposed rule requests comments on using CLASS prior to the effective date. Target setting on this developmental measure depends on what is ultimately published in the final rule, as that impacts when ACF will be able to collect data from CLASS for purposes of designation renewal.

week[6], which may provide a realistic "ceiling" to what might be expected even under optimal circumstances.

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 Head Start teachers with an AA, BA, or advanced degrees in early childhood education and has exceeded the FY 2009 target. The Head Start reauthorization requires that all Head Start preschool center-based 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 fiscal years 2011 and 2012 is to reach 100 percent. Based on the most recent data as of December 2010, the PIR showed that in FY 2010, 85 percent of Head Start teachers had an AA degree or higher, meeting the target of 85 percent. More Head Start teachers have degrees than ever before, and are better equipped to deliver quality instruction to Head Start children. Of the 46,033 Head Start teachers in FY 2010, 39,121 have an AA degree or higher; of these degreed teachers, 14,848 have an AA degree, 20,127 have a BA degree, and 4,146 have a graduate degree. Not included in the percentage are an additional 5,678 teachers with a Child Development Associate (CDA) or state credential (no degree) and 444 teachers who do not have a degree but are enrolled in Early Childhood Education (ECE) degree programs. Of the teachers with a CDA or state credential, 47.9 percent are enrolled in ECE degree programs. The total FY 2010 figure represents an increase of 2,082 degreed teachers over the previous year.

In April of 2008 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 quality improvement funds (available through the Recovery Act) 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 determined that two of these grantees had repeated deficiencies creating a baseline number from which the rate for "repeat" deficiencies will be calculated. OHS is proposing to modify this measure to report annually, rather than triennially, how many grantees have repeat financial deficiencies from their triennial monitoring review three years prior (see measure footnote), as opposed to tracking the same group of grantees every three years and reporting the percent of repeat deficiencies. In FY 2010, for example, of the 18 grantees cited for financial management deficiencies in their 2007 monitoring review, 2 of those grantees also had a deficiency in the area of financial management when monitored in FY 2010. Based on the rate from the 2006/2009 pool of grantees, OHS has set a target of one grantee per year, and zero grantees with repeat

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

financial deficiencies by FY 2012. While OHS missed this target in FY 2010, performance was maintained relative to the prior year.

In FY 2012, ACF proposes discontinuing measure 3E to reflect a shift in policy to focus on improving classroom quality through improving teacher-child interaction, rather than just compliance. ACF believes the classroom quality measure using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) data is a more meaningful measure of early education services than a deficiency approach that only captures a small fraction of Head Start programs (less than 1 percent since the beginning of the old measure). ACF believes that using the CLASS measure reflects the push to continually improve the quality of Head Start programs.

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 now collects 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 can be difficult to fill vacancies quickly. First, some Head Start programs may not be successful at enrolling certain populations. 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 have grown 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 2009-2010 program year, Head Start grantees had, on average, not enrolled 0.7 percent of the children they were funded to serve, exceeding the FY 2010 target of 0.8 percent. This represents approximately 6,300 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 2012, the program expects under-enrollment in Head Start programs to be 0.1 percentage point less than the FY 2011 actual result through continued program support and technical assistance. As previously mentioned, the Head Start program received additional funding under the Recovery Act to (among other activities) expand enrollment. It is possible

that due to the expansion of the Head Start program, future performance in FY 2011 and FY 2012 for this measure would be affected. This potential impact has been taken into consideration in determining future year targets for efficiency measure 3F.

There are three recent GAO reports pertaining to the Head Start program and their findings have been taking into consideration with future targets. The first, entitled "Head Start: Undercover Testing Finds Fraud and Abuse at Selected Head Start Centers," reports on GAO's investigation to determine if Head Start programs were committing fraud and abuse related to eligibility verification. GAO found that in eight instances, staff misrepresented information to register over-income children in slots for under-income children. HHS takes this very seriously, is committed to program integrity, and continues to enhance efforts to reduce the vulnerability of Head Start programs to fraud and abuse related to the eligibility verification process. Examples of these efforts include, (1) partnering with the Office of Inspector General to continue in-depth reviews of high risk grantees that are suspected of committing eligibility verification fraud and abuse; (2) issuing guidance clarifying how Head Start programs should verify and determine eligibility and the consequences of not following the established procedures; and (3) activating StrengthenHeadStart@headstartinfo.org to enable grantees to share ideas on how to promote sound management. In order to emphasize our commitment to improving program integrity, OHS plans to conduct regular training; strengthen regulations related to eligibility determination; implement a web hotline for reporting fraud and abuse; produce a national level error rate using the Erroneous Payment Study; conduct unannounced monitoring visits; and review the current monitoring system to ensure that our procedures are clearing understood and fully implemented.

The second GAO report focused on how OHS has implemented the expansion of Head Start and Early Head Start programs through the Recovery Act funding. At the time of the report, OHS had awarded 832 grants intended to expand programs. GAO concluded that some grantees faced start-up challenges, and incomplete data and management information hinder OHS' oversight. ACF has taken action on GAO's recommendations to continually improve management processes and oversight. ACF's Office of Grants Management revised Federal Assistance Awards to ensure that grant funds are placed in the appropriate budget categories. ACF is also tracking waivers of the non-federal share matching requirement and verifying attendance during on-site monitoring. ACF takes GAO's recommendations seriously and is always striving to better the operation of its programs.

In the third report, issued on December 15, 2010, GAO focused on consistency of communication between OHS and grantees regarding enrollment and expenditure of Recovery Act funding. GAO made three recommendations to OHS: 1) verify a consistent definition of enrollment; 2) clearly communicate with grantees about procedures for extending use of Recovery Act funds from one fiscal year into the next; and 3) incorporate known risks into monitoring review planning. In response to previous GAO recommendations, OHS has implemented additional reviews for Recovery Act grantees which are "surprise" reviews. In addition, OHS has implemented a standard form for regional offices to use in assessing risks before the review process, after reviewing protocols and assessing the current communication system. ACF and OHS are committed to improving management and accountability of Recovery Act grant funding. To that end, OHS will issue explicit guidance on enrollment for grantees and monitoring teams and ACF will issue guidance to reiterate obligations and expenditure requirements of Recovery Act grants.

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
	2012	86%	Dec-12
	2011	85%	Dec-11
	2010	85%	87% (Target Exceeded)
	2009	85%	86% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	85%	86% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	84%	86% (Target Exceeded)
4.2LT and 4B: Increase the proportion of youth who complete the TLP by graduating or who leave ahead of schedule based upon a positive opportunity. *(Outcome)*	*Out-Year Target*	60% (FY 2014)	Dec-14
	2012	57%	Dec-12
	2011	56%	Dec-11
	2010	55%	55.0% (Target Met)
	2009	53.6%	53.2% (Target Not Met)
	2008	51.6%	59.7% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	49.6%	57.5% (Target Exceeded)
4C: Increase the proportion of TLP youth who are engaged in community service and service learning activities while in the program. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result +2%	Dec-12
	2011	Prior Result +2%	Dec-11
	2010	40% (Prior Result +2%)	37.1% (Target Not Met)
	2009	35%	39.0% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	34%	42.3% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	33%	42.1% (Target Exceeded)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
4D: Maintain the proportion of youth who are prevented from running away as a result of Basic Center Programs' (BCP) non-shelter, preventive services as a percentage of all youth receiving such services. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	96%	Dec-12
	2011	96%	Dec-11
	2010	96%	97% (Target Exceeded)
	2009	Set Baseline	96% (Baseline)
	2008	Pre-Baseline	96% (Historical actual)
4E (new): Increase the average number of street youth contacts per Street Outreach Program grantee who are provided shelter for at least one night. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result + 2%	Dec-12
	2011	Prior Result + 2 %	Dec-11
	2010	Set Baseline	149

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
4.1LT 4A 4.2LT 4B 4C 4D 4E	Runaway and Homeless Youth Management Information System (RHYMIS)	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. Historically, the reporting response rate of grantees has exceeded 97 percent every year.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) program is dedicated to providing emergency and transitional housing for youth who have absented themselves from home either voluntarily or by force. Due to the complexity of circumstances surrounding youth homelessness, RHY programs also provide preventive, street-based, family-based, and other non-residential services to help the variety of young people our grantees encounter. The key elements of RHY programming are both life-line services and developmental interventions for vulnerable youth to help them exit the program into safe and appropriate living situations.

Long-term objective 4.1/annual measure 4A is the Transitional Living Program (TLP) safe and appropriate exit rate, which is the percentage of TLP youth (aged 16-21) discharged during the year who find immediate living situations that are consistent with independent living.[1] During FY 2010, the program attained an 86.9 percent safe exit rate, not only surpassing the target of 85 percent, but also improving upon FY 2009's rate of 86.2 percent. The safe exit rate continues to hold onto substantial performance gains since FY 2007 after being below target over a number of years since FY 2002.

These improvements were achieved through ACF's promotion and support of innovative strategies that help grantees: (1) encourage youth to complete the program and achieve their developmental goals instead of dropping out, (2) stay connected with youth as they transition out of program residencies and

[1] 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.

provide preventive, follow-up and after care services, (3) track exiting youth more closely and stay connected, (4) report accurate data and maintain updated youth records to reduce the number of youth whose exit situations are unknown, and (5) analyze data to discover patterns and opportunities. These objectives are communicated through conferences, technical assistance services, mailings, conference calls, webinars and the direct efforts of federal staff through continuous oversight and onsite monitoring. These efforts were supported by two new national resource centers co-located at the University of Oklahoma, one for technical assistance and one for training, replacing the ten regional networks operating prior to FY 2008. The above strategies will be continued each year as the program adds new grantees or as grantees experience staff turnover, which is common in community-based organizations. Through FY 2012, the program expects to maintain a safe exit rate of 85 percent or better.

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 denominator consists of all exiting TLP youth, including youth who drop out, are expelled or who leave the program with no plan. In FY 2006, the measure first reached the 50 percent mark and has made continued improvement nearly each year. The FY 2010 result was 55 percent, on target with our expected goal and surpassing the FY 2009 result of 53 percent. Fiscal year 2010 performance is also recovering from FY 2009's exception to an earlier, long-term history of improvement.

TLP national averages are very sensitive to small changes that can result from a number of causes, not always identifiable among a complex population such as homeless youth. Given the relatively small size of the program (3,582 youth exited in FY 2010), the change in completion status for a small group can make a major difference in the national result. During fiscal years 2009 and 2010, the country experienced a severe economic downturn, which had a profound affect on families and community-based services. This has made it very challenging for exiting youth to secure self-sufficient employment. With few entry level jobs available, finding independent living situations becomes increasingly difficult, particularly for individuals becoming discouraged. The ACF Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) will continue to monitor performance trends and associated performance targets on this measure to account for potential additional negative impacts from the economic situation. By FY 2012, the program aims to achieve a 57 percent completion rate.

The percentage of youth who complete their residencies as planned reflects both the effectiveness and efficiency of grantees in keeping youth focused on their futures. Not surprisingly, Runaway and Homeless Youth Management Information System (RHYMIS) data have shown that the strongest improvements in education and employment status occur after tenures of at least 60 days. This is particularly advantageous to youth who are committed to their plans over a longer term, while dropouts or expellees usually have not remained in the program long enough to be as well prepared. In some cases, youth who drop out or are expelled simply may have been unready for the rigorous TLP curriculum or lacked full commitment to the program's goal of self-sufficient independent living. For this reason FYSB encourages formal assessments of youth before they enter the residencies to determine the suitability of the often demanding TLP experience to the needs and capacities of each individual youth. While 3,733 youth entered TLP services in FY 2010, many more (5,458) had to be turned away, placed on wait lists, or referred elsewhere due to lack of residential resources.

Program completion and longer tenures tend to lead to safer exits. While we cannot prevent youth from leaving from an RHY program voluntarily, grantees have been encouraged to identify potential dropouts, stay engaged with youth even after they have decided to leave, assist them during discharge in planning safe and appropriate exits, and recognize that some individuals need respites or time-outs in order to reconnect with their goals and recommit to the program. Accordingly, 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 project officers have encouraged grantees to decrease dropping out and widen service and aftercare options for potential expellees through non-residential means. Subsequent data reports following the additions made in FY 2008 demonstrated a dramatic increase in program completion rates over FY 2006 and earlier.

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. Making a meaningful contribution to the community can be a powerful stimulant to self-efficacy and pro-social attitudes.[2] 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. 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 and connecting to their surrounding community. Since CSL may not be appropriate for all youth in all situations, FYSB does not seek 100 percent participation or ever-increasing target levels. FYSB leadership and project officers encourage the creation of CSL experiences for youth who might benefit. 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. 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).

In FY 2010, annual measure 4C reached 37 percent, falling just short of its target of 40 percent, a decline from the FY 2009 level of 39 percent. One possible explanation for the decline in both years is that cash-strapped community-based organizations may have been forced to limit their services to crisis intervention, counseling and basic support. This has been in a climate of declining assistance from state and local government and the philanthropic sector, with fund-raising efforts hampered by widespread economic damage and the state budget crises. By FY 2012, the program hopes to reestablish increases of two percent over the previous year's actual result. In FY 2006 the CSL rate reached 32.3 percent from even lower levels in the past, so the current fall-off is still above historical levels.

Annual measure 4D is about preventing Basic Center Program (BCP) youth (up to age 18) from running away from home or being in a critical situation where running away may seem a viable option to a young person in crisis. This measure is based on the safe and appropriate exit rate for the subgroup of BCP youth who receive preventive services intended to divert them from running away or staying in risky living situations. (See footnote 1, above, for the distinction between "safe and appropriate exits" in TLP and in BCP.) The FY 2010 BCP safe exit rate within this subgroup was 96.8 percent, exceeding the 96 percent goal. The group represents about 15 percent (6,432) of youth exiting from BCP, and the vast majority of these were reunited with families or guardians, or were placed in safe and appropriate alternative living situations. FYSB's goal is to maintain these successful results. Less than 1 percent of this group entered the shelter after prevention, but this is still a safe and appropriate circumstance for BCP youth. The safe exit rate for this small group was 94 percent. For the entire "prevention subgroup" the safe and appropriate placement/discharge rate was about 5 points higher than for the youth who entered shelters directly from the street, their homes, or other previous living situations. Their rate was 91.7 percent. The overall BCP safe exit rate for all groups was 92.5 percent, which has been increasing from about 90 percent in FY 2003. The prevention results illustrate the value of such services with or without eventual shelter intake.

All youth (regardless of shelter entry) and often their families receive a range of services, such as

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

counseling, conflict mediation, interpersonal skill-building, promotion of basic life skills, educational advancement, employment, mental and physical health, parenting skills, financial literacy, and referral to sources of other needed services. Preventing future crises and runaway episodes is a key objective of both shelter-based and community-based interventions, but strengthening youth and keeping them on the path to a better future are important also. 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[3] after already suffering through chronic or escalating crises. However, successful performance in this measure demonstrates that preventive, non-residential interventions can protect youth from crises like running away at least as well as shelter services. However, the best interest of the youth is always the most important consideration.

Late in FY 2007 an independent research firm with considerable experience in studying homelessness began the design of an evaluation of long term outcomes for youth in the TLP programs, as mandated by the Statute. With a new contract in place, the evaluation design and data collection instruments were finalized and received for OMB approval in FY 2010. The evaluation will begin active implementation at multiple sites over the next year. 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 their experiences and the services they received, along with demographics and other characteristics, to determine if there are patterns linking such factors with better or poorer outcomes many months after program exit.

Annual measure 4E is a new measure for the RHY Street Outreach Program (SOP), which measures the average number of street youth contacts who are provided shelter for at least one night per SOP grantee. The purpose of SOP is to gain the trust of street youth and bring them into a safe place where services can begin. Street outreach programs may include roving teams of youth workers, a drop-in center, or other youth-friendly venue designed to attract street youth, who are constantly at risk of criminal exploitation and exposure to the elements. SOP teams distribute food, clothing, hygiene or first aid items, information about services and safe places, and encouragement to enter them.

During FY 2010, there were 164 Street Outreach grantees in operation, and 24,386 street youth accepted at least one night of shelter, averaging 149 youth per grantee. The average in FY 2009 was 163. In FY 2010 the number of (potentially duplicated) street "contacts" decreased slightly to 838,414 from the FY 2009 count of 845,372, but the drop in average entries is probably more plausibly explained by programmatic factors. There were nearly three times the number of new starts in FY 2010 over FY 2009, and in FY 2010 new starts outnumbered the continuations (of existing three-year grants) by more than double. Not all new starts in RHY require business and organizational establishment during the early quarters of a new grant, but SOP services in general become more effective as the organization and staff become more trusted by street youth in the area. The new starts would have included experienced service providers, but a number may have been establishing new services.

Sometimes a drop in overall counts and averages can be attributed to the award and distribution of limited grant funds over time into less densely populated counties, which helps reach underserved areas. This could conceivably apply to the decrease in the SOP averages. There is evidence that the decline in BCP caseloads over many years has resulted from grants being increasingly awarded to organizations in counties with lower population densities of youth under 18 per square mile of land area. BCP grants are not awarded on this basis, since the Statute directs BCP funds to be distributed among states according the proportion of the population of youth under 18. However, grants within states may go to a semi-rural location with an application superior to a program in an urban area proposing to serve a larger volume of

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

youth. Grants are awarded based on demonstration of need, but organizational experience, staffing, program approach, budget, and other factors come into play in a highly-competitive process.

Collecting detailed, individual data on street youth can be difficult due to the disposition of the youth, so RHYMIS data for SOP is currently collected only in aggregate, except for "shelter/service entries for at least one night." The number of contacts with youth and the volume of items distributed contain duplication since the same individual may be engaged over a series of days or nights. Once a youth is entered into a BCP or TLP, repeat visits and services can be tracked in RHYMIS, eliminating duplication. Defining the target as increases in the average number of shelter entries per grantee will provide ongoing continuity from year to year by accounting for changes in the number of street outreach grantees. Currently, ACF and FYSB leadership are working with experienced SOP grantees who were provided with supplemental grants to help develop more specific performance measures for the SOP program, including unduplicated counts if possible (perhaps only at certain sites). The hope is to explore strategies that help balance the vulnerability and reticence of the youth with whom we make contact and the need for data that provide a more clear depiction of this population and their service needs.

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)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1%	Dec-12
	2011	Prior Result +2%	Dec-11
	2010	40.1% (Prior Result +2%)	40.5% (Target Exceeded)
	2009	32.3%	39.3% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	35%	31.7% (Target Not Met)
	2007	60%	34.4% (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)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1%	Dec-12
	2011	24%	Dec-11
	2010	22%	37.9% (Target Exceeded)
	2009	22%	36.3% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	22%	29.8% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	20%	33% (Target Exceeded)
6D: Maintain the proportion of youth in the Relationship Quality Survey that consider their mentoring relationship to be of "high quality." *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1% until maintenance rate of 95% is reached	Dec-12
	2011	Prior Result +1% until maintenance rate of 95% is reached	Dec-11
	2010	95%	95.6% (Target Exceeded)
	2009	90%	95.4% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	89%	95% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	87%	90% (Target Exceeded)
6.3LT and 6E: Relative stabilization or improvement of intermediate outcomes among a sample of children of prisoners as measured after at least 12 months in one-to-one mentoring relationships in the MCP program. *(Outcome)*	*2010*	Final report to be submitted to ACF	Final report in clearance (In Progress)
	2009	Research organization conducts independent follow-up survey	Completed (Target Met)
	2008	Grantees administer baseline survey	Completed (Target Met)
	2007	Sites selected and grantees trained to administer baseline survey	Completed (Target Met)

[1] Percentages are measured in the final quarter of the year among grantees who have received MCP funding for at least twelve months. The numerator does not include stable and continuing matches in the caseload that reached the 11 month point or slightly less during the final quarter. These are generally likely to be enduring or sustained cases as they pass the 12th month.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
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.[2] *(Outcome and Efficiency)*	*2012*	Prior Result +2%	Dec-12
	2011	Prior Result +2%	Dec-11
	2010	83.3%	79.4% [3] (Target Not Met)
	2009	83.0%	81.7% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2008	82.0%	72.5% (Target Not Met)
	2007	75.0%	74.0% (Target Exceeded)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
6.1LT 6A 6.2LT 6B 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, reliable relationship measuring tool, developed by Rhodes, Reddy, Roffman, and Grossman, (see footnote below) assesses mentee satisfaction with the relationships; the extent to which mentors have helped mentees cope with problems; how happy mentees feel (or do not 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 has been 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 were utilized to ensure adequate sample selection, to address issues of attrition and bias, and to assure a valid comparison with benchmark groups.

By the close of fiscal year 2010, the Mentoring Children of Prisoners (MCP) program, administered by the ACF Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) since FY 2003, had formed 185,445 new mentoring matches between committed adult volunteers and youth experiencing parental incarceration. The performance measure tracking the number of new matches has been retired because the MCP program is focusing on the sustainability and quality of mentoring relationships, as opposed to sheer volume. In FY 2010, 95.6 percent of MCP youth who were in a mentoring relationship which lasted at least nine months rated their relationships with mentors positively, demonstrating a core strength of the program. Data measuring the high quality of our youth relationships is captured through an experimentally-validated Relationship Quality Survey, further detailed below. In addition to feedback from youth, the sustainability and longevity of relationships are also vital indicators of relationship quality. Performance in these dimensions also continued the MCP program's trend of reaching or exceeding targeted goals.

Research demonstrates that youth are more likely to experience positive benefits from mentoring relationships that last at least six months.[4] Relationships that endure twelve months or more (the MCP standard) provide evidence of a strong, enduring and possibly long-term bond. Stable relationships and

[2] "Prematurely" generally means matches lasting between 1 – 11 months, ultimately ceasing before the "full 12 month commitment."

[3] Matches lasting three months or less were only 1.1 percent of the entire 4th quarter active caseload.

[4] 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.

dependable bonding are crucial in the support of young people experiencing a myriad of challenges resulting from of having one or both parents in prison. Mentees may sometimes prematurely exit or drop out of the program for a number of reasons. In some cases it is the result of a child being in a transient or unstable family losing contact with the program. Similarly, mentors may move to a different area or experience personal or employment situations that unavoidably interfere with their commitment. For these reasons grantees are encouraged and enabled to find, train and retain volunteer mentors and secure commitments to persist through unanticipated challenges. Long-term objective 6.1/annual measure 6A reached 40.5 percent in FY 2010, improving over FY 2009 by increasing the proportion of MCP matches that endured at least 12 months. Performance exceeded the FY 2010 target of 40.1 percent. By FY 2012, the program expects to increase the proportion of matches that last at least 12 months by at least one percent over the FY 2011 actual result.

Long-term objective 6.2 and annual measure 6B, based on the percentage of cases lasting longer than 12 months, reached 37.9 percent in FY 2010, exceeding the 22 percent target. Annual measure 6B represents the longest-living group of cases (and includes the 12-month-only cases in measure 6A as well as cases lasting beyond 18 months and still continuing). New mentoring matches are added throughout the entire year and although strong, would not be included in this measure simply because the relationship has not yet reached the expected 12 months of "maturity." The expansion of the program with the influx of new grantees and first-time mentees offsets trends in average duration, and this trade-off effect will continue as long as the active caseload keeps growing. In addition, performance on measure 6B is challenging because volunteer mentors have met their commitments at 12 months and may not seek to renew these sometimes challenging relationships. The longer that healthy matches last, the better for the children. By FY 2012, the program expects to increase the proportion of matches lasting more than 12 months by at least one percent over the FY 2011 actual result.

The primary objective of the MCP program is to promote positive, healthy mentoring relationships which along with longevity, stability and/or dependability, are expected to promote successful youth-oriented outcomes. Field tests in similar mentoring programs have shown that a child's satisfaction with the quality of his or her mentoring experience is linked with more positive outcomes, including increased self-confidence and scholastic competence.[5] Relationship quality for the MCP program is measured in annual measure 6D and is based upon the participating child's perspective. 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 FY 2011, children in relationships of at least six months will be added to the survey. 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.

In FY 2010, 95.6 percent of the 5,745 MCP children in relationships with the same mentor that had lasted nine months or longer who responded to the survey reported a satisfaction level of three or more, exceeding the FY 2010 target of 95 percent and improving upon the previous year's result (based upon a Likert-type scale of one for least satisfaction to four for greatest). By FY 2012, the program expects to maintain a rate of at least 95 percent of children in matches that last at least six months[6] who consider

[5] 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.
[6] As previously stated, starting in FY 2011, the child satisfaction surveys will be administered after six months rather than nine months.

their mentoring relationship to be of "high quality."

Long-term objective 6.3/annual measure 6E refers to FYSB's independent longitudinal evaluation of MCP. The evaluation utilized 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 were compared with similarly at-risk youth who had been assigned to a control group (i.e. not matched with mentors) in the 2007 Public Private Ventures/Big Brothers Big Sisters school mentoring program impact study.[7] The MCP study used a quasi-experimental design with a non-equivalent comparison group to investigate what possible benefits, if any, youth in MCP programs may experience. Other information about the 48 participating grantee's program design, demographics, and other factors help highlight the variety of program settings and models used. In FY 2008, intake surveys were conducted among children in the sample (n=407), which consisted of newly-matched children between the ages of 9-17. In FY 2009 and FY 2010, follow-up surveys were administered after cases passed the 12-month anniversary. The Secretary will present the full and final report to Congress when clearance reviews have been completed. (There is no FY 2012 performance target associated with this measure, as the final report will be finished by that time.)

A final performance measure for the MCP program is measure 6F, which captures the MCP program's ability to increase the proportion of matches that endure beyond three months to 80 percent of all matches that end prematurely or ahead of schedule. In FY 2010, measure 6F reached 79.4 percent. Although this result did not meet the FY 2010 target of 83.3 percent, it fell just .6 percent below the standard maintenance rate of 80 percent. The MCP program has experienced improvements in this measure, increasing significantly from the FY 2008 reported rate of 72.5 percent. ACF understands that mentoring experts estimate that, in mentoring programs, "[o]ne half of all volunteer [mentoring] relationships dissolve within a few months."[8] Matches which end within the first three months represent significant investment and efficiency losses. Mentoring program 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 within the first three months are potentially harmful to a child if he or she loses trust of adults or feels guilty or abandoned.[9] By carefully matching adults and children and providing supportive activities and ongoing supervision of matches, grantees protect the start-up investment and strengthen the odds in favor of continuing relationships with benefits for the children. ACF will continue in its effort to provide grantees with access to resources that promote best practices and innovative strategies in support of this very important measure.

To aid in the program's use of effective practices, a new MCP Training and Technical Assistance Center began working in support of the MCP program throughout FY 2009 and FY 2010. During this time, regional and national conferences were held and numerous site visits were conducted to help grantees better serve their youth. Intensive technical assistance, oversight and support from federal staff helped to sustain 149 grantees nationwide (nearly 64 percent were new starts.) Many of the faith and community-based MCP organizations are new to the federal grants process and receive ongoing assistance to help them through the challenges of building infrastructure, hiring staff, developing a strategic plan, meeting reporting requirements, and establishing partnerships within the community. In order to continue to achieve the MCP performance targets, FYSB project officers and the MCP Training and Technical Assistance Support Center work closely to provide resources, tools and evidence-based techniques to

[7] In other words, MCP matches were compared with another study's control group; thus, this MCP study uses a comparison group, not a control group. The mentoring models differed in that MCP is community-based, not school-based. However, the results were adjusted for any significant differences observed between the two groups.

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

[9] Please note that children in these matches are usually re-matched with a new mentor as soon as possible.

MCP grantees, helping them establish, support and sustain high quality mentoring relationships.

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 2011, 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
	2011	1 state	Oct-11
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)*	*2012*	Prior Result -0.05	Oct-13
	2011	Prior Result -0.05	Oct-12
	2010	6.87	Oct-11
	2009	7.16	6.92 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	7.17	7.18 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2007	7.26	7.32 (Target Not Met but Improved)
7B: Decrease the percentage of children with substantiated or indicated reports of maltreatment that have a repeated substantiated or indicated report of maltreatment within six months. *(CAPTA) (Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result -0.2%	Oct-13
	2011	Prior Result -0.2%	Oct-12
	2010	6.6%	Oct-11
	2009	7%	6.8% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	7%	6.7% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	7%	6.8% (Target Exceeded)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
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)*	*2012*	Prior Result -5%	Oct-13
	2011	Prior Result -5%	Oct-12
	2010	55.62 hrs	Oct-11
	2009	62.73 hrs	58.55 hrs (Target Exceeded)
	2008	75.05 hrs	66.03 hrs (Target Exceeded)
	2007	62.23 hrs	82.04 hrs (Target Not Met)
7D: Increase the percentage of Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) total funding that supports evidence-based and evidence-informed child abuse prevention programs and practices. *(CBCAP) (Efficiency)*	*2012*	Prior Result +3PP	Aug-13
	2011	Prior Result +3PP	Aug-12
	2010	52%	Aug-11
	2009	40%	49% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	33%	37% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	30%	34% (Target Exceeded)

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

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

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

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

Annual measure 7A tracks the rate of first-time child maltreatment victims (maltreatment victims who have not been maltreatment victims in any prior year) per 1,000 children. The annual targets for FY 2010 through FY 2012 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 the 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 2007 and 2008 data updated to reflect lower rates than originally reported. Data for FY 2009 reflect continued progress with a reported rate of 6.92, which reflects stronger performance than the target of 7.16.

Annual measure 7B (repeat child maltreatment) evaluates the trend in the percentage of children with substantiated or indicated reports who experience repeat maltreatment. In FY 2009, 6.8 percent of children with a substantiated or indicated report were found to be victims of another substantiated or indicated report of maltreatment within six months, which exceeded the target of 7 percent. Performance on this measure has remained relatively constant for the last several years. 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 2012, the program expects to reduce the rate of repeat maltreatment by 0.2 percent from the previous year's actual result.

Annual measure 7C (maltreatment report-to-investigation response time) is based on the median[1] 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 2007, ACF clarified the definition of response time by 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. Following that clarification, the average response time for all states was determined to be 82.04 hours. In FY 2008, there was a substantial drop in the average response time down to 66.03 hours, which exceeded the FY 2008 target of 75.05 hours. ACF again exceeded the target in FY 2009 by lowering the average response time to 58.55 hours. The target for FY 2009 was 62.73. ACF will continue to 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 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. In each of fiscal years 2011 and 2012, 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 progress towards programs' use of these types of practices. Currently, the Children's Bureau and its National Resource Center for CBCAP are working closely with the states to promote more rigorous evaluations of their funded programs. Over time, the program expects to increase the number of effective programs and practices that are implemented, thereby maximizing the impact and efficiency of CBCAP funds. For the purposes of this efficiency measure, the Children's Bureau defines evidence-based and evidence-informed programs and practices along a continuum, which includes the following four categories of programs or practices: Emerging and Evidence Informed; Promising; Supported; and Well-Supported. Programs determined to fall within specified program parameters will be considered to be implementing "evidence-informed" or "evidence-based" practices (EBP), as opposed to programs that have not been evaluated using any set criteria. The funding directed towards these types of programs (weighted by EBP level) will be calculated over the total amount of CBCAP funding used for direct service programs to determine the percentage of total funding that supports evidence-based and evidence-informed programs and practices. A baseline of 27 percent was established for this measure in FY 2006. The target of a three percentage point annual increase in the amount of funds devoted to evidence-based practice through FY 2012 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 states directing 37 percent of CBCAP funds toward these practices in FY 2008. In FY 2009, ACF again exceeded its target, with 49 percent of CBCAP funding direct to evidence-informed and evidence-based practices, compared to the target of 40 percent. ACF is committed to continuing to work with CBCAP grantees to invest in known evidence-

[1] 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.

based practices, while continuing to promote evaluation and innovation, so as to expand the availability of evidence-informed and evidence-based practice over time.

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

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 2011, 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
	2011	1 state	Oct-11
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 2011, 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
	2011	1 state	Oct-11
7.3LT: Three states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor "Case Review System" by the end of FY 2011, 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
	2011	3 states	Oct-11

Measure	FY	Target	Result
7.4LT: One state or jurisdiction will be in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome Measure 2: "Children are maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate" by the end of FY 2011, 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)*	*Out-Year Target*	9 states (FY 2016)	Oct-16
	2011	1 state	Oct-11
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 2011, 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
	2011	1 state	Oct-11
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 2011, 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
	2011	1 state	Oct-11
7.7LT: Ten states or jurisdictions will be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor "Service Array" by the end of FY 2011, 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
	2011	10 states	Oct-11

Measure	FY	Target	Result
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 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)*	*2012*	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-12
	2011	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free[2]	Oct-11
	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (52 states) (Target Exceeded)
	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)
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)*	*2012*	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-12
	2011	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-11
	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	94% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (49 states) (Target Exceeded)
	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)

[2] The FY 2011 performance target for this and all CFSR PIP measures have been revised upward to maintain rigor in light of recent data.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
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)*	*2012*	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-12
	2011	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-11
	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	98% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (51 states) (Target Exceeded)
	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)
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 all findings identified in its most recent CFSR by completing all agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. *(PSSF) (Outcome)*	*2012*	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-12
	2011	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-11
	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (52 states) (Target Exceeded)
	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)
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)*	*2012*	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-12
	2011	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-11
	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	98% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (51 states) (Target Exceeded)
	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)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
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)*	*2012*	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-12
	2011	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-11
	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	98% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (51 states) (Target Exceeded)
	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)
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 agreed to actions and meeting quantifiable outcomes within specified time frames. *(PSSF) (Outcome)*	*2012*	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-12
	2011	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-11
	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (52 states) (Target Exceeded)
	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)
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)*	*2012*	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-12
	2011	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-11
	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (52 states) (Target Exceeded)
	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)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
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)*	*2012*	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-12
	2011	93% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	Oct-11
	2010	90% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free	100% of states with a closed out PIP penalty free (52 states) (Target Exceeded)
	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)
7N: Reduce the time needed to approve state Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) Program Improvement Plans (PIPs). *(Child Welfare Services, PSSF) (Efficiency)*	*2012*	Prior Result -0.5	Oct-12
	2011	12.2 months	Oct-11
	2010	9.2 months	12.7 months (Target Not Met)
	2009	11.2 months	9.7 months (Target Exceeded)
	2008	Set Baseline	11.7 months (Baseline)
7O: Increase the percentage of children who exit foster care within two years of placement either through guardianship or adoption. *(PSSF, Guardianship Assistance) (Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result +2PP	Oct-13
	2011	Prior Result +2PP	Oct-12
	2010	43.4%	Oct-11
	2009	38%	41.4% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	36%	41.9% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	35%	42.2% (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.[3] *(Child Welfare Services) (Outcome)*	*2012*	80%	Oct-13
	2011	80%	Oct-12
	2010	80%	Oct-11
	2009	80%	85% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	80%	83.8% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	80%	84.4% (Target Exceeded)

[3] This performance measure is included in the FMAP American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Implementation Plan.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
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)*	*2012*	Prior Result -0.5PP	Oct-13
	2011	Prior Result -0.5PP	Oct-12
	2010	3.1%	Oct-11
	2009	5.4%	3.6% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	5.9%	3.4% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	6.4%	2.8% (Target Exceeded)
7R: Decrease improper payments in the title IV-E foster care program by lowering the national error rate.[4] *(Foster Care) (Efficiency)*	*2012*	4.5%[5]	Oct-12
	2011	4.7%	Oct-11
	2010	4.50%	4.90% (Target Not Met)
	2009	6.00%	4.70% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	3.25%	6.42% (Target Not Met)[6]
	2007	7.57%	3.30% (Target Exceeded)
7.8LT and 7S: Increase the adoption rate.[7] *(Foster Care, Adoption Opportunities, Adoption Incentives, Adoption Assistance) (Outcome)*	*Out-Year Target*	12.00% (FY 2015)	Oct-16
	2012	10.40%	Oct-13
	2011	10.30%	Oct-12
	2010	10.20%	Oct-11
	2009	10.10%	11.8% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	10.00%	11.02% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	9.90%	10.00% (Target Exceeded)

[4] This performance measure is included in the FY 2010-2015 HHS Strategic Plan.
[5] The FY 2012 target for this measure should be considered preliminary pending the FY 2012 review results.
[6] 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.
[7] This performance measure is included in the FMAP American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Implementation Plan.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
7.1LT 7.2LT 7.3LT 7.4LT 7.5LT 7.6LT 7.7LT 7E, 7F, 7G, 7H, 7I, 7J, 7K, 7L, 7M, 7N	Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) final reports, Program Improvement Plans (PIPs), and PIP status tracking information	CFSR information is subject to several forms of data validation. Statewide data information, used as part of the initial review and the tracking of PIP progress, is collected through the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCANDS) and the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS), which each have extensive validation procedures discussed later in this section. Information collected during the onsite portion of the CFSR is subject to rigorous quality assurance procedures. States submit quarterly progress reports on PIP implementation which are carefully reviewed by ACF staff to assess the completeness and accuracy of the information. The Children's Bureau also has a database (maintained by a contractor) that tracks all key milestones for CFSR reviews.
7O 7P 7Q 7.8LT 7S	Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS)	States report child welfare data to ACF through AFCARS. All state semi-annual AFCARS data submissions undergo extensive edit-checks for validity. The results of the AFCARS edit-checks for each of the six-month data submissions are automatically generated and sent back to each state, to help the state to improve data quality. Many states submit revised data to ensure that accurate data are submitted, often for more than one prior submission period. The Children's Bureau conducts several AFCARS compliance reviews each year, which typically result in a comprehensive AFCARS Improvement Plan (AIP). States' Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems (SACWIS) are undergoing reviews to determine the status of their operation and the system's capability of reporting accurate AFCARS data. To speed improvement in these data, the agency funds the National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology. This Resource Center provides technical assistance to states to improve reporting to AFCARS, improve statewide information systems, and to make better use of their data. All of these activities should continue to generate additional improvements in the data over the next few years.
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 (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 2010, all 52 states and jurisdictions had completed program improvement plans and all but four states were determined to be penalty free.[8]

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. The measure is cumulative, so that each year the percentage of states found penalty free is measured for all states having a completed PIP since the beginning of that CFSR round. Fiscal year 2010 marked the last year for closing out PIPs from the first round of CFSRs and for that round ACF had set a target of 90 percent of states being penalty free. It was intended as an ambitious but realistic target that appropriately reflected the newness of the process. Final data from the first round of the CFSR show that in FY 2010, 100 percent of the 52 states/jurisdictions were found to be penalty free on annual measures 7E, 7H, 7L, and 7M. In addition, 98 percent of the 52 states/jurisdictions that had final evaluations of closed-out PIPs were found penalty free on annual measures 7G; and 94 percent of the states/jurisdictions were found penalty free on measure 7F relating to Permanency Outcome 1, "Children have permanency in their living situation."

ACF is pleased that performance has been so high on many of the measures for round 1 of the CFSR, exceeding the target set. Beginning in FY 2011, ACF will begin reporting on the closing out of PIPs from round 2 of the CFSR. Based on the strong performance in the first round and ACF's work with states to set realistic PIP goals that improve performance in important ways within a limited period of time, ACF proposes to increase the target for these measures from 90 percent of states penalty free to 93 percent of states penalty free beginning in FY 2011, through FY 2012. In order to support continued strong 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.

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, including the issuance of final reports assessing the degree to which states were in substantial conformity with the

[8] Several additional States were initially assessed penalties, but the determination was subsequently reversed. 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.

outcomes and systemic factors. While all onsite reviews were completed by the end of FY 2010, final reports for several states are still pending completion. Therefore, long term objectives 7.2 – 7.7, to be reported for FY 2011, 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 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. In FY 2010 performance on this measure did not improve and the average time to produce a report was 12.7 months. Factors contributing to the increase in the length of time to approve PIPs included a larger number of PIPs needing to be approved, and a number of instances in which ACF needed to engage states in extensive negotiations relating to complex issues in order to develop PIPs that will results in meaningful improvements. ACF continues to work to improve performance in this area in order to decrease the length of time needed to approve CFSR PIPs by 0.5 months from the previous year's actual result in fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

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 FY 2008 target of 36 percent of children exiting from foster care within two years of placement. Fiscal year 2009 again saw a slight decrease in performance, although the actual result of

41.4 percent exceeded the target of 38 percent. 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 fiscal years 2011 and 2012, ACF has set a goal of increasing the percentage of children who exit to either guardianship or adoption within two years 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 2009, 85 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 2012. 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. Updated data show performance in FY 2007 was 2.8 percent, well below the 6.4 percent target for that year. In FY 2008, 3.4 percent of children in foster care had an undetermined case plan goal, performance that exceeded the 5.9 percent target. In FY 2009, ACF's performance declined slightly to 3.6 percent, but still exceeded the target of 5.4. percent. By FY 2012, the program expects to reduce the FY 2009 actual result by at least 1.5 total percentage points by decreasing 0.5 percentage points per fiscal year.

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 155 regulatory foster care reviews, with over 14,500 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. Using this new methodology, for FY 2008, the Foster Care estimated national payment error rate was 6.42 percent. This represented 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. In FY 2009, the error rate declined to 4.7 percent. For FY 2010, ACF reported an error rate of 4.9 percent, a very slight increase over the previous year's rate. As a result, ACF, in consultation with OMB has adjusted out-year targets for fiscal years 2011 through 2013 (4.7 percent, 4.5 percent and 4.5 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 424,000 children in care as of the last day of FY 2009. 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, and in FY 2009 the adoption rate reached 11.8 percent, with approximately 57,000 children adopted, which exceeded the 10.10 percent target. Current performance has already surpassed the target for out-years through 2012. 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 Incentives program and by gradually increasing the population of children eligible for title IV-E adoption assistance.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional $889 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 were also eligible to receive these funds. This matching rate increase was effective October

1, 2008 through December 31, 2010. Public Law 111-226, the Education, Jobs and Medicaid Assistance Act, which was signed into law on August 10, 2010, extends the period during which a special increased FMAP rate is applicable through June 30, 2011, but provides for a phasing-out of the special FMAP rate by substituting an increase of 3.2 percent (applicable to the quarter ending March 31, 2011) and 1.2 percent (applicable to the quarter ending June 30, 2011) for the 6.2 percent increase that was provided under the Recovery Act. Since states have discretion over how to spend the freed up state dollars resulting from the increased federal match under the Recovery Act, 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.[9] *(Foster Care, Adoption Opportunities, Adoption Incentives, Adoption Assistance) (Outcome)*	*Out-Year Target*	10.50% (FY 2013)	Oct-14
	2012	10.40%	Oct-13
	2011	10.30%	Oct-12
	2010	10.20%	Oct-11
	2009	10.10%	11.8% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	10.00%	11.02% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	9.90%	10.00% (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%	67% (Target Not Met)
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%	67% (Target Not Met)
7.12 LT and 7T: Decrease the gap between the percentage of children nine and older waiting to be adopted and those actually adopted.[10] *(Adoption Incentives) (Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result -2%	Oct-13
	2011	Prior Result -2%	Oct-12
	2010	14.3%	Oct-11
	2009	12.2%	16.3% (Target Not Met)
	2008	13.7%	16.2% (Target Not Met)
	2007	15.2%	15.6% (Target Not Met but Improved)

[9] This performance measure is included in the FY 2009 FMAP Recovery Act Implementation Plan.
[10] Based on data available as of September 2005.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
7U: Maintain or decrease the average administrative claim per IV-E Adoption Assistance child. *(Adoption Assistance) (Efficiency)*	*2012*	Prior Result -2%	Oct-13
	2011	Prior Result -2%	Oct-12
	2010	$1,785	Oct-11
	2009	$1,757	$1,822 (Target Not Met)
	2008	$1,504	$1,793 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2007	$1,535	$1,802 (Target Not Met)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
7.8LT 7S 7.12LT 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 7.10LT	Children's Bureau Performance Management On-line Tool	The Children's Bureau and the Child Welfare Information Gateway will provide technical assistance and resource information to all grantees so that they understand the criteria for their data reporting. Data submitted semi-annually will be check for validity by Children's Bureau staff and cross referenced with grantees' semi-annual reports.
7U	Form IV-E-1 used by states to submit financial claims	Federal staff in the ACF Regions carefully review claims information submitted by the states each quarter and may ask for additional information to verify claims, when necessary.

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 with which it has worked 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 had expected that 75 percent of Adoption Opportunities grantees would 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 to increase to 80 percent. Adoption Opportunities grantees work on a variety of different projects and, based on the nature of the specific project, have discretion to select the specific performance measures on which to report. In analyzing data for this report, ACF determined that only six grantees had chosen to report on this measure and that those grantees had completed their grant activities in FY 2008; no grantees in operation in FY 2009 reported data for the measure. Therefore, the reported performance reflects information from FY 2008 from six grantees, four of which reported that their grant findings were applied to practice and that they were the impetus for policy change. Based on this very small sample, therefore, 67 percent of grantees had their findings applied to practice or serving as the impetus of policies; falling short of the target of 75 percent. In light of the small sample size for this measure, ACF plans to review and evaluate the performance measures for the Adoption Opportunities program.

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. In FY 2009, ACF again missed the target, with performance remaining relatively flat with a gap of 16.3 percent. While the target for decreasing the gap was again not achieved in FY 2009, 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 2010, approximately 14,800 foster children previously featured on the AdoptUsKids website found permanent, adoptive homes. 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. In FY 2009, ACF did not meet the target of $1,757 for the average administrative costs claimed per IV-E Adoption Assistance child; instead the figure went up to $1,822. ACF will continue to seek to reduce average claims in future years. In each of fiscal years 2011 and 2012, 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.

As previously noted, the Recovery Act provided an additional $889 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. The Education, Jobs and Medicaid Assistance Act, which was signed into law on August 10, 2010, extends the period during which a special increased FMAP rate is applicable through June 30, 2011, but provides for a phasing-out of the special FMAP rate by substituting an increase of 3.2 percent (applicable to the quarter ending March 31, 2011) and 1.2 percent (applicable to the quarter ending June 30, 2011) for the 6.2 percent increase that was provided under the Recovery Act. Since states have discretion over how to spend the freed up state dollars resulting from the increased federal match under the Recovery Act, it is unclear what impacts this change may have on performance on the Adoption Assistance program performance measures.

THE CHAFEE FOSTER CARE INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM

Measure	FY	Target	Result
7W: Increase the percentage of Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) youth who avoid high-risk behaviors. *(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)*	*2012*	Prior Result +2% (until maintenance goal of 52 states/juris. is achieved)	Sep-14
	2011	Prior Result +2% (until maintenance goal of 52 states/juris. is achieved)	Sep -13
	2010	Prior Result +2% (until maintenance goal of 52 states/juris. is achieved)	Sep -12
	2009	Prior Result +2% (until maintenance goal of 52 states/juris. is achieved)	Sep -11
	2008	50 of 52 states/juris.	50 of 52 states/juris. (Target Met)
	2007	50 of 52 states/juris.	49 of 52 states/juris[11] (Target Not Met but Improved)
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)*	*2012*	Prior Result -10%	Sep -14
	2011	Prior Result -10%	Sep -13
	2010	Prior Result -10%	Sep -12
	2009	Prior Result -10%	Sep -11
	2008	$199,381	$352,337 (Target Not Met)
	2007	$1,704,200	$221,534 (Target Exceeded)

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

The Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) under section 477 of the Social Security Act will develop a full set of performance measures once the National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD) begins full implementation. The NYTD is designed to meet statutory requirements for data collection and

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

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. The final rule to implement the new data collection was published on February 26, 2008 and both ACF and the states have undertaken extensive work to prepare for implementation of the system in FY 2011. The first data submissions, reflecting information for FY 2011, will be submitted in May and November of 2011. 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[12] out of 52 states/jurisdictions (94 percent) fully expending their grant awards. 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. For FY 2008, ACF met the target for the number of states fully expending Chafee funds, with 50 out of 52 states fully expending their grant awards. While missing the target for the amount of unspent funds, the amount left unexpended represented a very small proportion of available funds; of the combined $137,900,000 in grant awards, less than three-tenths of one percent, equal to approximately $352,300, was unexpended.

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

[12] 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 2012 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 percent of Adoption Opportunities grantees will have their findings applied to practice.						X			
7.10 Long Term Objective: By 2009, 75 percent of Adoption Opportunities grantees will have their findings provide the impetus for policies being enacted or amended.						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	
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. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result +0.1%	Jul-13
	2011	Prior Result +0.1%	Jul-12
	2010	13.38%	Jul-11
	2009	12.69%	13.38% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	12.47%	12.68% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	14.03%	12.46% (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)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1%	Jul-13
	2011	Prior Result +1%	Jul-12
	2010	93.4%	Jul-11
	2009	93.9%	92.5% (Target Not Met)
	2008	92.9%	93% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	93%	92% (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)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1%	Oct-12
	2011	36.1%	Oct-11
	2010	33.3%	35.7% (Target Exceeded)
	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, self-sufficient and integrated into the community per $1,000 of federal funding to the Councils.[1] *(Efficiency)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1%	Jul-13
	2011	Prior Result +1%	Jul-12
	2010	8.49	Jul-11
	2009	8.05	8.41 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	8.48	7.97 (Target Not Met)
	2007	7.66	8.40 (Target Exceeded)

[1] 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.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
8.1LT 8A 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 January 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 and 8E are derived from data from the State Councils.[2] The State Councils do not provide services directly, but rather review and analyze the quantity and quality of services that are provided at the state and local level in order to promote the development of a comprehensive, statewide, consumer and family-centered system that provides a coordinated array of culturally-competent services and other assistance for individuals with developmental disabilities. 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.

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

Regarding annual measure 8A, in FY 2009, nationally, 13.38 percent of individuals with developmental disabilities were independent, self-sufficient and integrated into the community as a result of Council efforts as measured by such indicators as: adults have jobs of their choice through Council efforts; students have the education and support they need to reach their educational goals through Council efforts; infants and young children have the services/supports needed to reach developmental goals through Council efforts; individuals have homes of their choice through Council efforts; people have needed health services through Council efforts; and people have transportation services through Council efforts. This result exceeded the FY 2009 target of 12.69 percent. Annual measure 8A is an important measure because it demonstrates progress toward an important objective of the Councils, across multiple systems including housing, education, transportation, health services and more. Starting in FY 2004, the ADD improved quality control procedures and later improved program guidance related to clearer definitions for the data elements and procedures for collecting the reported data, which resulted in improved data quality. Program information that was reported previously had overstated program accomplishments, and targets that had been set through FY 2007 were based on erroneous data. Targets for FY 2008 and FY 2009 were based on more precise data and the program met its targets for these years. It is anticipated that future targets will be met through FY 2012.

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 2012 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 2011, ADD is engaging a workgroup of Council representatives and independent researchers to review and evaluate the current measurement system used by Councils to report progress on an annual basis. This discussion will include how to ensure quality control in the data collection process.

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.[3] 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 FY 2009 was 92.5 percent, which did not meet the target of 93.9 percent. While the target was not met, the accomplishments are not to be minimized, as individuals with developmental disabilities faced many challenges relating to advocacy activities and cases. It is anticipated that with future collaborative efforts, and analysis relating to advocacy efforts, future targets will be met.

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

[3] 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.

P&A systems is measured across the spectrum of different populations served. For FY 2012, 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.

In FY 2010, ADD analyzed trends in the results for annual measure 8C (*Increase the percentage of trained individuals actively working to improve access of individuals with developmental disabilities to services and supports*), which revealed concerns about the reliability and validity of the data to support this performance measure (see Discontinued Measures section at the end of this document). Analysis of the data over time shows the results have been quite scattered:

- FY 2004: 93%
- FY 2005: 71%
- FY 2006: 85%
- FY 2007: 68%
- FY 2008: 92%
- FY 2009: 98%

The variability of the results raised questions about the quality of the data. Although ADD has annually provided technical assistance to grantees on procedures for collecting the data for this measure, these efforts do not appear to be yielding reliable results. Moreover, the results from the analysis of the FY 2009 data (98 percent) would have essentially nullified any targets for subsequent years. For these reasons, ADD did not consider annual measure 8C as useful, reliable or valid, with concurrence from the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, ADD is working on developing a better measure of program performance.

Annual measure 8D was established during the CY 2003 program assessment, and then revised in CY 2006 to the current performance measure. In contrast with the previous measure on UCEDDs, ADD broadened its information collection to more accurately reflect the work of the UCEDDs.[4] 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. 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. ADD identified outliers in the data that appeared to be unrealistic (especially overly large numbers) and asked the UCEDDs follow up on these survey results to verify the accuracy of the data and revise the results reported as needed. Finally, ADD formed a working group that examined the data collection methods for this measure. ADD will continue to track grantees to ensure that their data reports

[4] 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.

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 three years since FY 2007, which translates into more reliable and precise data.

For annual measure 8D, the actual result for FY 2010 was 35.7 percent, which exceeds the target of 33.3 percent. It is believed that this result is an artifact of the quality control process, and that the result for the next year (FY 2011) will be reflective not only of highly precise data, but also highly accurate and stable data, and is expected to meet its target of 36.1 percent. By FY 2012, 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. In addition, the workgroup continues to examine this measure and overall data collection processes used by the UCEDDs.

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. ADD exceeded the FY 2009 target of 8.05 with an actual result of 8.41 individuals with developmental disabilities being reached per $1,000 federal funding to the Councils. This result is important given the 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 2012, 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
9A (new): Increase the percentage of projects that meet the Administration for Native Americans (ANA) reporting requirements in a timely manner. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results	May-13
	2011	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results	May-12
	2010	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results: 71.5%	May-11
	2009	N/A	72% (Historical Actual)
	2008	Set Baseline	69% (Baseline)[1]
9.1 LT and 9B (new): Increase the percentage of projects that meet or exceed funded objectives. *(Outcome)*	*Out Year Target*	75% (FY 2014)	May-15
	2012	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results	May-13
	2011	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results	May-12
	2010	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results: 71%	May-11
	2009	Set Baseline	72% (Baseline)
9C (new): Increase the percentage of projects that leverage more than $10,000. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results	May-13
	2011	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results[2]	May-12
	2010	Baseline + 5%: 49%	May-11
	2009	1% over avg. prior 3 year actuals: 60%	76% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	1% over avg. prior 2 year actuals: 56%	69% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	N/A	68% (Historical Actual)
9D (new): Increase the percentage of projects that formed or strengthened five or more partnerships. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results	May-13
	2011	1% over avg. prior 3 year actual results	May-12
	2010	1% over avg prior 3 year actual result: 84%	May-11
	2009	N/A	89% (Historical Actual)

[1] ANA is assessing this measure to more accurately reflect the number of projects that are meeting the requirements on time. Results will be available by the end of September, 2010.
[2] The FY 2011 target for this measure has been updated to maintain rigor.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
	2008	N/A	78% (Historical Actual)
	2007	N/A	86% (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)*	*2012*	1% over avg prior 3 actual results	Sep-12
	2011	1% over avg prior 3 actual results: 65%	Sep-11
	2010	64%	69% (Target Exceeded)
	2009	58%	68% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	59%	57% (Target Not Met)
	2007	N/A	66% (Historical Actual)
9.2LT and 9F (new): Increase the percentage of grantees that reported securing funding to sustain project activities after ANA funding has ended. *(Outcome)*	*Out Year Target*	65% (FY 2014)	May-15
	2012	1% over avg. prior 3 actual results	May-13
	2011	1% over avg. prior 3 year actual results	May-12
	2010	1% over avg. prior 3 year actual results : 60.2%	May-11
	2009	N/A	60.5%[3] (Historical Actual)
	2008	Set Baseline	60% (Baseline)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
9A	ANA Database Reporting System	Upon submission of the required quarterly reports (Objective Progress Reports and SF-269) data are entered in a system to track the compliance results.
9.1LT 9B 9.2LT 9C 9D 9F	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. The tool also establishes partnership and project sustainability data.

[3] This number is a result of projects that have 'Desired Funding in Place' and 'Some Funding Secured.' To note, this does not include the category 'No Additional Funding Needed', as these answers are typically given because a project's services/responsibilities will be rolled into an ongoing program and therefore do not require funds to continue progress. However, this is an assumption that is not necessarily always true.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
9E	Training/Technical Assistance (T/TA) quarterly reports, ANA application data, and application scores	ANA developed new tools to evaluate the effectiveness of ANA T/TA and has provided e-learning opportunities for 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 mission of the Administration for Native Americans (ANA) is to promote the goal of self-sufficiency and cultural preservation for Native Americans. ANA provides social and economic development opportunities through financial assistance, training, and technical assistance to eligible tribe and Native American communities, including American Indians, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and other Native Pacific Islanders' organizations. ANA provides funding for projects that are designed to improve the lives of Native children and families and reduce long-term dependency on public assistance.

ANA has reviewed and updated these performance measures to more accurately reflect how ANA can be accountable. Over the last two years, ANA focused on how to improve transparency and strengthen monitoring and evaluation processes. These improvements have allowed ANA to accurately report how its grantees are utilizing ANA funding and measure progress toward project objectives (measure 9C) and also track their compliance to mandated reporting (measure 9A). Regarding measure 9A, beginning in FY 2008, ANA initiated a tracking system to track the timeliness of mandated quarterly reports. This system was significantly updated in FY 2009 and ANA is now able to determine the number of reports turned in on time and, as a result, able to quickly notify program specialists and training and technical assistance (T/TA) providers for grantee follow-up. ANA has found grantee failure to provide quarterly reports on time is often the first sign of more serious problems. Tracking these quarterly therefore serves as an early warning system which enables ANA to quickly assess projects that are at risk and provide early intervention.

Also, beginning in FY 2008, ANA measured grantee success in meeting and exceeding the performance objectives of their project (measure 9B). Each quarter, ANA measures progress toward grantees' goals and at the end the project impact visits measure the overall success of the project meeting its objectives. Since 2006, ANA maintains compliance with the Native American Programs Act (NAPA) of 1974 for Community Impact Evaluations. Each year ANA conducts evaluations on approximately one-third of its ending grant portfolio. The rigorous one-day evaluations describe and measure the impact of ANA projects, their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on the community, 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.

As demonstrated by our measures, through increased monitoring efforts (such as report tracking and quarterly reviews of applicants) grantees will be more successful. Such tracking enables ANA to identify projects that are struggling to accomplish objectives and provide training and technical assistance to assist grantees in getting back on track. ANA intends that the closer monitoring and reporting will result in better project compliance and overall project success. ANA's FY 2012 target for both measures 9A and 9B is to improve by one percent over the average of the prior three years actual results.

Efficiency measure 9E evaluates the effectiveness of ANA investments in 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. In FY 2010, the T/TA providers continued to utilize more efficient tools to assist potential grantees. For example, electronic technical assistance (email, telephone, webinars, web-based guides) were used to increase effectiveness and decrease costs for both ANA and potential applicants. In FY 2010, 69 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. Also compelling to note is that of all applications that scored over 70 percent, the median score was 87 percent for those who received T/TA and 83 percent for those who did not. By FY 2012, ANA aims to increase performance in this area by one percent over the average of the previous three years' results.

Annual measures 9C, 9D and 9F address the "core" and purpose of ANA projects: sustainability. Grantees form partnerships with other tribes, organizations, and agencies to maximize ANA funds and further advance project goals. To achieve the long-term objectives of these measures, ANA works with grantees to encourage partnership development and ensure they maximize their leveraging potential.

ANA funds projects, not programs. ANA promotes using ANA funds as seed money for community-based projects that will have a lasting impact on the community and will be sustainable by the community after ANA funding ends. To that end, annual measure 9C assesses the percentage of projects that leverage more than $10,000. By leveraging resources through partnerships and community involvement, projects reach greater success and project sustainability. ANA has found the following results in an analysis of grantees from FY 2006 to FY 2009: of the grantees that leveraged less then $10,000, 44 percent had desired funding levels or some funding already secured for sustainability. By comparison, of grantees that leveraged $10,000 or more, 65 percent had desired funding levels or some funding already secured. As grantees are able to increase leveraged funding, they are more likely to meet the sustainability needs of the project.

Annual measure 9D assesses the percentage of projects that formed or strengthened five or more partnerships. ANA has found a direct correlation between the number of project partnerships and project success. Since FY 2006, ANA has collected data from 341 projects with the following results: 11 percent of projects with 0-5 partnerships did not meet objectives; nearly nine percent of projects with 6-10 partnerships did not meet objectives; while zero percent of projects with 11-15 partnerships did not meet objectives. Additionally, of those who had five to nine partnerships, or ten to twenty partnerships (55 percent and 63 percent, respectively) secured some or all funding for the continuation of the project. Since the size of native communities varies drastically, ANA intends to promote partnerships widely at trainings and through T/TA providers, webinars, newsletters and other communications. ANA feels the measure of five or more partnerships will help all grantee success.

Annual measure 9F measures the percentage of grantees that reported securing funding to sustain project activities. ANA funds projects rather than long-term programs, therefore it is vital for grantees to develop sustainability plans to continue project activities. As noted previously, ANA has documented increased project success and sustainability when communities leverage other resources and strengthen or build community partnerships. ANA intends to promote establishing and maintaining partners, leveraging resources and establishing a sustainability plan at the pre-award T/TA, post-award T/TA and through its grantee e-mails, newsletters and its website.

11. Federal Administration

Measure	FY	Target	Result
11A: Obtain the highest level of success for each management initiative. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Highest level of success in all management initiatives	Nov-12
	2011	Highest level of success in all management initiatives	Nov-11
	2010	Highest level of success in all management initiatives	Highest level of success in all 8 management initiatives (Target Met)
	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)

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

In FY 2010 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 Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships. 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.

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 eighth 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] ACF developed a Workforce Succession Plan which has been utilized to provide leadership succession strategies based on the needs of the ACF workforce

[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.

through FY 2014.

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 to provide 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 many agencies' financial and programmatic stewardship. The national awareness of the leadership, integrity and commitment of the HHS/ACF COE continues to grow as the list of partners expands to include multiple HHS OpDivs (OPHS, HRSA, IHS, ASPR, ONC, OCIIO, CMS), the State Department, the Federal Railroad Administration, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration, the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Denali Commission. In the last six months both the Office of the National Coordinator (ONC) and the Office of Consumer Information and Insurance turned to the HHS/ACF COE to help implement new grant programs that are key components of the President's health care initiative. The HHS/ACF COE continues to transform an HHS electronic government initiative into a U.S.-wide strategic partnership.

In improving financial performance, the Department received another clean opinion on its FY 2010 audit (representing the eleventh consecutive clean audit opinion for ACF, with no ACF-specific material weaknesses in FY 2010). 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 has concluded that new statutory authority is needed in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program to calculate an improper payment rate. 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 Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, 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)*	*2012*	13 million[2]	Oct-13
	2011	26 million	Oct-12
	2010	30 million	Oct-11
	2009	30 million	33.4 million (Target Exceeded)
	2008	27 million	29 million (Target Exceeded)
	2007	28 million	26 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.[3] *(Efficiency)*	*2012*	19.00%	Oct-13
	2011	19.00%	Oct-12
	2010	19.00%	Oct-11
	2009	19.00%	16.96 % (Target Exceeded)
	2008	N/A	18.42% (Historical Actual)
	2007	N/A	19.11% (Historical Actual)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
12.1LT 12A 12B	CSBG Information System (CSBG/IS) survey administered by the National Association for State Community Services Programs (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 2009 data indicate that 33.4 million conditions of poverty among low-income individuals, families, and communities were addressed as a result of community action interventions. For example, the CSBG network was able to help 154,000 unemployed individuals obtain a job and 25,000 individuals were able

[1] This performance measure is included in the CSBG American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Implementation Plan.
[2] The FY 2012 targets for this measure appears to be a decrease in performance due to proposed changes in the funding level included in the FY 2012 President's Budget Request.
[3] This performance measure is included in the CSBG American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Implementation Plan.

to complete Adult Basic Education or GED coursework and received certificates or diplomas through Community Action initiatives.

The higher than projected result is 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. These indicators track outcomes from emergency services to more comprehensive and coordinated services. In FY 2009, the percent of conditions of poverty addressed through provision of emergency services decreased by nine percent. By contrast, a number of indicators related to comprehensive and coordinated services increased, accounting for the overall 16 percent increase of the total number of conditions of poverty addressed through all Community Action initiatives. In fact, non-emergency services saw a 40 percent increase in the conditions of poverty addressed in FY 2009.

For example, agencies increased their assistance to help 42 percent more unemployed individuals obtain a job in FY 2009. Agencies were also able to help 29 percent more low-income individuals receive Adult Basic Education or GED diplomas, as well as 43 percent more low-income individuals complete post-secondary education. These increases are mainly attributable to the fact that in FY 2009 states began to utilize American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) funds to target the job creation goals of the Recovery Act. We expect this trend to continue in FY 2010 due to continuing implementation of the Recovery Act. In addition, increases were shown in removing barriers to employment, such as housing; agencies assisted 51 percent more individuals in obtaining safe and affordable housing in FY 2009.

Agencies were also able to reach higher levels of results in part by leveraging increased funds from some resources, while also utilizing the Recovery Act funds. 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.

As previously noted, CSBG received an additional $1 billion in funding under the Recovery Act 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 are already seeing an uptick in the number of conditions of poverty addressed due to Recovery Act funding for CSBG in FY 2009, and this will likely remain true for FY 2010 as well, since outcomes will be measured based on the full 12 months that the CSBG network provides services with the infusion of Recovery Act funds in local communities. Fiscal year 2011 and future targets are lower because Recovery Act funds will not be available after FY 2010. By FY 2012, the program expects to reach the performance target of 13 million for this performance measure. Although this performance target is a reduction from the prior years, the target is proportionally consistent with the accompanying FY 2012 President's Budget request, meaning that at least 50 percent of the number and conditions of poverty addressed in the prior year would be addressed. A key goal of the program reauthorization would be to make sure that program efforts are focused on the most critical areas of services.

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. 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 administrative spending by sub-grantees. 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 2009, 16.96 percent of CSBG sub-grantee funds were used for administrative costs, an improvement over the previous year's result of 18.42 percent. Through FY 2012, the program expects to maintain a rate of 19 percent for this measure. As previously noted, CSBG received additional funding for services under the Recovery Act. 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. During FY 2012, ACF plans to revamp performance measures for CSBG based on a new competitive funding process within states. A key goal of the program reauthorization will be to ensure that program efforts are focused on the most critical areas of services based on local community needs, grantee performance, and local community action plans.

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)*	*2012*	Avg of two prev years* growth factor [1]	Feb-13
	2011	Avg of two prev years* growth factor [1]	Feb-12
	2010	$5,622,939	Feb-11
	2009	$4,923,386	$5,741,686 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	$4,864,071	$5,071,659 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	$4,179,848	$4,677,620 (Target Exceeded)
13B: Increase the number of participants who withdraw funds for the three asset purchase goals. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Avg of two prev years* growth factor [1]	Feb-13
	2011	Avg of two prev years* growth factor [1]	Feb-12
	2010	4,414 participants	Feb-11
	2009	3,886 participants	4,422 participants (Target Exceeded)
	2008	3,868 participants	4,067 participants (Target Exceeded)
	2007	3,332 participants	3,629 participants (Target Exceeded)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
13.1LT 13A 13B	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. The program exceeded the target for measure 13A in FY 2009 by 17 percent. The target was that participants would use $4,923,386 in IDA savings during the year for an asset purchase; grantees reported that participants actually used $5,741,686 during the year. The program achieved a similar result for measure 13B. For this measure, the program exceeded the annual target in FY 2009 by 14 percent. The target was that 3,886 participants would use their IDA savings during the year to finance an asset purchase; by the end of the reporting period, a total of 4,422 participants had used their IDA savings for such a purchase.[1] 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.

The annual targets for each year through FY 2012 will be calculated using results from the prior two years. 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, the calculation of the 13A target for FY 2010 was arrived at as follows:

Base	
Savings used for allowable purchases in 2008	$5,071,659
Savings used for allowable purchases in 2009	$5,741,686
Average of the above	$5,406,672
Growth Factor	
New IDAs opened in 2008	7,918
New IDAs opened in 2009	8,258
Growth between 2008 and 2009[2]	4.3%
Target	
Base adjusted by growth factor:	$5,406,672 increased by 4.3% = $5,622,939

Annual targets for the number of participants who withdraw IDA funds (13B) are based on the same formula as above: the average of the number of participants who made withdrawals in the prior two years multiplied by the annual percentage growth in new IDAs. [3]

[1] The $5.7 million in IDA savings for allowable asset purchases in FY 2009 represented an increase in the total savings used for asset purchases in the AFI program of 25 percent, from $23.2 million through the end of FY 2008 to $28.9 million through the end of FY 2009. The 4,422 participants using IDA savings for a purchase in FY 2009 represented a 24 percent increase in the total number of participants who have made purchases, from 18,725 participants in FY 2008 to 23,147 participants in FY 2009.

[2] The percent is the growth rate in the number of IDAs opened between 2008 and 2009 (for the period 2008-2009, the growth rate was 4 percent). This is not the change in dollars saved or participants withdrawing funds; rather, it is the rate of growth in the number of new IDAs opened. As the number of IDAs opened increases, the potential new savings withdrawn (measure 13A) and the number of participants making withdrawals within a year (measure 13B) will also increase.

[3] If the program achieves the FY 2010 target for 13A, it will represent an increase in total savings used for allowable asset purchases by the AFI program of 19 percent, from $28.9 million through the end of FY 2009 to $34.5 million through the end of FY 2010. Similarly, if the program

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.

ACF has proposed the deletion of the previous two efficiency measures (which can now be referenced in the Discontinued Measures section). ACF is continuing to explore options for additional outcome measures based on the knowledge gained to date, to be developed in consultation with the Department and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). New performance measures for the AFI program will be included in the FY 2013 submission.

---

achieves the FY 2010 target for 13B, it will represent an increase in the total number of participants who have withdrawn IDA funds for allowable asset purchases of 19 percent, from 23,147 participants through the end of 2009 to 27,561 participants through the end of 2010.

14. Family Violence Prevention and Services

Measure	FY	Target	Result
14A (new): Reduce the total number of unmet requests for shelter (state and tribal programs). *(Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	May-13
	2011	TBD	May-12
	2010	Set Baseline	May-11
	2009	Pre-baseline	167,069[1] (Historical Actual)
14B (revised): Increase the capacity of the National Domestic Violence Hotline to respond to increased call volume (as measured by percentage of total annual calls to which the hotline responds).[2] *(Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	Mar-13
	2011	TBD	Mar-12
	2010	Set Baseline	Mar-11
	2009	Pre-baseline	81% (Historical Actual)
14C (new): Increase the number of youth who attended youth-targeted community education programs, including tribal programs. (*Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	May-13
	2011	TBD	May-12
	2010	Set Baseline	May-11
	2009	Pre-baseline	1,698,649[1] (Historical Actual)
14D (new): Increase the percentage of domestic violence program clients who report improved knowledge of community resources. (*Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	May-13
	2011	TBD	May-12
	2010	Set Baseline	May-11
	2009	Pre-baseline	92% (Historical Actual)
14E: Increase the percentage of domestic violence program clients who report improved knowledge of safety planning. (*Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	May-13
	2011	TBD	May-12
	2010	Set Baseline	May-11
	2009	Pre-baseline	90% (Historical Actual)
14F (new): Increase the number of supportive counseling and advocacy contacts with children provided by domestic violence programs, including tribal programs. (*Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	May-13
	2011	TBD	May-12
	2010	Set Baseline	May-11
	2009	Pre-baseline	323,914[1] (Historical Actual)
14G (new): Increase the number of culturally specific, community-based programs funded through FVPSA (not including tribal grants).[3] (*Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	May-13
	2011	Set Baseline	May-12

[1] This result includes data reported from only 75 percent of the tribal programs.

[2] Although ACF has extensive historical data on this performance measure, ACF is awarding a new grant in FY 2010 and may have either a new grantee or new requirements for the current grantee. Due to these potential changes, this performance measure should be considered developmental.

[3] Data for this developmental measure will be available pending Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval of a modification to the SF-PPR, which is anticipated by the end of FY 2010.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
14H (new): Increase the number of people trained by FVPSA-funded training and technical assistance providers. (*Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	Mar-13
	2011	TBD	Mar-12
	2010	Set Baseline	Mar-11
	2009	Pre-baseline	29,661 (Historical Actual)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
14A, 14C, 14F	Family Violence Prevention and Services Program Performance Progress Report Form	Submission of this report 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, tribes and domestic violence coalitions.
14B	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, 14E	Family Violence Prevention and Services Program Performance Progress Report Form	Submission of this report 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. Currently only the states are collecting these outcomes.
14G	Family Violence Prevention and Services Program Performance Progress Report Form	This outcome measure will require an update to the OMB-approved data collection form. The Department has requested additional reporting on subgrantees, so this additional measure will be part of the required edits to the data collection, pending OMB-approval for FY 2011.
14H	Reports from FVPSA-funded training and technical assistance providers.	This outcome measure is currently voluntarily reported at the end of each fiscal year. New reporting requirements will be issued beginning in FY 2012 when new grants are awarded.

In FY 2008, the ACF Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB), Division of Family Violence Prevention began implementation and nationwide training on a new data collection program to measure outcomes, particularly those adopted to ensure quality services provided to victims of domestic violence and their children. The new data collection requirements were the result of a program assessment and strategic grantee collaborations to identify new program efficiency indicators. In FY 2009, grantees began collecting and reporting new data in a new data collection survey. As data are reported through FY 2012, ACF will analyze trends in performance measures, thereby establishing a baseline by the spring of FY 2011 to establish ambitious targets.

This new data collection obtains data on outputs and outcomes that directly relate to the safety and the services provided to the people served and the new measures more clearly align with the goals of the FVPSA funds to provide emergency shelter and related services to victims and their children. The new measures are able to track changes at the client and the service level instead of the federal program administration level. For example, a measure that reported on the number of family violence prevention grants to tribes, which attempted to measure the performance of the federal program administration of the funds, was removed. With the new tool, multiple new measures were added that counted the amount of people served at the local level, along with outcome measures related to the victim's safety.

Annual measures 14A, 14C and 14F are all collected as part of the new data collection survey for FY

2009. This is the first time that ACF has had uniform data elements for domestic violence services in the state, local and tribal programs. The data collected in FY 2009 is the first full year of data. However, some states and programs did not have systems in place to collect the required data elements until the middle of the fiscal year. More training and technical assistance will be provided on the specific definitions for both the states and the tribes to ensure accuracy in the reported numbers for FY 2010, at which time the baseline data will be established.

Regarding annual measure 14B, staff and volunteers of the National Domestic Violence Hotline (NDVH) provide victims of domestic violence, and those calling on their behalf, with crisis intervention, domestic violence information and referrals to local service providers. Each year, the number of incoming calls has increased. The hotline's performance in 2012 will focus on the response to calls by measuring the percentage of total annual responses to calls in relation to the number of calls received. The evolution of this performance measure acknowledges that tracking the answers or responses to calls is a better determinant of the hotlines usefulness than reporting the number of calls received. 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.

Developmental annual measures 14D and 14E concentrate on the maintenance of quality of services provided to victims of family violence and their children through FVPSA grant funds. ACF maintains that a comprehensive measure is needed to track shelter outcomes rather than simpler unit-cost measures. Therefore a cost-efficiency workshop was convened 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, ACF introduced new performance reporting requirements to grantees throughout FY 2008 and FY 2009 at grantees' conferences, through grantee correspondence and guidance, and through program announcements. ACF programs provided technical assistance to grantees related to developing mechanisms for collecting outcome data directly from survivors. In FY 2009, grantees began collecting new data. ACF will continue to offer technical assistance related to collecting data on the new outcome measures. Annual measures 14D and 14E capture two key outcomes, increasing the percentage of domestic violence program clients who report improved knowledge of safety planning and knowledge of community resources. These measures are correlated with other indices of longer-term client safety and well-being, and will help document improved work by FVPSA grantees and subgrantees.[4]

Developmental annual measure 14G will document the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (FVPSA) program's increase in addressing the needs of underserved populations. Given the FVPSA mandate to address the needs of underserved populations, the new data collection survey includes data tracking for FVPSA funded organizations to report activities that reach underserved and culturally diverse populations. In the past, there has been no standardized way to document local level efforts/programming that addresses culturally specific populations.

Developmental annual measure 14H currently relies on voluntary reporting from FVPSA funded national resource and technical assistance centers. In prior years, this data was not reported. In FY 2009, the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence took the lead in compiling the numbers of people trained through ten FVPSA funded centers for the baseline report. This measure will more adequately capture the breadth of FVPSA funded activities to support the FVPSA training and technical assistance mandate.

[4] 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
	2012	Prior Result + 1%	Dec-13
	2011	Prior Result + 1%	Dec-12
	2010	52.61%	Dec-11
	2009	61.07%	52.09% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2008	59.87%	44.00% (Target Not Met)
	2007	58.70%	60.00% (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
	2012	Prior Result + 1%	Dec-13
	2011	Prior Result + 1%	Dec-12
	2010	$9.18	Dec-11
	2009	$8.37	$9.09 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	$8.29	$8.82 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	$8.20	$8.29 (Target Exceeded)
15C (revised): 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)*	*2012*	TBD	TBD

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

Regarding annual measure 15A and related long term objective 15.1, a cash assistance termination is defined as the closing of a cash assistance case due to earned income in an amount that is predicted to exceed the state's payment standard for the case based from employment on family size, rendering the

case ineligible for cash assistance. Due to dampening economic conditions starting in FY 2008, targets for this and other measures for FY 2011 and future have been revised to better reflect reality in the field, structured as percentage increases over the previous year's actual result. In FY 2009, the 61 percent target was not met (actual result was 52 percent), but showed significant improvement over the previous FY 2008 actual result of 44 percent. ORR plans to continue to assess 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 2009 saw a $0.27 increase in the aggregate average wage from FY 2008, exceeding the target by $0.72. While $9.09 per hour is a modest wage, it is nonetheless 25.5 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 and FY 2009, it remains to be seen whether this hourly wage can be maintained given continuing adverse economic conditions. There are some indications that economic conditions are improving somewhat, and that refugees are becoming employed at a greater rate in FY 2010 than in FY 2009. However, many of these jobs are with temporary agencies and pay little over minimum wage.

ACF proposes to revise the efficiency measure for both the Transitional and Medical Services and Refugee Social Services programs. ACF is in the process of revising the ORR-6 trimester report to include a new data element that would use 240 days from a refugee's arrival to the U.S. as a parameter to measure self-sufficiency. States would report the self-sufficiency status of Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) recipients reaching 240 days from arrival to the U.S. during the reporting period, as well as the number of recipients whose RCA was terminated due to earned income from employment. This measure should be considered developmental until the proposed additions to the ORR-6 are approved, communicated to states, and implemented for data collection. ACF expects to begin reporting data for this developmental efficiency measure in FY 2012.

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 (after 120 days). *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1%	Apr-13
	2011	Prior Result +1%	Apr-12
	2010	47.58%	Apr-11
	2009	57.67%	47.11%[2] (Target Not Met)
	2008	64.40%	57.10% (Target Not Met)
	2007	72.86%	63.76% (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)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1%	Apr-13
	2011	Prior Result +1%	Apr-12
	2010	52.62%	Apr-11
	2009	62.72%	52.10% (Target Not Met)
	2008	69.56%	62.10% (Target Not Met)
	2007	76.3%	68.87% (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
	2012	Prior Result +1%	Apr-13
	2011	Prior Result +1%	Apr-12
	2010	67.88%	Apr-11
	2009	80.5%	67.21% (Target Not Met)
	2008	80.0%	78.3% (Target Not Met)
	2007	79.5%	80.3% (Target Exceeded)

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

[2] The FY 2009 actual results for all Matching Grants performance measures have been updated, based on data verification efforts by federal program staff. The original figures reported were initial grantee reports that were then checked and verified, resulting in slightly lower results. Two new federal staff have been hired to assist in the data verification process for the over 220 Matching Grants sites.

Measure	PY[3]	Target	Result
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)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1%	Apr-13
	2011	Prior Result +1%	Apr-12
	2010	333.5	Apr-11
	2009	390	330.2 (Target Not Met)
	2008	420	399 (Target Not Met)
	2007	410	450 (Target Exceeded)

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

Annual measure 16A measures the percent of employable adults that find jobs by the 120th day after they become eligible for services. In program year (PY) 2009, this measure fell short of the target of 57.67 percent with an actual result of 47.11 percent of refugees entering employment. This decrease can be largely attributed to the continuing economic challenges faced by the nation as a whole. Note that this measure has dropped 16.65 percent since PY 2007. 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 2012, the program expects to return or exceed the targeted performance level as the job market grows stronger, and the service providers continuously refine their methods.

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 2009 target of 62.72 percent with an actual result of 52.10 percent. Annual performance measure 16C also fell below the PY 2009 target of 79.08 percent with an actual result of 67.21 percent. Both 120 day and 180 day self-sufficiency outcomes continued to drop due to the ongoing economic challenges in most areas of the country. Increased competition in a still struggling job market has negatively impacted the overall self-sufficiency rate of the program participants, especially newly arriving clients with low levels of English and limited work experience. That being said, ongoing efforts by the service providers are showing promise with self-sufficiency levels increasing by 15.11 percent between the 120 and 180 day measures. By PY 2012 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 out-year targets for annual measure 16C may be increasingly ambitious given the diversity of refugees currently served and the difficult economic climate in most areas. Economic self-sufficiency means earning a total family income at a level that enables a family unit to support itself without receipt of a cash assistance grant. Although these measures are extremely difficult to reach in this time of high unemployment, Matching Grant program offices

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

throughout the country continue to accept the challenge of assisting an 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 is achieved for the investment in the program. ORR employed performance based funding 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 incentive has generally led to dramatic improvement in performance from the weakest grantees 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 2009 goal of 390 was not reached, with an actual result of 330.2, in great part due to the economic downturn. By PY 2012, 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 2009 ORR served 28,444 people in the Matching Grant program, of whom fully 1,172 were served solely with private (non-federal) funding raised by the grantees.

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 (FY 2014)	Jun-15
	2012	Prior Result +5%	Jun-13
	2011	568	Jun-12
	2010	399	541[1] (Target Exceeded)
	2009	333	380 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	318	317 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2007	400	303 (Target Not Met but Improved)
17B: Increase the number of victims certified and served by whole network of grantees per million dollars invested. *(Efficiency)*	*2012*	Prior Result +5%	Jun-13
	2011	57.9	Jun-12
	2010	40.6	55.1[2] (Target Exceeded)
	2009	34.0	38.7 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	32.1	32.3 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	40.0	30.8 (Target Not Met but Improved)
17C1: Increase hotline calls per thousand dollars invested. *(Efficiency)*	*2012*	Prior Result +3%	Jun-13
	2011	20.09	Jun-12
	2010	15.10[3]	19.50 (Target Exceeded)
	2009	10.83	14.70[4] (Target Exceeded)
	2008	5.15	10.51 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	1.80	5.00 (Target Exceeded)
17C2: Increase website visits per thousand dollars invested. *(Efficiency)*	*2012*	Prior Result +3%	Jun-13
	2011	3,548	Jun-12
	2010	2,497	3,445 (Target Exceeded)

[1] ACF recognizes that the FY 2010 actual result significantly exceeds the FY 2010 target; however, this result is likely an anomaly, based on a significant number of victims from three large labor cases certified during FY 2010. ACF will continue to evaluate future year targets for this measure, should this result prove to be a new data trend.
[2] See previous.
[3] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been updated due to a technical correction related to the FY 2009 actual results.
[4] The FY 2009 actual result for this measure has been updated as a result of final data confirmation.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
	2009	1,852	2,424 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	3,643	1,798 (Target Not Met)
	2007	69	3,537 (Target Exceeded)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
17.1LT 17A 17B	HHS Database of trafficking victim certifications, based on information provided by the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and 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 17C2	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 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 so that they can receive benefits and services. The goal of long-term objective 17.1 and annual measure 17A is to achieve 425 foreign victims' certification per year by FY 2014. This target is a reflection of the certification process that, by statute, involves several federal agencies.[5] 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. In FY 2009, ORR certified 380 victims, exceeding both the previous year's total and the target of 333. In FY 2010, ORR certified 541 victims, once again exceeding the previous year's total and the target of 399. The two causes for this significant increase are (1) large labor trafficking cases involving hundreds of victims; and (2) ORR's increased ability to make eligibility determinations for child victims as a result of the TVPRA of 2008. 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 continues to see increased cooperative efforts with law enforcement entities responsible for investigating cases and improved protocols and training for the identification and case management of trafficked children in ORR custody within the Division of Unaccompanied Children's Services (DUCS).

By FY 2012, the program expects to increase the number of victims certified by at least five percent over the previous year's result. From FY 2005 to FY 2006, the number of victims certified increased by only a very small percentage, followed by a 29 percent gain in FY 2007, a 4.6 percent increase in FY 2008, a 20

[5] 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.

percent increase in FY 2009, and a 42 percent increase in FY 2010 over the previous year. ACF will continue to evaluate future year targets for this measure, should the most recent results prove to be a trend. The program believes that a target of an annual increase of five percent is realistic, 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 the structure of the ATIP program, such as awareness campaigns, the efforts 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). In every year since FY 2004, ACF has seen an increase in victims certified per million dollars. The result in FY 2008 of 32.3 exceeded the FY 2008 target of 32.1, in FY 2009 the result of 38.7 exceeded the target of 34.0, and again in FY 2010 the result of 55.1 exceeded the target of 40.6. 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 2012, 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. More 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 2010 (11,382) per thousand dollars of funding obligated specifically for the hotline operations during FY 2010, with a result that far exceeded the target. In FY 2009 the number of calls received by the hotline was 7,257. The nearly 57 percent increase in calls received resulted in an actual result (19.5) that exceeded the target (15.1) for the third straight year. The website visitors' component was calculated by dividing the total number of website visits (347,952) in FY 2010 per thousand dollars of FY 2010 funds invested in the website by the program. This result represented an increase of over 29 percent in the total number site visits and also exceeded the target of 2,497. By FY 2012, 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 (revised): 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)*	*2012*	TBD	TBD
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
	2012	Prior Result +2%	Dec-13
	2011	Prior Result +2%	Dec-12
	2010	40.87%	Dec-11
	2009	49.98%	40.07% (Target Not Met)
	2008	54.06%	49.00% (Target Not Met)
	2007	54.55%	53.00% (Target Not Met)
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
	2012	Prior Result +1%	Dec-13
	2011	Prior Result +1%	Dec-12
	2010	61.92%	Dec-11
	2009	63.45%	61.31% (Target Not Met)
	2008	62.82%	63.00% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	62.20%	63.00% (Target Exceeded)
18C: Increase the percentage of 90-day job retention as a subset of all entered employment. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1%	Dec-13
	2011	Prior Result +1%	Dec-12
	2010	70.18%	Dec-11
	2009	73.77%	69.28% (Target Not Met)
	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 performance measure is included in the FY 2010-2015 HHS Strategic Plan.

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

As previously noted in the Transitional and Medical Services section, ACF proposes to revise the efficiency measure for both the Transitional and Medical Services and Refugee Social Services programs. ACF is in the process of revising the ORR-6 trimester report to include a new data element that would use 240 days from a refugee's arrival to the U.S. as a parameter to measure self-sufficiency. States would report the self-sufficiency status of Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) recipients reaching 240 days from arrival to the U.S. during the reporting period, as well as the number of recipients whose RCA was terminated due to earned income from employment. This measure should be considered developmental until the proposed additions to the ORR-6 are approved, communicated to states, and implemented for data collection. ACF expects to begin reporting data for this developmental efficiency measure in FY 2012.

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 2009, performance targets were not met on any of the three measures (entered employment, employment with health benefits, and 90-day employment retention). In FY 2009, annual measure 18A to increase the percentage of refugees entering employment through ACF-funded refugee employment services fell short of the target of 49.98 percent with an actual result of 40.07 percent. As previously mentioned, the difficult economic climate has made the achievement of employment target for refugees particularly difficult to achieve. In addition, ORR faces challenges in terms of performance on this measure given the changing demographics of the U.S. Resettlement Program, 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 2012, 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 2009, annual measure 18B to increase the percentage of entered employment with health benefits available as a subset of full-time placements fell under the target of 63.45 percent with an actual result of 61.31 percent, reflecting the soft economy, the fact that refugees were competing with many more lower skilled job hunters, and the reality that many jobs were obtained with temporary agencies that do not offer health benefits. 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 2012, 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, also missed its FY 2009 target of 73.77 percent, with an actual result of 69.28 percent. This result reflects, in part, the practice of many temporary agencies only retaining employees for 60 or fewer days. Additionally, with such a larger than anticipated pool of potential applicants, the states have noted the employers' reluctance to invest in workers lacking English proficiency, which likely accounts for some of the shortfall in retention rates. By FY 2012, 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
	2012	Prior Result -2%	Mar-13
	2011	Prior Result -2%	Mar-12
	2010	1.18 hours	4.9 hours[1] (Target Not Met)
	2009	3.89 hours	1.2 hours (Target Exceeded)
	2008	2.90 hours	4.1 hours (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2007	2.90 hours	17.4 hours (Target Not Met)
19.2LT and 19B: Increase the percentage of UAC that receive medical screening or examination within 48 hours. (*Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result +1%	Mar-13
	2011	Prior Result +1%	Mar-12
	2010	89.9%	89.9%[2] (Target Met)
	2009	89.8%	89.0% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2008	Set Baseline	88.9% (Baseline)
	2007	N/A	77.6% (Historical Actual)
19C: Maintain the percentage of runaways from UAC shelters at 1.5 percent. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	1.5%	Mar-13
	2011	1.5%	Mar-12
	2010	1.5%	1.2%[3] (Target Exceeded)
	2009	1.5%	1.53% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2008	1.5%	1.55% (Target Not Met)
	2007	1.5%	1.50% (Target Met)

[1] The FY 2010 actual result for this measure is preliminary.
[2] The FY 2010 actual result for this measure is preliminary.
[3] The FY 2010 actual result for this measure is preliminary.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
19D: Increase the percentage of "closed" corrective actions. *(Efficiency)*	*2012*	Prior Result +2%	Mar-13
	2011	93.9%	Mar-12
	2010	91.9%	92% [4] (Target Exceeded).
	2009	89.9%	94% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	88.2%	78.3% (Target Not Met)
	2007	55.7%	86.5% (Target Exceeded)
19E (new): Increase the percentage of secure placements reviewed every 30 days. *(Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	Mar-13
	2011	TBD	Mar-12
	2010	Set Baseline	Mar-11
19F (new): Increase the percentage of UAC that receive legal screening. *(Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	Mar-13
	2011	TBD	Mar-12
	2010	Set Baseline	Mar-11
19G (new): Increase the percentage of UAC that are referred to and access specific follow up services. *(Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	Mar-13
	2011	TBD	Mar-12
	2010	Set Baseline	Mar-11

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

[4] The FY 2010 actual result for this measure is preliminary.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
19E 19F 19G	The Division of Unaccompanied Children's Services new database system Efforts to Outcomes (ETO)	ORR funded care providers will maintain UAC case records via ETO database system, which will reflect the delivery of all services including: objectives and time frames; measurable outcomes of referrals and resources, and reasons for termination of services. Data collected by grantees through ETO will be carefully tracked and verified by DUCS and grantees will be provided with detailed guidance to ensure consistent reporting.

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 was the result of an atypical increase in placement time in the summer months following the emergency closure of a large UAC facility in Texas. Once additional emergency beds had been located, referral times dropped to levels closer to the FY 2006 level. In FY 2008, DUCS referral times returned near previous fiscal year averages to 4.1 hours, yet it fell short of the 2.9-hour target. The program set a rigorous and ambitious target of a five percent annual reduction in time between notification and placement through FY 2009. In FY 2009, DUCS referral times decreased significantly, exceeding the target of 3.9 hours with an actual result of 1.2 hours.

Preliminary FY 2010 results indicate that DUCS will likely not achieve the target of 3.5 hours for FY 2010. The preliminary actual result for FY 2010 for time between apprehension and placement designation was 4.9 hours. The program was unable to meet the target for this measure due to myriad factors. In FY 2010, the program experienced a significant influx of UAC and total placements. Another factor is that some UAC referred for a placement designation required specialized residential care. Although 33 percent of DUCS grantees are designated as specialized care providers, the placement and exclusion criteria for these grantees are guided by state licensing requirements and often resulted in placement restrictions. For example, some grantees require receipt of specific information (i.e., juvenile detention records) prior to placement and in many instances the required documentation was not available to DHS, nor to DUCS. In FY 2011 ORR will increase the number of specialized beds by 15 percent, which will help to improve performance in this area. Also in FY 2011, DUCS will disseminate placement documentation requirements to all stakeholders to facilitate timely placements. By FY 2012, ACF 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. Annual

measure 19B measures the percentage of UAC who receive medical screening/examination within 48 business hours after admission to a DUCS-funded care provider facility.[5] 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.[6] The 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. Data for FY 2009 indicates that 89 percent of children receive screening within 48 business hours of placement in ORR facilities, narrowly missing the FY 2009 target of 89.8 percent. Preliminary FY 2010 data indicates that DUCS will likely meet the FY 2010 target of 89.9 percent of UAC receiving a medical screening or examination within 48 hours of placement. Final FY 2010 data collection for this measure will be available in March 2011. By FY 2012, the program expects to increase the percentage of children that receive medical screening within the established period by at least one percent over the previous year's actual result.

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, as only 1.6 percent of UACs ran away. In FY 2009, the target of 1.5 percent was slightly missed with an actual percentage of runaways at 1.53 percent. Based on preliminary FY 2010 data, it appears that DUCS will exceed the target of 1.5 percent, with an actual result of 1.2 percent. It is important to note that many of the UAC who runaway from DUCS are running to family rather than from their ORR placement. To decrease the number of runaways DUCS has identified runaway predictors for the UAC population served by the program. A number of placement-related factors are the primary predictors of runaways; these predictors include type of placement, disposition of immigration case status; reason for placement; and the quality of care UAC receive. ORR/DUCS also found that the risk of runaway is at its highest during the first few months of care and several weeks after an immigration status determination. In response to these predictors, ORR has developed policies and procedures that require grantees to provide UAC with a range of individualized assessments (initial intake, admission runaway, psychosocial, trauma and human trafficking) to ensure that UAC have immediate access to a range of services, interventions, and supports, tailored to meet their needs. ORR also strives to make appropriate initial placement decisions. In FY 2010 DUCS revised policies and procedures to require reassessment of placement decision to occur on a regular basis (as often as every 30 days for secure placements). To improve the quality of care, ORR required that all of its grantees in FY 2010 and FY 2011 increase the number of child welfare professionals on staff. This expertise enhances the quality of care provided to UAC who feel that they have a supportive network of care. In addition, one of the new developmental annual measures, to increase the percentage of UAC that receive legal screening (19F), will also facilitate decision making in regards to appropriate placement options for UAC and will help DUCS maintain or exceed the target to reduce the number of runaways. As stated in the language of the measure, the target percentage of runaways from the program is 1.5 percent through FY 2012.

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

Overall, the UAC program is focusing on improving the quality of services at the shelters, on improving physical security ("no climb" fences), improved staffing and staffing oversight at the shelters, and timely approvals of reunification requests with family and other sponsors. In FY 2010 DUCS increased the provision of training and technical assistance to facilitate grantees capacity to address compliance issues in a timely manner. Annual measure 19D 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. Since FY 2007, a 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 in FY 2006; the FY 2007 target was far exceeded, with 86.5 percent of corrective actions being closed within 30 days. In FY 2009, DUCS exceed the target of 79.9 percent closed corrective actions with actual closed corrective actions at 94 percent. Preliminary FY 2010 data indicates that DUCS will meet the target of 91.9 percent in FY 2010 with a preliminary result of 92 percent. In order to continue to improve performance in this area, DUCS will continue to provide training and technical assistance to grantees to facilitate their compliance with the new revised ORR/DUCS policies and procedures. Grantees commitment to compliance is also mandated as a condition of the cooperative agreement. It is expected that by FY 2012 the program will increase the percentage of "closed" corrective actions by at least two percent over the prior year's result.

The goal of developmental annual measure 19E is to increase the percentage of secure placements reviewed every 30 days. This measure reflects ACF's implementation of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (TVPRA) Safe and Secure Placement provisions that mandate timely review of UAC placements in secure facilities to determine if such placements remain justified. In FY 2010, ORR implemented the following actions in support of this outcome: 1) revised policies/procedures to guide initial placement determinations and transfers of UAC; 2) required DUCS funded care provider facilities to conduct immediate and ongoing assessments of UAC to ensure the evolving needs of UAC are met and that placements are appropriate; and, 3) developed a DUCS Placement Tool to expedite UAC transfers ("step downs") to less restrictive care provider settings Baseline data and related performance targets will be established using FY 2010 data. Data collection will be completed by December 31, 2010 and the analysis is expected to be completed in March, 2011.

The goal of developmental annual measure 19F is to increase the percentage of UAC that receive legal screening. This measure reflects efforts to ensure that UAC receive legal services information as mandated by the previously mentioned Flores Settlement Agreement and the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (TVPRA) provisions. Legal screenings will also facilitate decision making in regards to appropriate placement options for UAC. A baseline and related performance targets will be established using FY 2010 data. Analysis is expected to be completed in March, 2011.

The goal of developmental annual measure 19G is to increase the percentage of UAC that are referred to and access specific follow up services. DUCS is focusing on increasing UAC access to follow up services to ensure the safety of UAC when they are released to sponsors, and are no longer in the care of an ORR-funded residential shelter. Post release service providers shall provide or arrange for the services listed below for each assigned UAC. Service delivery shall be accomplished in a manner that is sensitive to the age, culture, religion, native language, and the individual needs of each UAC. Planning for follow-up services begins before the UAC is released from ORR custody, in collaboration with the ORR and shelter staff. The William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-457), section 235(c)(3)(B) states, "The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall

conduct follow-up services, during the pendency of removal proceedings, on children for whom a home study was conducted and is authorized to conduct follow-up services in cases involving children with mental health or other needs who could benefit from ongoing assistance from a social welfare agency." This performance measure will facilitate assessment of UAC physical and mental well-being post release. In FY 2010, ACF posted a funding announcement for DUCS grantees to provide a range of post release services primarily for UAC with: a history of child abuse, neglect, or exploitation; history of juvenile/criminal justice involvement, secure or staff secure placement or danger to the community; medical conditions; mental health/emotional concerns/trauma; risk of suicide or self-harming behaviors; cognitive or developmental delays; history of residential treatment and/or psychiatric placements; ambivalence toward and limited relationship with sponsor; substance abuse; behavioral issues; gang-involvement; and pregnant or parenting UAC. This performance measure characterizes the natural course of service delivery for UAC receiving follow up services, which may include legal services, guardianship, education, medical services, safety/placement issues, mental health services, substance abuse services, and independent living. Types of referrals, services and their date of delivery will be recorded. In addition to a qualitative assessment, this outcome measure also serves as a mechanism to assess the cost of different follow-up services. A baseline will be established using FY 2010 data; baseline data collection will be completed by December 31, 2010 and the analysis is expected to be completed in March, 2011.

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
	2009	N/A	$26.4B (Historical Actual)
	2008	$26 B	$26.6B (Target Exceeded)
20A: Maintain the paternity establishment percentage (PEP) among children born out-of-wedlock.[1] *(Outcome)*	*2012*	92%	Nov-13
	2011	93%[2]	Nov-12
	2010	94%	Nov-11
	2009	94%	94% (Target Met)
	2008	95%	96% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	95%	98% (Target Exceeded)
20B: Increase the percentage of IV-D (child support) cases having support orders.[3] *(Outcome)*	*2012*	77%	Nov-13
	2011	77%[4]	Nov-12
	2010	77%	Nov-11
	2009	77%	79% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	75%	79% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	73%	78% (Target Exceeded)

[1] This performance measure is included in the Child Support Enforcement American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Implementation Plan.
[2] The FY 2011 target for this measure has been updated to reflect recent economic and programmatic changes.
[3] This performance measure is included in the Child Support Enforcement American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Implementation Plan.
[4] The FY 2011 target for this measure has been updated to reflect recent economic and programmatic changes.

Measure	FY	Target	Result
20C: Maintain the IV-D (child support) collection rate for current support.[5] *(Outcome)*	*2012*	62%	Nov-13
	2011	61%[6]	Nov-12
	2010	62%	Nov-11
	2009	62%	62% (Target Met)
	2008	61%	62% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	61%	61% (Target Met)
20D: Maintain the percentage of paying cases among IV-D (child support) arrearage cases.[7] *(Outcome)*	*2012*	62%	Nov-13
	2011	61%[8]	Nov-12
	2010	62%	Nov-11
	2009	62%	63% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	61%	63% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	61%	61% (Target Met)
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
	2012	$4.84	Nov-13
	2011	$4.80	Nov-12
	2010	$4.77	Nov-11
	2009	$4.70	$4.78 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	$4.63	$4.80 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	$4.56	$4.73 (Target Exceeded)

[5] This performance measure is included in the FY 2010-2015 HHS Strategic Plan. This performance measure is also included in the Child Support Enforcement American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Implementation Plan.
[6] The FY 2011 target for this measure has been updated to reflect recent economic and programmatic changes.
[7] This performance measure is included in the Child Support Enforcement American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Implementation Plan.
[8] The FY 2011 target for this measure has been updated to reflect recent economic and programmatic changes.

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
20.1LT 20A 20B 20C 20D	Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) Form 157	States currently maintain information on the necessary data elements for the above performance measures. All states were required to have a comprehensive, statewide, automated Child Support Enforcement system in place by October 1, 1997. Fifty-three states and territories were Family Support Act-certified and Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act-certified (PRWORA) as of July 2007. Certification requires states to meet automation systems provisions of the specific act. Continuing implementation of these systems, in conjunction with cleanup of case data, will improve the accuracy and consistency of reporting. As part of OCSE's 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 20E	OCSE Forms 34A and 396A	Please see previous description of data validation.

Over the past decade, the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) program has made substantial 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 one of the most significant resources for children that promote their self-sufficiency, well-being, and health from birth through adulthood. Child support represents 40 percent of the household income of poor custodial families who receive it. By securing support from non-custodial parents on a consistent and continuing basis, the CSE program lifts 1 million people out of poverty every year and helps families avoid the need for public assistance. Research finds that dollar for dollar, child support income has a larger effect on children's educational attainment and achievement than other forms of income, including the custodial parent's earnings. The program serves 17 million children and both parents.

However, the downturn in the American economy, including an unemployment rate of over 9 percent, continues to present challenges to state and tribal child support programs. In addition, the continuing funding instability of the program, including significant state budget cuts and the expiration of the federal incentive match funding, has significantly reduced program staffing levels and taken a measurable toll on program performance and customer service. Between FY 2008 and FY 2009, 19 states experienced a decline in expenditures, despite availability of funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act). Additional funding declines are expected in fiscal years 2010 and 2011 and could be as high as 30 percent for some states. A number of states also experienced staffing reductions between FY 2008 and FY 2009. Total full time employees declined by 2.5 percent and again, additional declines are expected in fiscal years 2010 and 2011.

Despite some successes in exceeding and maintaining performance targets in FY 2009, the program saw a slight decrease in child support collections for the first time in the program's history. Administrative data indicate that collections offset from unemployment compensation benefits significantly increased, while collections from wage withholding and tax offsets decreased. In spite of these challenges, however, more than 90 percent of all child support collections went directly to families in FY 2009, highlighting a basic shift in the program from welfare cost recovery to helping parents support their children.

In the child support program, a substantial amount of federal funding is tied to performance, and the program's emphasis on measurable outcomes efficiently leverages federal funding to benefit children and families. The availability of federal incentive matching funds, which were eliminated in 2008 under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA), and temporarily restored in 2009 and 2010 under the Recovery Act, ended October 1, 2010.

The Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) has continued to implement provisions included in the DRA and Recovery Act. 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 eliminated performance incentive matching funds, eliminated enhanced paternity establishment funds, and imposed an annual $25 service fee on certain custodial parents. Federal funding included in the Recovery Act represented mandatory spending in the form of a temporary reinstatement of federal authority to match performance incentive dollars.

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 increase the long-term reliability of child support payments by working with both parents, especially non-custodial parents, to increase their ability and willingness to support their children. The program recognizes that 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 parents' 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.

In FY 2009 the CSE program continued to build upon partnerships and collaborations with all parts of the social services community to ensure the best outcomes for children and families. Through its work, the program remains a solid investment, bringing families $4.78 in FY 2009 for every $1 states and the federal government spent on the program. Broadly, this work includes efforts such as improving innovation and technology, fine tuning customer service and early intervention strategies, securing healthcare coverage, facilitating stable employment for noncustodial parents, partnering with youth programs on prevention, and collaborating with U.S. Departments of Justice, Labor, and Veterans Affairs to help non-custodial parents find work and manage their support obligations. Most state child support agencies actively partner with responsible fatherhood, workforce, and prisoner re-entry programs.

Measure 20A: Maintain the paternity establishment percentage (PEP) among children born out-of-wedlock.

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). In earlier years, achieving and exceeding the ambitious targets set for the PEP was more easily attainable because states were busy working through a backlog of cases establishing paternity for children up to age 18. Thus, it was possible

that the number of paternities established in a given year could exceed the number of non-marital births during the preceding year. As a result, the trend from 2004-2007 showed performance that either met or exceeded targets at rates close to 100 percent. More recently, since states have already been so successful at establishing paternity in backlogged cases, achieving the target rate for PEP has become more difficult. In FY 2009 OCSE met the 94 percent PEP performance target, reflecting a two percentage point decline over FY 2008. Achieving the target rate in FY 2009 required states to establish paternity for almost all new non-marital births. 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 2009, there were almost 643,000 IV-D paternities established or acknowledged and over 1.2 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 target for FY 2010 is set at 94 percent; the targets for FY 2011and FY 2012 were reduced to 93 and 92 percent respectively. As mentioned above, this decrease does not reflect an actual decline in performance expectations; 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. This illustrates one aspect of this measure which deserves attention for future refinement. In addition, effective FY 2008, the DRA lowered the federal match rate for genetic testing from 90 percent to 66 percent.

Measure 20B: Increase the percentage of IV-D (child support) cases having support orders.

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 2009, over 12 million cases had support orders established out of a total 15.8 million IV-D cases (79 percent), which is two percentage points above the target of 77 percent for FY 2009. Though actual performance exceeded the target for FY 2009, the increase was modest as compared to performance in previous years due to economic constraints on staffing levels.

Targets for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 have been reduced under the expectation that fiscal and staffing constraints at the state and local levels will continue to adversely impact performance through 2012. In recent years, state staffing levels have begun to decrease slightly while IV-D caseloads continue to increase slightly; therefore, appropriately increasing the number of support orders established may become more of a challenge for states. Further, during times of high unemployment, child support programs have the 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.[9] In addition, OCSE supports various programs and initiatives that establish

[9] 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.

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.

Measure 20C: Maintain the IV-D (child support) collection rate for current support.

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. Fiscal year 2009 data suggest that outcomes in this area weakened, most likely as a result of the slow economic recovery. The total amount of child support distributed as current support in FY 2009 was $20 billion, an increase of 2.4 percent over FY 2008 as compared to a 3.3 percent increase the previous year. The total amount of current support due in FY 2009 was over $32 billion. This provided a collection rate for current support of 62 percent, which met the target of 62 percent for FY 2009. The percent collection rate target for FY 2010 will remain at 62 percent. OCSE recently reduced the target for FY 2011 to 61 percent due to the dampening outlook for future performance increases; the target for FY 2012 is set to increase back to 62 percent in anticipation of a slight improvement in economic conditions. However, the pace of the recovery is still unknown. As a result, we will annually re-evaluate our targets and the progress we are making to meet them. 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.

The Project to Avoid Increasing Delinquencies (PAID) initiative was launched in 2007 to focus on activities that result in increasing collections of current support and reducing arrears. In support of measure 20C and its improvement in 2009, PAID continued to produce projects that influence child support payments. 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.

Measure 20D: Maintain the percentage of paying cases among IV-D (child support) arrearage cases.

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 11.3 million cases with arrearages due in FY 2009 and over 7.2 million of these cases had collections in FY 2009, representing only a minimal 0.5 percent increase over FY 2008. This figure also represents 63 percent of paying cases among IV-D arrearage cases, which exceeded the target of 62 percent for FY 2009. The target for FY 2010 will remain at 62 percent, but the target for FY 2011 was revised downward to 61 percent. The target for FY 2012 increases back up to 62 percent, which will continue to be difficult for states, particularly in light of the downturn in the economy; however state strategies to reduce arrears or help noncustodial parents manage their support are expected to improve outcomes in this area. Again, as the economic recovery gets further underway, OCSE will reexamine this target. 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.

Measure 20.2LT and 20E: Increase the cost-effectiveness ratio (total dollars collected per $1 of expenditures). (Efficiency)

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 2009, the national ratio was $4.78, which exceeded the target of $4.70. The formula for determining the CER is the total collections distributed ($26.4 billion), plus the collections forwarded to other states and countries for distribution ($1.5 billion), and fees retained by other states ($1.3 million), divided by the administrative expenditures ($5.9 billion), less the non-IV-D administrative costs ($18 million). Data from FY 2009 show $26.4 billion was collected and distributed for child support, which, as mentioned previously, was the first time collections have ever decreased in the history of the CSE program.

A tool that states have used to increase collections is the tax refund and administrative offset, from which $2.19 billion in delinquent child support was collected in calendar year 2009. 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[10] 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

[10] 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.

families and partner organizations, updating medical support policies to align with anticipated reforms to children's health care coverage, and building on evidence-based innovations. Again, consequences of a slow economic recovery are expected to adversely impact performance in this area through FY 2012. Although challenging, the target rate for FY 2012 is set at $4.84 collected per $1 of expenditures. With the cutbacks in funding, program expenditures are expected to decline, which may perhaps allow states to meet this target if collections do not decrease at the same pace, given the way the measure is calculated.

The above mentioned CSE activities and performance objectives work with parents to improve child well-being and align with the broader goals of strengthening families, supporting responsible fatherhood, and stimulating economic recovery by transferring income to families, which helps 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. Recovery Act funding came 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. Now that these funds are no longer available, state CSE agencies are faced with hard decisions about resource allocation and significant challenges to maintain program operations and overall performance and meet performance objectives to deliver lasting positive outcomes for children and families.

21. Social Services Block Grant

Measure	FY	Target	Result
21A: Decrease administrative costs as a percent of total costs. *(Efficiency)*	*2012*	4%	Dec-13
	2011	4%[1]	Dec-12
	2010	6%[2]	Dec-11
	2009	9%	3% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	9%	4% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	9%	5% (Target Exceeded)
21B (new): Decrease the percentage of variance between projected expenditures and recipients, by service for each state, and actual expenditures and recipients. *(Developmental Outcome)*	*2012*	TBD	Oct-13
	2011	Set Baseline	Oct-12
	2010	Pre-baseline	Oct-11

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.
21B	SSBG pre- and post-expenditure reports	States are required to submit a pre-expenditure report that describes how the state intends to use SSBG funds for the upcoming fiscal year. As part of the validation process, a comparison of the pre-expenditure report to the post-expenditure report is conducted to determine the extent to which SSBG funds were expended in a manner consistent with the intended use plan submitted in the pre-expenditure report. The validation process provides states with a table comparing the projected expenditures to the actual expenditures and the percentage of variance between the two. States are asked to confirm the accuracy of the comparison and to explain the variance between the projected expenditures as reported in the pre-expenditure report to the actual expenditures as reported in the post-expenditure report.

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 2009, the average of 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico showed that three 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 four percent, as

[1] The FY 2011 target for this measure has been updated to maintain rigor given the recent data trend.
[2] The FY 2010 target for this measure has been updated to maintain rigor given the recent data trend.

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 2009, the program decreased administrative costs as a percent of total costs to three percent, a significant improvement over the FY 2005 result of seven percent. This reduction in administrative costs in FY 2009 means that a greater percentage of funding was expended for direct services, and thus reached a greater number of recipients. By FY 2012, the program expects to meet or exceed the target of four percent. Future year targets for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 have been updated from six percent to four 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 has now developed a new outcome measure for SSBG using pre- and post-expenditure data that states will begin reporting on for FY 2010. Developmental annual measure 21B compares estimated expenditures as reported on the pre-expenditure report with actual expenditures as reported on the post-expenditure report. It is a measure of effective planning by the states of their capacity to use SSBG funds as intended. The expectation is that this measure will result in more rigorous planning efforts on the part of states.

ACF is continuing the process of developing a system of performance measures for SSBG that include both process and outcomes and that reflect the great diversity of the age groups and needs addressed and supported by SSBG. It is important that outcome measures do not have the unintended consequence of limiting flexibility of the program. Factors that need to be taken into consideration include service categories with the largest expenditures; data are readily available; measures address key populations served; and, measures address the range of ages of recipients.

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. *(Efficiency)*	*2012*	100%	Dec-13
	2011	100%	Dec-12
	2010	N/A	Dec-11
	2009	N/A	Jan-11
	2008	Set Baseline	82% (Baseline)
	2007	Set Baseline	73% (Baseline)
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
	2012	Prior Result +0.3PP	Oct-13
	2011	FY 2009 Actual Result + 0.3PP	Oct-12
	2010	38.4%	Oct-11
	2009	38.0%	27.3% (Target Not Met)
	2008	37.0%	34.6%[2] (Target Not Met)
	2007	36.0%	35.8% (Target Not Met but Improved)
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
	2012	Prior Result + 0.5PP	Oct-13
	2011	FY 2009 Actual Result + 1.5PP	Oct-12
	2010	62.3% (Prior Result +1PP)	Oct-11
	2009	65%	61.3% (Target Not Met)
	2008	63%	62.6%[103] (Target Not Met)
	2007	62%	64.4% (Target Exceeded)

[1] This performance measure is included in the FY 2010-2015 HHS Strategic Plan. This performance measure is also included in the TANF Supplemental Funds American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Implementation 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
22.4LT and 22D: Increase the percentage rate of earnings gained by employed adult TANF recipients/former recipients between a base quarter and a second subsequent quarter. *(Outcome)*	*Out-Year Target*	FY 2009 Actual Result +1.5PP (FY 2014)	Oct-15
	2012	Prior Result + 0.5PP	Oct-13
	2011	FY 2009 Actual Result +0.8PP	Oct-12
	2010	29.8% (FY 2009 Actual Result +0.5PP)	Oct-11
	2009	40.9%	29.3% (Target Not Met)
	2008	40.8%	33.2%[103] (Target Not Met)
	2007	40.7%	36.6% (Target Not Met but Improved)
22E: Increase the rate of case closures related to employment, child support collected, and marriage. *(Outcome)*	*2012*	Prior Result + 0.4PP	Oct-13
	2011	FY 2009 Actual Result +0.4PP	Oct-12
	2010	21.2%	Oct-11
	2009	21.0%	18.4% (Target Not Met)
	2008	20.8%	20.7% (Target Not Met)
	2007	20.4%	23.2% (Target Exceeded)

Measure	Data Source	Data Validation
22.1LT 22A	TANF Administrative Data	Data are validated via single state audits.
22.2LT 22B 22.3LT 22C 22.4LT 22D	National Directory of New Hires (NDNH)	Beginning with performance in FY 2001, the above employment measures – job entry, job retention, and earnings gain – are based solely on performance data obtained from the NDNH. Data are updated by states, and data validity is ensured with normal auditing functions for submitted data. Prior to use of the NDNH, states had flexibility in the data source(s) they used to obtain wage information on current and former TANF recipients under high performance bonus (HPB) specifications for performance years FY 1998 through FY 2000. ACF moved to this single source national database (NDNH) to ensure equal access to wage data and uniform application of the performance specifications.
22E	TANF Data Report database comprised of state TANF reports submissions	Data are validated via single state audits.

The TANF measures, taken together, assess the extent to which recipients move from welfare to work and self-sufficiency. Full success requires not only that recipients get jobs, but also that they stay in employment and increase their earnings in order to reduce dependency and enable families to support themselves. Long-term objective/efficiency measure 22A demonstrates the extent to which individuals are engaged in work-related activities. 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. However, these rate requirements may be adjusted downward if a state has a caseload decline since FY 2005 or if a state spends beyond its required level. 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 TANF program was reauthorized under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA), which became law in February 2006. Under DRA, the work participation rate calculation was modified to include certain 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.[3] In FY 2007, 73 percent of state and territory work participation rates met or exceeded their required targets, and in FY 2008, 82 percent of state and territory work participation rates met or exceeded their targets. These rates are lower than in prior years principally due to the DRA changes mentioned above. This FY 2007 performance result is the baseline number for the new efficiency measure (22A), and performance targets have been set for future years as having 100 percent of state and territory work participation rates met or exceeding their targets in FY 2011 and FY 2012. In order to meet this goal, ACF will work with states to inform them of their work participation rate status throughout the year. ACF will also work with states that fall short of their targets by reviewing and approving their plans to improve performance in future years. 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 (Recovery Act), an additional $5 billion in funding was appropriated and awarded to states for the TANF program Emergency Contingency Fund. In addition to this new funding, the Recovery Act 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.

Regarding annual measure 22B (job entry), in FY 2009, 27.3 percent of recipients became newly employed. States continue to help TANF adult recipients enter employment, and these efforts have been augmented by other factors including the employment focus of Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), ACF's commitment to finding innovative and effective employment tools through research, and 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 now clear how much the weak economy has affected

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

performance on this measure.

Annual measure 22B and long-term objective 22.2LT, have the goal of increasing the rate in FY 2012 by 0.3 percentage points above the prior year 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 2009, and in light of the challenging labor market in many states, ACF anticipates that it will 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 61.3 percent in FY 2009, which missed the target of 65 percent. The significant downturn in the economy and its impact on the labor market has made it more difficult for welfare recipients and former recipients to maintain employment, although the rate for FY 2009 is only slightly lower than the rate in the prior year. The program has set a target for FY 2012 of achieving a 0.5 percentage point increase over the prior year 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[4]) in a third quarter by the earnings of TANF recipients in a first quarter, provided they were employed in the first and third quarters.[5, 6] The target of 40.9 percent was missed in FY 2009, as TANF recipients and former recipients showed an increase in earnings of 29.3 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. Because targets for this measure were set prior to the passage of the Deficit Reduction Act and also before the current economic difficulties began, ACF will work with the Office of Management and Budget to discuss and review more realistic goals based on the historical performance of this measure. Currently, ACF aims to improve over the previous year's actual result by 0.5 percentage points in FY 2012.

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 states achieved a rate of 18.4 percent in FY 2009, which was below the target of 21.0 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 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.

[4] "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.

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

DISCUSSION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND TABLE

The following table shows the alignment of ACF's Strategic Goals with the HHS FY 2010 – 2015 Strategic Plan Goals:

HHS Strategic Goals	**ACF Goal 1:** Reduce child poverty and advance family economic security.	**ACF Goal 2:** Ensure children's safety and well-being.	**ACF Goal 3:** Support child and adolescent development.	**ACF Goal 4:** Support vulnerable populations.	**ACF Goal 5:** Upgrade ACF's capacity to make a difference for families and communities, and ensure program integrity.
1 Transform Health Care					
1.A: Make coverage more secure for those who have insurance, and extend affordable coverage to the uninsured					
1.B Improve health care quality and patient safety					
1.C Emphasize primary and preventive care linked with community prevention services					
1.D Reduce the growth of health care costs while promoting high-value, effective care					
1.E Ensure access to quality, culturally competent care for vulnerable populations				X	
1.F Promote the adoption of health information technology					
2 Advance Scientific Knowledge and Innovation					
2.A Accelerate the process of scientific discovery to improve patient care					
2.B Foster innovation at HHS to create shared solutions					X
2.C Invest in the regulatory sciences to improve food and medical product safety					
2.D Increase our understanding of what works in public health and human service practice					X
3 Advance the Health, Safety and Well-Being of the American People					
3.A Ensure the safety, well-being, and healthy development of children and youth	X	X	X	X	X

HHS Strategic Goals	ACF Goal 1: Reduce child poverty and advance family economic security.	ACF Goal 2: Ensure children's safety and well-being.	ACF Goal 3: Support child and adolescent development.	ACF Goal 4: Support vulnerable populations.	ACF Goal 5: Upgrade ACF's capacity to make a difference for families and communities, and ensure program integrity.
3.B Promote economic and social well-being for individuals, families and communities	X			X	X
3.C Improve the accessibility and quality of supportive services for people with disabilities and older adults				X	X
3.D Promote prevention and wellness			X		
3.E Reduce the occurrence of infectious diseases					
3.F Protect Americans' health and safety during emergencies, and foster resilience in response to emergencies					
4 Increase Efficiency, Transparency, and Accountability of HHS Programs					
4.A Ensure program integrity and responsible stewardship of resources					X
4.B Fight fraud and work to eliminate improper payments					X
4.C Use HHS data to improve the health and well-being of the American people					X
4.D Improve HHS environmental, energy, and economic performance to promote sustainability					
5 Strengthen the Nation's Health and Human Service Infrastructure and Workforce					
5.A Invest in the HHS workforce to meet America's health and human services needs today and tomorrow					
5.B Ensure that the Nation's health care workforce can meet increased demands	X				
5.C Enhance the ability of the public health workforce to improve public health at home and abroad					
5.D Strengthen the Nation's human services workforce					X

HHS Strategic Goals	ACF Goal 1: Reduce child poverty and advance family economic security.	ACF Goal 2: Ensure children's safety and well-being.	ACF Goal 3: Support child and adolescent development.	ACF Goal 4: Support vulnerable populations.	ACF Goal 5: Upgrade ACF's capacity to make a difference for families and communities, and ensure program integrity.
5.E Improve national, state, and local surveillance and epidemiology capacity					

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

	ACF		
HHS Strategic Goals and Objectives	**FY 2010 Enacted**	**FY 2011 Annualized CR**	**FY 2012 Request**
1: Transform Health Care			
1.A: Make coverage more secure for those who have insurance, and extend affordable coverage to the uninsured			
1.B: Improve health care quality and patient safety			
1.C: Emphasize primary and preventive care linked with community prevention services			
1.D: Reduce the growth of health care costs while promoting high-value, effective care			
1.E: Ensure access to quality, culturally competent care for vulnerable populations			
1:F: Promote the adoption of health information technology			
2: Advance Scientific Knowledge and Innovation			
2.A: Accelerate the process of scientific discovery to improve patient care			
2.B: Foster innovation at HHS to create shared solutions			
2.C: Invest in the regulatory sciences to improve food and medical product safety			
2.D: Increase our understanding of what works in public health and human service practice			
3: Advance the Health, Safety, and Well-Being of the American People	**$52,074.0**	**$50,679.0**	**$50,679.0**
3.A: Ensure the safety, well-being, and healthy development of children and youth	**$20,988.0**	**$20,277.0**	**$23,073.0**
Early Childhood Education	12,335.0	12,337.0	14,506.0
100%	12,335.0	12,337.0	14,506.0
Child Welfare	8,404.0	7,691.0	8,313.0
99.24%	8,340.1	7,632.5	8,249.8
Youth and Adolescent Development Programs[1]	249.0	249.0	254.0
95%	224.1	224.1	228.6
3.B: Promote economic and social well-being for individuals, families, and communities	**$30,891.0**	**$30,207.0**	**$27,433.0**
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	17,226.0	17,560.0	17,824.0
100%	17,226.0	17,560.0	17,824.0
Child Support Enforcement	5,142.0	4,131.0	3,880.0
100%	5,142.0	4,131.0	3,880.0

[1] This category includes the newly established Affordable Care Act Programs: Abstinence Education and Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP).

HHS Strategic Goals and Objectives (cont.)	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)	$5,103.0	$5,103.0	$2,573.0
100%	5,103.0	5,103.0	2,573.0
Assets for Independence/Individual Development Accounts	25.0	25.0	25.0
100%	25.0	25.0	25.0
Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)	1,701.0	1,701.0	1,701.0
50%	850.5	850.5	850.5
Community Services Programs	755.0	755.0	397.0
100%	755.0	755.0	397.0
Refugee and Entrant Assistance	752.0	745.0	840.0
82%	616.6	610.9	688.8
Native American Programs	52.0	52.0	52.0
100%	52.0	52.0	52.0
Domestic Violence	135.0	135.0	141.0
100%	135.0	135.0	141.0
3.C: Improve the accessibility and quality of supportive services for people with disabilities and older adults	**$193.0**	**$193.0**	**$171.0**
Developmental Disabilities	193.0	193.0	171.0
85.5%	165.0	165.0	146.2
3.D: Promote prevention and wellness			
3.E: Reduce the occurrence of infectious diseases			
3.F: Protect Americans' health and safety during emergencies, and foster resilience in response to emergencies	**$2.0**	**$2.0**	**$2.0**
Disaster Human Services Case Management	2.0	2.0	2.0
100%	2.0	2.0	2.0
4: Increase Efficiency, Transparency, and Accountability of HHS Programs			
4.A: Ensure program integrity and responsible stewardship of resources			
4.B: Fight fraud and work to eliminate improper payments			
4.C: Use HHS data to improve the health and well-being of the American people			
4.D: Improve HHS environmental, energy, and economic performance to promote sustainability			
5: Strengthen the Nation's Health and Human Service Infrastructure and Workforce			
5.A: Invest in the HHS workforce to help meet America's health and human service needs today and tomorrow			
5.B: Ensure that the Nation's health care workforce can meet increased demands			
5.C: Enhance the ability of the public health workforce to improve public health at home and abroad			
5.D: Strengthen the Nation's human service workforce			

HHS Strategic Goals and Objectives (cont.)	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
5.E: Improve national, state, local, and tribal surveillance and epidemiology capacity			
Full Cost Total	**$52,074.0**	**$50,679.0**	**$50,679.0**

Methodology

The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) calculates full cost by allocating its Federal Administration indirect costs[2] 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 eleven consecutive clean CFO audit opinions on its financial statements. ACF uses the Staff Resource Survey to determine indirect cost elements. ACF offices complete this survey, noting the total number of staff working directly on program activities and the total number of staff not working directly on program activities (such as planning, administrative, and front office staff). Offices are instructed to include fractions of staff for those working in more than program area as well as ACF staff detailed into the office from another ACF office; offices are asked not to include contractors or detailees outside of the office. The survey respondents are notified that since auditors will review this process, all offices must be prepared to provide documentation explaining how the numbers were calculated. The survey results in two groupings: FTEs working directly on program activities, and FTEs not working directly on program activities. For the first group, FTEs are directly linked to each program area. For the second group, ACF distributes FTEs from each office to the program areas, proportionate to the percentage of staff in each office working directly in each program area. Lastly, the FTEs (both from the first and second groups) allocated to each of the program areas are summed, and divided by the total FTEs funded by Federal Administration dollars. The resultant proportion is multiplied by Federal Administration funding, and added to the program area funding (see table above).

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

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

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMPLETED PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Further detail on the findings and recommendations of the following program evaluations completed during FY 2010 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:

- Fourth National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect (NIS-4): Report to Congress (January 2010)
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW), Brief 16: A Summary of NSCAW Findings (?)
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW), Brief 15: Kinship Caregivers in the Child Welfare System (?)
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW), Brief 14: Need for Adoption Among Infants Investigated for Child Maltreatment and Adoption Status 5 to 6 Years Later

Child Care Research:

- Design Phase of the National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand (NSCCSD): Final Report (January 2010)
- Compendium of Quality Rating Systems and Evaluations (April 2010)
- Supporting Quality in Home-Based Child Care: A Review of the Literature on Home-Based Child Care: Implications for Future Directions (January 2010)
- Supporting Quality in Home-Based Child Care: A Compilation of Initiatives to Support Home-Based Child Care (March 2010)
- Supporting Quality in Home-Based Child Care: A Compendium of 23 Initiatives (March 2010)
- Supporting Quality in Home-Based Child Care: Initiative Design and Evaluation Options (March 2010)
- Supporting Quality in Home-Based Child Care: Final Brief (March 2010)

Head Start Research:

- Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES): A Year in Head Start: Children, Families and Programs (October 2010)
- Head Start FACES: A Year in Head Start Report: Data Tables for FACES 2006 (October 2010)
- Head Start Impact Study Final Report (January 2010)
- Efforts to Meet Children's Physical Activity and Nutritional Needs: Findings from the I Am Moving, I Am Learning Implementation Evaluation: Final Report (February 2010)
- Report to Congress on a Plan for an Indian Head Start Study (January 2010)

Strengthening Families and Healthy Marriage Research:

- The Building Strong Families Project: Initial Implementation of a Couples-Focused Employment Program (October 2010)
- The Building Strong Families Project: Strengthening Unmarried Parents' Relationships: The Early Impacts of Building Strong Families (May 2010)
- The Building Strong Families Project: Implementation of Eight Programs to Strengthen Unmarried Parent Families (May 2010)
- Research Brief: Providing Culturally Relevant Services: Program in the Hispanic Health Marriage Initiative Implementation Evaluation (May 2010)

Welfare and Employment Research:

- Finding the Next Job: Reemployment Strategies in Retention and Advancement Programs for Current and Former Welfare Recipients (June 2010)
- The Employment Retention and Advancement Project: Benefit-Cost Findings for Three Programs in the Employment Retention and Advancement Project (May 2010)
- The Employment Retention and Advancement Project: How Effective Are Different Approaches Aiming to Increase Employment Retention and Advancement? Final Impacts for Twelve Models (April 2010)
- The Employment Retention and Advancement Project: Results from the Los Angeles Reach for Success Program (November 2009)
- Findings for the Eugene and Medford, Oregon, Models: Implementation and Early Impacts for Two Programs that Sought to Encourage Advancement Among Low-Income Workers (October 2009)
- Working Toward Wellness: Telephone Care Management for Medicaid Recipients with Depression, Eighteen Months After Random Assignment (November 2010)
- Recidivism Effects of the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) Program Vary by Former Prisoners' Risk of Reoffending (October 2010)
- Transitional Jobs: Background, Program Models, and Evaluation Evidence (February 2010)
- Alternative Welfare-to-Work Strategies for the Hard-to-Employ Testing Transitional Jobs and Pre-Employment Services in Philadelphia (October 2009)
- Welfare Rules Databook: State TANF Policies as of July 2009 (August 2010)

Cross Cutting & Other Research

- Research Brief – Building Non-Profit Capacity: Findings from the Compassion Capital Fund Evaluation (June 2010)
- Improving Capacity Among Non-Profits: Impact Study of the Compassion Capital Fund Demonstration Program (June 2010)
- Assessing Changes in Non-Profit Capacity: Outcome Study of the Compassion Capital Fund Demonstration Program (June 2010)

DISCONTINUED PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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*	189,107 (Prior Result + 27,500)	185,445 (Target Not Met but Improved)[1]
	2009	125,000	161,607 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	109,000	110,813 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	75,000	70,425 (Target Not Met but Improved)

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.[2] *(Outcome)*	*2009*	44.5%	46.0% (Target Not Met but Improved)
	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-13
	2008	33.0	Feb-12
	2007	33.4	37.4 (Target Not Met)
	2006	33.8	36.2 (Target Not Met)

Developmental Disabilities

Measure	FY	Target	Result
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%	98% (Target Exceeded)
	2008	90.9%	92% (Target Exceeded)
	2007	94.1%	68% (Target Not Met)

[1] Of 149 MCP grantees operating programs during FY 2010, 95 (64 percent) were new starts or programs beginning in new service areas with nonexistent or small caseloads during the early quarters of the measurement year.
[2] This measure is based on data collected every other year. Next data available data will be from CY 2009.

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	45.90 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	20.81	38.13 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	20.22	28.54 (Target Exceeded)
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	30.48 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	18.62	36.78 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	18.26	18.22 (Target Not Met)
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	6.16 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	2.53	4.79 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	2.44	5.93 (Target Exceeded)
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	42.62 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	32.59	45.82 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	Set Baseline	31.95 (Baseline)

Assets for Independence (Individual Development Accounts)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
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	Feb-11
	2009	$0.88	$1.60 (Target Exceeded)
	2008	$0.88	$2.78 (Target Exceeded)
	2007	$0.88	$1.45 (Target Exceeded)

Assets for Independence (Individual Development Accounts) (cont.)

Measure	FY	Target	Result
13D: Maintain the ratio of total earned income saved in IDAs per grant dollar spent on programmatic and administrative activities at the end of the five-year AFI project. *(Efficiency)*	*2011*	$5.78	Feb-12
	2010	$5.78	Feb-11
	2009	$5.78	$5.50 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2008	$7.23	$5.02 (Target Not Met but Improved)
	2007	$7.23	$4.99 (Target Not Met)