








| CRITERIA |  Administration for Children and Families (HHS) |  National and Community Service Corporation for |  Millennium Challenge Corporation |  U.S. Agency for International Development |  U.S. Department of Education |  U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development |  U.S. Department of Labor |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| TOTAL SCORE (Out of a possible 100)* | 80 | 72 | 85 | 83 | 80 | 76 | 80 |
| 1. Leadership: Did the agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them in FY16? | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 |
| 2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY16? | 9 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 |
| 3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY16? <i>(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)</i> | 7 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 8 |
| 4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals and aligned program objectives and measures, and did it frequently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other dimensions of performance in FY16? | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 |
| 5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY16? | 9 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| 6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY16? | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 9 |
| 7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY16? | 8 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 |
| 8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY16? | 7 | 9 | 8 ¹ | 8 ² | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| 9. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Non-Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs in FY16? <i>(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)</i> | 7 | 7 | N/A | N/A | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| 10. Repurpose for Results: In FY16, did the agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes? <i>(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)</i> | 8 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 |

* These scores are based on information provided by the 7 federal departments and agencies included in this index. You can find this background information - as well as a description of how RFA developed these scores - at <http://results4america.org/policy/invest-in-what-works-indices/>

¹ Since MCC only administers competitive grant programs, its total possible score was 20 for Question #8 and 0 for question #9.

² Since USAID only administers competitive grant programs, its total possible score was 20 for Question #8 and 0 for question #9.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. **Leadership:** Did the agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them in FY16?

ACE:

- In late FY15, ACF established the new career position of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning, Research, and Evaluation to oversee its [Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation](#) (OPRE) and support evaluation and other learning activities across the agency. ACF's budget for research and evaluation in FY16 is approximately \$142 million. ACF's [evaluation policy](#) gives the OPRE Director (now Deputy Assistant Secretary) "authority to approve the design of evaluation projects and analysis plans; and...authority to approve, release and disseminate evaluation reports." OPRE's staff of 42 includes experts in research and evaluation methods as well as ACF programs and policies and the populations they serve. OPRE engages in on-going collaboration with program office staff and leadership to interpret research and evaluation findings and to identify their implications for programmatic and policy decisions. OPRE also provides written summaries of emerging findings and holds monthly meetings with agency and program leadership to discuss their implications.
- While OPRE oversees most of ACF's evaluation activity and provides overall coordination, some ACF program offices also sponsor evaluations. ACF's evaluation policy states, "In order to promote quality, coordination and usefulness in ACF's evaluation activities, ACF program offices will consult with OPRE in developing evaluation activities. Program offices will discuss evaluation projects with OPRE in early stages to clarify evaluation questions and methodological options for addressing them, and as activities progress OPRE will review designs, plans, and reports. Program offices may also ask OPRE to design and oversee evaluation projects on their behalf or in collaboration with program office staff."

CNCS:

- CNCS's [Office of Research and Evaluation](#) Director (R&E) oversees the development of social science research designed to measure the impact of CNCS programs and shape policy decisions; encourage a culture of performance and accountability in national and community service programs; provide information on volunteering, civic engagement, and volunteer management in nonprofit organizations; and assist in the development and assessment of new initiatives and demonstration projects. The R&E Director, who is overseeing R&E's \$4 million budget and a [staff](#) of 9 in FY16, is a member of CNCS's Leadership Team and Policy Council. The R&E Director also meets regularly with CNCS Program Directors to identify areas where evidence can be generated and used for various decisions.
- The R&E Director meets annually with all CNCS program offices to identify priorities and negotiate which pools of funds are need to support the year's priorities. The FY16 plan was developed through a series of formal and informal conversations.

MCC:

- MCC's [Monitoring and Evaluation](#) (M&E) Division, which falls within the [Department of Policy and Evaluation](#) (DPE), has a staff of 23 and an FY16 budget of \$20.6 million in due diligence (DD) funds to be used directly for measuring high-level outcomes and impacts in order to assess the effects of its programs and activities. Departments throughout the agency have a total of [\\$75 million](#) in DD funds in FY16. The [M&E Managing Director](#) as well as the Departmental [Vice President](#) have the authority to execute M&E's budget and inform policy decisions affecting independent evaluations. The M&E Managing Director participates in technical reviews of proposed investments as well as in regular monitoring meetings in order to inform policy and investment decisions. The Vice President sits on the Agency's Investment Management Committee which examines the evidence base for each investment before it is approved by the MCC Board and conducts regular oversight over the compact (i.e., grant program) development process.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Leadership: Did the agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them in FY16?

USAID:

- USAID's [Office of Learning, Evaluation and Research \(LER\)](#) in the [Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning \(PPL\)](#) provides guidance, tools and technical assistance to USAID staff and partners to support monitoring, evaluation and learning practices, some of which can be found [online](#). The LER Director oversaw approximately 20 staff and a \$17.5 million budget in FY15. (The FY16 budget is estimated to be close to the same level as in FY2015.)
- LER holds several contracts that USAID missions and offices can use for building staff capacity in monitoring, evaluation and learning, and for commissioning evaluations and monitoring services directly. For example, LER manages the Monitoring and Evaluation Services Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (EVAL-ME IDIQ) contract, which allows missions, using their own funds, to competitively bid statements of work among 14 pre-approved companies that have been selected for their monitoring and evaluation capabilities, shortening and simplifying the process for contracting an independent evaluation team. LER also manages a classroom training program in monitoring and evaluation for USAID staff.
- The LER Director participates in the USAID Administrator's Leadership Council (ALC), a senior level bi-weekly meeting chaired by the USAID Administrator and attended by Assistant Administrators and select Agency Senior Staff, when the agenda includes issues related to evaluation. The LER Director also informs policy decisions across the agency by providing input into working groups and reviewing statements, draft memos and other policy products.
- One of LER's primary objectives is to build USAID's capacity in the field of Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning. For example, under a contract to build Monitoring and Evaluation capacity at USAID (MECap) individual USAID Offices and Missions can access Monitoring & Evaluation Fellows and Learning Fellows. These fellows work with a specific mission or office for 6 months to up to 2 years. MECap can also field experts for short-term technical assistance for a specific monitoring or evaluation-related task, like evaluation design or developing a mission-wide performance management plan. Another contract held by LER, LEARN, provides support to missions to more intentionally learn from monitoring, evaluation and experience and apply that learning. To build staff capacity in designing or commissioning impact evaluations funded by missions or offices, LER has hosted clinics on Impact Evaluation to provide USAID field Missions with tools, resources and hands-on support to design an impact evaluation for a future program activity. In addition to providing general capacity-building services in the form of training, clinics, technical assistance, and fellowships, LER staff occasionally manage evaluations directly or participate on evaluation teams for evaluations funded by LER or for those funded by other parts of the Agency. LER also coordinates several cross-agency working groups organized to support Learning champions and monitoring and evaluation specialists throughout the Agency.

USED:

- ED's [Institute of Education Sciences \(IES\)](#), with a budget of \$618 million in FY16, supports research and conducts evaluations of ED's major programs, including impact evaluations. The Director of IES and the Commissioner of the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) are supported by 10 staff who oversee these evaluations. The [Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development's \(OPEPD\) Program and Policy Studies Services \(PPSS\)](#) has a staff of 20 and serves as the Department's internal analytics office. PPSS conducts short-term evaluations to support continuous improvement of program implementation and works closely with program offices and senior leadership to inform policy decisions with evidence. While some evaluation funding – such as that for [Special Education Studies and Evaluations](#) – is appropriated to IES (\$10.8 million in FY16), most evaluations are supported by funds appropriated to ED programs. NCEE and PPSS staff work closely with program offices to design program evaluations that reflect program priorities and questions. Both IES and PPSS provide regular briefings on results to help ensure information can be used by program offices for program improvement.
- Both IES and PPSS sit on ED's Evidence Planning Group (EPG) with other senior staff from the ED's [Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development \(OPEPD\)](#) and the [Office of Innovation and Improvement \(OII\)](#). EPG reviews and advises programs and Department leadership on how evidence can be used to improve Department programs. Senior officials from IES, OII, and PPSS are part of ED's leadership structure and weigh in on major policy decisions. They play leading roles in the formation of the Department's annual budget requests, recommendations around grant competition priorities, including evidence, and providing technical assistance to Congress to ensure that evidence informs policy design.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Leadership: Did the agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them in FY16?

USHUD:

- HUD's [Office of Policy Development & Research](#) (PD&R) informs HUD's policy development and implementation by conducting, supporting, and sharing research, surveys, demonstrations, program evaluations, and best practices. PD&R achieves this mission through three interrelated core functions: (1) collecting and analyzing national housing market data (including with the Census Bureau); (2) conducting research, program evaluations, and demonstrations; and (3) providing policy advice and support to the HUD Secretary and program offices. PD&R is led by an Assistant Secretary who oversees six offices, about 149 staff including a team of field economists that work in HUD's 10 regional offices across the country, and a budget of \$108.1 million in FY16. The Assistant Secretary ensures that evidence informs policy development through frequent personal engagement with other principal staff, the Secretary, and external policy officials; HUDstat performance review meetings (see Question #4 below for a description); speeches to policy audiences, sponsorship of public research briefings, and policy implications memoranda. The Assistant Secretary also regularly engages with each HUD program office to ensure that metrics, evaluations, and evidence inform program design, budgeting, and implementation.
- Periodic PD&R meetings with program offices enable knowledge-sharing about evaluation progress and emerging needs for research, evaluation, and demonstrations. In recent years, Congress has authorized support for evaluations from program resources through set-asides, transfer authority, and supplemental appropriations to implement demonstrations.

USDOL:

- DOL's Chief Evaluation Officer is a senior official with responsibility for all activities of the [Chief Evaluation Office \(CEO\)](#), and coordination of evaluations Department-wide. CEO includes 15 full-time staff and contractors plus 1-2 detailees at any given time. The CEO is responsible for the appropriated budget for the Departmental Program Evaluation (\$10 million in FY16) and the Department's evaluation set-aside funds (\$30 million in FY16). In FY16, the CEO will directly oversee an estimated \$40 million in evaluation funding and collaborate with DOL agencies on additional evaluations being carried out through an additional \$15 million to evaluate Employment and Training Administration (ETA) pilots, demonstrations and research and evaluations of large grant programs including the Performance Partnership Pilots (P3), American Apprenticeship Initiative (AIA), the Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT) Grant Program, and Reentry Programs for Ex-Offenders. The CEO also participates actively in the performance review process during which each operating agency meets with the Deputy Secretary to review progress on performance goals established for the year required under Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). The CEO's role is to incorporate evidence and evaluation findings as appropriate and to identify knowledge gaps that might be filled by evaluations or convey evidence that can inform policy and program decisions or performance.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY16?

ACF:

- ACF's [evaluation policy](#), established in 2012, addresses the principles of rigor, relevance, transparency, independence, and ethics and requires ACF program, evaluation, and research staff to collaborate. For example, the policy states, "ACF program offices will consult with OPRE in developing evaluation activities." And, "There must be strong partnerships among evaluation staff, program staff, policy-makers and service providers."
- ACF's Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) proposes an evaluation plan to the Assistant Secretary each year in areas in which Congress has provided authority and funding to conduct research and evaluation.
- ACF's annual portfolio reviews describe recent work and ongoing learning agendas in the areas of [family self-sufficiency](#), [child and family development](#), and [family strengthening](#), including work related to [child welfare](#), [child care](#), [Head Start](#), [Early Head Start](#), [strengthening families](#), [teen pregnancy prevention and youth development](#), [home visiting](#), [self-sufficiency](#), [welfare and employment](#). Examples include findings from [Head Start CARES](#); the [BIAS project](#); multiple reports from the first nationally representative [study of early care and education](#) in over 20 years; [early findings](#) on the Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting program; and [a report on challenges and opportunities](#) in using administrative data for evaluation.
- ACF's evaluation policy requires that "ACF will release evaluation results regardless of findings... Evaluation reports will present comprehensive findings, including favorable, unfavorable, and null findings. ACF will release evaluation results timely – usually within two months of a report's completion." ACF has publicly released the findings of all completed evaluations to date. In 2015, OPRE released nearly [120 publications](#).

CNCS:

- CNCS has an [evaluation policy](#) that presents 5 key principles that govern the agency's planning, conduct, and use of program evaluations: rigor, relevance, transparency, independence, and ethics.
- CNCS has an evaluation plan/learning agenda that is updated annually based on input from agency leadership as well as from emerging evidence from completed studies. This agenda was shared with the CNCS Board in 2015 and is reflected in the CNCS Congressional Budget Justification for [Fiscal Year 2016](#) (pp. 55-56) and [Fiscal Year 2017](#) (pp. 5-6, 55-56). CNCS's R&E Office is currently developing scopes of work and will meet with program officers in April 2016 to discuss them.
- CNCS creates four types of reports for public release: research reports produced directly by research and evaluation staff, research conducted by third party research firms and overseen by research and evaluation staff, reports produced by CNCS-funded research grantees, and evaluation reports submitted by CNCS-funded program grantees. All reports completed and cleared internally are posted to the [Evidence Exchange](#). CNCS expects to release 34 additional reports in FY16, and all evaluations are expected to be cleared.
- In FY16 CNCS developed [Evaluation Core Curriculum Courses](#) which are presented to its grantees through a webinar series and is available on the CNCS website along with other [evaluation resources](#). The courses are designed to help grantees and other stakeholders easily access materials to aid in conducting or managing program evaluations.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/ learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY16?

MCC:

- MCC has developed a [Policy for Monitoring and Evaluation of Compacts](#) and Threshold Programs in order to ensure that all programs develop and follow comprehensive Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) plans that adhere to MCC's standards. The monitoring component of the M&E Plan lays out the methodology and process for assessing progress towards Compact (i.e., grant) objectives. It identifies indicators, establishes performance targets, and details the data collection and reporting plan to track progress against targets on a regular basis. The evaluation component identifies and describes the evaluations that will be conducted, the key evaluation questions and methodologies, and the data collection strategies that will be employed. Pursuant to MCC's M&E policy, every project must undergo an independent evaluation and analysis to assess MCC's impact. Once evaluation reports are finalized, they are published on the [MCC Evaluation Catalog](#). To date, fifty-three interim and final reports have been publicly released, with several additional evaluations expected to be completed and released in the coming months. MCC also produces periodic reports for internal and external consumption on results and learning, and holds agency-wide sessions that help to translate evaluation results into lessons learned for future compact development. Finally, in February 2016, MCC launched "[NEXT: A Strategy for MCC's Future](#)" which outlines [new strategic directions](#) on how it will invest more in strengthening feedback systems to harness this learning for ongoing adaptation of design and implementation, both for its own effectiveness and for the benefit of country partners and others in the development community. NEXT is designed to be a five-year strategic plan for MCC, but also includes MCC's learning agenda by incorporating agency-wide learning and knowledge goals to be pursued within that timeframe

USAID:

- USAID has an agency-wide [Evaluation Policy](#). The agency just released a [report](#) to mark the five-year anniversary of the policy.
- USAID field missions are required to have an evaluation plan, and all USAID missions and offices provide an internal report on an annual basis on completed, ongoing and planned evaluations, including evaluations planned to start anytime in the next three fiscal years. USAID provides a [Performance Management Plan \(PMP\) Toolkit](#) to assist missions worldwide.
- Given USAID's decentralized structure, individual programs, offices, bureaus and missions may develop learning agendas, which several have done, including the USAID's Bureau for Food Security for the US government's [Feed the Future initiative](#) and USAID's [Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance \(DRG\) Center](#). All Washington Bureaus have annual evaluation action plans that look at quality and use and identify challenges and the priorities for the year ahead.
- All final USAID evaluation reports are available on the Development Experience Clearinghouse except for approximately five percent of evaluations completed each year that are not public due to principled exceptions to the presumption in favor of openness guided by [OMB Bulletin 12-01 Guidance on Collection of U.S. Foreign Assistance Data](#).
- USAID is currently updating its operational policy for planning and implementing country programs. A key change in the policy is that missions will include a learning plan as part of their five-year strategic plan, also known as the CDCS. The plan will outline how missions will incorporate learning into their programming, including activities like regular portfolio reviews, evaluation tracking and dissemination plans, and other analytic processes to better understand the dynamics of their programs and their country contexts.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY16?

USED:

- ED's [Institute of Education Sciences](#) (IES) supports research and conducts evaluations of ED's major programs. IES' evaluation policies are set by the IES [Standards and Review Office](#), addressing issues of scientific quality, integrity, and timely release of reports. Related, the [National Board for Education Sciences](#), IES's advisory board, has approved policies for [Peer Review](#), which are implemented by the Standards and Review Office.
- EPG works with program offices and ED leadership on the development of ED's annual evaluation plan. This happens through the Department's annual spending plan process and through identification of high priority evaluations for use of the pooled evaluation authority. IES and PPSS work with programs to design and share results from relevant evaluations that help with program improvement.
- ED's current evaluations constitute its learning agenda.
- ED's evaluations are posted on the [IES](#) website and the [PPSS](#) website. See [FY15 Annual Performance Report and FY17 Annual Performance Plan](#) for a list of ED's current evaluations. IES publicly releases findings from all of its completed, peer-reviewed evaluations on the [IES website](#) and also in the [Education Resources Information Clearinghouse](#) (ERIC).
- ED's supports research through IES's [National Center for Education Research](#) (NCER), which makes grants for prekindergarten through postsecondary research and IES' [National Center for Special Education Research](#) (NCSEER), which sponsors a comprehensive program of special education research designed to expand the knowledge and understanding of infants, toddlers, children, and young adults with disabilities. IES also manages the Regional Educational Laboratory ([REL](#)) program, which supports districts, states, and boards of education throughout the United States to use research in decision making.

USHUD:

- HUD's [evaluation policy](#) (see pp. 1–6, 21, 23), which guides HUD's Research Roadmap described below, includes reaching out to internal and external stakeholders through a participatory approach; making research planning systematic, iterative, and transparent; focusing on research questions that are timely, forward-looking, policy-relevant, and leverage HUD's comparative advantages and partnership opportunities; aligning research with HUD's strategic goals; and using rigorous research methods including program demonstrations with randomized controlled trials as appropriate.
- HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) has developed the [Research Roadmap FY14-FY18](#), (see pp. 6-20) a strategic, five-year plan for priority program evaluations and research to be pursued given a sufficiently robust level of funding. PD&R also integrated its evaluation plan into HUD's [FY14-FY18 Strategic Plan](#) (see pp. 57-63) to strengthen the alignment between evaluation and performance management. During FY16, PD&R is using similar principles and methods to [refresh](#) the Roadmap to address emerging research topics.
- HUD also employs its role as [convener](#) to help establish frameworks for evidence, metrics, and future research.
- According to the [Research Roadmap FY14-FY18](#), (see p. 28), as part of HUD's annual performance report required by GPRA, "agencies should describe findings from agency-funded evaluations or other research completed during the prior fiscal year." Further, "Agencies are expected to have a web page on the agency's evaluations or links to other evaluations relevant to the agency's work with summaries of the findings and specific citations." PD&R publishes and disseminates evaluations in a timely fashion through these and other means, and also follows a policy of including language in research and evaluation contracts that allows researchers to independently publish results, even without HUD approval, after not more than 6 months.

USDOL:

- DOL has a formal [Evaluation Policy Statement](#) that formalizes the principles that govern all program evaluations in the Department, including methodological rigor, independence, transparency, ethics, and relevance. In addition, the Chief Evaluation Office publicly communicates the standards and methods expected in DOL evaluations in formal procurement statements of work.
- DOL also develops, implements, and publicly releases an annual Evaluation Plan (i.e., Department-level learning agenda), as do each of DOL's 17 operating agencies. The agency learning agendas form the basis for the DOL's Evaluation Plan. The [2016 Evaluation Plan](#) was released for public comment in the Federal Register and is posted on the CEO website.
- All DOL reports and findings are publicly released and posted on the [CEO website](#). DOL agencies also post and release their [reports](#).

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY16?

(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)

ACF:

- In FY16, ACF plans to spend \$138 million on evaluations, representing 0.3% of ACF's \$53 billion budget in FY16 (in addition to investments in evaluations by ACF grantees).
- The Administration's FY17 [budget request](#) seeks authority for numerous [new investments in learning](#), including set-asides of up to 1.5% of the Social Services Block Grant program (\$18.5m in FY17, including \$10 million for a demonstration and evaluation on supplying diapers to low-income families and \$8.5 million for research and evaluation in FY17) and 1% of the Community Services Block Grant program (\$3.5 million in FY17) for evaluations.

CNCS:

- CNCS plans to spend a total of \$5.1 million (representing .46% of CNCS's \$1.1 billion budget in FY16) in evaluation and evaluation capacity building activities (R&E evaluation and program funds combined), including:
 - \$1.2 million of Senior Corps funding for the supplemental award, program funding used for evaluation and evidence purposes versus funding given to sponsor organizations;
 - \$400,000 in Senior Corps funds for the longitudinal survey in FY16, an evaluation of the volunteers who participate in Senior Corps programs (examining their health and well-being outcomes over time);
 - \$500,000 in supporting reviews of grantee evaluation plans and reports, including for research & evaluation expertise to review studies submitted by grantees applying for funding; and
 - \$3 million in evaluation funds and SIF funds to support program evaluations and technical assistance for grantees to conduct evaluations.

MCC:

- In FY15, M&E invested over \$17.1 million on monitoring and evaluation of Compact projects, which amounted to 2.9% of Compact spending for FY15 (\$570.7 million). Calculations are still ongoing for FY16. However, MCC expects to disburse amounts similar to FY15. This is reflected in numbers for Q1 & Q2 in FY16, as of March 30, which show M&E investments of \$7.5 million.

USAID:

- In FY15, USAID missions and offices reported completing 244 evaluations with resources totaling approximately \$69.3 million and managing another 251 ongoing evaluations, many that span more than one year, with total ongoing budgets estimated to reach \$168.9 million. Overall spending on evaluations completed or ongoing in FY15 (\$238.2 million) represents about 1.1% of USAID's \$21.1 billion FY15 program budget.
- This amount does not include the Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research budget which primarily focuses on evaluation capacity building and technical assistance (\$17.5 million FY15) or the investment in the [Demographic and Health Surveys](#) (DHS) (\$189 million total in FY13-FY18) or surveys funded by other sector programs that often make up some of the underlying data used in many evaluations.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY16?

(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)

USED:

- There are a variety of ways that ED generally supports evaluations as well as evaluation technical assistance and capacity-building. In FY15 and FY16, ED has the authority to reserve up to 0.5% of ESEA funds – except Title I funds, Title III funds, and funds for programs that already have an evaluation provision – to evaluate ESEA programs (which RFA estimates at \$41.3 million for FY15). In FY15, ED pooled \$8.8 million to conduct evaluations that will build new evidence about the following programs: ESEA Title I, Part A; the migrant education program; and the Indian Education LEA Grants Program; and also provided continued support for program evaluations on ESEA Title I, Part A; ESEA Title I, Part D; and ESEA Title III, which began with FY14 pooled funding. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015, which reauthorized ESEA, continues the pooling authority and includes Title III as an allowable program from which to pool funds. ESSA also authorizes \$710,000 for an evaluation of Title I for FY17-FY20. ED spent over \$60 million on program evaluations in FY15.
- In addition, many EDq programs are authorized to support national activities, including program evaluations, and some programs encourage their grantees to conduct project-level evaluations. One of the key lessons from i3 has been that high-quality technical assistance for grantees on project-level evaluations is critical to producing credible information on project outcomes. In FY15 i3 invested more than \$4 million of its appropriation in evaluation technical assistance – virtually no other discretionary grant program has the authority or means to fund such a robust vehicle for technical assistance. ED, with the expertise of IES, has begun to pilot less expensive approaches to evaluation technical assistance for programs like [First in the World](#) (\$1.5 m), and [Supporting Effective Educator Development](#) (\$~800,000), which also tasks its grantees with producing rigorous project-level evaluations.
- According to RFA estimates, overall spending on evaluation (\$60 million in FY15) and evaluation technical assistance and capacity-building (\$6.3 million in FY15) represents 0.1% of ED's \$67.1 billion discretionary budget in FY15.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY16?

(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)

USHUD:

- For FY16, Congress appropriated \$50 million for core research activities; \$10 million for research, evaluations, and demonstrations; and \$25 million for technical assistance in the Research & Technology account. This \$85 million total, half of the requested amount, equals 0.19 percent of HUD's \$45.5 billion of FY16 program [budget authority](#), net of Salaries and Expenses. The \$10 million devoted to research, evaluations, and demonstrations is about 12 percent of the \$85 million total. Additionally, much of the \$50 million is used for surveys (especially for the American Housing Survey) and other data acquisition that indirectly support evaluation of HUD's mission activities in domains such as affordable housing and housing finance.
- In FY10, Congress authorized the transfer of up to 1% of funds from individual HUD program funds to the Transformation Initiative (TI) Fund for: (1) research, evaluation, and program metrics; (2) program demonstrations; (3) technical assistance; and (4) information technology. After FY11, HUD no longer sought to fund information technology with the TI Fund, and Congress has not provided requested levels of evaluation funding or, since FY14, supported transfers to TI

USDOL:

- In FY 16, DOL's CEO will directly oversee an estimated \$40 million in evaluation funding. Additionally CEO will collaborate with DOL agencies on additional evaluations being carried out, with approximately \$15 million to evaluate Employment and Training Administration (ETA) pilots, demonstrations and research and evaluations of large grant programs, including, for example, the Performance Partnership Pilots (P3), American Apprenticeship Initiative (AIA), the Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT) Grant Program, and Reentry Programs for Ex-Offenders. The combined amount of \$55 million represents approximately .44% of DOL's FY16 discretionary budget of \$12.4 billion. (For many of the largest programs, however, up to 5% of their budgets is dedicated to program evaluation and related activities).
- DOL's Chief Evaluation Office directly funds evaluations and also combines CEO funds with agency funds to jointly sponsor some evaluations. The largest discretionary programs can use program funds for evaluations and technical assistance, often up to 5% by statute. For example, three separate rounds of grants funded by H1-B worker visa fees totaling about \$400 million in FY16 support training particular populations, such as high school students transitioning to work, long-term unemployed workers, and apprenticeship training, and between 3% and 7% of these grant funds (at least \$25 million) is expected to be invested in evaluations in FY16. Another example, in FY14 and FY15, up to 5% of the funds available for the workforce innovation activities were used for technical assistance and evaluations related to the projects carried out with these funds. The legislation provided further that the Secretary may authorize awardees to use a portion of awarded funds for evaluation, upon the Chief Evaluation Officer's approval of an evaluation plan. Further, several DOL agencies also have separate evaluation appropriations. DOL studies funded through individual agencies are also coordinated with DOL's CEO.
- The Administration's FY14-FY17 budget requests recommended allowing the U.S. Secretary of Labor to set aside up to 1% of all operating agencies' budgets for evaluations, coordinated by CEO. In FYs 2012-2015, Congress authorized the Secretary to set aside up to 0.5% of these funds for evaluations, in addition to the separate evaluation funds that exist in many DOL agencies. In FY16, Congress authorized DOL to set aside up to .75% of operating agency budgets in evaluations.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

4. Performance Management/Continuous

Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals and aligned program objectives and measures, and did it frequently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other dimensions of performance in FY16?

ACF:

- ACF's performance management framework focuses on outcomes and aims for coordinated and results-oriented management and operations across all ACF programs. [ACF's Strategic Plan](#) establishes five priorities, which align with the [HHS Strategic Plan](#). ACF formally reviews progress toward its Strategic Plan goals every quarter. ACF's Strategic Plan establishes five priorities in support of the agency's mission of fostering health and well-being by providing federal leadership, partnership, and resources for the compassionate and effective delivery of human services. The five priorities are: 1) Promote economic, health, and social well-being for individuals, families, and communities; 2) Promote healthy development and school readiness for children, especially those in low-income families; 3) Promote safety and well-being of children, youth, and families; 4) Support underserved and underrepresented populations; and 5) Upgrade the capacity of ACF to make a difference for families and communities.
- ACF aims to develop performance measures that are meaningful and can be used by program managers, leadership, outside stakeholders, and Congress to assess and communicate progress. Results for these metrics are reported annually in the [ACF Congressional Budget Justification](#). ACF reports on a total of 156 performance measures (94 outcome measures and 62 output measures) in the FY17 Congressional Budget Justification. A selection of ACF performance measures is also highlighted as part of the [FY 2017 HHS Annual Performance Plan and Report](#), which describes HHS' progress toward achieving the goals and objectives described in the [FY 2014-2018 HHS Strategic Plan](#). This report includes the most recent results available at the end of FY15 for HHS, including ACF.
- As part of the FY17 President's Budget request, HHS announced the FY16-17 [HHS Priority Goals](#). ACF is the lead agency for the goal to "Improve the quality of early childhood programs for low-income children" in collaboration with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) and the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). On a quarterly basis, ACF provides updates on this Priority Goal on [Performance.gov](#). ACF also participates in the GPRAMA-required Strategic Objective Annual Review process. HHS maintains an internal performance dashboard where ACF provides regular performance updates on the 156 performance measures included in the annual ACF Budget Request.

CNCS:

- CNCS's performance management framework is described in the Congressional Budget Justification for [Fiscal Year 2016](#) (p.3) and [Fiscal Year 2017](#) (p.6).
- CNCS has a focused set of Agency-Wide Priority Measures derived from the 2011-2015 [Strategic Plan](#). Every CNCS Program contributes to the Agency-Wide Priority Measures. There are also specific grantee/sponsor measures that roll up into the Agency-Wide Priority Measures, which can be found in the [Agency-Wide Priority Measures chart](#). Grantees are required to select at least one national performance measure, and they are required to report performance measures data annually. CNCS encourages grantees to use these measure for continuous program improvement. CNCS uses the agency-wide priority measures to assess its own progress toward attaining the goals and objectives of its strategic plan.
- Additionally, CNCS produces [state profile reports](#), which provide a picture of agency resources in each state at a given point. These reports contain a number of priority indicators, including the number of participants engaged in national service activities as well as the amount of non-CNCS resources generated by the agency's programs. Along with its stakeholders, CNCS uses this information to understand the capacity of service available in different geographic regions and discuss related implications with key service partners.
- CNCS's Chief Operating Officer (COO) is currently piloting a proof of concept performance framework that aligns with GPRA. The COO is finalizing their objectives, measures, and targets, and they will be conducting quarterly performance reviews starting in the fourth quarter of FY16. The goal is to establish an effective performance framework within the COO, work agency-wide to implement a similar process, and have an enhanced performance management framework in place as CNCS begins its new Strategic Planning process in 2017.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

4. Performance Management/Continuous

Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals and aligned program objectives and measures, and did it frequently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other dimensions of performance in FY16?

MCC:

- MCC monitors progress towards compact results on a quarterly basis using performance indicators that are specified in the Compact M&E Plans. The M&E Plans specify indicators at all levels (process, output, and outcome) so that progress towards final results can be tracked. Every quarter each country partner submits an [Indicator Tracking Table \(ITT\)](#) that shows actual performance of each indicator relative to the baseline level that was established before the activity began and the performance targets that were established in the M&E Plan. Some of the key performance indicators and their accompanying [data by country](#) are publicly available. MCC reviews this data every quarter to assess whether results are being achieved and integrates this information into project management decisions.
- MCC also supports the creation of multidisciplinary '[compact development teams](#)' to manage the development and implementation of each Compact program. Teams usually include the following members: Coordinator, economist, private sector development specialist, social inclusion and gender integration specialist, technical specialists (project specific), M&E specialist, environmental and social performance specialist, Legal, and financial management and procurement specialists. From the earliest stages, these teams develop project logics and M&E frameworks supported by data and evidence, and use them to inform the development of the projects within each Compact program. Teams meet frequently to gather evidence, discuss progress, make project design decisions, and solve problems; and they are encouraged to use the lessons from completed evaluations to inform their work going forward.
- MCC hosts regular "colleges" in which MCC counterparts from partnering countries are invited to a weeklong set of meetings and workshops to discuss best practices, strengthen collaboration, and improve strategies for effectively implementing projects..

USAID:

- USAID partners with the U.S. Department of State to jointly develop and implement clear strategic goals and objectives. USAID's Performance Improvement Officer (PIO) leads Agency efforts to use data for decision-making and improve performance and operational efficiency and effectiveness. The Assistant Administrator for the Management Bureau, [Angelique M. Crumbly](#), also serves as the Performance Improvement Officer. The Office of Management and Budget's circular A-11 "[Preparation, Submission, and Execution of the Budget](#)," Part Six describes the role of the PIO. Specifically, the PIO coordinates tracking of Cross Agency Priority (CAP) and Agency Priority Goal (APG) progress; leverages stat reviews, such as PortfolioStat, HRStat, and CyberStat, to conduct deep-dives into evidence; and oversees business process reviews and other assessments to ensure that the Agency more efficiently and effectively achieves its mission and goals.
- USAID's strategic plan, annual performance plan and report, and other performance reports are publicly available:
 - [Agency Joint Strategic Plan \(JSP\)](#)
 - [Agency Financial Report \(AFR\)](#)
 - [Annual Performance Plan and Report \(APR\)](#)
 - [Summary of Performance and Financial Information](#)
- USAID reports on three Agency Priority Goals and nine Cross Agency Priority Goals on [www.performance.gov](#). These goals help the Agency improve performance and cut costs, while holding the Agency accountable to the public. USAID assesses progress and challenges toward meeting the goals annually during data-driven reviews with Agency leadership. USAID also measures progress toward its [USAID Forward](#) reform agenda through eight public indicators, which help the Agency adapt business processes to improve performance.
- USAID field missions develop [Country Development Cooperation Strategies](#) (CDCS) with clear goals and objectives and a [performance management plan](#) that identifies expected results, performance indicators to measure those results, plans for data collection and analysis, and periodic review of performance measures to use data and evidence to adapt programs for improved outcomes.
- In addition to measuring program performance, USAID measures operations performance management to ensure that the Agency achieves its development objectives; aligns resources with priorities; and institutionalizes [USAID Forward](#) reforms.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

4. Performance Management/Continuous

Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals and aligned program objectives and measures, and did it frequently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other dimensions of performance in FY16?

USED:

- ED develops a four-year strategic plan and holds quarterly data-driven progress reviews of the goals and objectives established in the plan, as required by the Government Performance and Results Act Modernization Act (GPRAMA) of 2010. ED's [FY14-18 Strategic Plan](#) includes a goal on the continuous improvement of the United States education system with objectives focused on enhancing the use of data, research, evaluation, and technology (see pp. 37-43). GPRMA also requires agencies to develop agency priority goals (APGs) and submit information on those goals to OMB on a quarterly basis. APGs reflect the top near-term performance priorities that agency leadership aims to accomplish within a two-year period. ED established an APG on enabling evidence-based decision-making (see [Performance.gov](#) for quarterly reporting on the APGs) and, in March 2016, decided to continue its work on this APG for FY16-17. Once established the metrics for the APGs are included in the strategic plan. For example, strategic objective 5.3 in the Department's current four-year strategic plan, which is part of the continuous improvement goal referenced above, includes the metrics for the evidence APG. Although many of the metrics in the strategic plan are annual, the Department uses the quarterly reviews to discuss data available and milestones achieved.

USHUD:

- HUD conducts regular data-driven performance reviews—"HUDStat" meetings—that focus on quarterly progress toward achieving each of HUD's priority goals. The HUD Secretary and senior leadership from throughout the agency, and sometimes from partner agencies, attend these meetings to address challenges, review metrics, improve internal and external collaboration, and increase performance. Strategic goals and two-year priority goals are [publicly posted](#). HUD documents alignment between strategic goals and supporting objectives and metrics in the consolidated [Annual Performance Plan-Annual Performance Report](#), and identifies the staff assigned lead responsibility for each objective.

USDOL:

- DOL's [Performance Management Center](#) (PMC) is responsible for the Department's extensive performance management system, which includes over 400 measures whose results are reviewed quarterly by the Deputy Secretary. PMC's activities are intended to improve DOL's program performance through data-driven analysis, sharing best practices, and implementing activities associated with the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 (GPRA). Using a PerformanceStat-type reporting and dashboard system, PMC coordinates quarterly meetings between the Deputy Secretary and each agency head, to review performance results and analysis of the priority performance measures contributing to DOL's strategic goals, to make commitments related to performance improvement, and to follow up on the progress of previous performance improvement commitments. PMC also oversees the [Strategic Planning process](#) and analyzes performance data in collaboration with agencies to achieve continuous performance improvement. CEO actively participates in the quarterly performance reviews to incorporate findings from evaluations as appropriate.
- One of the most important roles that DOL's CEO plays is to facilitate the interaction between program and evaluation analysts, and performance management and evaluation. Learning agendas updated annually by DOL agencies in collaboration with DOL's CEO include program performance themes and priorities for analysis needed to refine performance measures and identify strategies for improving performance. The quarterly GPRA meetings with the Deputy Secretary routinely include specific discussions about improving performance and findings from recent evaluations that suggest opportunities for improvement.
- To promote the use of evidence based strategies DOL's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) also continues to manage the [Workforce Systems Strategies](#) website, which identifies a range of potential strategies informed by research evidence and peer exchanges to support grantees in providing effective services to customers.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY16?

ACE:

- ACF has made numerous administrative and survey datasets publicly available for secondary use, such as data from the [National Survey of Early Care and Education](#), [Child Care and Development Fund](#), [National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being](#), and [Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System](#), among many other examples.
- ACF's [Interoperability Initiative](#) supports data sharing through policies and guidelines to accelerate adoption; standards and tools that are reusable across the country; field-based pilots; and addressing common privacy and security requirements to mitigate risks.
- Several ACF divisions have also been instrumental in supporting cross-governmental efforts, such as the [National Information Exchange Model](#) (NIEM) that will enable human services agencies to collaborate with health, education, justice, and many other constituencies that play a role in the well-being of children and families.
- ACF's National Directory of New Hires has entered into data sharing agreements with numerous agencies. For example, DOL's CEO and ETA have interagency agreements with HHS-ACF for sharing and matching earnings data on 9 different formal net impact evaluations. The [NDNH Guide](#) for Data Submission describes an agreement with the Social Security Administration to use its network for data transmission. Also, ACF Administers the [Public Assistance Reporting Information System](#), a platform for exchange of data on benefits receipt across ACF, Department of Defense, and Veterans Affairs programs. This platform entails data sharing agreements between these three federal agencies and between ACF and state agencies.
- The Administration's FY17 budget request includes \$261 million over five years for human services data interoperability, including grants for Statewide Human Services Data Systems and a Systems Innovation Center.

CNCS:

- As the nation's largest grant maker for service and volunteering, CNCS collects data about service program members, volunteers, and the organizations in which members and volunteers are placed. Member/volunteer demographic, service experience, and outcome data are collected in a variety of ways – both through administrative processes and through surveys:
 - In FY16 data collected from a revised member exit survey allowed CNCS to generate more accurate reports on key experiences and anticipated college, career, and civic engagement outcomes, which were shared internally. Survey results are being shared with program and agency leadership in FY16 for program improvement purposes. In FY16 R&E will also begin generating state-level reports for its State Commissions. The longer-term goal is to finalize response rate standards across the AmeriCorps programs so that data sets can be made available for public use in FY17.
 - A report summarizing cross-sectional survey findings on Senior Corps Foster Grandparents and Senior Companion Program volunteers will be released in FY16. The paper compares health, mobility disability, and life satisfaction between participants in both programs; and examines how their health status differs from similar adult volunteers and non-volunteers in the general population (a matched sample of volunteers and non-volunteers from the Health and Retirement Study (HRS). A longitudinal survey of volunteers in these 2 Senior Corps programs was implemented in FY15, and preliminary findings are expected in FY16.
 - For the first time, results from the redesigned AmeriCorps member exit survey were merged with administrative data sets on member demographics, program characteristics, and service locations to produce a new unified data set that currently has almost 70,000 observations. Analysis began in FY16, and preliminary findings are expected by the end of FY16.
 - Findings from an [alumni outcome survey pilot](#) were published in FY16.
- In FY16, CNCS's R&E Office is executing a new administrative data match between a sample of AmeriCorps alumni records and postsecondary outcome data from the National Student Clearinghouse. R&E also plans to execute a second administrative data match between alumni records and the Census' LEHD dataset to obtain employment and employment sector outcomes for AmeriCorps alumni. Although R&E currently relies on surveys, CNCS would prefer to reduce its reliance on this method so that key college and career outcomes can be obtained from more objective sources and for less cost.
- CNCS's [Office of Research and Evaluation](#) (R&E) makes publicly available (1) [state profiles](#) that depict national service resources (grant funds, members, volunteers, grantees) and program performance metrics across the country and (2) [volunteering statistics](#) at the local, state, and national levels collected for CNCS by the U.S. Census Bureau through an interagency agreement. ((<https://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/>))

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY16?

MCC:

- MCC's M&E Division oversees the upload of anonymized evaluation data to MCC's public [Evaluation Catalog](#). There, partner countries, as well as the general public, can access spreadsheets that show [economic rates of return](#) calculations, performance [indicator tracking tables](#), results of [independent evaluations](#) for MCC-funded projects, and public use versions of the data used in those evaluations. All evaluation data is meticulously reviewed by MCC's internal [Disclosure Review Board](#) prior to posting to ensure that respondents' privacy is protected.
- As part of its [Data2x commitment](#), MCC and other donors are increasing the amount of gender data released and helping to improve international data transparency standards.
- MCC is also a founding partner of the [Governance Data Alliance](#), a collaborative effort by governance data producers, consumers, and funders to improve the quality, availability, breadth, and use of governance data.
- MCC also has a partnership with the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) which is helping to increase the availability and quality of development-related data in selected countries. MCC partnered with PEPFAR to create [local data hubs](#) that would engage stakeholders around the availability, accessibility and analysis of data. The data hubs have a local board drawn from partner country governments, the private sector and civil society. The hubs will comprise both a physical space for data analysts and other staff and virtual engagement among such stakeholders as donors, foundations, researchers, and NGOs.
- MCC also hosted a publicly available webinar, "[Monitoring and Evaluation in the Water Sector](#)," in which a presentation was given on MCC's rigorous evidence-based approach to monitoring and evaluation, followed by a closer look at lessons learned in the water sector and a discussion of ways in which monitoring and evaluation can contribute to aid effectiveness.

USAID:

- USAID has an [open data policy](#) which:
 - Establishes the [Development Data Library](#) (DDL) as the Agency's repository of USAID-funded, machine readable data created or collected by the Agency and its implementing partners;
 - Requires USAID staff and implementing partners (via associated changes to procurement instruments) to submit datasets generated with USAID funding to the DDL in machine-readable, non-proprietary formats;
 - Implements a data tagging protocol in keeping with the President's Executive Order and Office of Management and Budget policy on Open Data;
 - Defines a data clearance process to ensure that USAID makes as much data publicly available as possible, while still affording all protections for individual privacy, operational and national security, and other considerations allowable by law; and
 - Ensures data is updated quarterly, at minimum.
- In November 2011, the United States became a signatory to the [International Aid Transparency Initiative](#) (IATI). IATI developed a standard for publishing foreign assistance spending data that allows for comparison across publishers. [Publish What You Fund](#) (PWYF), a United Kingdom-based nongovernmental organization advocating for greater aid transparency, assesses 60+ bilateral and multilateral donors' overall commitment to aid transparency and the information they publish in an annual [Aid Transparency Index](#) (ATI). In 2014, USAID ranked 31st out of 68 donors and was at the bottom of the "Fair" category. In July 2015, USAID produced a [cost management plan](#) (CMP) in order to improve its reporting to IATI and, thereby, improve the Agency's score in the ATI. The plan elaborates on the necessary requirements (for example, political movement/discussions, technical work, system upgrades) and estimated timeline for implementation to advance in these areas. Recognizing the level of effort involved with the improvements varies greatly, the CMP outlines a four-phased approach. USAID is already seeing results. USAID's score in PWYF's 2015 Aid Transparency Review jumped by more than 20 points, propelling USAID to the "Good" category.
- USAID continues to expand the data it publishes on [ForeignAssistance.gov](#) (The Foreign Assistance Dashboard) and the [International Aid Transparency Initiative](#). USAID recently launched the [Foreign Aid Explorer](#) which shares 40 years of data through an easy to navigate website. USAID publishes its core datasets, as well as program specific data, in application program interface (API) formats. In 2014, USAID also began publicly sharing data files and its open data plan through its new [Open Government website](#) as part of the U.S. Government's open data initiative.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY16?

USAID (cont.):

- The USAID [GeoCenter](#) uses data and analytics to improve the effectiveness of USAID's development programs by geographically assessing where resources will maximize impact. The GeoCenter team works directly with field missions and Washington-based bureaus to integrate geographic analysis into the strategic planning, design, monitoring, and evaluation of USAID's development programs. To date, the GeoCenter has leveraged \$32 million worth of high-resolution satellite imagery for development projects, at no cost to the Agency.
- USAID's [Economic Analysis and Data Services](#) (EADS) unit has a public web site to share data and also provides data analysis tools. The unit also works to provide analysis upon request. In particular, the International Data and Economic Analysis part of EADS provides USAID staff, partners, and the public with analytical products and a platform for querying data.
- USAID uses data to inform policy formulation, strategic planning, project design, project management and adaptation, program monitoring and evaluation, and learning what works. The [Program Cycle](#) is USAID's particular framing and terminology to describe this set of processes and the use of data and evidence to inform decisions is a key part of the process.
- USAID's [Monitoring Country Progress](#) (MCP) system is an empirical analytical system which tracks and analyzes country progress along five dimensions: (1) economic reforms; (2) governing justly and democratically; (3) macro-economic performance; (4) investing in people; and (5) peace and security. It is used to facilitate country strategic planning including country graduation from USG foreign assistance programs.
- USAID has also begun publishing funding data alongside program results on the [Dollars to Results](#) page of the USAID website. Dollars to Results provides information on USAID's impact around the world by linking annual spending (inputs) to results (outputs and outcomes) in some of the more than 100 developing countries where we work. There are plans to expand Dollars to Results in the future. Due to the nature of foreign assistance programs, it is difficult to directly link Fiscal Year disbursements to Fiscal Year results. There is often a time lag between when a dollar is disbursed and when a result is achieved from that investment. For example, if USAID builds a school, most of the spending takes place in the first several years of the project as construction begins. However, results may not be achieved until years later when the school opens and classes begin. Results shown on the website give a snapshot of the type of results achieved by USAID.
- To help inform the U.S. Government's aid transparency agenda, USAID conducted three aid transparency country pilot studies in [Zambia \(May 2014\)](#), [Ghana \(June 2014\)](#), and [Bangladesh \(September 2014\)](#). The country pilots assessed the demand for and relevance of information that the U.S. Government is making available, as well as the capacity of different groups to use it. The [final report](#) summarizes findings from the three pilots and provides recommendations to help improve the transmission of foreign assistance data to ensure that the transparency efforts of the U.S. Government create development impact.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY16?

USED:

- ED has several resources to support the high-quality collection, analysis, and use of high-quality data in ways that protect privacy. IES' [National Center for Education Statistics](#) (NCES) serves as the primary federal entity for collecting and analyzing data related to education. Almost all of ED's K-12 statistical and programmatic data collections are now administered by NCES via [EDFacts](#). NCES also collects data through national and international [surveys](#) and [assessments](#). Administrative institutional data and statistical sample survey data for postsecondary education is collected through NCES in collaboration with the [Federal Student Aid Office](#) (FSA). NCES data are made publicly available [online](#) and can be located in the ED [Data Inventory](#). Some data are available through public access while others only through [restricted data licenses](#). ED's Office for Civil Rights conducts the [Civil Rights Data Collection](#) (CRDC) on key education and civil rights issues in our nation's public schools. Additionally, the Data Strategy Team helps to coordinate data activities across the Department and the [Disclosure Review Board](#), the [Family Policy Compliance Office](#) (FPCO), the EDFacts Governing Board, and the [Privacy Technical Assistance Center](#) all help to ensure the quality and privacy of education data.
- ED has made concerted efforts to improve the availability and use of its data in FY16. With the release of the new [College Scorecard](#), the Department now provides newly combined data in a tool that helps students choose a school that is well-suited to meet their needs, priced affordably, and consistent with their educational and career goals. Additionally, the College Scorecard promotes the use of open data by providing the underlying data in formats that researchers and developers can use. This effort is a model for future releases of education data, and led to ED's new effort, InformED, to improve Department capacity to release data in innovative and effective ways to improve public use of data. InformED was part of the [FY17 budget](#) request (see p. 78).
- ED has several data sharing agreements with other agencies. For example, ED and the U.S. Department of Treasury match Federal Student Aid data with administrative Internal Revenue Service tax records to calculate earnings information by postsecondary institution for the [College Scorecard](#) consumer tool. This agreement allows ED to annually update and publish data on mean earnings, median earnings, and fraction not working among all students who received Title IV aid (i.e., federal grants and loans). ED and the U.S. Department of Labor are engaged in a joint federal/state workgroup that is developing help for data sharing at the state level through the new State Wage Interchange System (SWIS) for the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For calculating the Gainful Employment (GE) debt-to-earnings metric, the Department of Education obtains from the Social Security Administration (SSA) annual earnings of students who completed a GE program. ED submits the Social Security numbers of students who received Title IV aid (i.e., federal grants and loans) to SSA in order to calculate the highest of mean and median earnings for each program.
- Additionally, ED administers the [Statewide Longitudinal Data System](#) (SLDS) program (\$34.5 million in FY16), which provides grants to states to develop their education-related data infrastructure and use these data for education improvement..

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY16?

USHUD:

- The HUD USER web portal continues to provide researchers, practitioners, and the public with [PD&R datasets](#) including the American Housing Survey, HUD median family income limits, and Picture of Subsidized Households tabulations at multiple geographic levels, as well as microdata from research initiatives on topics such as housing discrimination, the HUD-insured multifamily housing stock, and the public housing population. To help users identify which data are useful to them, [reference guides](#) identify datasets and characterize their relevance and usefulness for research in designated categories.
- HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) has authority to enter into cooperative agreements with research organizations, including both funded [Research Partnerships](#) and unfunded [Data License Agreements](#), to support innovative research projects that leverage HUD's data assets and inform HUD's policies and programs. A dedicated subject-matter expert is available to answer questions for those seeking a data license.
- HUD's PD&R and the National Center for Health Statistics at the Centers for Disease Control have successfully linked HUD administrative data for assisted renters with respondents to two national health surveys and made the [linked](#) data available to researchers to begin building a picture of tenant health issues.
- HUD is involved in a wide array of data-sharing agreements, including geocoding services provided by HUD's Geocoding Service Center; a recent agreement with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to pilot an administrative data linkage with Medicare and Medicaid utilization records; national compilation of local point-in-time counts of homeless individuals and administrative data from homeless service providers using Homeless Management Information Systems; collection of tenant data for Low-Income Housing Tax Credit properties from state housing finance agencies; an ongoing agreement with Actionable Intelligence for Social Policy to develop integrated data systems for policy analysis and program reform, including local education data; and a multiagency federal agreement under development about protocols for information security in data-sharing.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

5. **Data:** Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY16?

USDOL:

- DOL's [Bureau of Labor Statistics](#) (BLS) (approximately \$600 million in FY16) serves as the principal Federal agency responsible for measuring labor market activity, working conditions, and price changes in the economy. BLS has [111 Cooperative Agreements](#) with 50 States and 4 Territories for labor market and economic data sharing, 505 "letters of agreement" on data usage with academics to conduct statistical research, and [data sharing agreements](#) with the Bureau of Economic Analysis and the Census Bureau.
- DOL's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) has [agreements with 52 States and Territories](#) for data sharing and exchange of wage data for performance accountability purposes.
- DOL's CEO, Employment Training Administration (ETA), and the Veterans Employment and Training Service (VETS) have worked with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to develop a secure mechanism for obtaining and analyzing earnings data from the Directory of New Hires. In this past year DOL has entered into interagency data sharing agreements with HHS and obtained data to support 9 job training and employment program evaluations (Reemployment Assistance Demonstration Evaluation with unemployment insurance claimants, Young Parents Demonstration Evaluation, Enhanced Transitional Jobs Program Evaluation, Youthbuild Evaluation, Workforce Investment Act Evaluation, Green Jobs/Health Care Demonstration Evaluation, Re-entry for Ex-Offenders Evaluation, Transition Assistance Program for separating activity duty military persons, and the Job Training Scorecard Feasibility Study).
- DOL's worker protection agencies have open-data provisions on enforcement activity for firms from DOL's five labor enforcement agencies online and accessible through the [Enforcement Data Base](#) (Mine Safety and Health Administration, Wage and Hour Division, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the Employee Benefits Security Administration).
- The privacy provisions for BLS and DOL's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) are publicly available [online](#).
- In FY16, DOL expanded efforts to improve the quality of and access to data for evaluation and performance analysis through the Data Analytics Unit in DOL's CEO office, and through new pilots beginning in BLS to access and exchange state labor market and earnings data for statistical and evaluation purposes. The Data Analytics unit has also developed the Data Exchange and Analysis Platform (DEAP) with high processing capacity and privacy provisions to share, link, and analyze program and survey data across DOL programs and agencies and with other agencies. Internal use of DEAP is available now and public access will be available in the future.
- The Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) calls for aligned indicators of performance for WIOA authorized programs. DOL's Employment and Training Administration has worked within DOL and with the U.S. Department of Education to pursue the deepest WIOA alignment possible, including indicators definitions, data elements, and specifications to improve the quality and analytic value of the data. DOL chose to include several additional DOL programs in this process, which will result in unprecedented alignment of data and definitions for 13 federal programs (11 DOL and 2 Education). DOL and ED have issued the [proposed rule](#) for public comment and will finalize it in late spring 2016, and has also issued the related [Information Collection Requests](#) for public comment, and expect to finalize those Information Collection requires prior to that date.
- ETA continues funding and technical assistance to states under the [Workforce Data Quality Initiative](#) to link earnings and workforce data and education data longitudinally. ETA and DOL's Veteran's Employment and Training Service have also modified state workforce program reporting system requirements to include data items for a larger set of grant programs, which will improve access to administrative data for evaluation and performance management purposes. An example of the expanded data reporting requirements is the [Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program](#) FY16 grants.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works

Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY16?

ACF:

- ACF has established a [common evidence framework](#) adapted for the human services context from the framework for education research developed by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation. The ACF framework, which includes the six types of studies delineated in the ED/NSF framework, aims to (1) inform ACF's investments in research and evaluation, and (2) clarify for potential grantees and others the expectations for different types of studies.
- ACF maintains an online [clearinghouse](#) of evidence reviews of human services interventions. These reviews rate the quality of evaluation studies using objective standards vetted by technical experts and applied by trained, independent reviewers, and similar to those used by other agencies such as the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse and the U.S. Department of Labor's CLEAR. The clearinghouse includes results of the reviews in a searchable format as well as comprehensive details about the review standards and process. Reviews to date have covered [teen pregnancy prevention](#); [home visiting](#); [relationship education and responsible fatherhood](#); and [employment and training](#); and include both ACF-sponsored and other studies.

CNCS:

- CNCS's Office of Research and Evaluation (R&E) Office is actively involved with 3 other federal agencies in the interagency Common Evidence Framework working group in order to ensure consistency in definitions and use of evidence standards in grant-making. CNCS uses the [Cross-agency Federal Evidence Framework](#) for evaluation planning and dissemination.
- CNCS also adapted the evidence framework used by its Social Innovation Fund and the Investing in Innovation Fund at ED and included it as part of the AmeriCorps State and National program's [FY16 grant competition](#). The evidence framework used in the FY16 AmeriCorps competition was revised from FY15 to make it more consistent with what is used in other federal agencies.
- In March 2015, CNCS released Phase I of the CNCS [Evidence Exchange](#), a virtual repository of reports intended to help CNCS grantees and other interested stakeholders find information about evidence- and research- based national service and social innovation programs. Phase 1 includes a database of single study reports with some additional descriptive information about the study, as well as a systematic review of the national service evidence base. Phase 2 in FY16 added studies as grantees completed their independent evaluations and submitted reports to CNCS.

MCC:

- MCC uses common, rigorous, evidence-based selection criteria to ensure objectivity in country selection for grant awards. To be eligible for selection, countries must first pass the MCC [scorecard](#) – a collection of 20 independent, third-party developed indicators that objectively measure a country's policy performance in the areas of economic freedom, investing in its people, and ruling justly. The criteria for passing the scorecard are applied universally to all candidate countries. MCC's Board of Directors then considers [3 key factors](#) for selecting countries: 1) a country's performance on the scorecard; 2) the opportunity to reduce poverty and generate economic growth; and 3) availability of funds. An in-depth description of the country selection procedure can be found in the annual [Selection Criteria and Methodology](#) report.
- MCC's model is based on a set of [core principles](#) essential for development to take place and for development assistance to be effective – good governance, country ownership, focus on results, and transparency. In pursuing these, MCC has created a [Principles into Practice](#) series which describes how to make these principles operational. Finally, all of MCC's evaluations are then published on the [MCC Evaluation Catalog](#). Associated data, upon which evaluations are based, are published when confidentiality concerns are adequately addressed.
- MCC is also developing an enhanced consolidated results framework that will assist it in telling the full picture of the impact of its programs and enrich programmatic learning. Currently in draft form, the framework will help MCC consolidate impacts across projects, compacts and sectors to assess an overall impact at an organizational level..

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works

Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY16?

USAID:

- USAID has a scientific [research policy](#) that sets out quality standards for research. USAID's [Program Cycle guidance](#) includes specific evidence standards for strategic planning, project design, [monitoring](#), and [evaluation](#). For example USAID has [guidance](#) that requires evidence and data to assess the development context, challenges, and opportunities in all of USAID's country strategies. Similarly, all USAID projects must include a detailed [analytical phase](#) in the Project Appraisal Document.
- USAID does most of its Agency-wide engagement around evidence and frameworks for "what works" through its board membership and funding (along with other donors) of the [International Initiative for Impact Evaluations](#) (3ie) which funds impact evaluations and systematic reviews that generate evidence on what works in development programs and why. Rather than creating a separate "what works" clearinghouse, USAID has chosen to work with 3ie and other development partners to support 3ie's [database of impact evaluations](#) relevant to development topics (includes over 2,500 entries to date), [knowledge gap maps](#) and [systematic reviews](#) that pull the most rigorous evidence and data from across donors. 3ie also houses a collection of [policy briefs](#) that examine findings from its [database of impact evaluations](#) on overarching policy questions to help policymakers and development practitioners improve development impact through better evidence.
- USAID technical bureaus provide guidance based on evidence of "what works" by sector that applies to all relevant Agency programs. USAID's Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA), for example, includes the [Center of Excellence on Democracy, Rights, and Governance](#), which publishes evidence-based standards for what works in this field. The DRG Center convenes leading scholars from a range of fields to work with USAID to study, analyze, and assess the effectiveness of its initiatives and programs in DRG, using this data to shape programming. In addition, USAID established the Evaluating Democracy and Governance Effectiveness (EDGE) Initiative, with the objective to supply and apply sophisticated tools to measure the impact of democracy, human rights, and governance work, and infuse evidence-based programmatic decision-making throughout the DRG portfolio. In another example, USAID's Global Health Bureau has a [strategic framework](#) that presents details in Annex 1 on specific evidence-based strategies, targets, and approaches for achieving goals within each technical area under the health priorities.
- Several USAID Bureaus also synthesize all the evaluations relevant to a specific sector to summarize key findings and identify gaps in knowledge that then inform sector learning agendas. For example, in March, the Bureau for Food Security (BFS) published a [synthesis report](#) summarizing findings from 196 evaluations of Feed the Future projects that focused on the six themes outlined in the BFS Learning Agenda. Across the themes, the synthesis illuminated trends and patterns summarized in the points found below the graphic. These trends can be shared with relevant staff and stakeholders engaged in designing new projects, or updating sector strategies and policies. The synthesis also identified gaps where more evaluation research is needed, helping to inform the design of future evaluations that can contribute to the body of knowledge on food security to improve the design and management of interventions in the agriculture and nutrition sectors by specifically addressing Learning Agenda questions.

USED:

- ED's evidence standards for its grant programs, as outlined in the Education Department General Administrative Regulations ([EDGAR](#)), build on ED's [What Works Clearinghouse™](#) (WWC) evidence standards. ED often includes these evidence standards in its discretionary grant competitions to direct funds to applicants proposing to implement projects that have evidence of effectiveness and/or to build new evidence through evaluation (see Question #8 below for more detail). Additionally, IES and the National Science Foundation issued a joint report that describes six types of research studies that can generate evidence about how to increase student learning in 2013. These principles are based, in part, on the research goal structure and expectations of IES's National Center for Education Research (NCER) and National Center for Special Education Research (NCSEER). NCER and NCSEER communicate these expectations through their [Requests for Applications](#) and [webinars](#) that are archived on the IES website and available to all applicants.
- ED's [What Works Clearinghouse™](#) (WWC) identifies studies that provide credible and reliable evidence of the effectiveness of a given practice, program, or policy (referred to as "interventions"), and disseminates summary information and reports on the WWC website. The WWC has reviewed more than 11,325 studies that are available in a [searchable database](#).

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works

Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY16?

USHUD:

- HUD's [Policy Development and Research \(PD&R\)](#) office provides evidence of "what works" primarily through [HUD USER](#), a portal and web store for program evaluations, case studies, and policy analysis and research; the Regulatory Barriers Clearinghouse; and through initiatives such as Innovation of the Day, Sustainable Construction Methods in Indian Country, and the Consumer's Guide to Energy-Efficient and Healthy Homes. This content is designed to provide current policy information, elevate effective practices, and synthesize data and other evidence in accessible formats. Through these resources, researchers and practitioners can see the full breadth of work on a given topic (e.g., rigorous established evidence, case studies of what's worked in the field, and new innovations currently being explored) to inform their work.

USDOL:

- DOL uses the [Cross-agency Federal Evidence Framework](#) for evaluation planning and dissemination.
- DOL's [Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research \(CLEAR\)](#) is an internet-based evidence clearinghouse of evaluation reports that reviews designs, methodologies, and findings according to specific standards developed by technical work groups. Each study is scored and given a "causal evidence rating" according to the scoring rubric in the standards. CLEAR is a user-friendly, searchable website, that includes academic quality reviews for each study included in the system, appropriate for peer academic researchers, potential evaluation contractors submitting technical proposals, program practitioners seeking information on "what works", policy makers, and the general public.
- DOL uses the CLEAR evidence guidelines and standards when discretionary program grants awarded using evidence-informed or evidence-based criteria. The published guidelines and standards are thus used in grants for evidence-based programs demonstrations and in reviewing evaluations in the structured evidence reviews conducted in CLEAR. Requests for proposals also indicate the CLEAR standards apply to all CEO evaluations. Also, DOL has a "[Department Evaluation Policy Statement](#)" that formalizes the principles that govern all program evaluations in the Department, including methodological rigor, independence, transparency, ethics, and relevance. In addition, CEO publicly communicates the standards and methods expected in all DOL evaluations, and the standards are incorporated into formal procurement statements of work, with scoring for awards based on the standards.
- Additionally, DOL collaborates with other agencies (HHS, ED-IES, NSF, CNCS) on refining cross-agency evidence guidelines and developing technological procedures to link and share reviews across clearinghouses. The [Interagency Evidence Framework](#) conveys the categories of evaluations, the quality review of evaluation methodologies and results, and the use of evaluation findings. The framework is accepted Department-wide.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY16?

ACF:

- ACF's [Behavioral Innovations to Advance Self-Sufficiency](#) (BIAS) project is the first major effort to apply a behavioral economics lens to programs that serve poor families in the U.S. Since its inception in 2010, the project has conducted 15 rapid-cycle randomized tests of behavioral innovations in seven states with nearly 100,000 sample members.
- ACF's [Behavioral Interventions for Child Support Services](#) (BICS) demonstration project is applying behavioral insights to child support contexts, developing promising behavioral interventions, and building a culture of regular, rapid-cycle evaluation and critical inquiry within the child support community.
- The Administration's FY17 [budget request](#) (p. 347) proposes to repurpose the Temporary Assistance Contingency Fund for a targeted set of approaches to reducing poverty and promoting family economic security. These include demonstration projects to improve parental employment outcomes concurrently with child and family wellbeing outcomes; subsidized employment programs; and program improvement initiatives, such as monitoring and oversight, technical assistance, and research and evaluation. The proposed demonstration programs would set aside funds for evaluation.
- ACF has actively participated in the [HHS IDEA Lab](#), an entity within HHS launched in 2013, to invest in internal innovation, leverage external innovation, and build collaborative communities to tackle cross-cutting issues of strategic importance. [Current projects](#) include the ACF Administration for Native Americans' Application Toolkit and DataQuest: Making ACF Native Data Visible and Useful, the ACF Office of Family Assistance's Understanding Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Through Data Visualization, and the ACF Office of Head Start's Partnership Alignment Information Response System.
- ACF is participating in the [Performance Partnership Pilots for Disconnected Youth](#) initiative by providing flexibility for grantees to join partnerships at the state level. In addition ACF staff have served as technical and evaluation reviewers for selecting the Round 1 pilot sites, participated in the flexibility review process, and contributed evaluation expertise to planning for local and national evaluations of pilot sites.

CNCS:

- CNCS remains a partner in the [Performance Partnership Pilot](#) (P3) program and has contributed to the national evaluation of this initiative. R&E estimates that one pilot site is leveraging CNCS funding through P3.
- CNCS awarded 10 grants that launched in FY16 as part of a new grant making initiative called [Operation AmeriCorps](#). This initiative was designed to encourage tribal and local leaders to identify a high-priority local challenge that AmeriCorps State and National, AmeriCorps NCCC, and/or AmeriCorps VISTA members can holistically address in a relatively short period of time (no more than 2 years). This grant making initiative is innovative for CNCS as it is the first grant program that requires the blending of resources from different AmeriCorps programs – which usually operate separately – to create a new transformative service solution. In addition to requiring a blended service model, the grant program streamlined the application process and facilitated an internal examination of ways the agency's business processes can be improved. CNCS's R&E Office is conducting a two-year process evaluation of Operation AmeriCorps, which is designed to provide more formal findings on the extent to which the goals of the initiative were achieved.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY16?

MCC:

- In September 2014, MCC's [Monitoring and Evaluation](#) division launched the agency's first [Open Data Challenge](#), a call-to-action to Masters and PhD students working in economics, public policy, international development, or other related fields who were interested in exploring how to use [publicly available MCC-financed primary data](#) for policy-relevant analysis. The Challenge was intended to facilitate broader use of MCC's US-taxpayer funded data. Due to the success of the first [Open Data Challenge](#), a second Open Data Challenge was launched in February 2016 in order to encourage innovative ideas and maximize the use of data that MCC finances for its independent evaluations.
- MCC is launching a [gender data competition](#) in Côte d'Ivoire in partnership with the Data2x initiative of the UN Foundation and the World Wide Web Foundation. The competition and larger partnership will spur interest in, creative use of, and new learning from data related to women and girls.
- In 2014, MCC launched an internal "Solutions Lab" that was designed to encourage innovation by engaging staff to come up with creative solutions to some of the biggest challenges MCC faces.
- MCC is conducting an "[Innovation Grant Program](#)" in Zambia in order to encourage local innovation in pro-poor service delivery in the water sector through grants to community-based organizations, civil society and/or private sector entities.
- MCC regularly engages in implementing pilot projects as part of its overall Compact programs. A few examples include: 1) in Morocco, an innovative [pay for results](#) (PFR) mechanism to replicate or expand proven programs that provide integrated support including short-term (one to six months) job readiness skills training, technical training, job matching, follow-up to ensure longevity, and other services and 2) a "[call-for-ideas](#)" in Benin in 2015 that extended an invitation to interested companies and organizations from around the world to submit information regarding potential projects that would expand access to renewable off-grid electrical power in Benin, and 3) a regulatory strengthening project in Sierra Leone that includes funding for a [results-based financing system](#) designed to strengthen the regulator's role, incentivize performance by the utilities, and enhance accountability.

USAID:

- USAID established the U.S. [Global Development Lab](#) (the Lab) in 2014 to increase the application of technology, innovation, and partnerships to extend the Agency's development impact in helping to end extreme poverty. The Lab does this by working closely with colleagues across the Agency and by bringing together a diverse set of partners to discover, test, and scale breakthrough innovations to solve development challenges faster and cheaper and more sustainably. The Lab is the home for the Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning Innovations program ([MERLIN](#)) to source, co-design, implement and test solutions that innovate on traditional approaches to monitoring, evaluation, research and learning.
- USAID has also launched six [grand challenges](#) to engage the public in the search for solutions to development problems.
- The Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) awards grant financing to winners in three distinct stages of financing. Funding ranges from under \$100,000 to \$15 million, and is based on where a project is in its development and to what extent it has previously gathered evidence of success. The [DIV model](#) is designed to find breakthrough solutions, minimize risk and maximize impact through stage financing, rigorously test impacts and cost effectiveness, and scale proven solutions through the public or private sectors.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY16?

USED:

- ED's [Investing in Innovation \(i3\)](#) is the Department's signature innovation program for K–12 public education. While the larger i3 grants are focused on validating and scaling evidence-based practices, the smaller i3 grants are designed to encourage innovative approaches to persistent challenges. These "Development" grants are the most prevalent type of i3 grant, comprising 105 out of the 157 i3 grants to date, and 7 of the 13 new i3 grants made in FY15. In order to spur similar types of innovation in higher education, the Department made its second cohort of grantees under its [First in the World \(FITW\)](#) program in FY15. The Department made 18 FITW grants in FY15, the vast majority of which (16 of 18) were in the "Development" category.
- ED is participating in the [Performance Partnership Pilots for Disconnected Youth](#) initiative. These pilots give state, local, and tribal governments an opportunity to test innovative new strategies to improve such outcomes for low-income disconnected youth ages 14 to 24, including youth who are in foster care, homeless, young parents, involved in the justice system, unemployed, or who have dropped out or are at risk of dropping out of school.
- The [White House Social and Behavioral Sciences Team](#) has conducted several behavioral science studies related to ED's work, including looking at the impact of text message reminders for students about key tasks related to college matriculation, such as completing financial aid paperwork, and about notices to student borrowers about income-driven repayment plans.
- ED is currently implementing the [Experimental Sites Initiative](#) to test the effectiveness of statutory and regulatory flexibility for participating institutions disbursing Title IV student aid.
- ED has hired a full-time [Pay-for-Success fellow](#) in FY16. ED has entered into an agreement with the University of Utah's Policy Innovation Lab to support a full-time Pay for Success Fellow at ED. With additional expertise provided by this fellow, ED is deepening its capacity and developing ways to use Pay for Success to expand effective educational programs and promote innovation.
- The IES [Research Grants Program](#) supports the development and iterative testing of new, innovative approaches to improving education outcomes. IES makes research grants with a goal structure. "Goal 2: Development and Innovation" supports the development of new education curricula; instructional approaches; professional development; technology; and practices, programs, and policies that are implemented at the student-, classroom-, school-, district-, state-, or federal-level to improve student education outcomes.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY16?

USHUD:

- HUD's Policy Development and Research (PD&R) office is conducting a number of evaluated, random-assignment program demonstrations to test new program models, which can be found in PD&R's [biennial report](#): the [Family Options study](#) of homelessness interventions, Family Self-Sufficiency Demonstration, Pre-Purchase Homeownership Counseling Demonstration, Support and Services at Home (SASH) Demonstration for elderly households, Supportive Services Demonstration for health services in elderly housing, Rent Reform Demonstration, and the Small Area Fair Market Rent Demonstration. The latter demonstrations are in early or middle stages; interim results and long-term follow-up results generally will be reported through HUD USER during the next 2-4 years.
- PD&R also is collaborating with the White House [Social and Behavioral Sciences Team](#) and U.S. Department of Education to link tenant data with records of students and individuals submitting Free Applications for Federal Student Aid, helping increase access of HUD tenants to higher education through low-cost, behaviorally informed experiments about effective outreach methods. While detailed information about these experiments is not available at present, some can be found in HUD's [2015 Annual Report](#) (see p. 62) and will be included in SBST's annual report in July 2016.
- PD&R houses the [Office of International and Philanthropic Innovation](#), and administers five types of [Secretary's Awards](#) to encourage excellence: Public-Philanthropic Partnerships, Opportunity and Empowerment, Healthy Homes, Historic Preservation, and Housing and Community Design. The competitions are judged by juries of professionals, and bring visibility to the nation's most compelling solutions for addressing housing and community development challenges.
- PD&R sponsors an [Innovation in Affordable Housing Competition](#) to engage multidisciplinary teams of graduate students in addressing a specific housing problem developed by an actual public housing agency. The [competition](#) increases the nation's future human capacity to address the affordable housing crisis by exposing future designers, administrators, and policymakers to real-world challenges of a specific legal and community context, with their proposals to be evaluated by an expert jury.
- In FY16, HUD's [National Disaster Resilience Competition](#) is providing funding for resilient housing and infrastructure projects to states and communities that suffered major disasters. Collaborative teams were assisted in extensively researching and developing their proposals by nine Resilience Academies developed by the Rockefeller Foundation in partnership with HUD. The in-depth, juried process is ensuring that the \$1 billion of resources available for these communities in FY16 will result in more resilient housing and infrastructure and bridge the gap between social and physical vulnerabilities.

USDOL:

- DOL is participating in the [Performance Partnership Pilots \(P3\)](#) for innovative service delivery for disconnected youth which includes not only waivers and blending and braiding of federal funds, but gives bonus points in application reviews for proposing "high tier" evaluations. DOL is the lead agency for the evaluation of P3. DOL's CEO and ETA prepared an evaluation technical assistance [webinar](#) for P3 grantees in 2014 and will be repeated for the next round of grantees in 2016. Beginning in FY16, the national P3 evaluation contractor is also providing evaluation TA to grantees for methodological design issues and data and management information systems.
- DOL has initiated six behavioral insights tests (three in unemployment insurance, two in OSHA, and one in EBSA for pension contributions), and two behavioral insights testing different messaging to encourage voluntary compliance embedded into a larger experimental evaluations (in OSHA and Unemployment Insurance). The behavioral tests are being conducted in FY16. Initial findings will be released in April 2016 and will be posted on the CEO [website](#).

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive

Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY16?

ACF:

- In FY16 the 5 largest competitive grant programs are: 1) Head Start (\$9,168,095,000); 2) Unaccompanied Children Services (\$948,000,000); 3) Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships (\$915,799,422); 4) Transitional and Medical Services (\$490,000,000); and 5) Preschool Development Grants (\$250,000,000).
- ACF's [template](#) (see p. 14 in Attachment C) for grant announcements includes two options, requiring grantees to either 1) collect performance management data that contributes to continuous quality improvement and is tied to the project's logic model, or 2) conduct a rigorous evaluation for which applicants must propose an appropriate design specifying research questions, measurement and analysis.
- In FY12, ACF established the [Head Start Designation Renewal System](#) requiring Head Start (\$9.2 billion in FY16) grantees to compete for grants moving forward if they failed to meet criteria related to service quality, licensing and operations, and fiscal and internal control.
- ACF's [Personal Responsibility Education Program](#) (\$75 million in FY16) includes three individual discretionary grant programs that support evidence-based competitive grants that teach youth about abstinence and contraception to prevent pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections.
- To receive funds through ACF's [Community Based Child Abuse Prevention](#) (CBCAP) program, states must "demonstrate an emphasis on promoting the increased use and high quality implementation of evidence-based and evidence-informed programs and practices." CBCAP defines evidence-based and evidence-informed programs and practices along a continuum with four categories: Emerging and Evidence-Informed; Promising; Supported; and Well Supported. Programs determined to fall within specific program parameters will be considered to be "evidence informed" or "evidence-based" practices (EBP), as opposed to programs that have not been evaluated using any set criteria. ACF monitors progress on the percentage of program funds (most recently 89.4% in FY14) directed towards evidence-based and evidence-informed practices.

CNCS:

- In CNCS is operating three competitive grant programs in FY16: 1) AmeriCorps State and National program (excluding State formula grant funds) (\$386 million in FY16); 2) Senior Corps RSVP program (\$49 million in FY16); and 3) the Social Innovation Fund (SIF) (\$50 million in FY16).
- SIF provides competitive grants to non-profit grant-making organizations to help them grow promising, evidence-based solutions that address pressing economic opportunity, healthy futures, and youth development issues in low- income communities. The FY14-16 Omnibus Appropriations Acts have allowed CNCS to invest up to 20% of SIF funds each year in Pay for Success initiatives. There are 2 Pay for Success competitions planned for FY16, which will invest both the FY15 and 16 appropriations (approximately \$11.6 million at minimum).
- CNCS's AmeriCorps State and National Grants Program (excluding State formula grant funds), [application](#) (see pp. 10-14) allocated up to 27 points out of 100 to organizations that submit applications supported by performance and evaluation data in FY16. Specifically, up to 15 points can be assigned to applications with theories of change supported by relevant research literature, program performance data, or program evaluation data; and up to 12 points (a 4 point increase from FY15) can be assigned for an applicant's incoming level of evidence with the highest number of points awarded to strong levels of evidence. These categories of evidence are modeled closely on the levels of evidence defined in the Social Innovation Fund.
- In FY16, Senior Corps RSVP grantees [seeking funding](#) (see p. 1) through the administrative renewal process are encouraged to fulfill the National Performance Measures requirement by committing a certain number of volunteers to serve in an evidence-based health education program. A total of \$500,000 (just above 1% of program funds) is allocated to support organizations in implementing evidence-based interventions or to evaluate programs.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY16?

MCC:

- MCC awards all of its agency funds through two competitive grant programs: [Compact and Threshold programs](#) (whose budgets for FY16 were \$667 and \$30 million respectively). Both require demonstrable, objective evidence to support the likelihood of success in order to be awarded funds. For country partner selection, MCC uses twenty different indicators within the categories of economic freedom, investing in people, and ruling justly to determine country eligibility for program assistance. These indicators (see MCC's [FY2016 Guide to the Indicators](#)) are collected by independent third parties. When considering granting a [second compact](#), MCC considers 1) the degree to which there is evidence of strong political will and management capacity, 2) the degree to which the country has exhibited commitment and capacity to achieve program results, and 3) the degree to which the country has implemented the compact in accordance with MCC's core policies and standards.
- Following country selection, MCC conducts a [constraints analysis](#) (CA) to identify the most binding constraints to private investment and entrepreneurship that hold back economic growth. The results of this analysis enable the country, in partnership with MCC, to select compact or threshold activities most likely to contribute to sustainable poverty-reducing growth. Due diligence, including feasibility studies where applicable, are conducted for each potential investment. MCC also performs [Cost-Benefit Analysis](#) to assess the potential impact of each project, and estimates an Economic Rate of Return. MCC projects generally have an ERR above 10% at project inception, and MCC recalculates ERRs at compact closeout in order to test original assumptions and assess the cost effectiveness of MCC programs. In connection with the ERR, MCC conducts a [Beneficiary Analysis](#), which seeks to describe precisely which segments of society will realize the project benefits. It is most commonly used to assess the impact of projects on the poor, but it has broader applicability that allows for the estimation of impact on populations of particular interest, such as women, the aged, children, and regional or ethnic sub-populations. In line with MCC's M&E policy, MCC projects are required to submit quarterly Indicator Tracking Tables showing progress toward projected targets. MCC also requires independent evaluations of every project to assess progress in achieving outputs and outcomes throughout the lifetime of the project and beyond..

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY16?

USAID:

- USAID is committed to using evidence of effectiveness in all of its competitive contracts, cooperative agreements and grants, which comprise the majority of the Agency’s work. USAID has rebuilt its [planning, monitoring, and evaluation framework](#) to produce and use evidence through the introduction of a new [Program Cycle](#), which systematizes use of evidence across all decision-making regarding grants and all of USAID’s work. The Program Cycle is USAID’s particular framing and terminology to describe a common set of processes intended to achieve more effective development interventions and maximize impacts. The Program Cycle acknowledges that development is not static and is rarely linear, and therefore stresses the need to assess and reassess through regular monitoring, evaluation, and learning. Thus the different components of the Program Cycle mutually reinforce each other by having learning and adapting integrated throughout. The Program Cycle encourages planning and project management innovations to increase the cost-effectiveness and lasting impact of development cooperation.
- In 2013, USAID reformed its policy for awarding new contracts to elevate past performance to comprise 20 to 30 percent of the non-cost evaluation criteria. For assistance, USAID does a “risk assessment” to review an organization’s ability to meet the goals and objectives outlined by the Agency. This can be found in [ADS 303](#), section 303.3.9. Contractor performance is guided by USAID operational policy [ADS 302](#), section 302.3.8.7. As required in FAR Subpart 42.15, USAID must evaluate contractor performance using the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS). Information in CPARS, while not available to the public, is available for Contracting Officers across the Government to use in making determinations of future awards.
- USAID has also instituted a policy called the Acquisition and Assistance Review and Approval Document (AARAD) process where all contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements over \$75 million are reviewed by the Administrator prior to being awarded and all awards over \$25 million are reviewed by the relevant Assistant Administrators. Included in the AARAD review are several key factors that include: Policy Relevant, Commitment to Sustainable Results, Feasibility, and Value for Money. This policy ensures that results, evidence, and long-term strategies are incorporated into all of USAID’s major programs. In addition, it ensures senior level accountability on USAID’s biggest programs. This policy is outlined in [ADS 300](#). USAID [guidance](#) for competitive grants is also available online.
- The [Development Innovation Ventures](#) program (\$22.4 million in FY16) provides funding for proof of concept through rigorous evaluation of innovative solutions, and scale-up funding when a solution is proven to work. [DIV’s approach](#) is unique in three ways:
 1. DIV recognizes that good ideas can come from anywhere, so they welcome a [wide range of potential partners](#) to propose their concepts for high-impact development solutions.
 2. Borrowing from the experience of venture capital, DIV takes advantage of a staged financing model. They pilot promising new ideas with small amounts of money, and we scale only those solutions that rigorously demonstrate their impact.
 3. DIV emphasizes a high standard of evidence, including the use of impact evaluations and randomized control trials whenever possible.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY16?

USED:

- ED's five largest competitive grant programs in FY16 include: 1) TRIO (\$900 million); 2) GEAR UP (\$323 million); 3) Teacher Incentive Fund (\$230 million); 4) Charter Schools Grants (\$333 million); and 5) Preschool Development Grants (\$250 million).
- The Evidence Planning Group (EPG) advises program offices on ways to incorporate evidence in grant programs, including use of evidence as an entry requirement or priority to encourage the use of practices where there is evidence of effectiveness, and/or an exit requirement or priority to build new evidence. For the past several years, ED has reported publicly on [Performance.gov](#) on its [Agency Priority Goal](#) (APG) focused on directing an increasing percentage of funds available for new competitive awards towards projects that are supported by evidence. In FY15, ED spent 29% of its funding available for new discretionary awards on projects that are supported by promising, moderate, or strong evidence, based on [EDGAR](#) evidence levels, surpassing both the FY15 and FY16 targets for that APG.
- While not all of ED's FY16 decisions have been finalized yet, ED has announced the following FY16 competitions, which include the use of evidence beyond a logic model: 1) Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions, 2) Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions Program, 3) College Assistance Migrant Program, 4) Educational Technology, Media, and Materials for Individuals with Disabilities—Stepping-up Technology Implementation, 5) High School Equivalency Program, 6) Hispanic-Serving Institutions - Science, Technology, Engineering, or Mathematics, 7) National Professional Development, 8) Native American-Serving Nontribal Institutions Program, 9) Technical Assistance and Dissemination To Improve Services and Results for Children With Disabilities, and 10) TRIO Talent Search.
- The [Investing in Innovation \(i3\) program](#) (\$120 million in FY16) provides competitive grants to local school districts and non-profit organizations that have demonstrated positive impacts to innovate, expand, and scale evidence-based activities to improve student achievement, although details for the FY16 competition have not been announced. ESSA authorizes an Education Innovation and Research (EIR) Grants program.
- Additionally, ESSA requires that ED give priority to applicants demonstrating strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence within the following seven competitive grant programs: Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation; Supporting Effective Educator Development; School Leader Recruitment and Support; Statewide Family Engagement Centers; Promise Neighborhoods; Full-Service Community Schools; and Supporting High-Ability Learners and Learning.
- ESSA authorizes the Supporting Effective Educator Development program that awards grants to applicants with a demonstrated record of improving student outcomes while giving priority to applicants demonstrating strong, moderate, or promising evidence of effectiveness (as described above). And ESSA authorizes the Replication and Expansion of High-Quality Charter Schools program that awards grants to applicants based on their demonstrated success in improving student outcomes.
- ED's FY17 budget, which for P-12 programs is based on ESSA, prioritizes funding evidence-based activities. For example, the budget includes \$180 million for the EIR program, an increase of \$60 million over the FY16 enacted level for its predecessor, the i3 program. ED also proposes building new evidence to increase the effectiveness of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program. Requests like the \$100 million in FITW program, \$30 million HBCU/MSI Innovation for Completion Fund competitive grant program, and the use of up to \$20 million to develop a TRIO Demonstration Initiative, in consultation with the TRIO community, demonstrate ED's commitment to building and using evidence to improve college access and completion.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY16?

USHUD:

- In FY16 HUD's major competitive grant programs are: 1) [Homeless Assistance](#) (\$1.9 billion); 2) [Disaster Assistance/National Disaster Resilience Competition](#) (\$300 million); 3) [Choice Neighborhoods Grants program](#) (\$125 million); 4) [Service Coordinators program](#) (\$77 million); and 5) [Family Self-Sufficiency Program](#) Coordinators (\$73 million).
- The National Disaster Resilience Competition used evidence about disaster resilience, including benefit/cost analysis, to ensure that disaster funding improves communities' ability to withstand and recover more quickly from future disasters, hazards, and shocks rather than simply recreating the same vulnerabilities.
- Decisions regarding the design, funding, and implementation of all HUD competitive grant programs are evidence-based, as specified in funding criteria in HUD's FY16 [Notice of Funding Availability](#) (NOFA). The "Achieving Results and Program Evaluation" factor (see p.13), provides funding priority for applicants that demonstrate effective use of evidence in identifying or selecting the proposed practices, strategies, or programs proposed in the application, and requires all grantees to cooperate in HUD-funded research and evaluation studies (see p. 14). Another factor, "Past Performance," provides: "In evaluating applications for funding HUD will take into account an applicant's past performance in managing funds, including, but not limited to.... meeting performance targets as established in Logic Models or other performance evaluation tools approved as part of the grant agreement...." (see p. 14). The "Achieving Results and Program Evaluation" factor and "Past Performance" factor are two of five factors considered that total 100 points. The maximum achievable score, with priority points and bonus points, is 106.

USDOL:

- In FY16, the five largest competitive grant programs awarded were: 1) American Apprenticeship Initiative (\$175 million), 2) Face Forward Grants Program (\$59 million), 3) Disability Employment Initiative (\$60 million), 4) Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program (\$35 million), and 5) the Workforce Innovation Fund/Pay for Success 2016 (\$35 million in FY16). All have national evaluations designed by CEO and the relevant agencies, and two also require grantees to use a portion of their fund for high-quality evaluations on which incentive and priority points were received in the application funding competitive selection process.
- DOL includes rigorous evaluation requirements in all competitive grant programs, involving either: 1) full participation in a national evaluation as a condition of grant receipt; 2) an independent third-party local or grantee evaluation with priority incentives for rigorous designs (e.g., tiered funding, scoring priorities, bonus scoring for evidence-based interventions or multi-site rigorous tests), or 3) full participation in a national evaluation as well as rigorous grantee (or local) evaluations. The \$10 million [Linking to Employment Assistance Pre-Release Grant](#) program to improve employment for formerly incarcerated individuals serves as an example of the requirement to participate in a national evaluation as a condition of the grant.
- The [Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training Grant Program](#) (TAACCT) program (\$2 billion in FY12-14 available through FY 2017; including \$410 million in FY 2016) provides grants to community colleges and other higher education institutions to develop and expand evidence-based education and training for dislocated workers changing careers. Up to 10% of each grant can be spent on evaluation. DOL has awarded \$11 million for technical assistance and a national evaluation of the program.
- The [Workforce Innovation Fund](#) grants (\$232 million total, including \$35 million awarded in FY 2016) and Pay for Success (\$35 million total) are awarded to rigorously test innovation training and employment strategies, with rigorous evaluations incorporated into the programming. PFS is a social investment pilot with payment based on rigorous randomized control trial impacts.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

9. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Non-Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs in FY16?

(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)

ACF:

- In FY16, ACF's 5 largest non-competitive grant programs are: 1) Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (\$17,345,407,000); 2) Child Care and Development Fund (Block Grant and Entitlement to States combined) (\$5,678,000,000); 3) Foster Care (\$4,799,573,280); 4) Child Support Enforcement Payments to States (\$4,303,998,000); and 5) Low Income Home Energy Assistance (\$3,390,304,000).
- ACF's [Foster Care](#) program (\$4.8 billion in FY16) has approved over 30 jurisdictions to develop and implement child welfare waiver demonstration projects to improve outcomes for children in foster care or at risk for entry or re-entry into foster care. Through these demonstrations, ACF waives provisions of law to allow flexible use of funding normally limited to foster care for other child welfare services. Many participating jurisdictions are implementing evidence-based or evidence-informed interventions and all demonstration projects are required to have a rigorous evaluation conducted by a third-party evaluator. Although ACF does not currently have statutory authority to grant new waivers, current projects are expected to continue through September 30, 2019. [General information](#) on this program, including a [fact sheet](#) and summary of relevant [legislation/policy](#), is available at the online [Children's Bureau](#) portal.

CNCS:

- CNCS operates one formula grant program, the AmeriCorps State formula grants program (\$130 million in FY16). CNCS also operates four direct grant programs in FY16: 1) National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC) (\$30 million in FY16), 2) VISTA (\$92 million in FY16), 3) Senior Corps Foster Grandparents (\$108 million in FY16), and 4) Senior Corps Senior Companion Program (\$46 million in FY16).
- In FY16, for the first time, the Senior Corps Foster Grandparents and Senior Companion programs embedded evidence into their grant renewal processes by offering supplemental funding to grantees interested in deploying volunteers to serve in [evidence-based programs](#) (see pp. 2-4) and providing evaluation data on implementation fidelity, including outcomes. A total of \$400,000.00 is allocated for the Foster Grandparents program in FY16, or .4% of program funds. A total of \$300,000.00 is allocated for the Senior Companion program in FY16, or .65% of program funds.
- VISTA is currently developing a theory of change that will make explicit the link between the work that the volunteers perform, the design of a sponsor's project to address community needs, and the evidence to support this activity. This effort will impact several management aspects including project approval, volunteer assignment descriptions, member activity, data collection, and the role of evidence in the design and implementation of projects.

MCC:

- MCC does not administer non-competitive grant programs.

USAID:

- USAID does not administer non-competitive grant programs.
- USAID does contribute funding to multilateral institutions known as Public International Organizations (PIOs), which are listed [here](#), and include the World Bank, UN, and multi-donor funds such as the Global Fund. A Public International Organization (PIO) is an international organization composed principally of countries. In these specific cases, USAID funds are part of overall US Government funding for these partner institutions. These funds become subject to the monitoring and evaluation requirements of the organization that receives them. For example, the [Global Fund](#) has a performance-based funding system, which bases funding decisions on a transparent assessment of results against time-bound targets. USAID's [ADS chapter 308](#) provides more information on how PIOs are defined and includes guidance related to due diligence required prior to awarding grants to PIOs.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

9. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Non-Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs in FY16?

(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)

USHUD:

- HUD's [budget](#) contains 3 large formula grant programs for public housing authorities (PHAs): 1) the Public Housing Operating Fund (\$4.5 billion in FY16), 2) the Public Housing Capital Grants (\$1.8 billion in FY16), and 3) Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Administrative Fees (\$1.7 billion in FY16). Another 3 formula grant programs serve cities or tribes: 1) Community Development Block Grant Entitlement/Non-Entitlement (\$3.0 billion in FY16), 2) HOME Investment Partnerships (\$0.9 billion in FY16), and 3) Native American Housing Block Grants (\$0.6 billion in FY16).
- Although the funding formulas are prescribed in statute, evaluation-based evidence is central to each program. HUD is using evidence from a 2015 Administrative Fee study of the costs that high-performing PHAs incur in administering a HCV program to propose a new FY17 approach for funding Administrative Fees while strengthening PHA incentives to improve HCV outcomes by providing tenant mobility counseling.
- HUD is also conducting a [Rent Reform](#) demonstration and a [Moving To Work](#) (MTW) demonstration to test efficiencies of changing rent rules.
- HUD also is conducting an extensive [assessment](#) of Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian housing needs to strengthen the evidence base for the formula programs.

USDOL:

- In FY16, the 5 largest non-competitive grant programs at DOL are in the Employment and Training Administration, all of which allocate funding, by statute, and all include performance metrics (e.g., unemployment insurance payment integrity, WIOA common measures) tracked quarterly: 1) the Unemployment Insurance State grants (\$2.6 billion in FY 2016); 2) the Employment Security program state grants (\$680 million in FY 2016); and 3) three authorized programs under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). The 3 WIOA-authorized grants are: 1) Youth Workforce Investment program (\$873 million in FY 2016), 2) Adult Employment and Training program (\$816 million in FY 2016), and 3) Dislocated Workers Employment and Training program (\$1.2 billion in FY 2016).
- WIOA includes evidence and performance provisions beginning in Program Year 2016 which: (1) increase the amount of WIOA funds states can set aside and distribute directly from 5-10% to 15% and authorize them to invest these funds in Pay for Performance initiatives; (2) authorize states to invest their own workforce development funds, as well as non-federal resources, in Pay for Performance initiatives; (3) authorize local workforce investment boards to invest up to 10% of their WIOA funds in Pay for Performance initiatives; and (4) authorize States and local workforce investment boards to award Pay for Performance contracts to intermediaries, community based organizations, and community colleges.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY16, did the agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?

(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)

ACE:

- In FY12, ACF established the [Head Start Designation Renewal System](#) requiring Head Start (\$9.2 billion in FY16) grantees to compete for grants moving forward if they failed to meet criteria related to service quality, licensing and operations, and fiscal and internal controls. The 2007 Head Start Reauthorization Act made all Head Start grants renewable, five-year grants. At the end of each five-year term, grantees that are running high-quality programs will have their grants renewed. But grantees that fall short of standards are now required to compete to renew grants. Grantees whose ratings on any of the three domains of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System, an assessment of adult:child interactions linked to improved outcomes, fall below a certain threshold, or in the lowest 10 percent of grantees, must also compete.
- ACF's FY17 [budget request](#) (p. 418) proposes to eliminate funding for Abstinence Education grants because the program is not focused on funding evidence-based models.

CNCS:

- In FY13-FY14, Mile High United Way, a grantee of the Social Innovation Fund (SIF), ended funding relationships with 3 of its sub-grantees who were not able to conduct rigorous evaluations of their activities. In FY15, United Way for Southeastern Michigan, also a SIF grantee, ended its funding relationship with one of its sub-grantees for the same reason. These actions are consistent with the [SIF National Assessment](#) findings, which recognize the role SIF has played in fostering evidence-based grant making among its grantees.

MCC:

- MCC has established a [Policy on Suspension and Termination](#) that describes the process and procedures for suspension and termination of MCC assistance in cases in which partner countries are not living up to their commitments. MCC has suspended or [terminated](#) a compact partnership, in part or in full, seven times out of 33 compacts approved to date, and has suspended partner country eligibility to develop a compact an additional four times (most recently with the suspension of Tanzania in March 2016). In 2012 MCC suspended [Malawi's Compact](#) due to a pattern of actions by the Government of Malawi that was inconsistent with the democratic governance evidence criteria that MCC uses for selection. However, the Government of Malawi took a number of decisive steps to improve the human rights environment and to ensure that laws and institutions support democratic rights and processes. These steps and the resumption of sound economic policy led to the reinstatement of Malawi's Compact in 2012.
- MCC also consistently monitors the progress of Compact programs, and makes changes as necessary. For example, an activity in the Philippines, the Electronic Tax Information System (eTIS), an activity under the Revenue Administration Reform Project, was [reduced in scope](#) in FY15 due to time and completion risks. This proactive approach allowed MCC to judiciously reallocate funds to finance additional subprojects under the Kalahi-CIDSS Community-Driven Development Project (K-C) and further maximize the project's benefits.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY16, did the Agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?

(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)

USAID:

- USAID uses rigorous evaluations to maximize its investments. A [recent independent study](#) found that 71 percent of USAID evaluations have been used to modify and/or design USAID projects. Below are a few examples where USAID has shifted funds and/or programming decisions based on performance:
- **Mozambique:** Many donors working in the education sector in Mozambique were using traditional reading programs to improve early grade literacy. USAID recently designed an impact evaluation to test whether reading interventions alone or reading interventions paired with school management support led to improved reading outcomes. Findings from a mid-term impact evaluation found that pairing reading instruction interventions with school management support improved reading outcomes more than reading instruction alone, and was more cost effective. Based on these findings, USAID Mozambique changed the way it worked in Mozambique, and the findings prompted the Government of Mozambique to request that this approach be scaled from 120 schools to 1,060 new schools. More information can be found in the [recently published report on USAID evaluation practice](#).
- **Armenia:** A 2013 mid-term [evaluation](#) of USAID/Armenia's flagship health program revealed a number of significant design and implementation flaws, which prompted the Mission to terminate the program early and saved USG resources. Since then, USAID/Armenia has redesigned its health portfolio to focus on areas where it can make difference and leave a positive legacy, as it phases out from the sector.
- **Latin America and Caribbean Bureau:** USAID's Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) Bureau no longer funds expensive out-of-country scholarship programs such as the Scholarship for Education and Economic Development (SEED) and other precursor programs. A 2013 [evaluation](#) of the Latin America and Caribbean region's Higher Education Scholarships Program looked at the cost-effectiveness of providing students with scholarships to study at US institutions and determined that USAID could provide improved training opportunities for many more poor youth by focusing resources on improving the quality of LAC regional or in-country training institutions. This finding informed a redesign of the program and the issuing of a new Request for Applications (RFA).
- **Indonesia:** In 2013, a USAID Indonesia changed the geographic targeting of a forestry program based on a USAID-commissioned evaluation that found that the program was spread out among too many geographic locations and could be more effective by focusing on fewer locations. This example can be found in the recently published independent [study on evaluation use at USAID](#).
- In 2011, a USAID-commissioned evaluation of a USAID/Afghanistan road rehabilitation program found that cooperative agreements and grants are not as effective implementing mechanisms as contracts in terms of the levels of implementing partner accountability to USAID, particularly in regards to infrastructure activities. In part as a result of this evaluation's findings, in 2013 USAID released a new operating policy, entitled "[USAID Implementation of Construction Activities](#)," that mandates the use of contracts rather than grant or cooperative agreement mechanisms for projects that involve construction.

USED:

- Since 2010, ED has worked with Congress to eliminate 50 programs, saving more than \$1.2 billion, including programs like [Even Start](#) (see pp. A-72 to A-73) (-\$66.5 million in FY11) and [Mentoring Grants](#) (see p. G-31) (-\$47.3 million in FY10), which the Department recommended eliminating out of concern based on evidence.
- ED also tries to shift program funds to support more effective practices by prioritizing the use of entry evidence. For ED's grant competitions where there is evaluative data about current or past grantees, or where new evidence has emerged independent of grantee activities, ED typically reviews such data to shape the grant competition design of future projects. For example, an [impact evaluation](#) of the [Teacher Incentive Fund](#) (TIF) will inform ED's FY16 competition design for TIF, including focusing applicants' attention on practices more likely to be effective.
- Additionally, ED uses evidence in competitive programs to encourage the field to shift away from less effective practices and toward more effective practices. For example, ESSA's Education Innovation and Research (EIR) program - the successor to i3 - supports the creation, development, implementation, replication, and scaling up of evidence-based, field-initiated innovations designed to improve student achievement and attainment for high-need students.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY16, did the agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?

(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)

USHUD:

- HUD's FY17 [budget request](#) includes a new formula for funding [Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Fees](#) that shifts funding away from inappropriately compensated public housing agencies and increases overall funding according to evidence about actual costs of maintaining a high-performing voucher program. (See [here](#) for more info.)
- The Administration's FY17 request recommends shifting support from homeless interventions shown to have limited effectiveness toward housing vouchers that were proven effective in the [Family Options study](#).

USDOL:

- DOL's evidence-based strategy is focused on program performance improvement and expansion of strategies and programs on which there is evidence of positive impact from rigorous evaluations. The department takes all action possible to improve performance before considering funding reductions or program termination. However, DOL does use program performance measures to make decisions about future funding. For example there is currently a proposal to close a Job Corps Center because of its chronic low performance. Closure of this center will allow DOL to shift limited program dollars to centers that will better serve students by providing the training and credentials they need to achieve positive employment and educational outcomes. In a [Federal Register notice](#) published in March 2016, DOL requested public comments on this proposal. Additionally, all discretionary grant performance is closely monitored and has been used to take corrective action and make decisions about continued funding.

About the Results for America Federal Invest in What Works Index

Results for America's Federal Invest in What Works Index (2016) highlights the extent to which the Administration for Children and Families (within HHS); Corporation for National and Community Service; Millennium Challenge Corporation; U.S. Agency for International Development; U.S. Department of Education; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and U.S. Department of Labor are currently building the infrastructure necessary to be able to use data, evidence and evaluation in budget, policy, and management decisions. It is important to note that:

- Results for America developed the criteria and scoring structure in the attached index in close consultation with more than 75 current and former Federal government officials and key stakeholders from all across the country.
- The purpose of the attached index is to educate members of the general public as well as public, private, and non-profit sector leaders on how federal departments and agencies are currently using data, evidence and evaluation to invest taxpayer dollars in what works.
- Results for America gave the federal departments and agencies included in the attached index multiple opportunities to review and comment on the content and presentation of the information included in it. We greatly appreciate their willingness to help us develop this document and their continued commitment to making the federal government as effective and efficient as possible. Since we recognize that it is very difficult to distill complex practices, policies, and programs into a single cross-agency scorecard, we exercised our best judgment and relied on the deep expertise of leaders both within and outside of the federal government during the development of the attached index.
- Results for America released four previous versions of this Invest in What Works Index in; [June 2013](#), [September 2013](#), [May 2014](#) and [March 2015](#).

Scoring

The attached index assesses seven federal departments and agencies against 10 data, evidence and evaluation criteria. Each criteria was equally weighted and scored on a scale of 0-10 resulting in a total possible score of 100 points. Federal departments and agencies were given 1-3 points if they have demonstrated an intent to meet the stated criteria; 4-5 points if they have demonstrated some initial internal progress toward meeting the criteria; 6-7 points if they have made some initial public progress toward meeting the criteria; 8-9 points if they have made some meaningful public progress toward meeting the criteria; and 10 points if they have fully and successfully met the criteria. These scores are based on the information and links provided by these seven departments and agencies.

About Results for America

Results for America is improving outcomes for young people, their families, and communities by shifting public resources toward evidence-based, results-driven solutions. RFA is working to achieve this goal by building a strong bipartisan "Invest in What Works" coalition; developing and advancing the next generation of evidence-based, results-driven practices, policies, and programs; and supporting leaders at all levels of government to invest in what works.

In November, 2014, Results for America published [Moneyball for Government](#), the national bestselling book that brings together a group of bipartisan leaders and makes the case for government at all levels to inform public policy and funding decisions by using the best possible data, evidence and evaluation about what works. In January, 2016, RFA published the second edition of Moneyball for Government featuring a new bipartisan chapter about the importance of using data and evidence to drive U.S. foreign assistance. For more information about Results for America, visit www.results4america.org.