2019 INVEST IN WHAT WORKS FEDERAL STANDARD OF EXCELLENCE

RESULTS FOR AMERICA

CRITERIA	ACF	ACL	USAID	CNCS	ED	HUD	DOL	MCC	SAMHSA[1]
TOTAL SCORE (100 points possible)	61	59	78	64	73	64	66	80	48
1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19? *(8 points possible)*	7	**8**	**8**	6	**8**	**8**	**8**	**8**	6
2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19? *(9 points possible)*	7	7	8	**9**	7	**9**	7	5	6
3. Resources:** Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? *(9 points possible)*	6	7	8	**9**	5	5	3	**9**	1
4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19? *(9 points possible)*	6	5	**9**	3	8	**9**	**9**	5	6
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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19? *(9 points possible)*	5	6	8	5	6	6	5	6	5
6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19? *(9 points possible)*	7	5	2	6	**9**	2	**9**	5	4
7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19? *(8 points possible)*	6	5	8	4	4	6	6	6	3
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 FY19? *(15 points possible)*	7	7	10	13	13	8	6	**15**	6
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 FY19? *(15 points possible)*	6	3	N/A[2]	6	7	3	7	N/A[2]	7
10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes? *(9 points possible)*	4	6	7	3	6	8	6	6	4

** Meeting this criteria requires both federal agency and congressional action.

[1] RFA gave SAMHSA several opportunities to review and edit the information in this document, but it declined to do so. Therefore, the SAMHSA portion of the 2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence includes information previously supplied by SAMHSA as well as additional information from the SAMHSA website.

[2] USAID and MCC only administered competitive grant programs in FY19. Therefore, for both agencies, Results for America doubled the score for criteria #8 and awarded 0 points for criteria #9.

2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence

About the Results for America 2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard

Results for America's *2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence* highlights how nine federal agencies, which oversee more than $220 billion in federal investments annually, are building the infrastructure necessary to use evidence and data in their budget, policy, and management decisions.

The *Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence* (Federal Standard of Excellence) is an annual snapshot of how federal agencies are building and using evidence and data to get better results for young people, their families, and communities. The 2019 Federal Standard of Excellence highlights the significant progress these nine federal agencies have made to operate effectively and efficiently, including their early efforts to implement the new requirements in the *Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act* (Evidence Act), which took effect in early 2019.

In 2019, Results for America, based on the advice of its Federal Standard of Excellence Advisory Committee and the participating federal agencies themselves, updated the scoring criteria for the Federal Standard of Excellence to provide a more complete picture of the evidence-based and results-driven progress being made within the federal government, including the new evidence and data requirements in the Evidence Act. Due to these changes, which raised the bar for federal agencies as they build on the promise of the Evidence Act, the overall and criteria-specific 2019 scores for each agency should not be compared to their scores from previous years.

Results for America would like to thank participating federal agencies for their work to improve lives by investing taxpayer dollars in what works: the Administration for Children and Families (within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, or HHS); Administration for Community Living (within HHS); U.S. Agency for International Development; Corporation for National and Community Service; U.S. Department of Education; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; U.S. Department of Labor; Millennium Challenge Corporation; and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (within HHS).

When reviewing the information and scores in the 2019 Federal Standard, it is important to note that:

- Results for America developed the standard's criteria and scoring structure in close consultation with more than 100 current and former federal government officials and key stakeholders from all across the country.

- The purpose of the standard is to educate members of the general public as well as public, private, and nonprofit sector leaders on how federal departments and agencies are currently using evidence, data, and evaluation to invest taxpayer dollars in what works.

- Results for America gave the federal departments and agencies included in the standard multiple opportunities to review and comment on the content and presentation of the information included in it. Results for America greatly appreciates their willingness to help develop this standard and their continued commitment to making the federal government as effective and efficient as possible. Since Results for America recognizes that it is very difficult to distill complex practices, policies, and programs into a single cross-agency scorecard, Results for America exercised its best judgment and relied on the deep expertise of leaders both within and outside of the federal government during the development of the standard.

Results for America released seven previous versions of the *Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence*, formerly entitled as the *Invest in What Works Index*, in June 2013, September 2013, May 2014, March 2015, April 2016, October 2017, and November 2018.

Learn more online at 2019.results4america.org.

2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

Score

8

Administration for Children and Families

1.1 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Evaluation Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 313)

The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning, Research, and Evaluation serves in a role equivalent to the Chief Evaluation Officer for the Administration for Children and Families (ACF). A Senior Executive Service career official, the Deputy Assistant Secretary oversees ACF's Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) and supports evaluation and other learning activities across the agency. ACF's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning, Research, and Evaluation oversees a research and evaluation budget of approximately $200 million in FY19. OPRE has 64 federal staff positions; OPRE staff are experts in research and evaluation methods and data analysis as well as ACF programs, policies, and the populations they serve.

1.2 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Chief Data Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 202(e))

In 2016, ACF established a new Division of Data and Improvement (DDI) providing federal leadership and resources to improve the quality, use, and sharing of ACF data. The Director of DDI reports to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning, Research, and Evaluation and oversees work to improve the quality, usefulness, interoperability, and availability of data and to address issues related to privacy and data security and data sharing. DDI has 9 federal staff positions and an FY19 budget of approximately $4.4M (not including salaries).

1.3 Did the agency have a governance structure to coordinate the activities of its evaluation officer, chief data officer, statistical officer, and other related officials in order to inform policy decisions and evaluate the agency's major programs?

With the 2016 reorganization that created the Division of Data and Improvement (DDI), ACF nested the following functions within the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation: strategic planning; performance measurement and management; research and evaluation; statistical policy and program analysis; synthesis and dissemination of research and evaluation findings; data quality,

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

usefulness, and sharing; and application of emerging technologies to improve the effectiveness of programs and service delivery. This reorganization was for the purpose of consolidating and giving the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning, Research, and Evaluation oversight for evaluation, data, statistical, and related functions.

Score

8

Administration for Community Living

1.1 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Evaluation Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 313)

The Director of the Office of Performance and Evaluation (OPE) serves as the Administration for Community Living (ACL) evaluation officer. OPE, which oversees the agency's performance and evaluation work, has seven full time staff positions and in FY19 had a budget of approximately $11.5 million. The Director of OPE has the education, skill, and experience to meet the Evaluation Officer requirements listed in the Evidence Act and routinely gauges the coverage, quality, methods, consistency, effectiveness, independence, and balance of the portfolio of evaluations, policy research, and ongoing evaluation activities of the agency and assesses agency capacity to support the development and use of evaluation. The Director is also the designated ACL Performance Officer.

1.2 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Chief Data Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 202(e))

As an operating division of a CFO Act Agency, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, ACL is not required to have its own Chief Data Officer. But the Director of OPE has demonstrated training and experience in data management, governance, collection, analysis, protection, use, and dissemination and fulfills the aspects of this role which are relevant to ACL. These include coordinating with ACL's CIO and Chief Privacy Officer on use, protection, dissemination, and generation of data to ensure that the data needs of the agency are met; ensuring that agency data conform with data management best practices; engaging agency employees, the public, and contractors in using public data assets; and encouraging collaborative approaches on improving data use.

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

1.3 Did the agency have a governance structure to coordinate the activities of its evaluation officer, chief data officer, statistical officer, and other related officials in order to inform policy decisions and evaluate the agency's major programs?

As an operating division of the US Department of Health and Human Services, ACL is not required to have its own Chief Data Officer or Statistical Official. But ACL does have a governance structure to coordinate the use of evidence for program operations and policy making. The Office of Performance and Evaluation staff work with staff across ACL to define and implement ACL's learning agenda and evaluation plan. This includes semi-annual meetings with ACL leadership and management staff and annual consultation with all program managers. In FY 2019 ACL funded a council to improve ACL's data governance, including the development of improved processes and standards for defining, collecting, reviewing, certifying, analyzing, and presenting data that ACL collects through its evaluations, grant reporting, and other administrative data collections. ACL is also a member of the Interagency Committee on Disability Research and the Interagency Forum on Aging Related Statistics. These councils promote coordination of federal data, set federal research priorities, work closely with policy makers, and inform comprehensive government wide strategic plans for aging, disability, independent living, and rehabilitation research.

Score

8

U.S. Agency for International Development

1.1 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Evaluation Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 313)

The Director of the Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research (LER) serves as the USAID evaluation officer. In compliance with the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act, the Administrator of USAID designated the LER Director as the Agency's Evaluation Officer through an internal Executive Message that was shared with the Agency on June 4, 2019.

USAID's Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research (LER) in the Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning (PPL) helps the Agency build a body of evidence from which to learn and adapt programs. The LER Director is a senior staff member with the authority, staff, and budget to ensure agency evaluation requirements are met, including that all projects are evaluated at some

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

level, and that decision-making is informed by evaluation and evidence. The LER Director oversaw approximately 25 staff and an estimated $4.6 million budget in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018.

USAID has proposed creating a Bureau for Policy, Resources, and Performance (PRP), which will align policy, resources and evidence-based programming, and elevate the evaluation function by creating an Office for Learning and Evaluation that will manage the Agency's Evaluation Policy. The office will also create and update the Agency Learning and Evaluation Plans, and commission or conduct cross-cutting evaluations. If approved by Congress, the estimated timeline for establishing the bureau is approximately a year and a half. In the meantime, working groups for each new office are developing work plans and focus areas for the new bureau to ensure PRP will be able to meet its mandate.

1.2 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Chief Data Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 202(e))

The Agency's Chief Data Officer (CDO) reports to the Chief Information Officer in the Bureau for Management. In compliance with the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act, the Administrator of USAID designated the Chief Data Officer through an internal Executive Message that was shared with the Agency on June 4, 2019. The CDO manages the USAID Data Services team which focuses exclusively on improving the usage of data and information to ensure the Agency's development outcomes are supported and enhanced by evidence. The CDO's team includes several direct hire data science and IT professionals along with a budget for contract professionals who provide a comprehensive portfolio of data services in support of the Agency's mission. The CDO oversaw approximately 55 staff and an estimated $12.5 million budget in 2019. The CDO is a senior career civil servant, and the USAID Data Services team is regularly called upon to generate products and services to support the Agency's highest priorities. USAID also invests in roles including the Chief Innovation Officer, Chief Geographer, Chief Economist, Chief Scientist, and other key roles that drive the use of evidence across the agency.

1.3 Did the agency have a governance structure to coordinate the activities of its evaluation officer, chief data officer, statistical officer, and other related officials in order to inform policy decisions and evaluate the agency's major programs?

The Agency uses several governance structures and processes currently, and will be updating these in accordance with OMB guidance related to the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act. Two notable current examples include:

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

A. InfoGov: Agency policy, ADS 579 - USAID Development Data, establishes an Information Governance Committee (InfoGov) under USAID's Management Operations Council (MOC). First issued in 2014, this policy is undergoing a comprehensive re-write and will constitute a Data Administration and Technical Advisory (DATA) Board, replacing InfoGov, to address the full data management lifecycle and will enhance the Agency's data governance structure to align with more recent legislation, including the Evidence Act and Open Government Data Act. The DATA Board supports the work of the Agency Evaluation Officer by directing data services to facilitate evaluations.

B. Management Operations Council: USAID also uses a Management Operations Council (MOC) as the platform for Agency leadership to assess progress toward achieving the strategic objectives in USAID's Strategic Plan and cross-agency priority goals and additional management issues. Established in 2014, the MOC provides Agency-wide leadership for initiatives and investments to reform USAID business systems and operations worldwide. The MOC also provides a platform for senior leaders to learn about and discuss improving organizational performance, efficiency, and effectiveness. The Agency's Performance Improvement Officer and Chief Operating Officer co-chair the MOC, and membership includes, among others, all the Agency's Chief Executive Officers (e.g., Senior Procurement Executive, Chief Human Capital Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Information Officer and Project Management Improvement Officer). Depending on the agenda, it also includes the Chief Data Officer, Agency Evaluation Officer, and (once in place) the Agency Senior Statistical Official.

Score

6

Corporation for National and Community Service

1.1 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Evaluation Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 313)

The Director of the Office of Research & Evaluation serves as the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) evaluation officer. The Director of Research and Evaluation (R&E) oversees R&E's FY19 $4 million budget and a staff of 5.

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

1.2 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Chief Data Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 202(e))

CNCS hired a new Chief Information Officer (CIO) in FY19. The CIO was appointed by the agency's CEO as the Acting Chief Data Officer (CDO). The CIO has a long-term plan for standing up a department overseen by a permanent Chief Data Officer. The plan will likely be formalized in FY20.

1.3 Did the agency have a governance structure to coordinate the activities of its evaluation officer, chief data officer, statistical officer, and other related officials in order to inform policy decisions and evaluate the agency's major programs?

CNCS established a Data Council in FY19. The purpose of this Council is to improve data governance and evidence-building activities within the agency. Members of the Council include the Director of R&E, the CIO/Acting CDO, the Chief of Staff, as well as representatives from the Chief of Program Operations and the Chief Operating Officer.

Score

8

U.S. Department of Education

1.1 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Evaluation Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 313)

The Commissioner for the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) serves as the Department of Education (ED) evaluation officer. ED's Institute of Education Sciences (IES), with a budget of $616.5 million in FY19, is primarily responsible for education research, evaluation, and statistics. The NCEE Commissioner is responsible for planning and overseeing ED's major evaluations and also supports the IES Director. IES employed approximately 160 full-time staff in FY19, including approximately 20 staff in NCEE.

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

1.2 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Chief Data Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 202(e))

ED has a designated Chief Data Officer, who serves as the Director of the Policy and Program Studies Service. The Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development (OPEPD) Policy and Program Studies Service (PPSS) has a staff of about 20 and serves as the Department's internal analytics office. Historically, PPSS has performed data analysis, and conducted short-term evaluations that support continuous improvement of program implementation, fostered a culture of data management and transparency, and worked closely with program offices and senior leadership to inform policy decisions with data and evidence.

1.3 Did the agency have a governance structure to coordinate the activities of its evaluation officer, chief data officer, statistical officer, and other related officials in order to inform policy decisions and evaluate the agency's major programs?

The Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development (OPEPD) reports to, and advises, the Secretary on matters relating to policy development and review; program performance measurement and evaluation; and the use of data and evidence to inform decision-making. The Director of IES reports to, and advises, the Secretary on matters related to research, evaluation, and statistics and coordinates education research and related activities carried out by IES with those carried out elsewhere in government.

Officials from OPEPD and IES participate in the Department's Policy Committee, which is led by the OPEPD Assistant Secretary. OPEPD officials serve a policy leadership function, managing the Secretary's policy priorities including evidence, while IES is focused on (a) bringing extant evidence to policy conversations and (b) suggesting how evidence can be built as part of policy initiatives. OPEPD plays leading roles in the formation of the Department's policy positions as expressed through annual budget requests, grant competition priorities, including evidence. Both OPEPD and IES provide technical assistance to Congress to ensure evidence appropriately informs policy design.

The Evidence Leadership Group (ELG) supports program staff that run evidence-based grant competitions and monitor evidence-based grant projects. It advises Department leadership and staff on how evidence can be used to improve Department programs and provides support to staff in the use of evidence.

Upon official designation, the Evidence Act's named officials began regular meetings to enable better coordination. ED's new

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

Data Governance Board, chaired and established by the Chief Data Officer in late FY19, similarly enables participation by both the Evaluation Official and Statistical Official.

Score

8

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

1.1 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Evaluation Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 313)

The General Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Office of Policy Development & Research (PD&R) serves as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) evaluation officer. HUD's Office of Policy Development & Research (PD&R) is led by an Assistant Secretary and the career General Deputy Assistant Secretary. PD&R comprises six offices, 139 staff including a team of field economists that work in HUD's 10 regional offices across the country, and a budget of $96 million in FY19. The Assistant Secretary and Evaluation Officer ensure that evidence informs policy development through frequent personal engagement with other principal staff, the Secretary, and external policy officials including consultation with Congress, speeches to policy audiences, sponsorship of public research briefings, and policy implications memoranda.

1.2 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Chief Data Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 202(e))

HUD's Chief Data Officer is a senior advisor in the Office of the Chief Financial Officer. Budget and staffing have not been determined. The PD&R GDAS and Statistical Official are responsible for numerous data infrastructure functions such as the collection and analysis of national housing market data (including survey collaborations with the Census Bureau); developing income limits and factors to support program operations; advising and assisting program offices with the development and analysis of administrative data collections; and developing open data products drawn from administrative systems, including geospatial data products.

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

1.3 Did the agency have a governance structure to coordinate the activities of its evaluation officer, chief data officer, statistical officer, and other related officials in order to inform policy decisions and evaluate the agency's major programs?

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 analytic support to the HUD Secretary and program offices. PD&R is supporting the decision-making and roles of the evaluation officer, chief data officer, and statistical official for the Department.

Score

8

U.S. Department of Labor

1.1 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Evaluation Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 313)

The Chief Evaluation Officer serves as the evaluation officer for the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The Chief Evaluation Officer oversees DOL's Chief Evaluation Office (CEO), housed within the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy (OASP), and the coordination of evaluations Department-wide, including office staff and leadership to interpret research and evaluation findings and to identify their implications for programmatic and policy decisions.

CEO is directly appropriated $8.04 million and then, may receive up to 0.75% from statutorily specified program accounts, based on the discretion of the Secretary. In FY18, that number was $1.9 million, bring the spending total to $9.94 million. The FY19 number is not known yet, because the Secretary has not determined the set-aside amount.

CEO includes nine full-time staff plus a small number of contractors and one to two detailees at any given time. This staff level is augmented by staff from research and evaluation units in other DOL agencies such as the Employment and Training

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

Administration (ETA), which has nine FTE's dedicated to research and evaluation activities with which CEO coordinates extensively on the development of a learning agenda, management of studies, and dissemination of results.

1.2 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Chief Data Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 202(e))

Building on existing efforts initiated before the OPEN Government Data Act, Secretary Acosta released a Secretary's Order (02-2019) directing the department to create a Chief Data Officer position and a data governance board to help realize the strategic value in data, as well as to establish, coordinate, and manage policy, processes, and standards for data management.

The Department has designated a Chief Data Officer. The Chief Data Officer chairs DOL's data governance body, and leads data governance efforts, open data efforts, and associated efforts to collect, manage, and utilize data in a manner that best supports its use to inform program administration and foster data-informed decision-making and policymaking.

DOL has arranged for temporary staffing to support governance and open data efforts as well as compliance with the Evidence Act, the Federal Data Strategy, and DOL's data governance goals. DOL is in the process of hiring permanent staff to support the office through customized position descriptions.

1.3 Did the agency have a governance structure to coordinate the activities of its evaluation officer, chief data officer, statistical officer, and other related officials in order to inform policy decisions and evaluate the agency's major programs?

DOL, through a Secretary's Order, has created a structure that coordinates and leverages the important roles within the organization to accomplish objectives like those in the Evidence Act. The Secretary's Order mandates collaboration between the Chief Data Officer, the Chief Performance Officer, Chief Evaluation Officer, Chief Information Officer, and Chief Statistical Officer.

The Secretary's Order mandates a collaborative approach to reviewing IT infrastructure and data asset accessibility, developing modern solutions for managing, disseminating and generating data, coordinating statistical functions, supporting evaluation, research and evidence generation, and supporting all aspects of performance management including assurances that data are fit for purpose.

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

DOL continues to leverage current governance structures, such as the Chief Evaluation Officer continuing to play a role in the formation of the annual budget requests of DOL's agencies, recommendations around including evidence in grant competitions,

and providing technical assistance to the Department leadership to ensure that evidence informs policy design. There are a number of mechanisms set up to facilitate this: The Chief Evaluation Officer traditionally participates in quarterly performance meetings with DOL leadership and the Performance Management Center (PMC). The Chief Evaluation Officer reviews agency operating plans and works with agencies and the PMC to coordinate performance targets and measures and evaluation findings; quarterly meetings are held with agency leadership and staff as part of the Learning Agenda process; and meetings are held as needed to strategize around addressing new priorities or legislative requirements.

Score

8

Millennium Challenge Corporation

1.1 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Evaluation Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 313)

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Managing Director serves as the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) Evaluation Officer. The Managing Director is a career civil service position with the authority to execute M&E's budget, an estimated $24.6 million in due diligence funds in FY19, with a staff of 28 people. In accordance with the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act, MCC designated an Evaluation Officer.

1.2 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Chief Data Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 202(e))

The Director of Product Management in the Office of the Chief Information Officer is MCC's Chief Data Officer. The Chief Data Officer manages a staff of 7 and an estimated FY19 budget of $900,000 in administrative funds. In accordance with the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act, MCC designated a Chief Data Officer.

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

1.3 Did the agency have a governance structure to coordinate the activities of its evaluation officer, chief data officer, statistical officer, and other related officials in order to inform policy decisions and evaluate the agency's major programs?

The MCC Evaluation Management Committee (EMC) oversees decision-making and quality control on the agency's evaluation and programmatic decision-making. The EMC is intended to integrate evaluation with program design and implementation to ensure that evaluations are designed and implemented in a manner that increases their utility, to both MCC and in-country stakeholders. The EMC includes the agency's evaluation officer, Chief Data Officer, representatives from M&E, the project lead, the economist, and gender and environmental safeguards staff.

Score

6

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration

1.1 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Evaluation Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 313)

The director of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's (SAMHSA) Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality (CBHSQ) Office of Evaluation serves as the agency's evaluation lead with key evaluation staff housed in this division. SAMHSA evaluations are funded from program funds that are used for service grants, technical assistance, and for evaluation activities. Evaluations have also been funded from recycled funds from grants or other contract activities.

1.2 Did the agency have a senior leader with the budget and staff to serve as the agency's Chief Data Officer (or equivalent)? (Example: Evidence Act 202(e))

CBHSQ, led by its Director, designs and carries out special data collection and analytic projects to examine issues for SAMHSA and other federal agencies and is the government's lead agency for behavioral health statistics, as designated by the Office of Management and Budget.

2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence

1. Leadership: Did the agency have senior staff members with the authority, staff, and budget to build and use evidence to inform the agency's major policy and program decisions in FY19?

1.3 Did the agency have a governance structure to coordinate the activities of its evaluation officer, chief data officer, statistical officer, and other related officials in order to inform policy decisions and evaluate the agency's major programs?

Evaluation authority, staff, and resources are decentralized and found throughout the agency. SAMHSA is composed of four Centers, the Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS), the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT), the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) and the Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality (CBHSQ). CMHS, CSAT, and CSAP oversee grantee portfolios and evaluations of those portfolios. Evaluation decisions within SAMHSA are made within each Center specific to their program priorities and resources. Each of the three program Centers uses their program funds for conducting evaluations of varying types. CBHSQ, SAMHSA's research arm, provides varying levels of oversight and guidance to the Centers for evaluation activities. CBHSQ also provides technical assistance related to data collection and analysis to assist in the development of evaluation tools and clearance packages

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

Score

7

Administration for Children and Families

2.1 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation policy? (Example: Evidence Act 313(d))

ACF's evaluation policy confirms ACF's commitment to conducting evaluations and using evidence from evaluations to inform policy and practice. ACF seeks to promote rigor, relevance, transparency, independence, and ethics in the conduct of evaluations. ACF established the policy in 2012 and published it in the Federal Register on August 29, 2014.

2.2 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation plan? (Example: Evidence Act 312(b))

OPRE annually identifies questions relevant to the programs and policies of ACF and proposes a research and evaluation spending plan to the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families. This plan focuses on activities that the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation plans to conduct during the following fiscal year.

2.3 Did the agency have a learning agenda (evidence-building plan) and did the learning agenda describe the agency's process for engaging stakeholders including, but not limited to the general public, state and local governments, and researchers/academics in the development of that agenda? (Example: Evidence Act 312)

ACF's annual portfolios describe key findings from past research and evaluation work and how ongoing projects are addressing gaps in the knowledge base to answer critical questions in the areas of family self-sufficiency, child and family development, and family strengthening. In addition to describing key questions, methods, and data sources for each research and evaluation project, the portfolios provide narratives describing how evaluation and evidence-building activities unfold in specific ACF programs and topical areas over time, and how current research and evaluation initiatives build on past efforts and respond to remaining gaps in knowledge.

OPRE engages stakeholders via gatherings such as the Research and Evaluation Conference on Self-Sufficiency, the National Research Conference on Early Childhood, and the Child Care and Early Education Policy Research Consortium Annual Meetings; and through both project-specific and topical technical working groups, including the agency's Family Self-Sufficiency Research Technical Working Group.

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

2.4 Did the agency publicly release all completed program evaluations?

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 2018, OPRE released nearly 130 research publications. OPRE publications are publicly available on the OPRE website.

2.5 What is the coverage, quality, methods, effectiveness, and independence of the agency's evaluation, research, and analysis efforts? (Example: Evidence Act 315, subchapter II (c)(3)(9))

Coverage: ACF conducts research in areas where Congress has given authorization and appropriations. Programs for which ACF is able to conduct research and evaluation using dedicated funding include Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Health Profession Opportunity Grants, Head Start, Child Care, Child Welfare, Home Visiting, Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood, Personal Responsibility Education Program, Sexual Risk Avoidance Education, Teen Pregnancy Prevention, Runaway and Homeless Youth, Family Violence Prevention Services, and Human Trafficking services. These programs represent approximately 85% of overall ACF spending.

Quality: ACF's Evaluation Policy states that ACF is committed to using the most rigorous methods that are appropriate to the evaluation questions and feasible within budget and other constraints, and that rigor is necessary not only for impact evaluations, but also for implementation or process evaluations, descriptive studies, outcome evaluations, and formative evaluations; and in both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Methods: ACF uses a range of evaluation methods. ACF conducts impact evaluations as well as implementation and process evaluations, cost analyses and cost benefit analyses, descriptive and exploratory studies, research syntheses, and more. ACF is committed to learning about and using the most scientifically advanced approaches to determining effectiveness and efficiency of

ACF programs; to this end, OPRE annually organizes meetings of scientists and research experts to discuss critical topics in social science research methodology and how innovative methodologies can be applied to policy-relevant questions.

Effectiveness: ACF's Evaluation Policy states that ACF will conduct relevant research and disseminate findings in ways that are accessible and useful to policymakers and practitioners. OPRE engages in ongoing collaboration with ACF program office staff

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

and leadership to interpret research and evaluation findings and to identify their implications for programmatic and policy decisions such as ACF regulations and funding opportunity announcements. For example, when ACF's Office of Head Start significantly revised its Program Performance Standards—the regulations that define the standards and minimum requirements for Head Start services—the revisions drew from decades of OPRE research and the recommendations of the OPRE-led Secretary's Advisory Committee on Head Start Research and Evaluation. Similarly, ACF's Office of Child Care drew from research and evaluation findings related to eligibility redetermination, continuity of subsidy use, use of funds dedicated to improving the quality of programs, and other information to inform the regulations accompanying the reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

Independence: ACF's Evaluation Policy states that independence and objectivity are core principles of evaluation and that it is important to insulate evaluation functions from undue influence and from both the appearance and the reality of bias. To promote objectivity, ACF protects independence in the design, conduct, and analysis of evaluations. To this end, ACF conducts evaluations through the competitive award of grants and contracts to external experts who are free from conflicts of interest; and, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning, Research, and Evaluation, a career civil servant, has authority to approve the design of evaluation projects and analysis plans; and has authority to approve, release, and disseminate evaluation reports.

2.6 Did the agency use rigorous evaluation methods, including random assignment studies, for research and evaluation purposes?

ACF's Evaluation Policy states that in assessing the effects of programs or services, ACF evaluations will use methods that isolate to the greatest extent possible the impacts of the programs or services from other influences and that for causal questions, experimental approaches are preferred. As of March 2019, over 25 ongoing OPRE projects included one or more random assignment impact evaluations. To date in FY19, OPRE has released RCT impact findings related to Teen Pregnancy Prevention, TANF Job Search Assistance strategies, Home Visiting, Transitional Jobs, and Career Pathways.

Score

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

7

Administration for Community Living

2.1 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation policy? (Example: Evidence Act 313(d))

ACL's evaluation policy confirms ACL's commitment to conducting evaluations and using evidence from evaluations to inform policy and practice. ACL seeks to promote rigor, relevance, transparency, independence, and ethics in the conduct of evaluations. The policy addresses each of these principles.

2.2 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation plan? (Example: Evidence Act 312(b))

ACL is drafting an agency-wide evaluation plan that will be published on the ACL website once finalized. ACL's evaluation plan is based on the results of developing an ACL-wide Learning Agenda. From the list of priority questions generated, the ones determined to be best addressed through evaluation were compiled into an agency-wide evaluation plan that briefly describes how evaluation research will be used to answer the relevant priority questions and also places the planned evaluations into the larger agency context.

2.3 Did the agency have a learning agenda (evidence-building plan) and did the learning agenda describe the agency's process for engaging stakeholders including, but not limited to the general public, state and local governments, and researchers/academics in the development of that agenda? (Example: Evidence Act 312)

ACL has adopted a learning agenda approach, which involves annual reviews with each ACL center to support the generation and use of evaluation findings to inform agency strategies and decision making. The approach was implemented between September 2018 and December 2019. The result will be a written learning agenda that will guide ACL's evaluation and performance management work based on broad input from ACL leadership and staff as well as external stakeholders.

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

2.4 Did the agency publicly release all completed program evaluations?

ACL releases all evaluation reports as well as interim information such as materials from presentations.

2.5 What is the coverage, quality, methods, effectiveness, and independence of the agency's evaluation, research, and analysis efforts? (Example: Evidence Act 315, subchapter II (c)(3)(9))

ACL selects evaluation contractors through a competitive acquisition process. Staff of the Office for Performance and Evaluation (OPE) oversee the evaluations and act as liaisons between program staff and evaluation contractors. While program staff are encouraged to write forwards for evaluation reports, they do not influence the findings. ACL's evaluation policy states that ACL will conduct evaluations through the competitive award of grants and contracts to external experts who are free from conflicts of interest. Further, the Director of the Office of Planning and Evaluation has authority to approve the design of evaluation projects and analysis plans as well as to approve, release and disseminate evaluation reports. While all ACL programs are required to report on program results, over the past 10 years ACL has evaluated or is in the process of evaluating at least one program in 55% percent of its major budget lines. The programs least likely to be evaluated are resource centers and projects like State Councils on Developmental Disabilities (Councils) that are self-governing organizations charged with identifying the most pressing needs of people with developmental disabilities in their state or territory. Evaluation data have been used to improve programs through updating funding requirements and refocusing technical assistance.

2.6 Did the agency use rigorous evaluation methods, including random assignment studies, for research and evaluation purposes?

ACL typically funds evaluation design contracts, such as those for the Older Americans Act Title VI Tribal Grants Program evaluation and the Long Term Care Ombudsman Evaluation, that are used to determine the most rigorous evaluation approach that is feasible given the structure of a particular program. While the Tribal Grants Program and the Ombudsman program are full coverage programs, where comparison groups are not possible, ACL most frequently uses propensity score matching to identify comparison group members. This was the case for the Older Americans Act Nutrition Services Program and National Family Caregivers Support Program evaluations and the Wellness Prospective Evaluation Final Report conducted by CMS in partnership with ACL and published in January 2019.

ACL is currently working with the Corporation for National and Community Service to design an evaluation of CNCS grantees

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

serving older adults that are using evidence-based programs highlighted by ACL. The purpose of this joint work is to build the evidence base in the field and to improve the use of evidence-based programming by ACL and CNCS grantees.

ACL's NIDILRR funds the largest percentage of ACL's RCTs. Of their 121 research projects being conducted by grantees, 19% (23/121) are employing a randomized clinical trial (RCT) or "true experimental" design. To ensure research quality, NIDILRR adheres to strict peer reviewer evaluation criteria that are used in the grant award process (see part (c) for details on rigor of research projects and part (d) for details on the design of research projects). In addition, ACL's evaluation policy states that "In assessing the effects of programs or services, ACL evaluations will use methods that isolate to the greatest extent possible the impacts of the programs or services from other influences such as trends over time, geographic variation, or pre-existing differences between participants and non-participants. For such causal questions, experimental approaches are preferred. When experimental approaches are not feasible, high-quality quasi-experiments offer an alternative."

Score
8

U.S. Agency for International Development

2.1 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation policy? (Example: Evidence Act 313(d))

The agency-wide USAID Evaluation Policy, published in January 2011 and updated in October 2016, incorporates changes that better integrate with USAID's Program Cycle Policy and ensure compliance with the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act (FATAA). The 2016 changes to the evaluation policy updated evaluation requirements to simplify implementation and increase the breadth of evaluation coverage, dissemination, and utilization.

2.2 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation plan? (Example: Evidence Act 312(b))

USAID has an agency-wide evaluation registry that collects information on all evaluations planned to commence within the next three years (as well as tracking ongoing and completed evaluations). Currently, this information is used internally and is not published. To meet the Evidence Act requirement, USAID will publish an agency-wide evaluation plan in the Agency's Annual Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report in future years.

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

In addition, USAID's Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research works with bureaus to develop internal annual Bureau Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plans that review evaluation quality and evidence building and use within each bureau, and identify challenges and priorities for the year ahead.

2.3 Did the agency have a learning agenda (evidence-building plan) and did the learning agenda describe the agency's process for engaging stakeholders including, but not limited to the general public, state and local governments, and researchers/academics in the development of that agenda? (Example: Evidence Act 312)

USAID has an agency-wide learning agenda called the Self-Reliance Learning Agenda (SRLA). The SRLA prioritizes evidence needs related to the Agency's mission to foster country self-reliance which covers all development program/sector areas, humanitarian assistance and resilience, and agency operations. This vision and mission is articulated in USAID's Policy Framework and reorients the Agency's programs, operations, and workforce around the vision of self-reliance or ending the need for foreign assistance.

USAID used a strongly consultative process for developing SRLA, as described in the SRLA Fact Sheet. First, the Agency compiled learning questions from a number of feedback processes to initially capture 260 questions which through consultations were reduced to the final to thirteen that represent the Agency's priority learning needs related to Self-Reliance.

Now that the questions are published, USAID will partner with internal and external stakeholders to generate and gather evidence and facilitate the utilization of learning. These stakeholders include USAID's implementing partners, other U.S. agencies, private coalitions and think tanks, researchers and academics, bilateral/multilateral organizations, and local actors and government in the countries in which it works.

2.4 Did the agency publicly release all completed program evaluations?

All final USAID evaluation reports are published on the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC), except for a small number of evaluations that receive a waiver to public disclosure (typically less than 5 percent of the total completed in a fiscal year). The process to seek a waiver to public disclosure is outlined in the document Limitations to Disclosure and Exemptions to Public Dissemination of USAID Evaluation Reports and includes exceptions for circumstances such as those when "public disclosure is likely to jeopardize the personal safety of U.S. personnel or recipients of U.S. resources."

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

To increase awareness of available evaluation reports, USAID has created infographics showing the number and type of evaluations completed in FY2015, FY2016, and FY2017. These include short narratives that describe findings from selected evaluations and how that information informed decision-making. The information for FY2018 is being finalized.

2.5 What is the coverage, quality, methods, effectiveness, and independence of the agency's evaluation, research, and analysis efforts? (Example: Evidence Act 315, subchapter II (c)(3)(9))

USAID recognizes that sound development programming relies on strong evidence that enables policymakers and program planners to make decisions, improve practice, and achieve development outcomes.

USAID staff review evaluation quality on an ongoing basis and the Agency is in the process of commissioning an external study to assess the current coverage, quality, methods, effectiveness and independence of the Agency's evaluation, research and analysis efforts. In the meantime, there are several studies that have looked at parts of this question over the previous several years. These include GAO reports, such as Agencies Can Improve the Quality and Dissemination of Program Evaluations; From Evidence to Learning: Recommendations to Improve Foreign Assistance Evaluations; reviews by independent organizations like the Center for Global Development's Evaluating Evaluations: Assessing the Quality of Aid Agency Evaluations in Global Health - Working Paper 461; and studies commissioned by USAID such as the Meta-Evaluation of Quality and Coverage of USAID Evaluations 2009 - 2012. These studies generally show that USAID's evaluation quality is improving over time with room for continued improvement.

2.6 Did the agency use rigorous evaluation methods, including random assignment studies, for research and evaluation purposes?

USAID uses rigorous evaluation methods, including random control trials (i.e. assignment studies) and quasi-experimental methods for research and evaluation purposes. For example, in FY2018, USAID completed 21 impact evaluations, 12 of which used random control trials.
The Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) program makes significant investments using randomized controlled trials to provide evidence of impact for pilot approaches to be considered for scaled funding. USAID is also experimenting with cash benchmarking—using household grants to benchmark traditional programming. USAID conducted five randomized control trials (RCT) of household grants or "cash lump sum" programs, and three RCTs of more traditional programs with household grant elements.

2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

Score

6

Corporation for National and Community Service

2.1 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation policy? (Example: Evidence Act 313(d))

CNCS has an evaluation policy that presents five key principles that govern the agency's planning, conduct, and use of program evaluations: rigor, relevance, transparency, independence, and ethics.

2.2 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation plan? (Example: Evidence Act 312(b))

In FY19, CNCS finalized and posted a five year, agency-wide strategic evaluation plan. The CNCS CEO's goal is to use the plan to guide FY20 budget planning.

2.3 Did the agency have a learning agenda (evidence-building plan) and did the learning agenda describe the agency's process for engaging stakeholders including, but not limited to the general public, state and local governments, and researchers/academics in the development of that agenda? (Example: Evidence Act 312)

CNCS uses the terms learning agenda, evaluation plan, and evidence-building plan synonymously. CNCS has a strategic evidence plan that includes an evergreen learning agenda. The plan will be reviewed and updated annually. While the agency is open to the feedback of external stakeholders, it has not engaged external stakeholders in the development of the evidence plan.

2.4 Did the agency publicly release all completed program evaluations?

All completed evaluation reports are posted to the Evidence Exchange, an electronic repository for evaluation studies and other reports. This virtual repository was launched in September 2015.

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

2.5 What is the coverage, quality, methods, effectiveness, and independence of the agency's evaluation, research, and analysis efforts? (Example: Evidence Act 315, subchapter II (c)(3)(9))

A comprehensive portfolio of research projects has been built to assess the extent to which CNCS is achieving its mission. As findings emerge, future studies are designed to continuously build the agency's evidence base. R&E relies on scholarship in relevant fields of academic study; a variety of research and program evaluation approaches including field, experimental, and survey research; multiple data sources including internal and external administrative data; and different statistical analytic methods. CNCS relies on partnerships with universities and third party research firms to ensure independence and access to state of the art methodologies. CNCS supports its grantees with evaluation technical assistance and courses to ensure their evaluations are of the highest quality and requires grantees receiving $500,000 or more in annual funding to engage an external evaluator. These efforts have resulted in a robust body of evidence that national service allows: (1) national service participants to experience positive benefits, (2) nonprofit organizations to be strengthened, and (3) national service programs to effectively address local issues.

2.6 Did the agency use rigorous evaluation methods, including random assignment studies, for research and evaluation purposes?

CNCS uses the research design most appropriate for addressing the research question. When experimental or quasi-experimental designs are warranted, the agency uses them and encourages its grantees to use them, as noted in the agency evaluation policy: "CNCS is committed to using the most rigorous methods that are appropriate to the evaluation questions and feasible within statutory, budget and other constraints." As of May 2019, CNCS has received 41 grantee evaluation reports that use experimental design and 66 that use quasi-experimental design.

2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

Score
7

U.S. Department of Education

2.1 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation policy? (Example: Evidence Act 313(d))

ED has a scientific integrity policy to ensure that all scientific activities (including research, development, testing, and evaluation) conducted and supported by ED are of the highest quality and integrity, can be trusted by the public, and contribute to sound decision-making. In January 2017, IES published "Evaluation Principles and Practices," which describes the foundational principles that guide its evaluation studies and the key ways in which the principles are put into practice. That document is expected to serve as the foundation of ED's formal evaluation policy, under development by the Evaluation Officer for consideration by the Evidence Leadership Group and, subsequently, senior ED leadership.

2.2 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation plan? (Example: Evidence Act 312(b))

Since the passage of ESSA, IES has worked with partners across ED, including the Evidence Leadership Group, to prepare and submit to Congress a biennial, forward-looking evaluation plan covering all mandated and discretionary evaluations of education programs funded under ESSA (known as ED's "8601 plan"). The plan is biennial, with the current plan covering FY18 and FY19. The process by which that plan is developed serves as the foundation for ED's work on both its forthcoming Learning Agenda and Annual Evaluation Plan.

2.3 Did the agency have a learning agenda (evidence-building plan) and did the learning agenda describe the agency's process for engaging stakeholders including, but not limited to the general public, state and local governments, and researchers/academics in the development of that agenda? (Example: Evidence Act 312)

To develop its draft Learning Agenda, ED has expanded the question generation and prioritization process from ESSA-funded programs, operated by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), to all programs operated by all of its programmatic principal offices. To help ensure alignment of the draft learning agenda to ED's strategic plan, the Evidence Leadership Group has been expanded to include a member from ED's Performance Improvement Office, and work has begun to

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

ensure that evidence needs from Strategic Plan Goal Teams is actively solicited. ED anticipates seeking external stakeholder feedback on the draft Learning Agenda in the middle of 2020.

2.4 Did the agency publicly release all completed program evaluations?

ED's FY 2018 Annual Performance Report and FY 2020 Annual Performance Plan includes a list of ED's current evaluations in Appendix D, organized by topic. IES also maintains profiles of all its evaluations on its website, which include key findings, publications, and products. IES publicly releases all peer-reviewed publications from its evaluations on the IES website and also in the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). IES regularly conducts briefings on its evaluations for ED, the Office of Management and Budget, Congressional staff, and the public.

2.5 What is the coverage, quality, methods, effectiveness, and independence of the agency's evaluation, research, and analysis efforts? (Example: Evidence Act 315, subchapter II (c)(3)(9))

To develop its draft Annual Evaluation Plan, ED will expand its current 8601 plan format to include the broader set of evidence activities implied by the Learning Agenda. This includes evaluation studies, as is typical for the 8601 plan, but also information about planned evidence building activities beyond evaluations, such as significant administrative data collections, improvements to ED's performance monitoring activities, use of evidence in grant competitions, relevant policy studies, and advanced statistical and analytic activities (e.g., predictive modeling of student, borrower, and institutional behavior at Federal Student Aid).

2.6 Did the agency use rigorous evaluation methods, including random assignment studies, for research and evaluation purposes?

The IES website includes a searchable database of evaluations, including those that use experimental, quasi-experimental, or regression discontinuity designs in order to determine impact. As of August 2019, IES has published 41 experimental studies, 1 quasi-experimental study, and 5 regression discontinuity studies. The What Works Clearinghouse lists studies by design. Currently, the WWC's database includes 10,646 studies, including 1,115 that meet WWC standards for internal validity. Among them are randomized controlled trials (currently 747), quasi-experimental (currently 217), regression discontinuity (currently 4), and single case (currently 49).

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

Score

9

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

2.1 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation policy? (Example: Evidence Act 313(d))

PD&R has published a Program Evaluation Policy that establishes core principles and practices of PD&R's evaluation and research activities. The six core principles are rigor, relevance, transparency, independence, ethics, and technical innovation.

2.2 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation plan? (Example: Evidence Act 312(b))

A key feature of HUD's Research Roadmap is a lengthy list of potential research and evaluation projects that feed into proposed evaluation plans that PD&R submits to Congress as part of its budget request. Actual research activities are substantially determined by Congressional funding and guidance.

2.3 Did the agency have a learning agenda (evidence-building plan) and did the learning agenda describe the agency's process for engaging stakeholders including, but not limited to the general public, state and local governments, and researchers/academics in the development of that agenda? (Example: Evidence Act 312)

HUD's Research Roadmap serves as the Department's evidence-building plan and learning agenda. A new Roadmap is under development in FY19. HUD's participatory process (see for example pp. 14–16 of Roadmap Update 2017) engages internal and external stakeholders to identify research questions and other evidence-building activities to support effective policy-making. Stakeholders include program partners in state and local governments and the private sector; researchers, academics; policy officials; and the general public frequently accessing HUDuser.gov web portal. Outreach mechanisms include email, web forums, conferences and webcasts, and targeted meetings.

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

2.4 Did the agency publicly release all completed program evaluations?

PD&R's Program Evaluation Policy requires the publishing and dissemination in a timely fashion all evaluations that meet standards of methodological rigor. Completed evaluations and research reports are posted on PD&R's website, HUDUSER.gov. Additionally, the policy includes language in research and evaluation contracts that allows researchers to independently publish results, even without HUD approval, after not more than 6 months.

2.5 What is the coverage, quality, methods, effectiveness, and independence of the agency's evaluation, research, and analysis efforts? (Example: Evidence Act 315, subchapter II (c)(3)(9))

PD&R is HUD's independent evaluation office, with scope spanning all the Department's program operations. PD&R's Program Evaluation Policy defines six core principles for evaluation and research activities: rigor, relevance, transparency, independence, ethics, and technical innovation.

2.6 Did the agency use rigorous evaluation methods, including random assignment studies, for research and evaluation purposes?

For decades, PD&R has been a federal leader in the use of random assignment and other rigorous methods for research and evaluation purposes. Examples of random-assignment program demonstrations found on HUDUSER.gov include landmark research in the Housing Allowance experiment, the Moving to Opportunity Demonstration, and the Family Options Demonstration. Ongoing random-assignment experiments include the Moving to Work Demonstration, Family Self-Sufficiency Demonstration, the First-Time Homebuyer Education and Counseling demonstration, the Rent Reform Demonstration, and the Integrated Wellness in Supportive Housing Demonstration (See the PD&R Biennial Report FY 2017–2018).

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

Score

7

U.S. Department of Labor

2.1 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation policy? (Example: Evidence Act 313(d))

DOL has an Evaluation Policy that formalizes the principles that govern all program evaluations in the Department, including methodological rigor, independence, transparency, ethics, and relevance. The policy represents a commitment to using evidence from evaluations to inform policy and practice.

2.2 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation plan? (Example: Evidence Act 312(b))

The Chief Evaluation Office (CEO) develops, implements, and publicly releases an annual DOL evaluation plan. The evaluation plan is based on the agency learning agendas as well as the Department's Strategic Plan priorities, statutory requirements for evaluations, and Secretarial and Administration priorities. The evaluation plan includes the studies CEO intends to undertake in the next year using set-aside dollars. Appropriations language requires the Chief Evaluation Officer to submit a plan to the U.S. Senate and House Committees on Appropriations outlining the evaluations that will be carried out by the Office using dollars transferred to CEO– the DOL evaluation plan serves that purpose. The evaluation plan outlines evaluations that CEO will use its budget to undertake. CEO also works with agencies to undertake evaluations and evidence building strategies to answer other questions of interest identified in learning agencies, but not undertaken directly by CEO.

2.3 Did the agency have a learning agenda (evidence-building plan) and did the learning agenda describe the agency's process for engaging stakeholders including, but not limited to the general public, state and local governments, and researchers/academics in the development of that agenda? (Example: Evidence Act 312)

In FY19, the Department's evaluation plan and learning agenda are a combined document. DOL will leverage its existing practices and infrastructure to develop the broad, four-year prospective research agenda, per the Evidence Act requirement. This new document will also reflect stakeholder engagement beyond the agency.

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

2.4 Did the agency publicly release all completed program evaluations?

All DOL program evaluation reports and findings funded by CEO are publicly released and posted on the complete reports section of the CEO website. DOL agencies, such as the Employment & Training Administration (ETA), also post and release their own research and evaluation reports.

2.5 What is the coverage, quality, methods, effectiveness, and independence of the agency's evaluation, research, and analysis efforts? (Example: Evidence Act 315, subchapter II (c)(3)(9))

DOL's Evaluation Policy touches on the agency's commitment to high-quality, methodologically rigorous research through funding independent research activities. Further, CEO staff have expertise in research and evaluation methods as well as in DOL programs and policies and the populations they serve. CEO also employs technical working groups on the majority of evaluation projects whose members have deep technical and subject matter expertise.

2.6 Did the agency use rigorous evaluation methods, including random assignment studies, for research and evaluation purposes?

DOL employs a full range of evaluation methods to answer key research questions of interest, including when appropriate, impact evaluations. Among DOL's active portfolio of approximately 50 projects, the study type ranges from rigorous evidence syntheses to implementation studies to quasi-experimental outcome studies to impact studies. Examples of current DOL studies with a random assignment component include an evaluation of a Job Corps' demonstration pilot, the Cascades Job Corps College and Career Academy. An example of a multi-arm randomized control trial is the Reemployment Eligibility Assessments evaluation, which assesses a range of strategies to reduce Unemployment Insurance duration and wage outcomes.

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

Score

5

Millennium Challenge Corporation

2.1 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation policy? (Example: Evidence Act 313(d))

MCC's Independent Evaluation Portfolio is governed by its publicly available Policy for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). This Policy requires all programs to develop and follow comprehensive M&E plans that adhere to MCC's standards. The Policy was revised in March 2017 to ensure alignment with the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016. Pursuant to MCC's M&E policy, every project must undergo an independent evaluation.

2.2 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation plan? (Example: Evidence Act 312(b))

Every MCC investment must adhere to MCC's rigorous Policy for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) that requires every MCC investment to contain a comprehensive M&E Plan, which includes two main components. The monitoring component lays out the methodology and process for assessing progress towards the investment's objectives. 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. Each country's M&E Plan represents the evaluation plan and learning agenda for that country's set of investments.

2.3 Did the agency have a learning agenda (evidence-building plan) and did the learning agenda describe the agency's process for engaging stakeholders including, but not limited to the general public, state and local governments, and researchers/academics in the development of that agenda? (Example: Evidence Act 312)

For FY19, in an effort to advance MCC's evidence base and respond to the Evidence Act, MCC is pursuing learning agendas at the country, sector, and agency level. At the country level, each country's Monitoring and Evaluation Plan contains the context-specific learning that MCC hopes to advance during the life cycle of its investments. At the sector level, communities of practice around key MCC sectors have been formed to create, capture, and advance sector-level learning. In FY19, communities of practice around education, water, and sanitation will produce learning reports based on their findings to key research questions for the sector. Finally, at the agency level, MCC is embarking on an agency-wide learning agenda to better understand how MCC develops, implements, monitors, and evaluates the policy and institutional reforms (PIRs) it undertakes alongside capital

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

investments. The PIR learning agenda is focused on better evidence for methodological guidance to economists and sector practices to support the expanded use of cost-benefit analysis in more cases of PIR that MCC supports. The purpose is to make investments in PIR more effective by meeting the same investment criteria as other interventions MCC considers for investment; to make assumptions and risks more explicit for all its investments that depend on improved policies or institutional performance; and to help inform the design of PIR programs to ensure that they have a high economic rate of return. In developing each of these learning agendas, MCC consults with internal staff, technical experts, partner country governments, beneficiaries, and MCC stakeholders.

2.4 Did the agency publicly release all completed program evaluations?

MCC publishes each independent evaluation of every project, underscoring the agency's commitment to transparency, accountability, learning, and evidence-based decision-making. All independent evaluations and reports are publicly reported on the MCC Evaluation Catalog. As of August 2019, MCC has contracted or is planning 195 independent evaluations. To date, 109 Interim and Final Reports have been finalized and released to the public.

In FY19, MCC also began to publish Evaluation Briefs that distill key findings and lessons learned from MCC's independent evaluations. MCC will produce Evaluation Briefs for each evaluation moving forward, and is in the process of writing Evaluation Briefs for the backlog of all completed evaluations.

2.5 What is the coverage, quality, methods, effectiveness, and independence of the agency's evaluation, research, and analysis efforts? (Example: Evidence Act 315, subchapter II (c)(3)(9))

Once a compact or threshold program is in Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) resources are used to procure evaluation services from external independent evaluators to directly measure high-level outcomes to assess the attributable impact of all of MCC's programs. MCC sees its independent evaluation portfolio as an integral tool to remain accountable to stakeholders and the general public, demonstrate programmatic results, and promote internal and external learning. Through the evidence generated by monitoring and evaluation, the M&E Managing Director, Chief Economist, and Vice President for the Department of Policy and Evaluation are able to continuously update estimates of expected impacts with actual impacts to inform future programmatic and policy decisions. In FY19, MCC began or continued comprehensive, independent evaluations for every compact or threshold project at MCC, a requirement stipulated in Section 7.5.1 of MCC's Policy for M&E. All evaluation designs, data, reports, and summaries are available on MCC's Evaluation Catalog.

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

2.6 Did the agency use rigorous evaluation methods, including random assignment studies, for research and evaluation purposes?

MCC employs rigorous, independent evaluation methodologies to measure the impact of its programming, evaluate the efficacy of program implementation, and determine lessons learned to inform future investments. As of August 2019, 37% of MCC's evaluation portfolio consists of impact evaluations, and 63% consists of performance evaluations. All MCC impact evaluations use random assignment to determine which groups or individuals will receive an MCC intervention, which allows for a counterfactual and thus for attribution to MCC's project, and best enables MCC to measure its impact in a fair and transparent way. Each evaluation is conducted according to the program's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan, in accordance with MCC's Policy for M&E.

Score

6

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration

2.1 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation policy? (Example: Evidence Act 313(d))

SAMHSA's Evaluation Policy and Procedure (P&P) provides guidance across the agency regarding all program evaluations. Specifically, the Evaluation P&P describes the demand for rigor, compliance with ethical standards, and compliance with privacy requirements for all program evaluations conducted and funded by the agency.

2.2 Did the agency have an agency-wide evaluation plan? (Example: Evidence Act 312(b))

The Evaluation P&P serves as the agency's formal evaluation plan. The Evaluation P&P sets the framework for planning, monitoring, and disseminating findings from significant evaluations. The Evaluation P&P requires Centers to identify research questions and appropriately match the type of evaluation to the maturity of the program.

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

2.3 Did the agency have a learning agenda (evidence-building plan) and did the learning agenda describe the agency's process for engaging stakeholders including, but not limited to the general public, state and local governments, and researchers/academics in the development of that agenda? (Example: Evidence Act 312)

According to the Evaluation P&P (p. 1): "SAMHSA is actively working to develop a learning agenda to align its evaluation goals and activities with those of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)." As of September 2019, no public learning agenda is available on SAMHSA's website. However, SAMHSA has posted a National Research Agenda on Homelessness.

2.4 Did the agency publicly release all completed program evaluations?

Results from significant evaluations are made available on SAMHSA's evaluation website, a new step SAMHSA took with its newly-approved Evaluation P&P in the fall of 2017. As of September 2019, the evaluation website had one evaluation summary: a process evaluation of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SS/HS) State Program. No other evaluation reports or summaries are posted, including of any ongoing evaluation studies. However, a word search of SAMHSA's publications for the term "evaluation" yielded 38 results, of which 10 are evaluation reports.

The following criteria is used to determine whether an evaluation is significant: (1) whether the evaluation was mandated by Congress; (2) whether there are high priority needs in states and communities; (3) whether the evaluation is for a new or congressionally-mandated program; (4) the extent to which the program is linked to key agency initiatives; (5) the level of funding; (6) the level of interest from internal and external stakeholders; and (7) the potential to inform practice, policy, and/or budgetary decision-making.

2.5 What is the coverage, quality, methods, effectiveness, and independence of the agency's evaluation, research, and analysis efforts? (Example: Evidence Act 315, subchapter II (c)(3)(9))

In 2017, SAMHSA formed a new workgroup, the Cross-Center Evaluation Review Board (CCERB). According to the Evaluation P&P (p. 2), the CCERB reviews and provides oversight of significant evaluation activities for SAMHSA, from contract planning to

evaluation completion and at critical milestones, and is comprised of representatives from each of the centers, and Office of Tribal Affairs and Policy (OTAP) for cultural competency consultation, as necessary. CCERB staff provide support for program-specific and administration-wide evaluations.

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and learning agenda (evidence-building plan), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed program evaluations in FY19?

2.6 Did the agency use rigorous evaluation methods, including random assignment studies, for research and evaluation purposes?

SAMHSA does not list any completed evaluation reports on its evaluation website. Of the 10 evaluation reports found on the publications page, none appear to use experimental methods. According to the Evaluation P&P (p. 5): "evaluations should be rigorously designed to the fullest extent possible and include '...inferences about cause and effect [that are] well founded (internal validity), [...] clarity about the populations, settings, or circumstances to which results can be generalized (external validity); and requires the use of measures that accurately capture the intended information (measurement reliability and validity).'

2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

Score

6

Administration for Children and Families

3.1 ____ (Name of agency) invested $____ on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing __% of the agency's $___ billion FY19 budget.

The Administration for Children and Families invested approximately $200 million in evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing approximately 0.3% of the agency's approximately $59 billion FY19 budget.

3.2 Did the agency have a budget for evaluation and how much was it? (Were there any changes in this budget from the previous fiscal year?)

In FY19, ACF's Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation has a budget of approximately $200 million, a $35 million increase from FY18.

3.3 Did the agency provide financial and other resources to help city, county, and state governments or other grantees build their evaluation capacity (including technical assistance funds for data and evidence capacity building)?

ACF provides evaluation technical assistance to grantees to support sites participating in federal evaluations, to support grantees who are conducting their own local evaluations (for example projects supporting Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood grantees and Personal Responsibility Education Program grantees), and to provide general capacity building support (for example the TANF Data Innovation Project and the Tribal Early Childhood Research Center). ACF also publishes resources such as The Program Manager's Guide to Evaluation to provide guidance to programs planning and implementing evaluations.

2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

Score
7

Administration for Community Living

3.1 ____ (Name of agency) invested $____ on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing __% of the agency's $___ billion FY19 budget.

ACL invested $18.8 million on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing 0.85% of the agency's $2.2 billion FY19 enacted budget.

3.2 Did the agency have a budget for evaluation and how much was it? (Were there any changes in this budget from the previous fiscal year?)

ACL's budget for evaluation was $18.8 million in FY19; there were no significant changes to the evaluation budget since the previous year. The bulk of ACL's evaluation funds are based on a set-aside required in Title II, section 206 of the Older Americans Act, "From the total amount appropriated for each fiscal year to carry out title III, the Secretary may use such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed 1⁄2 of 1 percent of such amount, for purposes of conducting evaluations under this section, either directly or through grants or contracts." In addition, in 2017 ACL's Office of Performance and Evaluation established a mechanism that allows ACL programs not covered by the OAA set-aside to transfer funds to OPE to be able to support evaluations of their programs. In 2017, 2018, and 2019 OPE added approximately $950,000, $1.7 million, and $3.2 million from these programs to its evaluation budget respectively.

3.3 Did the agency provide financial and other resources to help city, county, and state governments or other grantees build their evaluation capacity (including technical assistance funds for data and evidence capacity building)?

ACL provides technical assistance to grantees related to using evidence-based programs and building evidence. For example, the National Resource Center on Nutrition and Aging (NRC) provides research-based insight into different programs and approaches that deliver nutrition-related home- and community-based services (HCBS) administered through grants to the 56 states and territories. ACL's Alzheimer's Disease Supportive Services Program (ADSSP) grant program supports state efforts to expand the availability of community-level supportive services including the translation of evidence-based models into

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

community-level practice in their programs. The 68 University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (UCEDDs) throughout the United States and its territories serve as liaisons between academia and the community. They fund model demonstrations to build evidence for addressing issues, finding solutions, and advancing research related to the needs of individuals with developmental disabilities and their families.

Score

8

U.S. Agency for International Development

3.1 ____ (Name of agency) invested $____ on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing __% of the agency's $___ billion FY19 budget.

USAID invested $195.6 million on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing 1% of the agency's $18.8 billion FY18 budget.

3.2 Did the agency have a budget for evaluation and how much was it? (Were there any changes in this budget from the previous fiscal year?)

In FY18, USAID operating units reported investing approximately $191 million on evaluations that were completed or ongoing in that fiscal year. LER's budget for evaluation technical assistance and evaluation capacity-building in FY18 was $4.6 million, coming to a total of $195.6 million. This represents 1% of the Agency's $18.8 billion FY18 budget.[1] This total does not include other research, studies, analysis or other data collection that is often used for evaluation, such as USAID's investment in the Demographic Health Survey or some of the assessments done by third-parties across USAID's innovation portfolio. It also does

[1] Source for FY2018 Agency budget: FY 2020 Congressional Budget Justification. Page 2. Bilateral Economic Assistance total ($24,433,542,000) minus State's Global Health Programs ($5,670,000,000) is $18,763,542,000.

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

not include funding by agency sub-components for evaluation technical assistance.

USAID Missions and Operating Units (OUs) reported completing 189 evaluations with resources totaling approximately $70 million. In addition, Missions/OUs are currently managing another 209 ongoing evaluations, many that span more than one year, with total ongoing evaluation budgets estimated to reach almost $121 million. Overall, USAID's spending on evaluations completed or ongoing in FY18 was $191 million, a reduction from the FY17 total of $252 million. LER's FY18 budget was $4.6 million, down from $8.9 million in FY17 due in part to an overall FY18 Agency program budget decline from $19.6 billion in FY17[2] to $18.8 billion in FY18. Despite these reductions, the overall proportion the Agency invested in evaluations remained at 1% of program funds.

3.3 Did the agency provide financial and other resources to help city, county, and state governments or other grantees build their evaluation capacity (including technical assistance funds for data and evidence capacity building)?

While specific data on this is limited, USAID estimates that investment in contracts or grants that provide support to build local organizational or governmental capacity in data collection, analysis, and use could be as high as $250 million.

For example, USAID's Data for Impact (D4I) activity helps low- and middle-income countries—primarily in sub-Saharan Africa—to increase their capacity to use available data and generate new data to build evidence for improving health programs, health policies, and for decision-making. D4I's goal is to help low-resource countries gather and use information to strengthen their health policies and programs and improve the health of their citizens.

In another example, the MEASURE Evaluation project, funded by USAID, has a mandate to strengthen health information systems (HIS) in low-resource settings. The Project enables countries to improve lives by strengthening their capacity to generate and use high-quality health information to make evidence-informed, strategic decisions at local, subregional, and national levels.

[2] Source for FY2017 Agency budget: FY 2019 Congressional Budget Justification. Page 2. Bilateral Economic Assistance total ($25,316,492) minus State's Global Health Programs ($5,670,000) is $19,646,492.

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

Score

9

Corporation for National and Community Service

3.1 ____ (Name of agency) invested $____ on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing __% of the agency's $___ billion FY19 budget.

CNCS invested $12,450,000 on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing 1.2% of the agency's $999,211,010 million FY19 budget.

3.2 Did the agency have a budget for evaluation and how much was it? (Were there any changes in this budget from the previous fiscal year?)

Congress allocated $4,000,000 to CNCS for its evaluation budget. This is the same amount allocated in FY18.

3.3 Did the agency provide financial and other resources to help city, county, and state governments or other grantees build their evaluation capacity (including technical assistance funds for data and evidence capacity building)?

R&E funds a contractor to provide AmeriCorps grantees with evaluation capacity building support ($500,000 of the $4,000,000 evaluation budget). R&E staff are also available to State Commissions for their evaluation questions and make resources (e.g., research briefs summarizing effective interventions, online evaluation planning and reporting curricula) available to them and the general public. AmeriCorps awards investment fund grants to State Commissions ($8.5 million in FY19), of which approximately one-third will be used for data and evidence capacity building activities based on prior year activities.

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

Score

5

U.S. Department of Education

3.1 ____ (Name of agency) invested $____ on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing __% of the agency's $___ billion FY19 budget.

ED invested $53.5 million on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing 0.11% of the agency's $47.9 billion discretionary budget (not including Student Financial Assistance and administrative funds) in FY19.

This total reflects a targeted definition of program funds dedicated to evaluation, including impact studies and implementation studies. It is important to note that the timing of evaluation projects and the type of research projects proposed by the field results in year-to-year fluctuations in this amount and does not reflect a change in ED's commitment to evaluation.

3.2 Did the agency have a budget for evaluation and how much was it? (Were there any changes in this budget from the previous fiscal year?)

In FY19, ED spent $53.5 million on evaluation related activities, an increase from the $39.7 million spent in FY18.

This amount included $39.7 million spent on evaluations in FY19, a slight increase from about $38 million it spent in FY18. While ED does not have a specific budget solely for evaluation, it is authorized by ESEA to reserve up to .5% of ESEA program funds for evaluation activities. Other sources of funding include the IES budget and program funds that require evaluations.

The FY20 President's Budget proposed a new pooled evaluation authority in the Higher Education Act (HEA), similar to that of the ESEA, that would permit the Department to reserve up to .5% of funding appropriated for each HEA program (with the exception of the Pell Grant program) to support rigorous independent evaluations and data collection and analysis of student outcomes of all HEA programs.

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

3.3 Did the agency provide financial and other resources to help city, county, and state governments or other grantees build their evaluation capacity (including technical assistance funds for data and evidence capacity building)?

Since FY15, IES has been supporting a cohort of 16 state grantees, with awards totaling approximately $24 million, as part of the Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant program. This supports efforts related to (1) increasing use of data for decision making; (2) conducting training on data use, data tools, or accessing data and reporting systems; and (3) utilizing research and analysis results. In FY19, IES announced a new round of SLDS funding totaling $26.1 million.

The Regional Education Laboratories (RELs) provide extensive technical assistance on evaluation and support research alliances that conduct implementation and impact studies on education policies and programs in ten geographic regions of the U.S., covering all states, territories, and the District of Columbia. Congress appropriated $55.4 million for the RELs in FY19.

Comprehensive Centers provide support to States in planning and implementing interventions through coaching, peer-to-peer learning opportunities, and ongoing direct support. The State Implementation and Scaling Up of Evidence-Based Practices Center provides tools, training modules, and resources on implementation planning and monitoring.

Score

5

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

3.1 ____ (Name of agency) invested $____ on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing __% of the agency's $___ billion FY19 budget.

HUD invested $96 million on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing 0.18% of the agency's $53.762 billion FY19 appropriation.

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

3.2 Did the agency have a budget for evaluation and how much was it? (Were there any changes in this budget from the previous fiscal year?)

For FY19, Congress appropriated $96 million for the Office of Policy Development and Research's (PD&R's) Research & Technology account. FY19 funding was up $7 million from FY18, reflecting congressional support for the value of PD&R's research, evaluations, and demonstrations. This budget includes $50 million for core research activities; up to $21 million for research, evaluations, and demonstrations; and not less than $25 million for technical assistance. The total represents an FY19 investment in evaluations and evidence amounting to 0.18 percent of HUD's $53.762 billion gross discretionary budget authority, net of salaries and expenses, for FY19. The funding for core research is used primarily for the American Housing Survey, other surveys, data acquisition, and research dissemination that support evaluation of HUD's mission activities in domains such as affordable housing and housing finance.

PD&R's FY19 appropriation of $26 million for Salaries and Expenses, up $2 million from FY18, also supports evidence in the form of PD&R's in-house research and evaluation program; economic analyses; data linkage initiatives; and management of housing surveys, contract research, and evaluation.

3.3 Did the agency provide financial and other resources to help city, county, and state governments or other grantees build their evaluation capacity (including technical assistance funds for data and evidence capacity building)?

For FY 2019, HUD is making available $25 million through the Community Compass NOFA for technical assistance to equip HUD's customers with the knowledge, skills, tools, capacity, and systems to implement HUD programs and policies successfully and to provide effective oversight of federal funding. State and local governments and authorities are among the eligible applicants.

HUD operates a Section 4 Capacity Building grant program that funds national intermediaries and rural jurisdictions in building capacity for functions including assessing needs, planning programs, and evaluation.

HUD's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, which provides formula grants to entitlement jurisdictions, increases local evaluation capacity. Specifically, federal regulations (Section 24 CFR 507.200) authorize CDBG recipients (including city and state governments) to use up to 20% of their CDBG allocations for administration and planning costs that may

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

include evaluation-capacity building efforts and evaluations of their CDBG-funded interventions (as defined in 507.205 and 507.206).

Score

3

U.S. Department of Labor

3.1 ____ (Name of agency) invested $____ on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing __% of the agency's $___ billion FY19 budget.

The Department of Labor invested $9.94 million on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing .1% of the agency's $12 billion discretionary budget in FY19.

3.2 Did the agency have a budget for evaluation and how much was it? (Were there any changes in this budget from the previous fiscal year?)

In FY19, DOL's CEO is directly overseeing approximately $9.94 million in evaluation funding (this includes a direct appropriation of $8.04 million for department program evaluation and a set-aside amount of approximately .02% of select department accounts). CEO also collaborates with DOL program offices and other federal agencies on additional evaluations being carried out by other offices and/or supported by funds appropriated to other agencies or programs. In FY18, CEO oversaw approximately $21 million in evaluation and evidence building activities.

This amount only represents the dollars that are directly appropriated or transferred to CEO. Additionally, many DOL evaluations and research studies are supported by funds appropriated to DOL programs and/or are carried out by other offices within DOL. In some programs, such as the America's Promise grant evaluation and the Reentry Grant Evaluation, evaluation set asides exceed 1% (2.9% and 2.8% respectively for these programs).

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

3.3 Did the agency provide financial and other resources to help city, county, and state governments or other grantees build their evaluation capacity (including technical assistance funds for data and evidence capacity building)?

Grantees and programs that participate in DOL evaluations receive technical assistance related to evaluation activities and implementation such as the Evaluation and Research Hub (EvalHub). DOL agencies, like ETA, are also making a concerted effort to help states and local areas build evaluation capacity to meet the program evaluation requirements for the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act and Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessment (RESEA) through tools such as RESEA program evaluation technical assistance (RESEA EvalTA). A suite of evaluation technical assistance resources is being developed throughout FY19, including webinars and other tools and templates to help states understand, build, and use evidence. DOL's evaluation technical assistance webinar series for states has been posted online to the RESEA community of practice. This series will ultimately hold 11 webinars, over the course of approximately six months. To date, most of the posted webinars have been viewed by the field between 2,000-4,000 times. Additional RESEA EvalTA products are being developed and will be posted the RESEA community of practice, the DOL Chief Evaluation Office's website, and in CLEAR, as appropriate.

Score

9

Millennium Challenge Corporation

3.1 ____ (Name of agency) invested $____ on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing __% of the agency's $___ billion FY19 budget.

MCC invested $26.3 million on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing 3.7% of the agency's $905 million FY19 budget (minus staff/salary expenses).

3.2 Did the agency have a budget for evaluation and how much was it? (Were there any changes in this budget from the previous fiscal year?)

MCC budgeted $26.3 million on monitoring and evaluation in FY19, an increase of $11.2 million compared to FY18 ($15.1 million total).

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

3.3 Did the agency provide financial and other resources to help city, county, and state governments or other grantees build their evaluation capacity (including technical assistance funds for data and evidence capacity building)?

In support of MCC's emphasis on country ownership, MCC also provides intensive and ongoing capacity building to partner country Monitoring and Evaluation staff in every country in which it invests. As a part of this, MCC provides training and ongoing mentorship in the local language. This includes publishing select independent evaluations, Evaluation Briefs, and other documentation in the country's local language. The dissemination of local language publications helps further MCC's reach to its partner country's government and members of civil society, enabling them to fully reference and utilize evidence and learning beyond the program.

Score

1

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration

3.1 ____ (Name of agency) invested $____ on evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and evaluation capacity-building, representing __% of the agency's $___ billion FY19 budget.

RFA was unable to determine the amount of resources SAMHSA invested in evaluations in FY19.[3]

3.2 Did the agency have a budget for evaluation and how much was it? (Were there any changes in this budget from the previous fiscal year?)

RFA was unable to determine the budget for evaluation at SAMHSA and, thus, any changes from the previous fiscal year. SAMHSA evaluations are funded from program funds that are used for service grants, technical assistance, and for evaluation activities. Each of the three program Centers uses their program funds for conducting evaluations of varying types. Evaluations have also been funded from recycled funds from grants or other contract activities.

[3] RFA was unable to determine the amount of resources SAMHSA invested in evaluations in FY19 for criterion #3.

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY19? (Examples: Impact studies; implementation studies; rapid cycle evaluations; evaluation technical assistance, rigorous evaluations, including random assignments)

3.3 Did the agency provide financial and other resources to help city, county, and state governments or other grantees build their evaluation capacity (including technical assistance funds for data and evidence capacity building)?

SAMHSA's Evidence-Based Practices Resource Center aims to provide communities, clinicians, policy-makers and others in the field with the information and tools they need to incorporate evidence-based practices into their communities or clinical settings. The Center lists nine technical assistance projects, two of which appear to provide financial or other resources to help city, county, and state governments or other grantees build evaluation capacity (as of September 2019):

The Bringing Recovery Supports to Scale Technical Assistance Center Strategy (BRSS TACS) advances recovery supports and services for people with mental or substance use disorders and their families. The BRSS TACS website indicates it has provided training and technical assistance for building the capacity of peer-run, recovery community, and family organizations through evaluation, among six other topics.

The National Training and Technical Assistance Center for Child, Youth & Family Mental Health (NTTAC) provides states, tribes, and communities with training and technical assistance on children's behavioral health, with a focus on systems of care. NTTAC's Training and Technical Assistance activities for clinical best practices, wraparound services, and workforce development focus on evaluation, fidelity assessment, and quality assurance, among nine other topics.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

Score
6

Administration for Children and Families

4.1 Did the agency have a strategic plan with outcome goals, program objectives (if different), outcome measures, and program measures (if different)?

ACF was an active participant in the development of the FY 2018-2022 HHS Strategic Plan, which includes several ACF-specific objectives. ACF regularly reports on progress associated with those objectives as part of the FY 2019 HHS Annual Performance Plan/Report, including the eight performance measures that support Goal Three objectives to "Strengthen the Economic and Social Well-Being of Americans Across the Lifespan." ACF supports Objective 3.1 (Encourage self-sufficiency and personal responsibility, and eliminate barriers to economic opportunity), Objective 3.2 (Safeguard the public against preventable injuries and violence or their results), and Objective 3.3 (Support strong families and healthy marriage, and prepare children and youth for healthy, productive lives) by reporting annual performance measures. ACF reports on a total of nine performance measures throughout the FY 2018-2022 HHS Strategic Plan. ACF is also an active participant in the HHS Strategic Review process, which is an annual assessment of progress on the subset of nine performance measures that ACF reports on as part of the HHS Strategic Plan.

4.2 Does the agency use data/evidence to improve outcomes and return on investment?

Individual ACF programs regularly analyze and use performance data, administrative data, and evaluation data to improve performance. Two performance management systems worth noting are the Participant Accomplishment and Grant Evaluation System (PAGES) management information system for Health Profession Opportunity Grant (HPOG) grantees and the Information, Family Outcomes, Reporting, and Management (nForm) management information system for Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood grantees. Both are web-based management information systems that are used to track grantee progress for program management and to record grantee and participant data for research and evaluation purposes.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

4.3 Did the agency have a continuous improvement or learning cycle processes to identify promising practices, problem areas, possible causal factors, and opportunities for improvement? (Examples: stat meetings, data analytics, data visualization tools, or other tools that improve performance)

Different ACF program areas take tailored approaches to continuous improvement and rapid learning. For example, ACF has provided continuous quality improvement (CQI) resources specifically for child welfare agencies and home visiting grantees; is exploring how child care and Head Start programs can institutionalize continuous quality improvement using a Breakthrough Series Collaborative approach; and developed a Learn Innovate Improve model that has been used with TANF programs. In 2018 OPRE devoted its annual innovative methods meeting to Rapid Learning Methods for Testing and Evaluating Change in Social Service Programs to advance ACF's understanding of how rapid learning methods designed to quickly test program improvements and evaluate program implementation or impact can be implemented in high-quality, effective ways.

Score
5

Administration for Community Living

4.1 Did the agency have a strategic plan with outcome goals, program objectives (if different), outcome measures, and program measures (if different)?

ACL's strategy focuses on five pillars: supporting families and caregivers, protecting rights and preventing abuse, connecting people to resources, expanding employment opportunities, and strengthening the aging and disability networks. These pillars provide structure and focus for ACL's work. ACL's outcomes measures are available, by program, in its annual Congressional Budget Justification, and include measures of program efficiency. As part of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Annual Performance Plan and Report, ACL reports on the following two Agency Priority Goals: (1) Increase the success rate of the Protection and Advocacy Program's individual or systemic advocacy, thereby advancing individuals with developmental disabilities' right to receive appropriate community based services, resulting in community integration and independence,

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

and have other rights enforced, retained, restored and/or expanded; and (2) Improve dementia capability of long-term support systems to create dementia-friendly, livable communities (Lead Agency ACL).

4.2 Does the agency use data/evidence to improve outcomes and return on investment?

ACL employs a program performance management strategy with multiple components. This includes coordination and collaboration with other agencies and organizations, enhanced partnerships between aging and disability networks, and senior leadership involvement in performance management. ACL has several recent and ongoing evaluation studies that examine the cost benefits of its programs in terms of health care savings (see Report to Congress: The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services' Evaluation of Community-Based Wellness and Prevention Programs Under Section 4202 (b) of the Affordable Care Act which focused on several of ACL's programs and Evaluation of the Effect of the Older Americans Act Title III-C Nutrition Services Program on Participants' Health Care Utilization).

The regional staff conduct annual reviews with the state units on aging to review the states' work under their state plans on aging (which they develop under the Older Americans Act). While the forms used are for internal use only, states are asked to document their progress towards their approved goals, what performance indicators they use to measure their progress, and to report out on changes in program performance, targeting of priority populations, and program innovations for which they have received honors or recognition. There are also checks of how and whether states verify the quality of their performance data. ACL uses this information to inform TA directed to improve program operations, results, and return on investment. When making decisions about continued grant funding, NIDILRR uses a risk scale to determine whether the additional funding will be a good use of funds. NIDILRR's long range plan also describes research as part of their new employment research agenda to continue development of return-on-investment models that can be used by Vocational Rehabilitation agencies to optimize the services they provide.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

4.3 Did the agency have a continuous improvement or learning cycle processes to identify promising practices, problem areas, possible causal factors, and opportunities for improvement? (Examples: stat meetings, data analytics, data visualization tools, or other tools that improve performance)

As part of ACL's performance strategy, OPE staff provide annual presentations on ACL Performance to ACL leadership. They also provide information to internal and external stakeholders about agency performance trends. OPE staff also hold annual meetings with ACL staff to report performance measure data and results, including discussing methods to incorporate performance and evaluation findings into funding and operational decision-making.

Score
9

U.S. Agency for International Development

4.1 Did the agency have a strategic plan with outcome goals, program objectives (if different), outcome measures, and program measures (if different)?

USAID partners with the U.S. Department of State to jointly develop and implement clear strategic goals, strategic objectives, and performance goals, which are articulated in the FY 2018 - 2022 U.S. Department of State - USAID Joint Strategic Plan (JSP). The Agency measures progress towards its own strategic goals, strategic objectives, and performance goals using data from across the Agency, including from annual Performance Plan and Reports (PPRs) completed by operating units, and uses that information to report on performance externally through the Annual Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (APP/APR) and the Agency Financial Report.

To aggregate and track performance in key sectors, USAID works with the U.S. Department of State to develop and manage nearly 200 standard foreign assistance indicators that have common definitions and defined collection methods. Once finalized,

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

USAID publishes indicator data on a publicly available dashboard known as Dollars to Results. Finally, USAID reports on Agency Priority Goals (APG) and Cross Agency Priority (CAP) goal progress on www.performance.gov.

4.2 Does the agency use data/evidence to improve outcomes and return on investment?

Many of USAID's innovation or co-created programs and those done in partnerships reflect a data-driven "pay for results" model, where milestones are agreed by all parties, and payments are made when milestones are achieved. This means that, for some programs, if a milestone is unmet, funds may be re-applied to an innovation or intervention that is achieving results. This rapid and iterative performance model means that USAID more quickly understands what isn't working and can move resources away from it and toward what is working.

Approaches such as prizes, Grand Challenges, and ventures can also be constructed to be "pay for results only" where interventions such as "Development Impact Bonds" are used to create approaches where USAID only pays for outcomes and not inputs or attempts only. The Agency believes this model will pave the way for much of USAID's work to be aligned with a "pay for results" approach. USAID is also piloting the use of the impact per dollar of cash transfers as a minimum standard of cost-effectiveness for applicable program designs.

Additionally, USAID Missions develop Country Development Cooperation Strategies (CDCSs) with clear goals and objectives and a Performance Management Plan (PMP) that identifies expected results, performance indicators to measure those results, plans for data collection and analysis, and regular review of performance measures to use data and evidence to adapt programs for improved outcomes. USAID also promotes operations performance management to ensure that the Agency achieves its development objectives and aligns resources with priorities. USAID uses its Management Operations Council OC to conduct an annual Strategic Review of progress toward achieving the strategic objectives in the JSP.

To improve linkages and break down silos, USAID continues to develop the Development Information Solution (DIS)—an enterprise-wide management information system that will enable USAID to collect, manage, and visualize performance data across units, along with budget and procurement information, to more efficiently manage and execute programming.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

4.3 Did the agency have a continuous improvement or learning cycle processes to identify promising practices, problem areas, possible causal factors, and opportunities for improvement? (Examples: stat meetings, data analytics, data visualization tools, or other tools that improve performance)

USAID's Program Cycle policy (ADS 201.3.2.18) requires that Missions conduct at least one portfolio review per year that focuses on progress toward strategy-level results. Missions must also conduct a CDCS mid-course stocktaking at least once during the course of implementing their Country Development Cooperation Strategy, which typically spans five years.

USAID developed an approach to explicitly ensure adaptation through learning called Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA). It is incorporated into USAID's Program Cycle guidance (ADS 201.3.5.19) where it states: "Strategic collaboration, continuous learning, and adaptive management link together all components of the Program Cycle." Through CLA, USAID ensures its programming is coordinated with others, grounded in a strong evidence base, and iteratively adapted to remain relative throughout implementation.

In addition to this focus through its programming, USAID has two senior bodies which oversee Enterprise Risk Management, and meet regularly to improve the accountability and effectiveness of USAID programs and operations through holistic risk management. USAID tracks progress toward strategic goals and annual performance goals during data-driven reviews at Management Operations Council meetings.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

Score
3

Corporation for National and Community Service

4.1 Did the agency have a strategic plan with outcome goals, program objectives (if different), outcome measures, and program measures (if different)?

CNCS continued to implement its Transformation and Sustainability Plan in FY19. This plan aims to ensure CNCS is maximizing its resources to achieve results. The agency is in the process of developing more specific goals for the Transformation and Sustainability Plan, though they are currently internal goals. In addition, the agency will be conducting a process evaluation/rapid cycle assessment for each phase of its transition to a new portfolio manager grant management model. The goal is to use lessons learned from implementation of Phase 1 to inform Phase 2 and beyond. Data collection will begin in quarter 1 of FY20.

4.2 Does the agency use data/evidence to improve outcomes and return on investment?

CNCS started the fiscal year with a series of internal budget formulation meetings that asked each office to identify in their budget proposals how evidence-based activities and evidence-building activities would be prioritized. All program offices are using data/evidence to improve returns on investment. For example:

- AmeriCorps VISTA used poverty mapping data to inform resource allocation decisions in FY19. VISTA also launched a dashboard that puts project and member data at the fingertips of staff to help them identify best practices and trouble-shoot problems in a timely fashion.

- AmeriCorps NCCC is creating a qualitative database of all NCCC projects completed since 2012. The database will thematically organize projects, classify project frameworks, and categorize the outcomes of these service initiatives. Moving forward this data will be used to invest more strategically in projects with the best results by refining project development with community sponsors based on those that seem to have the best uptake and outcomes.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

- In FY19, Senior Corps contracted with a research firm to comprehensively assess the quality of program administrative data and its potential uses for performance management.

- CNCS conducted an analysis of usage of education awards to identify information trends related to how AmeriCorps alumni use these education awards to further their education and employment opportunities (a key goal of the AmeriCorps program). The report highlights a number of opportunities to encourage the usage of education awards to improve education and employment for AmeriCorps alumni.

4.3 Did the agency have a continuous improvement or learning cycle processes to identify promising practices, problem areas, possible causal factors, and opportunities for improvement? (Examples: stat meetings, data analytics, data visualization tools, or other tools that improve performance)

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer meets quarterly to assess progress toward the goals of its performance plan. The plan includes strategic objectives, strategies for achieving the objectives, milestones, measures, and targets. Quarterly meetings are used to discuss actuals versus targets and identify promising practices used to achieve targets as well as areas for better optimizing the delivery of budget, procurement, grants, and financial management.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

Score
8

U.S. Department of Education

4.1 Did the agency have a strategic plan with outcome goals, program objectives (if different), outcome measures, and program measures (if different)?

ED's FY18-22 Strategic Plan includes two parallel goals, one for P-12 and one for higher education (Strategic Objectives 1.4 and 2.2, respectively), that focus on supporting agencies and educational institutions in the identification and use of evidence-based strategies and practices.

The Department's FY 2018 Annual Performance Report and FY 2020 Annual Performance Plan contains FY18 performance results as well as metrics for evidence from strategic objective 5.3 in the previous Strategic Plan, where established targets were mostly met.

4.2 Does the agency use data/evidence to improve outcomes and return on investment?

The newly formed Grants Policy Office in the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development (OPEPD) works with offices across the Department to ensure alignment with the Secretary's priorities, including evidence-based practices. The Grants Policy Office looks at where the Department and the field can continuously improve by building stronger evidence, making decisions based on a clear understanding of the available evidence, and disseminating evidence to decision makers. Specific activities include: strengthening the connection between the Secretary's policies and grant implementation from design through evaluation; supporting a culture of evidence-based practices; providing guidance to grant-making offices on how to integrate evidence into program design; and identifying opportunities where the Department and field can improve by building, understanding, and using evidence.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

4.3 Did the agency have a continuous improvement or learning cycle processes to identify promising practices, problem areas, possible causal factors, and opportunities for improvement? (Examples: stat meetings, data analytics, data visualization tools, or other tools that improve performance)

The newly formed Grants Policy Office in the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development (OPEPD) works with offices across the Department to ensure alignment with the Secretary's priorities, including evidence-based practices. The Grants Policy Office looks at where the Department and the field can continuously improve by building stronger evidence, making decisions based on a clear understanding of the available evidence, and disseminating evidence to decision makers. Specific activities include: strengthening the connection between the Secretary's policies and grant implementation from design through evaluation; supporting a culture of evidence-based practices; providing guidance to grant-making offices on how to integrate evidence into program design; and identifying opportunities where the Department and field can improve by building, understanding, and using evidence.

Score
9

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

4.1 Did the agency have a strategic plan with outcome goals, program objectives (if different), outcome measures, and program measures (if different)?

HUD's FY 2018–2022 Strategic Plan defines strategic objectives, priority outcome goals, and program metrics supporting each objective. Progress on program metrics is tracked through HUD's Annual Performance Plan.

4.2 Does the agency use data/evidence to improve outcomes and return on investment?

HUD uses data and evidence extensively to improve outcomes and return on investment. The primary means are through PD&R's investments in data collection, program demonstrations, program evaluations, and research guided by a multi-year

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

learning agenda; HUD's extensive use of outcome-oriented performance metrics in the Annual Performance Plan; senior staff oversight and monitoring of key outcomes and initiatives through the Prescription for HUD, the Advancing Economic Opportunity Task Force, and the Agency-Wide Integrity Task Force, which bring together senior staff for quarterly performance management meetings. In addition, the Standards for Success pilot is a new standardized data collection and reporting framework for discretionary grant programs.

4.3 Did the agency have a continuous improvement or learning cycle processes to identify promising practices, problem areas, possible causal factors, and opportunities for improvement? (Examples: stat meetings, data analytics, data visualization tools, or other tools that improve performance)

HUD's senior staff support continuous improvement and oversight and monitoring of key outcomes and initiatives through the Prescription for HUD, the regular meetings of the Advancing Economic Opportunity Task Force, and the Agency-Wide Integrity Task Force. These processes are supported by ongoing, significant investments in evidence-building as documented in the Annual Performance Plan and the iterative process of developing the Research Roadmap learning agenda.

Score
9

U.S. Department of Labor

4.1 Did the agency have a strategic plan with outcome goals, program objectives (if different), outcome measures, and program measures (if different)?

DOL's Performance Management Center (PMC) leads the development of DOL's four-year Strategic Plan and Annual Performance Report.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

4.2 Does the agency use data/evidence to improve outcomes and return on investment?

Using a performance and budget system linked to component agencies' annual operating plans, PMC coordinates quarterly reviews of each agency's program performance to analyze progress and identify opportunities for performance improvements. 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 annual Strategic Reviews with leadership include specific discussions about improving performance and findings from recent evaluations that suggest opportunities for improvement. Using a performance stat reporting and dashboard system linked to component agencies' annual operating plans, PMC coordinates quarterly reviews of each agency's program performance by the Deputy Secretary to analyze progress and identify opportunities for performance improvements.

4.3 Did the agency have a continuous improvement or learning cycle processes to identify promising practices, problem areas, possible causal factors, and opportunities for improvement? (Examples: stat meetings, data analytics, data visualization tools, or other tools that improve performance)

DOL leverages a variety of continuous learning tools, including the learning agenda approach to conceptualize and make progress on substantive learning goals for the agency, as well as DOL's Performance Management Center's (PMC) Continuous Process Improvement (CPI) Program, which supports agencies in efforts to gain operational efficiencies and improve performance. The program directs customized process improvement projects throughout the department and grows the cadre of CPI practitioners through Lean Six Sigma training.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

Score
5

Millennium Challenge Corporation

4.1 Did the agency have a strategic plan with outcome goals, program objectives (if different), outcome measures, and program measures (if different)?

MCC's strategic plan, "NEXT: A Strategy for MCC's Future," lays out five specific goals and priority actions for deepening and expanding impact and meeting the challenges of the new landscape of global poverty and development.

In an effort to track and aggregate evidence across its entire portfolio, MCC has implemented a common indicators structure across the seven sectors in which it invests: energy; land and property rights; education; water, sanitation, and irrigation; health; roads and transport infrastructure; and agriculture. In all MCC countries, projects in these sectors capture evidence across a common set of indicators to allow MCC to build an agency-wide evidence base around its investments.

4.2 Does the agency use data/evidence to improve outcomes and return on investment?

MCC is committed to using high-quality data and evidence to drive its strategic planning and program decisions. The Monitoring and Evaluation plans for all programs and tables of key performance indicators for all projects of key performance indicators for all projects are available online by compact and threshold program and by sector, for use by both partner countries and the general public. Prior to investment, MCC performs a Cost-Benefit Analysis to assess the potential impact of each project, and estimates an Economic Rate of Return (ERR). MCC uses a 10% ERR hurdle to more effectively prioritize and fund projects with the greatest opportunity for maximizing impact. MCC then recalculates ERRs at investment closeout, drawing on information from MCC's monitoring data (among other data and evidence), to test original assumptions and assess the cost effectiveness of MCC programs.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

In addition, MCC produces periodic reports that capture the results of MCC's learning efforts in specific sectors and translate that learning into actionable evidence for future programming. At the start of FY18, MCC published a Principles into Practice (PiP) report on its investments into roads; this report demonstrated MCC learning around the implementation and evaluation of its roads projects, and critically assessed how MCC was changing its practice as a result of this learning. In FY19, MCC will publish a PiP report on its technical and vocational education training activities in the education sector. MCC is also midway through research related to learning in the water, sanitation, and hygiene sector, with a PiP capturing the results of that learning expected in FY20.

4.3 Did the agency have a continuous improvement or learning cycle processes to identify promising practices, problem areas, possible causal factors, and opportunities for improvement? (Examples: stat meetings, data analytics, data visualization tools, or other tools that improve performance)

In FY18, MCC implemented a new reporting system that enhanced MCC's credibility around results, transparency, learning, and accountability. The Star Report and its associated quarterly business process captures key information to provide a framework for results and improve the ability to promote and disseminate learning and evidence throughout the compact and threshold program lifecycle. For each compact and threshold program, evidence is collected on performance indicators, evaluation results, partnerships, sustainability efforts, and learning, among other elements. Critically, this information will be available in one report after each program ends. Each country will have a Star Report published roughly seven months after completion. In FY19, MCC released its first Star Reports about its recently completed investment in Cabo Verde and Indonesia. There are currently four Star Reports in progress that cover MCC's programs in Honduras, Zambia, Georgia, and Malawi. These are expected to be published in FY20.

MCC also supports the creation of multidisciplinary country teams to manage the development and implementation of each compact and threshold program. Teams meet frequently to gather evidence, discuss progress, make project design decisions, and solve problems. Prior to moving forward with a program investment, teams are encouraged to use the lessons from completed evaluations to inform their work going forward.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

Continual learning and improvement is a key aspect of MCC's operating model. MCC continuously monitors progress towards compact and threshold program results on a quarterly basis using performance indicators that are specified in the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan for each country's investments. 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 partner country submits an Indicator Tracking Table that shows actual performance of each indicator relative to the baseline that was established before the activity began and the performance targets that were established in the M&E Plan. Key performance indicators and their accompanying data by country are updated every quarter and published online. MCC management and the relevant country team review this data in a formal Quarterly Performance Review meeting to assess whether results are being achieved and integrates this information into project management and implementation decisions.

Score
6

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration

4.1 Did the agency have a strategic plan with outcome goals, program objectives (if different), outcome measures, and program measures (if different)?

The SAMHSA Strategic Plan FY2019-FY2023 outlines five priority areas with goals and measurable objectives to carry out the vision and mission of SAMHSA. For each priority area, an overarching goal and series of measurable objectives are described followed by examples of key performance and outcome measures SAMHSA will use to track progress.

4.2 Does the agency use data/evidence to improve outcomes and return on investment?

The Centers have historically managed internal performance review boards to periodically review grantee performance and provide corrective actions as needed.

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with 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 FY19?
(Example: Performance stat systems, frequent outcomes-focused data-informed meetings)

According to the FY2019-FY2023 Strategic Plan (pp. 21-22), SAMHSA will modernize the Performance Accountability and Reporting System by 1) capturing real-time data for discretionary grant programs in order to monitor their progress, impact, and effectiveness, and 2) developing benchmarks and disseminating annual Performance Evaluation Reports for all SAMHSA discretionary grant programs.

4.3 Did the agency have a continuous improvement or learning cycle processes to identify promising practices, problem areas, possible causal factors, and opportunities for improvement? (Examples: stat meetings, data analytics, data visualization tools, or other tools that improve performance)

In 2016, SAMHSA's Office of Financial Resources (OFR) established a Program Integrity Review Team (PIRT) staffed by representatives from each of its four Centers and managed by OFR. On a quarterly basis, three SAMHSA discretionary grant portfolios (one from each of the three program Centers) conduct a self-analysis to examine grantee performance based on objective performance data, financial performance and other factors. Program staff present their program self-assessments to the PIRT and receive feedback on, for example, targets of concern.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

Score
5

Administration for Children and Families

5.1 Did the agency have a strategic data plan, including an open data policy? (Example: Evidence Act 202(c), Strategic Information Resources Plan)

ACF's Interoperability Action Plan was established in 2017 to formalize ACF's vision for effective and efficient data sharing. Under this plan ACF and its program offices will develop and implement a Data Sharing First (DSF) strategy that starts with the assumption that data sharing is in the public interest. The plan states that ACF will encourage and promote data sharing broadly, constrained only when required by law or when there are strong countervailing considerations.

5.2 Did the agency have an updated comprehensive data inventory? (Example: Evidence Act 3511)

In 2018, ACF produced a Compendium of ACF Administrative and Survey Data Resources. All major ACF person-level administrative data sets and surveys are included, including 11 administrative data sources and eight surveys. Each entry includes the following information: data ownership and staff experts, basic content, major publications and websites, available data sets (public, restricted use, in-house), restrictions on data sharing, capacity to link with other data sets along with history of such linking, data quality, and resources to collect, prepare, and analyze the data. The compendium is currently available for internal use at HHS; a public version is forthcoming.

5.3 Did the agency promote data access or data linkage for evaluation, evidence-building, or program improvement? (Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; downloadable machine-readable, de-identified tagged data; Evidence Act 3520(c))

ACF has multiple efforts underway to promote and support the use of documented data for research and improvement, including making numerous administrative and survey datasets publicly available for secondary use and actively promoting the archiving of research and evaluation data for secondary use. These data are machine readable, downloadable, and de-identified as

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

appropriate for each data set. For example, individual-level data for research is held in secure restricted use formats, while public-use data sets are made available online. To make it easier to find these resources, ACF plans to release a Compendium of ACF Administrative and Survey Data and to consolidate information on archived research and evaluation data on the OPRE website.

OPRE actively promotes archiving of research and evaluation data for secondary use. OPRE research contracts include a standard clause requiring contractors to make data and analyses supported through federal funds available to other researchers and to establish procedures and parameters for all aspects of data and information collection necessary to support archiving information and data collected under the contract. Many datasets from past OPRE projects are stored in archives including the ACF-funded Child Care & Early Education Research Connections site and the ICPSR data archive. OPRE has funded grants for secondary analysis of ACF/OPRE data; examples in recent years include secondary analysis of strengthening families datasets and early care and education datasets.

5.4 Did the agency have policies and procedures to secure data and protect personal, confidential information? (Example: differential privacy; secure, multiparty computation; homomorphic encryption; or developing audit trails)

ACF developed a Confidentiality Toolkit that supports state and local efforts by explaining rules governing confidentiality in ACF and certain related programs, by providing examples of how confidentiality requirements can be addressed, and by including sample memoranda of understandings and data sharing agreements. ACF is currently in the process of updating the Toolkit for recent changes in statute, and to provide real-world examples of how data has been shared across domains—which frequently do not have harmonized privacy requirements—while complying with all relevant privacy and confidentiality requirements (e.g. FERPA, HIPPA). These case studies will also include downloadable, real-world tools that have been successfully used in the highlighted jurisdictions.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.5 Did the agency provide assistance to city, county, and/or state governments, and/or other grantees on accessing the agency's datasets while protecting privacy?

ACF engages in several broad-based and cross-cutting efforts to support state, local, and tribal efforts to use human services data while protecting privacy and confidentiality. Through the Interoperability Initiative, ACF supports data sharing through developing standards and tools that are reusable across the country, addressing common privacy and security requirements to mitigate risks, and providing request-based technical assistance to states, local jurisdictions, and ACF program offices. 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 also undertakes many program-specific efforts to support state, local, and tribal efforts to use human services data while protecting privacy and confidentiality. For example, ACF's TANF Data Innovation Project supports innovation and improved effectiveness of state TANF programs by enhancing the use of data from TANF and related human services programs. This work includes encouraging and strengthening state integrated data systems, promoting proper payments and program integrity, and enabling data analytics for TANF program improvement.

Score
6

Administration for Community Living

5.1 Did the agency have a strategic data plan, including an open data policy? (Example: Evidence Act 202(c), Strategic Information Resources Plan)

As an operating division of a CFO Act Agency, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, ACL is not required to have its own strategic data plan and utilizes HHS's data strategy. ACL provides public access to its programmatic data through a web based portal. In 2019, ACL created a council to improve ACL's data governance, including the development of improved processes and standards for defining, collecting, reviewing, certifying, analyzing, and presenting data that ACL collects through

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

its evaluation, grant reporting, and administrative performance measures. In addition, the council will help the Office of Performance and Evaluation meet its mission to provide and promote high quality, transparent information to support sound decision-making.

5.2 Did the agency have an updated comprehensive data inventory? (Example: Evidence Act 3511)

As part of its data restructuring efforts, ACL has created an internal inventory of its administrative data sets. In addition, these data sets/files are documented through the Privacy Impact Assessment and the Systems of Records Notice processes which are required under Titles II and III of the E-Government Act of 2002. The Act specifically requires that agencies evaluate systems that collect personally identifiable information (PII) and determine whether the privacy of that PII is adequately protected. Agencies perform this evaluation through a privacy impact assessment (PIA). One result is a complete listing of all data collections.

5.3 Did the agency promote data access or data linkage for evaluation, evidence-building, or program improvement? (Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; downloadable machine-readable, de-identified tagged data; Evidence Act 3520(c))

In 2016, ACL implemented a Public Access Plan as a mechanism for compliance with the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy's public access policy. The plan focused on making published results of ACL/NIDILRR-funded research more readily accessible to the public; making scientific data collected through ACL/NIDILRR-funded research more readily accessible to the public; and increasing the use of research results and scientific data to further advance scientific endeavors and other tangible applications. In March 2019, the ACL completed the ACL Data Restructuring (DR) Project to assess the data hosted on the Aging Integrated Database (AGID), and to develop and test a potential restructuring of the data in order to make it useful and usable for stakeholders. In 2019, ACL awarded a follow on contract to further integrate its datasets along the lines of conceptual linkages, and to better align the measures within ACL's data collections across the agency. This work will consist of careful data documentation, building a data repository for aging datasets (with a capability for expansion for ACL's disability datasets), aligning measures for conceptual linkages across ACL datasets, and reviewing datasets for potential topical navigation of the data. The ultimate goal is to expand ACL's current public data portal (AGID) to allow users to examine ACL data across data sets, geographies, and years.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.4 Did the agency have policies and procedures to secure data and protect personal, confidential information? (Example: differential privacy; secure, multiparty computation; homomorphic encryption; or developing audit trails)

As an operating division of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, ACL follows all departmental guidance regarding data privacy and security. This includes project-specific reviews by ACL's Office of Information Resource Management (OIRM), which monitors all of ACL's data collection activities to ensure the safety and security of ACL's data assets. In FY19, ACL awarded a contract to stand up a "Data Council" to enhance the quality, security, and statistical usability of the data ACL collects through its evaluation, grant reporting, and administrative data collections, and to develop effective data governance standards. In addition, each funding opportunity announcement states that "a data and safety monitoring board (DSMB) is required for all multi-site clinical trials involving interventions" (see for example The FOA for Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRRP): Assistive Technology to Promote Independence and Community Living (Development) HHS-2019-ACL-NIDILRR-DPGE-0355).

5.5 Did the agency provide assistance to city, county, and/or state governments, and/or other grantees on accessing the agency's datasets while protecting privacy?

ACL staff provide technical assistance through presentations and ACL's technical assistance resource centers to grantees, including state, tribal, and local governments. The resource centers providing technical assistance include: the National Resource Center on Nutrition and Aging (NRC), the Alzheimer's Disease Supportive Services Program (ADSSP) and the University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service. This technical assistance includes annual workshops and presentations at the Title VI National Training and Technical Assistance Conference; training available through the ACL funded National Ombudsman Resource Center; and the Disability and Rehabilitation Research Program (DRRP), which funds capacity building for minority research entities.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

Score
8

U.S. Agency for International Development

5.1 Did the agency have a strategic data plan, including an open data policy? (Example: Evidence Act 202(c), Strategic Information Resources Plan)

USAID's data related investments and efforts are guided by its Information Technology Strategic Plan. This includes support for the Agency's Development Data Policy, USAID's open data policy, that provides a framework for systematically collecting Agency-funded data, structuring the data to ensure usability, and making the data public while ensuring rigorous protections for privacy and security. In addition, this policy sets requirements for how USAID data is tagged, submitted, and updated. The Development Data Library (DDL) is the Agency's repository of USAID-funded, machine readable data, created or collected by the Agency and its implementing partners. The DDL, as a repository of structured and quantitative data, complements the DEC which publishes qualitative reports and information.

5.2 Did the agency have an updated comprehensive data inventory? (Example: Evidence Act 3511)

Launched in November 2018 as part of the Development Information Solution (DIS), USAID's public-facing Development Data Library (DDL) provides a comprehensive inventory of data assets available to the Agency. The DDL's data catalog is also harvested via javascript on an ongoing basis for further distribution on the federal Data.gov website.

5.3 Did the agency promote data access or data linkage for evaluation, evidence-building, or program improvement? (Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; downloadable machine-readable, de-identified tagged data; Evidence Act 3520(c))

The Data Services team— located in USAID's Management Bureau's Office of the Chief Information Officer (M/CIO)— manages a comprehensive portfolio of data services in support of the Agency's mission. This includes enhancing the internal and external

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

availability and ease-of use of USAID data and information via technology platforms such as the USAID Economic Analysis And Data Services platform, broadening global awareness of USAID's data and information services, and bolstering the Agency's capacity to use data and information via training and the provision of demand-driven analytical services.

The Data Services Team also manages and develops the Agency's digital repositories, including the Development Data Library (DDL), the Agency's central data repository. USAID and external users can search for and access datasets from completed evaluations and program monitoring by country and sector.

USAID staff also have access to an internal database of over 100 standard foreign assistance program performance indicators and associated baseline, target, and actual data reported globally each year. This database and reporting process, known as the Performance Plan and Report (PPR) promotes evidence building and informs internal learning and decisions related to policy, strategy, budgets, and programs.

The United States is a signatory to the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI)—a voluntary, multi-stakeholder initiative that created a data standard for publishing foreign assistance spending data in machine-readable format. The standard links an activity's financial data to its evaluations. USAID continues to improve and add to its published IATI data, and is looking into ways to utilize these data as best practice—including using it to populate partner country systems, fulfill transparency reporting as part of the U.S. commitment to the Grand Bargain, and make decisions internally, including based on what other development actors are doing by using the newly launched Development Cooperation Landscape tool.

The Landscape tool enables USAID staff to better understand cooperation partners' priorities and identify potential areas of alignment. This data source is contributing to more robust cooperation strategy development, decision making, and helping USAID to more effectively and efficiently use cooperation resources. USAID created the Global Innovation Exchange that shares information around development innovations with hundreds of other industry partners and governments.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.4 Did the agency have policies and procedures to secure data and protect personal, confidential information? (Example: differential privacy; secure, multiparty computation; homomorphic encryption; or developing audit trails)

USAID's Privacy Program directs policies and practices for protecting personally identifiable information and data, while several policy references (ADS303maz and ADS302mbj) provide guidance for protecting information to ensure the health and safety of implementing partners. USAID's Development Data Policy (ADS Chapter 579) details a data publication process that provides governance for data access and data release in ways that ensure protections for personal and confidential information. As a reference to the Development Data Policy, ADS579maa explains USAID's foreign assistance data publications and the protection of any sensitive information prior to release. USAID applies statistical disclosure control on all public data before publication or inclusion in the DDL.

5.5 Did the agency provide assistance to city, county, and/or state governments, and/or other grantees on accessing the agency's datasets while protecting privacy?

While specific data on this is limited, USAID does invest in contracts or grants that provide support to build local organizational or governmental capacity in data collection, analysis, and use. In addition, to date, more than 245 USAID data assets are available to the public via USAID's DDL. These assets include microdata related to USAID's initiatives that provide partner countries and development partners with insight into emerging trends and opportunities for expanding peace and democracy, reducing food insecurity, and strengthening the capacity to deliver quality educational opportunities for children and youth around the globe. Grantees are encouraged to use the data on the DDL, which provides an extensive User Guide to aid in accessing, using, securing and protecting data. The Data Services team conducts communication and outreach to expand the awareness of websites with development data, how to access it, and how to contact the team for support. In addition, the Data Services team has developed a series of videos to show users how to access the data available. The dataservices@usaid.gov mail account responds to requests for assistance and guidance a range of data services from both within the Agency and from implementing partners and the public.

2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

Score
5

Corporation for National and Community Service

5.1 Did the agency have a strategic data plan, including an open data policy? (Example: Evidence Act 202(c), Strategic Information Resources Plan)

CNCS has an Information Technology Data Governance Policy, which addresses open data, and an internal Data Sharing Policy that was implemented in FY18. CNCS has not historically posted these policies publicly but is moving in that direction as the CIO develops and clears policies as well as hires staff to oversee these efforts.

The CIO/Acting CDO and the Director of Research and Evaluation/Evaluation Officer will be working together in FY20 to reconstitute and reconvene the agency's Data Council and determine what kind of charter/agency policy may be needed for establishing the role of the Council with regard to managing the agency's data assets. In essence, the role of the Council, under the direction of the Acting CDO, will be to prioritize data asset management issues such as creating an annual Fact Sheet (so all externally facing numbers have a single authoritative source), creating a more user-friendly interface for the agency's data warehouse/data inventory, and keeping the agency' open data platform current.

5.2 Did the agency have an updated comprehensive data inventory? (Example: Evidence Act 3511)

The agency has an Information Technology Data Governance Policy, which addresses the need to have a current and comprehensive data inventory. The agency has an open data platform.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.3 Did the agency promote data access or data linkage for evaluation, evidence-building, or program improvement? (Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; downloadable machine-readable, de-identified tagged data; Evidence Act 3520(c))

CNCS has a data request form and an MOU template so that anyone interested in accessing agency data may use the protocol to request data. In addition, public data sets are accessible through the agency's open data platform. The agency's member exit survey data was made publicly available for the first time in FY19. In addition, nationally representative civic engagement and volunteering statistics are available, through a data sharing agreement with the Census Bureau, on an interactive platform. The goal of these platforms is to make these data more accessible to all interested end-users.

5.4 Did the agency have policies and procedures to secure data and protect personal, confidential information? (Example: differential privacy; secure, multiparty computation; homomorphic encryption; or developing audit trails)

The agency has an Information Technology Data Governance Policy which addresses data security and protecting personal/confidential information. CNCS has a cybersecurity policy, and it will likely be subsumed under the new Data Governance Policy.

5.5 Did the agency provide assistance to city, county, and/or state governments, and/or other grantees on accessing the agency's datasets while protecting privacy?

CNCS provides assistance to grantees, including governments, to help them access agency data. For example, CNCS provided assistance on using the AmeriCorps Member Exit Survey data to State Service Commissions (many of which are part of state government) and other grantees at the National Service Training Conference in May 2019.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

Score
6

U.S. Department of Education

5.1 Did the agency have a strategic data plan, including an open data policy? (Example: Evidence Act 202(c), Strategic Information Resources Plan)

ED's FY18-22 Performance Plan outlines strategic goals and objectives for the Department, including Goal #3: "Strengthen the quality, accessibility and use of education data through better management, increased privacy protections and transparency." This currently serves as a strategic plan for the Department's governance, protection, and use of data while it develops the Open Data Plan required by the Evidence Act. The plan currently tracks measurable performance on a number of metrics including the public availability of machine-readable datasets and open licensing requirements for deliverables created with Department grant funds. ED will continue to expand its open data infrastructure to improve how stakeholders find, access and manage the Department's public data. This will include establishing an enterprise open data platform that will make the Department's public data discoverable from a single location and easily searchable by topic. As is required by the Evidence Act, the Department will be publishing its open data plan in 2020 within the agency's Information Resource Management Strategic Plan.

5.2 Did the agency have an updated comprehensive data inventory? (Example: Evidence Act 3511)

Information about Department data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) have historically been made publicly available online. Prioritized data is further documented or featured on the Department's data page.

In FY20, the Department will be launching an open data platform designed for improved public engagement and tailored to meet the requirements of the comprehensive data asset inventory described in the Evidence Act.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.3 Did the agency promote data access or data linkage for evaluation, evidence-building, or program improvement? (Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; downloadable machine-readable, de-identified tagged data; Evidence Act 3520(c))

In ED's FY18-22 Performance Plan, Strategic Objective 3.3 is to "Increase access to, and use of education data to make informed decisions both at the Department and in the education community" and outlines actions taken in FY18. In 2019, IES generated analysis and reporting of a new type of data produced by the new NAEP digitally based assessments. This included providing a detailed statistical guide (via an R package), which facilitates external researchers' computation of analytic weights. Additionally, IES added 12 longitudinal data sets to the DataLab system, which improved access to National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) sample survey data. In 2018, ED publicly released 126 data sets in machine readable formats. As of September 2019, the Department is on track to exceed its 2019 target for publicly released machine readable datasets.

Through leadership of NCES, ED continues to invest in clearer, more defined standards for education data. The Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) have been developed over the past 10 years using an open process to engage a broad range or data stakeholders, including local and state education agencies, postsecondary institutions, and interested organizations. CEDS establishes a common vocabulary, data model and technical tools to help education stakeholders understand and use education data.

ED has also made concerted efforts to improve the availability and use of its data with the release of the revised College Scorecard that links data from NCES, the Office of Federal Student Aid, and the Internal Revenue Service. In FY19, the Department released provisional data describing debt at the level of fields of study. ED plans to integrate additional field of study data into its College Scorecard consumer site and the Office of Federal Student Aid's NextGen student tools.

In September 2019, the Department established an agency-level Data Governance Body (DGB), chaired by the Chief Data Officer (CDO), with participation from relevant senior-level staff in agency business units. The DGB will assist the CDO in assessing and adjudicating competing proposals aimed at achieving and measuring desirable Departmental data outcomes and priorities.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.4 Did the agency have policies and procedures to secure data and protect personal, confidential information? (Example: differential privacy; secure, multiparty computation; homomorphic encryption; or developing audit trails)

The Disclosure Review Board, the EDFacts Governing Board, the Student Privacy Policy Office (SPPO), and SPPO's Privacy Technical Assistance Center all help to ensure the quality and privacy of education data. In FY19, the ED Data Strategy Team also published a user resource guide for staff on disclosure avoidance considerations throughout the data lifecycle.

In ED's FY18-22 Performance Plan, Strategic Objective 3.2 is to "Improve privacy protections for, and transparency of, education data both at the Department and in the education community." The plan also outlines actions taken in FY18. ED's Student Privacy website assists stakeholders in protecting student privacy by providing official guidance on FERPA, technical best practices, and the answers to Frequently Asked Questions. ED's Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC) responded to more than 3,200 technical assistance inquiries on student privacy issues and provided online FERPA training to more than 57,000 state and school district officials. FSA conducted a postsecondary institution breach response assessment to determine the extent of a potential breach and provide the institutions with remediation actions around their protection of FSA data and best practices associated with cybersecurity.

5.5 Did the agency provide assistance to city, county, and/or state governments, and/or other grantees on accessing the agency's datasets while protecting privacy?

InformED, the ED's primary open data initiative, works to improve the Department's capacity to make public education data accessible and usable in innovative and effective ways for families, policy makers, researchers, developers, advocates and other stakeholders.

In FY 2018, ED developed and released a series of three data stories focused on the characteristics, educational experiences and academic outcomes of English learners. ED also updated its data story on chronic absenteeism and released another new data story on career and technical education. These data stories have interactive graphics and accompanying narrative text to promote better access and use of Department data by a wider variety of stakeholders. Also in FY18, the Office of Special

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

Education and Rehabilitative Services supported technical assistance centers to conduct several conferences to assist states in using their Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) data to make informed decisions.

Score
6

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

5.1 Did the agency have a strategic data plan, including an open data policy? (Example: Evidence Act 202(c), Strategic Information Resources Plan)

As HUD implements the DATA Act and Evidence Act, new open data policies, accountability principles, and automated reporting are being developed and implemented during FY19 (see FY20 Annual Performance Plan). HUD maintains a vigorous open data program including administrative datasets on data.hud.gov, spatially enabled data on the eGIS portal, PD&R datasets for researchers and practitioners, a robust partnership with the Census Bureau, U.S. Postal Service vacancy data, and health data linkages with the National Center for Health Statistics.

5.2 Did the agency have an updated comprehensive data inventory? (Example: Evidence Act 3511)

HUD has an Inventory Schedule to identify tasks and timelines for engaging program offices to identify data assets, assess whether data can be made available to the public, and create metadata and guidance for shareable data. At present, the Enterprise Data Inventory remains incomplete while the Enterprise Data Management Policy is updated during FY19.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.3 Did the agency promote data access or data linkage for evaluation, evidence-building, or program improvement? (Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; downloadable machine-readable, de-identified tagged data; Evidence Act 3520(c))

HUD has an updated list of open data assets; numerous PD&R-produced datasets for researchers and practitioners, including tenant public use microdata samples; and an eGIS portal providing geo-identified open data to support public analysis of housing and community development issues using GIS tools.

PD&R has data linkage agreements with the National Center for Health Statistics and the Census Bureau to enhance major national survey datasets by identifying HUD-assisted households; making available major program demonstration datasets in secure environments; and to produce special open-access tabulations of census data for HUD's partners.

PD&R engages in cooperative agreements with research organizations, including both funded Research Partnerships and unfunded Data License Agreements, to support innovative research that leverages HUD's data assets and informs HUD's policies and programs. Data licensing protocols ensure that confidential information is protected.

5.4 Did the agency have policies and procedures to secure data and protect personal, confidential information? (Example: differential privacy; secure, multiparty computation; homomorphic encryption; or developing audit trails)

HUD's Evaluation Policy specifies that HUD protects client privacy by adhering to the Rule of Eleven to prevent disclosure from tabulations with small cell sizes.

Data licensing protocols ensure that researchers protect confidential information when using HUD's administrative data or program demonstration datasets.

HUD has an interagency agreement with the Census Bureau to link administrative data from HUD's tenant databases and randomized control trials with the Bureau's survey data collection and other administrative data collected under the privacy protections of its Title 13 authority. These RCT datasets are the first intervention data added to Federal Statistical RDCs by any

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

federal agency, and strict protocols and review of all output ensure that confidential information is protected.

5.5 Did the agency provide assistance to city, county, and/or state governments, and/or other grantees on accessing the agency's datasets while protecting privacy?

HUD has an updated list of open data assets, an open data program, numerous PD&R datasets for researchers and practitioners, and an eGIS portal providing geo-identified data to support public analysis of housing and community development issues related to multiple programs and policy domains using GIS tools. These accessible data assets have privacy protections. Researchers needing detailed microdata can obtain access through data licensing agreements.

HUDExchange offers numerous resources and training opportunities to help program partners use data assets more effectively. Additional technical assistance is offered through the Community Compass program, a $25 million technical assistance program to equip HUD's customers with the knowledge, skills, tools, capacity, and systems to implement HUD programs and policies successfully and provide effective oversight of federal funding.

Score
5

U.S. Department of Labor

5.1 Did the agency have a strategic data plan, including an open data policy? (Example: Evidence Act 202(c), Strategic Information Resources Plan)

DOL's open government plan was last updated in 2016, and subsequent updates have been delayed in anticipation of the formal release of the Federal Data Strategy and the Evidence Act.

DOL also has open data assets aimed at developers and researchers who desire data-as-a-service through application programming interfaces hosted by both the Office of Public Affairs and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Each of these has

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

clear documentation, is consistent with the open data policy, and offers transparent, repeatable, machine-readable access to data on an as-needed basis. The Department is currently developing a new API v3 which will expand the open data offerings, extend the capabilities, and offer a suite of user-friendly tools.

The Department has consistently sought to make as much data available to the public regarding its activities as possible. Examples of this include DOL's Public Enforcement Database, which makes available records of activity from the worker protection agencies and the Office of Labor Management Standards' online public disclosure room.

The Department also has multiple restricted-use access systems which go beyond what would be possible with simple open-data efforts. BLS has a confidential researcher access program, offering access under appropriate conditions to sensitive data. Similarly, the Chief Evaluation Office (CEO) has stood up a centralized research hub for evaluation study partners to leverage sensitive data in a consistent manner to help make evidence generation more efficient.

5.2 Did the agency have an updated comprehensive data inventory? (Example: Evidence Act 3511)

The Department has conducted extensive inventories over the last ten years, in part to support common activities such as IT modernization, White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) data calls, and the general goal of transparency through data sharing. These form the current basis of DOL's planning and administration. Some sections of the Evidence Act have led to a different federal posture with respect to data, such as the requirement for data to be open by default, and considered shareable absent a legal requirement not to do so, or unless there is a risk that the release of such data might help constitute disclosure risk. The Department is currently re-evaluating its inventories and its public data offerings in light of this very specific requirement and re-visiting this issue among all its programs. Because this is a critical prerequisite to developing open data plans, as well as data governance and data strategy frameworks, the agency hopes to have a revised inventory completed by the end of FY19.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.3 Did the agency promote data access or data linkage for evaluation, evidence-building, or program improvement? (Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; downloadable machine-readable, de-identified tagged data; Evidence Act 3520(c))

DOL's CEO, Employment & Training Administration (ETA), and Veterans Employment & 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 10 job training and employment program evaluations.

During FY19, the Department continued to expand efforts to improve the quality of and access to data for evaluation and performance analysis through the Data Analytics Unit in CEO, 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 also continued to leverage its Data Exchange and Analysis Platform (DEAP) with high processing capacity and privacy provisions to share, link, and analyze program data for recently separated veterans, public workforce outcomes, and sensitive worker protection data such as complaint filings. This work helps to identify trends and patterns in the data which become the foundation for future program improvements. The analysis also results in a feedback loop that can improve data quality, and allows for inquiries to determine if the data from the program are appropriate to support more rigorous performance and evaluation approaches.

5.4 Did the agency have policies and procedures to secure data and protect personal, confidential information? (Example: differential privacy; secure, multiparty computation; homomorphic encryption; or developing audit trails)

DOL has a shared services approach to data security. In addition, the privacy provisions for BLS and ETA are publicly available online.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.5 Did the agency provide assistance to city, county, and/or state governments, and/or other grantees on accessing the agency's datasets while protecting privacy?

DOL's ETA has agreements with 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico for data sharing and exchange of interstate wage data for performance accountability purposes. Currently, ETA is finalizing an updated data sharing agreement with states that will facilitate better access to quarterly wage data by states for purposes of performance accountability and research and evaluation requirements under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). This work aims to expand access to interstate wage data for the U.S. Department of Education's Adult and Family Literacy Act programs (AEFLA) and Vocational Rehabilitation programs, among others.

ETA continues to fund and provide technical assistance to states under the Workforce Data Quality Initiative to link earnings and workforce data with education data longitudinally to support state program administration and evaluation. As of June 2019, seven rounds of grants have been awarded to states. ETA and VETS also have 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.

Score
6

Millennium Challenge Corporation

5.1 Did the agency have a strategic data plan, including an open data policy? (Example: Evidence Act 202(c), Strategic Information Resources Plan)

As detailed on MCC's Digital Strategy and Open Government pages, MCC promotes transparency to provide people with access to information that facilitates their understanding of MCC's model, MCC's decision-making processes, and the results of MCC's investments. Transparency, and therefore open data, is a core principle for MCC because it is the basis for accountability,

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

provides strong checks against corruption, builds public confidence, and supports informed participation of citizens.

As a testament to MCC's commitment to and implementation of transparency and open data, the agency was the highest-ranked U.S. government agency in the 2018 Publish What You Fund Aid Transparency Index for the fifth consecutive year. In addition, the U.S. government is part of the Open Government Partnership, a signatory to the International Aid Transparency Initiative, and must adhere to the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act. All of these initiatives require foreign assistance agencies to make it easier to access, use, and understand data. All of these actions have created further impetus for MCC's work in this area, as they establish specific goals and timelines for adoption of transparent business processes.
Additionally, MCC convened an internal Data Governance Board, an independent group consisting of representatives from departments throughout the agency, to streamline MCC's approach to data management and advance data-driven decision-making across its investment portfolio.

5.2 Did the agency have an updated comprehensive data inventory? (Example: Evidence Act 3511)

MCC makes extensive program data, including financials and results data, publicly available through its Open Data Catalog, which includes an "enterprise data inventory" of all data resources across the agency for release of data in open, machine readable formats. The Department of Policy and Evaluation leads the MCC Disclosure Review Board process for publicly releasing the de-identified microdata that underlies the independent evaluations on the Evaluation Catalog, following MCC's Microdata Management Guidelines to ensure appropriate balance in transparency efforts with protection of human subjects' confidentiality.

5.3 Did the agency promote data access or data linkage for evaluation, evidence-building, or program improvement? (Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; downloadable machine-readable, de-identified tagged data; Evidence Act 3520(c))

MCC's Data Analytics Program (DAP) enables enterprise data-driven decision-making through the capture, storage, analysis, publishing, and governance of MCC's core programmatic data. The DAP streamlines the agency's data lifecycle, facilitating increased efficiency. Additionally, the program promotes agency-wide coordination, learning, and transparency. For example,

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

MCC has developed custom software applications to capture program data, established the infrastructure for consolidated storage and analysis, and connected robust data sources to end user tools that power up-to-date, dynamic reporting and also streamlines content maintenance on MCC's public website. As a part of this effort, the Monitoring and Evaluation team has developed an Evaluation Pipeline application that provides up-to-date information on the status, risk, cost, and milestones of the full evaluation portfolio for better performance management.

5.4 Did the agency have policies and procedures to secure data and protect personal, confidential information? (Example: differential privacy; secure, multiparty computation; homomorphic encryption; or developing audit trails)

MCC's Disclosure Review Board ensures that data collected from surveys and other research activities is made public according to relevant laws and ethical standards that protect research participants, while recognizing the potential value of the data to the public. The board is responsible for: reviewing and approving procedures for the release of data products to the public; reviewing and approving data files for disclosure; ensuring de-identification procedures adhere to legal and ethical standards for the protection of research participants; and initiating and coordinating any necessary research related to disclosure risk potential in individual, household, and enterprise-level survey microdata on MCC's beneficiaries.

The Microdata Evaluation Guidelines inform MCC staff and contractors, as well as other partners, on how to store, manage, and disseminate evaluation-related microdata. This microdata is distinct from other data MCC disseminates because it typically includes personally identifiable information and sensitive data as required for the independent evaluations. With this in mind, MCC's Guidelines govern how to manage three competing objectives: share data for verification and replication of the independent evaluations, share data to maximize usability and learning, and protect the privacy and confidentiality of evaluation participants. These Guidelines were established in 2013 and updated in January 2017. Following these Guidelines, MCC has publicly released 76 de-identified, public use, microdata files for its evaluations. MCC's experience with developing and implementing this rigorous process for data management and dissemination while protecting human subjects throughout the evaluation life cycle is detailed in Opening Up Evaluation Microdata: Balancing Risks and Benefits of Research Transparency.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.5 Did the agency provide assistance to city, county, and/or state governments, and/or other grantees on accessing the agency's datasets while protecting privacy?

Both MCC and its partner in-country teams produce and provide data that is continuously updated and accessed. MCC's website is routinely updated with the most recent information, and in-country teams are required to do the same on their respective websites. As such, all MCC program data is publicly available on MCC's website and individual MCA websites for use by MCC country partners, in addition to other stakeholder groups. As a part of each country program, MCC provides resources to ensure data and evidence are continually collected, captured, and accessed. In addition, each project's evaluation has an Evaluation Brief that distills key learning from MCC-commissioned independent evaluations. Select Evaluation Briefs have been posted in local languages, including Mongolian, Georgian, French, and Romanian, to better facilitate use by country partners.

MCC also has a partnership with the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), referred to as the Data Collaboratives for Local Impact (DCLI). This partnership is improving the use of data analysis for decision-making within PEPFAR and MCC partner countries by working toward evidence-based programs to address challenges in HIV/AIDS and health, empowerment of women and youth, and sustainable economic growth. Data-driven priority setting and insights gathered by citizen-generated data and community mapping initiatives contribute to improved allocation of resources in target communities to address local priorities, such as job creation, access to services, and reduced gender-based violence. DCLI continues to inform and improve the capabilities of PEPFAR activities through projects such as the Tanzania Data Lab, which has trained nearly 700 individuals, nearly 50% of whom are women, and has hosted a one-of-a-kind "Data Festival." Recently, the Lab has announced a partnership with the University of Virginia Data Science Institute and catalyzed launching of the first Masters in Data Science in East Africa, in partnership with the University of Dar es Salaam.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

Score
5

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration

5.1 Did the agency have a strategic data plan, including an open data policy? (Example: Evidence Act 202(c), Strategic Information Resources Plan)

The SAMHSA Strategic Plan FY2019-FY2023 (pp. 20-23) outlines five priority areas to carry out the vision and mission of SAMHSA, including Priority 4: Improving Data Collection, Analysis, Dissemination, and Program and Policy Evaluation. This Priority includes 3 objectives: 1) Develop consistent data collection strategies to identify and track mental health and substance use needs across the nation; 2) Ensure that all SAMHSA programs are evaluated in a robust, timely, and high-quality manner; and 3) Promote access to and use of the nation's substance use and mental health data and conduct program and policy evaluations and use the results to advance the adoption of evidence-based policies, programs, and practices.

5.2 Did the agency have an updated comprehensive data inventory? (Example: Evidence Act 3511)

SAMHSA Data and Dissemination site identifies six data collection initiatives: National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH): population data; Treatment Episode Data Set – Admissions: client level data; National Survey of Substance Abuse Treatment Services (N-SSATS): substance abuse facilities data; Drug Abuse Warning Network: emergency department data; the National Mental Health Services Survey (N-MHSS); and Mental Health Client-Level Data: data on mental health diagnoses, treatment services, outcomes, and characteristics of individuals in mental health treatment facilities. SAMHSA has made numerous administrative and survey datasets publicly available for secondary use.

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

5.3 Did the agency promote data access or data linkage for evaluation, evidence-building, or program improvement? (Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; downloadable machine-readable, de-identified tagged data; Evidence Act 3520(c))

The Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality (CBHSQ) oversees data collection initiatives and provides publicly available datasets so that some data can be shared with researchers and other stakeholders while preserving client confidentiality and privacy.

SAMHSA's Substance Abuse and Mental Health Data Archive (SAMHDA) contains substance use disorder and mental illness research data available for restricted and public use. SAMHDA promotes the access and use of SAMHSA's substance abuse and mental health data by providing public-use data files and documentation for download and online analysis tools to support a better understanding of this critical area of public health.

5.4 Did the agency have policies and procedures to secure data and protect personal, confidential information? (Example: differential privacy; secure, multiparty computation; homomorphic encryption; or developing audit trails)

SAMHSA's Performance and Accountability and Reporting System (SPARS) hosts the data entry, technical assistance request, and training system for grantees to report performance data to SAMHSA. SPARS serves as the data repository for the Administration's three centers, Center for Substance Abuse and Prevention (CSAP), Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS), and Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT). In order to safeguard confidentiality and privacy, the current data transfer agreement limits the use of grantee data to internal reports so that data collected by SAMHSA grantees will not be available to share with researchers or stakeholders beyond SAMHSA, and publications based on grantee data will not be permitted.

5.5 Did the agency provide assistance to city, county, and/or state governments, and/or other grantees on accessing the agency's datasets while protecting privacy?

The Center of Excellence for Protected Health Information (CoE for PHI) is a SAMHSA funded technical assistance project designed to develop and increase access to simple, clear, and actionable educational resources, training, and technical

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) outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and/or the performance of federal, state, local, and other service providers programs in FY19?
(Examples: Model data-sharing agreements or data-licensing agreements; data tagging and documentation; data standardization; open data policies; data-use policies)

assistance for consumers and their families, state agencies, and communities to promote patient care while protecting confidentiality.

Through SAMHSA's Substance Abuse and Mental Health Data Archive (SAMHDA) SAMHSA has partnered with the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) to host restricted-use National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) data at their Federal Statistical Research Data Centers (RDCs). RDCs are secure facilities that provide access to a range of restricted-use microdata for statistical purposes.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

Score
7

Administration for Children and Families

6.1 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *research and evaluation* purposes?

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' expectations for different types of studies.

6.2 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *funding* decisions?

While ACF does not have a common evidence framework across all funding decisions, certain programs do use a common evidence framework for funding decisions. For example:

- The Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA) enables states to use funds for certain evidence-based services. In April 2019, ACF published the Prevention Services Clearinghouse Handbook of Standards and Procedures, which provides a detailed description of the standards used to identify and review programs and services in order to rate programs and services as promising, supported, and well-supported practices.
- The Personal Responsibility Education Program Competitive Grants were funded to replicate effective, evidence-based program models or substantially incorporate elements of projects that have been proven to delay sexual activity, increase condom or contraceptive use for sexually active youth, and/or reduce pregnancy among youth. Through a systematic evidence review, HHS selected 44 models that grantees could use, depending on the needs and age of the target population of each funded project.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

6.3 Did the agency have a *user friendly tool* that disseminated information on rigorously evaluated, evidence-based solutions (programs, interventions, practices, etc.) including information on what works where, for whom, and under what conditions?

ACF sponsors several user-friendly tools that disseminate and promote evidence-based interventions. Several evidence reviews of human services interventions disseminate and promote evidence-based interventions by rating the quality of evaluation studies and presenting results in a user-friendly searchable format. Reviews to date have covered: teen pregnancy prevention; home visiting; marriage education and responsible fatherhood; and employment and training and include both ACF-sponsored and other studies. ACF is currently developing two new websites that will disseminate information on rigorously evaluated, evidence-based solutions: 1) The Pathways to Work Evidence Clearinghouse will be a user-friendly website (expected to launch in Spring 2020) that will report on "projects that used a proven approach or a promising approach in moving welfare recipients into work, based on independent, rigorous evaluations of the projects"; 2) ACF's Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse project launched a website in June 2019 that is easily accessible and searchable and allows users to navigate the site and find information about mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services, in-home parent skill-based programs, and kinship navigator services designated as "promising," "supported," and "well-supported" practices by an independent systematic review.

6.4 Did the agency promote the *utilization* of evidence-based practices in the field to encourage implementation, replication, and application of evaluation findings and other evidence?

OPRE's evaluation policy states that it is important for evaluators to disseminate research findings in ways that are accessible and useful to policy-makers and practitioners and that OPRE and program offices will work in partnership to inform potential applicants, program providers, administrators, policy-makers, and funders through disseminating evidence from ACF-sponsored and other good quality evaluations. OPRE has a robust dissemination function that includes the OPRE website, an OPRE e-newsletter, and social media presence on Facebook and Twitter. OPRE also biennially hosts two major conferences, the Research and Evaluation Conference on Self-Sufficiency and the National Research Conference on Early Childhood to share research findings with researchers and with program administrators and policymakers at all levels.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

Score
5

Administration for Community Living

6.1 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *research and evaluation* purposes?

ACL defines evidence-based programs on its website. ACL's National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR) uses a stages of research framework (SORF) to classify and describe its funded grants and research projects within the grants. The four stages of SORF include: exploration and discovery, intervention development, intervention efficacy, and scale-up evaluation. Using SORF, NIDILRR gains insight into what is known and unknown about a problem; whether it is time to develop interventions to address a particular problem; whether it is time to test the efficacy of interventions; and whether it is time to scale-up interventions for broader use.

6.2 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *funding* decisions?

The Older Americans Act requires the use of evidence-based programming in Title III-D-funded activities: Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Services. In response, ACL developed a definition of the term evidence-based, and created a website containing links to a range of resources for evidence-based programs. This is a common evidence framework used for Older Americans Act funded activities. For programs that are not legislatively required to use evidence-based models, through its funding process ACL requires all programs to provide clear justification and evidence (where available) that proposed projects will achieve their stated outcomes.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

6.3 Did the agency have a *user friendly tool* that disseminated information on rigorously evaluated, evidence-based solutions (programs, interventions, practices, etc.) including information on what works where, for whom, and under what conditions?

ACL does not have a common evidence repository, but publishes intervention summaries of aging and disability evidence-based programs and practices. To support the use of evidence-based and evidence-informed programming, service providers can find out about evidence-based programs that serve people with dementia and their caregivers by consulting a white paper drafted with funds from ACL– Translating Innovation to Impact: Evidence-based interventions to support people with Alzheimer's disease and their caregivers at home and in their communities. The Model Systems Knowledge Translation Center (MSKTC) has worked with NIDILRR's Model Systems grantees to develop and publish a variety of evidence-based factsheets about living with spinal cord injury, traumatic brain injury, or burn injury.

6.4 Did the agency promote the *utilization* of evidence-based practices in the field to encourage implementation, replication, and application of evaluation findings and other evidence?

ACL works through its resource centers to help grantees use evidence to drive improvements in outcomes for older adults and individuals with disabilities. For example, with funding from ACL, the National Resource Centers at National Center on Aging (NCOA), in collaboration with the Evidence-Based Leadership Council, led an innovative vetting process to increase the number of programs available to ACL's aging network that meet the Title III-D evidence-based criteria. This process resulted in adding six new health promotion programs and three new programs for preventing falls. The Alzheimer's Disease Supportive Services Program (ADSSP) funds competitive grants to expand the availability of evidence-based services that support persons with Alzheimer's disease and related dementia (ADRD) and their family caregivers. Extensive evaluation of the National Chronic Disease Self-Management Education (CDSME) and Falls Prevention database helped generate important insights for potential new ACL applicants in preparing their applications using data-driven estimation procedures for participant and completion targets (see Guidance for Administration for Community Living 2019 Chronic Disease Self-Management Education Grant Applicants: Considerations for Estimating Participation and Completion Targets).

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

Score
2

U.S. Agency for International Development

6.1 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *research and evaluation* purposes?

USAID's evidence standards are embedded within its policies and include requirements for the use of evidence in strategic planning, project design, activity design, program monitoring, and evaluation. USAID has a Scientific Research Policy that sets out quality standards for research across the Agency. USAID's Program Cycle Policy requires the use of evidence and data to assess the development context, challenges, potential solutions, and opportunities in all of USAID's country strategies. Specific programs, such as the Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) use evaluation criteria related to evidence and cost effectiveness to determine funding decisions to test and scale innovations.

6.2 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *funding* decisions?

While there is no one evidence framework for all funding decisions, there are general guidelines for evaluation and scientific research, and some specific types of programs do use evidence framework or standards to make funding decisions.

Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) uses a tiered funding system to test and scale evidence-based innovations, making funding decisions based on its evaluation criteria: evaluation and impact; cost-effectiveness; evidence and evaluation; implementation; sustainability and pathway to scale; and project team (see page 6 in DIV's most recent Annual Program Statement for the evaluation criteria). DIV's expectations vary by stage, but every awardee must report against a set of pre-negotiated key performance indicators and nearly all grants are structured in a pay-for-performance model.

For large scale Stage 2 DIV grants of $500,000 or more, DIV requires evidence of impact that must be causal and rigorous – the grantee must either have rigorous underlying evidence already established, use this funding to run an evaluation with an

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

evaluation partner, or run an evaluation with its own funding during the grant period. There must be significant demonstrated demand for the innovation.

6.3 Did the agency have a *user friendly tool* that disseminated information on rigorously evaluated, evidence-based solutions (programs, interventions, practices, etc.) including information on what works where, for whom, and under what conditions?

USAID does have an Agency-wide repository for development information (including evaluation reports and other studies) which is available to the public at the Development Experience Clearinghouse. In addition, USAID uses the International Initiative for Impact Evaluations (3ie) database of impact evaluations relevant to development topics (including over 4,500 entries to date), knowledge gap maps, and systematic reviews that pull the most rigorous evidence and data from across international development donors. 3ie also houses a collection of institutional policies and reports 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's Agency Programs and Functions policy designates technical bureaus responsible for being the repository for latest information in the sectors they oversee; prioritizing evidence needs and taking actions to build evidence; and disseminating that evidence throughout the agency for those sectors. Several USAID bureaus and sectors have created user friendly tools to disseminate information on evidence-based solutions. These include, but are not limited to:

- CLIMATELINKS: A global knowledge portal for climate change and development practitioners
- EDUCATIONLINKS: Shares innovations and lessons learned on implementation of the USAID Education Policy
- Natural Resources Management and Development Portal
- URBANLINKS: USAID's sharing platform for resources on sustainable urban development

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

6.4 Did the agency promote the *utilization* of evidence-based practices in the field to encourage implementation, replication, and application of evaluation findings and other evidence?

USAID's approach to Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) helps ensure that evidence from evaluation of USAID programming is shared with and used by our staff, partners, and stakeholders in the field. USAID requires a dissemination plan and post-evaluation action plan for each evaluation, and USAID field staff are encouraged to co-create evaluation action plans with key stakeholders based on evaluation evidence. USAID collects examples through the CLA Case Competition, held annually, which recognizes implementers, stakeholders, and USAID staff for their work generating and sharing technical evidence and learning from monitoring and evaluation. It is another way that the Agency encourages evidence-based practices among its stakeholders.

In one example of USAID's efforts to promote evidence utilization, the Mission in Senegal worked with a government ministry to co-create evaluation recommendations and an action plan based on those recommendations. Another example shows how an implementer adapted its approach based on findings from a mid-term evaluation for a project in Cambodia. The project maintains a collaborative and responsive relationship with the Mission and utilizes continuous learning and improvement supported by evidence for better development results.

USAID also periodically hold large learning events with partners and others in the development community around evidence including, but not limited to, Evaluation Summits, engagement around the Self-Reliance Learning Agenda, and Moving the Needle. These gatherings are designed to build interest in USAID's evidence, build capacity around applying that evidence and learning, and elicit evidence and learning contributions.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

Score
6

Corporation for National and Community Service

6.1 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *research and evaluation* purposes?

CNCS uses the same standard scientific research methods and designs for all of its studies and evaluations following the model used by clearinghouses like Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse, the Department of Labor's Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research, and the Department of Health and Human Services' Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness project.

6.2 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *funding* decisions?

CNCS has a common evidence framework for funding decisions in the Senior Corps and AmeriCorps State and National programs. This framework, which is articulated in the AmeriCorps State and National program notice of funding, includes the following evidence levels: pre-preliminary, preliminary, moderate, and strong.

6.3 Did the agency have a *user friendly tool* that disseminated information on rigorously evaluated, evidence-based solutions (programs, interventions, practices, etc.) including information on what works where, for whom, and under what conditions?

The CNCS Evidence Exchange is a virtual repository of reports and resources intended to help CNCS grantees and other interested stakeholders find information about evidence- and research- based national service programs. R&E is working with a contractor to enhance the functionality and usability of the repository. Examples of the types of resources available in the Evidence Exchange include research briefs that describe the core components of effective interventions such as those in the areas of education, economic opportunity, and health.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

R&E also creates campaigns and derivative products to distill complex report findings and increase their utility for practitioners (for example, this brief on a study about the health benefits of Senior Corps). R&E has categorized reports according to their research design, so that users can easily search for experimental, quasi-experimental, or non-experimental studies, and those that qualify for strong, moderate, or preliminary evidence levels.

6.4 Did the agency promote the *utilization* of evidence-based practices in the field to encourage implementation, replication, and application of evaluation findings and other evidence?

As part of the AmeriCorps State and National FY19 application process, CNCS provided technical assistance to grantees on using evidence-based practices through webinars and calls. R&E and AmeriCorps conducted a process evaluation of grantees with varied replication experiences to produce a series of products designed to help grantees implement evidence-based interventions (including a forthcoming article in The Foundation Review). Senior Corps continues to encourage and support the use of evidence-based programs, as identified by the HHS's Administration for Community Living, by its grantee organizations.

Score

9

U.S. Department of Education

6.1 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *research and evaluation* purposes?

ED has an agency-wide framework for evidence that is based on ratings of studies' internal validity. ED evidence-building activities are designed to meet the highest standards of internal validity (typically randomized control trials) when causality must be established for policy development or program evaluation purposes. When random assignment is not feasible, rigorous quasi-experiments are conducted. The framework was developed and is maintained by IES's What Works Clearinghouse™ (WWC).

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

Since 2002, ED—as part of its compliance with the Information Quality Act and OMB guidance— has required that all "research and evaluation information products documenting cause and effect relationships or evidence of effectiveness should meet that quality standards that will be developed as part of the What Works Clearinghouse" (see Information Quality Guidelines). Those standards, currently in their 4th version, are maintained on the WWC website. A stylized representation of the standards can be found here, along with information about how ED reports findings from research and evaluations that meet these standards.

6.2 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *funding* decisions?

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) research design standards. ED employs these same evidence standards in all of its discretionary grant competitions that use evidence to direct funds to applicants that are proposing to implement projects that have evidence of effectiveness and/or to build new evidence through evaluation.

6.3 Did the agency have a *user friendly tool* that disseminated information on rigorously evaluated, evidence-based solutions (programs, interventions, practices, etc.) including information on what works where, for whom, and under what conditions?

ED's What Works Clearinghouse™ (WWC) identifies studies that provide valid and statistically significant evidence of effectiveness of a given practice, product, program, or policy (referred to as "interventions"), and disseminates summary information and reports on the WWC website. The WWC has reviewed more than 10,600 studies that are available in a searchable database, including a commitment to review all publicly available evaluation reports generated under i3 grants. In spring 2019, the WWC tagged each study in its database to indicate whether study findings met EDGAR (and therefore ESSA) Tier 1/Strong Evidence or Tier 2/Moderate Evidence standards to make it easier for users to identify evidence-based interventions.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

6.4 Did the agency promote the *utilization* of evidence-based practices in the field to encourage implementation, replication, and application of evaluation findings and other evidence?

IES has funded two projects to study and promote knowledge utilization in education, including the Center for Research Use in Education and the National Center for Research in Policy and Practice.
The Evidence Leadership Group has coordinated the development of revised evidence definitions and related selection criteria for competitive programs that align with ESSA to streamline and clarify provisions for grantees. These revised definitions align with ED's suggested criteria for states' implementation of ESSA's four evidence levels, included in ED's non-regulatory guidance, Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments. ED also developed a fact sheet to support internal and external stakeholders in understanding the revised evidence definitions. This document has been shared with internal and external stakeholders through multiple methods, including the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education ESSA technical assistance page for grantees.

WWC Practice Guides are based on reviews of research and experience of practitioners. These guides are designed to address challenges in classrooms and schools. The WWC released two new Practice Guides in FY19: Using Technology to Support Postsecondary Student Learning and Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 through 8. WWC began three more guides in FY19: Assisting Students Struggling in Mathematics; Career and Technical Education Programs in Community College Settings; and Supporting Prosocial and Positive Behavior.

IES manages the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) program, which supports districts, states, and boards of education throughout the United States to use research and evaluation in decision making. The research priorities are determined locally, but IES approves the studies and reviews the final products.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

Score
6

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

6.1 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *research and evaluation* purposes?

PD&R's Program Evaluation Policy defines standards that prioritize rigorous methods for research and evaluation covering impact evaluations; implementation or process evaluations; descriptive studies; outcome evaluations; and formative evaluations; and both qualitative and quantitative approaches. It also provides for dissemination of such evidence to stakeholders in a timely fashion.

6.2 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *funding* decisions?

HUD seeks to employ tiered evidence in funding decisions by embedding implementation and impact evaluations in funding requests for program initiatives, including major program demonstrations that employ random assignment methods. These include the Moving To Work Expansion demonstration, the Rental Assistance Demonstration, the Rent Reform Demonstration, the Family Self-Sufficiency Demonstration, and the Housing Counseling Demonstration. Such trials provide robust evidence to inform scale-up funding decisions.

In FY17, HUD developed and piloted a new standardized data collection and reporting framework for its discretionary grant programs called Standards for Success. The framework consists of a repository of data elements that participating programs use in their grant reporting, creating common definitions and measures across programs for greater analysis and coordination of services.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

6.3 Did the agency have a *user friendly tool* that disseminated information on rigorously evaluated, evidence-based solutions (programs, interventions, practices, etc.) including information on what works where, for whom, and under what conditions?

HUD provides resources and assistance to support community partners in evidence-based practice through the HUD Exchange web portal. PD&R provides the public, policymakers, and practitioners with evidence of what works through the Regulatory Barriers Clearinghouse and HUD USER, which is a portal and web store for program evaluations, case studies, and policy analysis and research.

6.4 Did the agency promote the *utilization* of evidence-based practices in the field to encourage implementation, replication, and application of evaluation findings and other evidence?

HUD provides resources and assistance to support community partners in evidence-based practice through the HUD Exchange web portal. PD&R provides the public, policymakers, and practitioners with 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 such as Evidence Matters. 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 has worked in the field, and new innovations currently being explored) to inform their work.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

Score
9

U.S. Department of Labor

6.1 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *research and evaluation* purposes?

DOL uses the Cross-agency Federal Evidence Framework for evaluation planning and dissemination. Additionally, DOL collaborates with other agencies (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences (IES), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the Corporation for National and Community Service (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. Additionally, the Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research's (CLEAR) evidence guidelines, which describe quality standards for different types of studies, are applied to all independent evaluations, including all third party evaluations of DOL programs, determined eligible for CLEAR's evidence reviews across different topic areas. Requests for proposals also indicate these CLEAR standards should be applied to all Chief Evaluation Office (CEO) evaluations when considering which designs are the most rigorous and appropriate to answer specific research questions.

6.2 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *funding* decisions?

DOL uses the CLEAR evidence guidelines and standards to make decisions about discretionary program grants awarded using evidence-informed or evidence-based criteria. The published guidelines and standards are used to identify evidence-based programs and practices and to review studies to assess the strength of their causal evidence or to do a structured evidence review in a particular topic area or timeframe to help inform agencies what strategies appear promising and where gaps exist.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

6.3 Did the agency have a *user friendly tool* that disseminated information on rigorously evaluated, evidence-based solutions (programs, interventions, practices, etc.) including information on what works where, for whom, and under what conditions?

DOL's CLEAR is an online evidence clearinghouse. CLEAR's goal is to make research on labor topics more accessible to practitioners, policymakers, researchers, and the public more broadly, so that it can inform their decisions about labor policies and programs. CLEAR identifies and summarizes many types of research, including descriptive statistical studies and outcome analyses, implementation studies, and causal impact studies. For causal impact studies, CLEAR assesses the strength of the design and methodology in studies that look at the effectiveness of particular policies and programs. CLEAR's study summaries and icons, found in each topic area, can help users quickly and easily understand what studies found and how much confidence to have in the results.

6.4 Did the agency promote the *utilization* of evidence-based practices in the field to encourage implementation, replication, and application of evaluation findings and other evidence?

DOL promotes the utilization of evidence-based practices in a variety of ways. For example, the Employment & Training Administration (ETA) maintains a user friendly technical assistance tool that promotes state and local service providers' use of evidence-based interventions through Workforce System Strategies, a comprehensive database of over 1,000 profiles that summarize a wide range of findings from reports, studies, technical assistance tools and guides that support program administration and improvement. Additionally, recognizing that research over the past four decades has found subsidized on-the-job training strategies like apprenticeship improve participants' employment and earnings outcomes, DOL has awarded or announced several apprenticeship grant opportunities this fiscal year in addition to the State Apprenticeship Expansion Grants awarded in 2018. These include the ETA's Scaling Apprenticeship Through Sector-Based Strategies and Apprenticeships: Closing the Skills Gap opportunities and the Women's Bureau's Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations grant program.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

Score
5

Millennium Challenge Corporation

6.1 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *research and evaluation* purposes?

For each investment, MCC's Economic Analysis (EA) division undertakes a Constraints Analysis to determine the binding constraints to economic growth in a country. To determine the individual projects in which MCC will invest in a given sector, MCC's EA division combines root cause analysis with a cost-benefit analysis. The results of these analyses allow MCC to determine which investments will yield the greatest development impact and return on MCC's investment. Every investment also has its own set of indicators for monitoring during the lifecycle of the investment and an evaluation plan for determining the results and impact of a given investment. MCC's Policy for Monitoring and Evaluation details MCC's evidence-based research and evaluation framework. Per the Policy, each completed evaluation requires a summary of findings, now called the Evaluation Brief, to summarize the key components, results, and lessons learned of the evaluation. Evidence from previous MCC programming is considered during the development of new programs. Per the Policy, "monitoring and evaluation evidence and processes should be of the highest practical quality. They should be as rigorous as practical and affordable. Evidence and practices should be impartial. The expertise and independence of evaluators and monitoring managers should result in credible evidence. Evaluation methods should be selected that best match the evaluation questions to be answered. Indicators should be limited in number to include the most crucial indicators. Both successes and failures must be reported."

6.2 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *funding* decisions?

MCC uses a rigorous evidence framework to make every decision along the investment chain, from country partner eligibility to sector selection to project choices. MCC uses evidence-based selection criteria, generated by independent, objective third parties, to select countries for grant awards. To be eligible for selection, World Bank-designated low- and lower-middle-income countries must first pass the MCC 2019 Scorecard – a collection of 20 independent, third-party indicators that objectively

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

measure a country's policy performance in the areas of economic freedom, investing in people, and ruling justly. An in-depth description of the country selection procedure can be found in the annual Selection Criteria and Methodology report.

6.3 Did the agency have a *user friendly tool* that disseminated information on rigorously evaluated, evidence-based solutions (programs, interventions, practices, etc.) including information on what works where, for whom, and under what conditions?

All evaluation designs, data, reports, and summaries are made publicly available on MCC's Evaluation Catalog. To further the dissemination and use of MCC's evaluations' evidence and learning, in May 2019 the Agency launched Evaluation Briefs, a new product to capture and disseminate the results and findings of its independent evaluation portfolio. An Evaluation Brief will be produced for each evaluation and offers a succinct, user-friendly, systematic format to better capture and share the relevant evidence and learning from MCC's independent evaluations. These accessible products will take the place of MCC's Summaries of Findings. Evaluation Briefs will be published on the Evaluation Catalog and will complement the many other products published for each evaluation, including evaluation designs, microdata, survey questionnaires, baseline findings, interim reports, and final reports from the independent evaluator.

6.4 Did the agency promote the *utilization* of evidence-based practices in the field to encourage implementation, replication, and application of evaluation findings and other evidence?

From FY18-FY19, MCC conducted internal research and analysis to understand where and how its published evaluations, datasets, and knowledge products are utilized. The forthcoming results of this analysis will guide future efforts on evidence-based learning such as which sectors MCC prioritizes for evidence generation and publication and what types of products best disseminate MCC's evidence and learning. Evaluation Briefs are in part a result of MCC's findings around evaluation user metrics. MCC finalized baseline metrics around evidence and evaluation utilization in April 2018 and is continuing to track global use of its knowledge products on a quarterly basis with a goal of expanding the base of users of MCC's evidence and evaluation products.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

MCC has also used in-country evaluation dissemination events to ensure further results and evidence building. For example, a dissemination event was held in Zambia in June 2019 to disseminate results from two studies by an independent evaluator (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention): (i) a baseline survey of 12,000 (future) beneficiary and control groups, and (ii) water quality data along the utility's water distribution system and in people's homes. Attendees of the event included 60+ stakeholders representing water sector ministries, local community leaders, the water utility, the post-compact implementation unit, and donor partners.

To further bring attention to MCC's evaluation and evidence, MCC periodically publishes an evaluation newsletter called Statistically Speaking. This newsletter highlights recent evidence and learning from MCC's programs with a special emphasis on how MCC's evidence can offer practical policy insights for policymakers and development practitioners in the United States and in partner countries. It also seeks to familiarize a wider audience with the evidence and results of MCC's investments.

Score
4

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration

6.1 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *research and evaluation* purposes?

There is great diversity across SAMHSA programming, ranging from community-level prevention activities to residential programs for pregnant and post-partum women with substance misuse issues. While this diversity allows SAMHSA to be responsive to a wide set of vulnerable populations, it limits the utility of a common evidence framework for the entire agency. Within Centers (the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, and the Center for Mental Health Services), consistent evidence frameworks are in use and help to shape the process of grant-making (e.g., Center staff are familiar with the pertinent evidence base for their particular portfolios).

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

In 2011, based on the model of the National Quality Strategy, SAMHSA developed the National Behavioral Health Quality Framework (NBHQF). With the NBHQF, SAMHSA proposes a set of core measures to be used in a variety of settings and programs, as well as in evaluation and quality assurance efforts. The proposed measures are not intended to be a complete or total set of measures a payer, system, practitioner, or program may want to use to monitor quality of its overall system or the care or activities it provides. SAMHSA encourages such entities to utilize these basic measures as appropriate as a consistent set of indicators of quality in behavioral health prevention, promotion, treatment, and recovery support efforts across the nation.

6.2 Did the agency have a common evidence framework for *funding* decisions?

SAMHSA has universal language about using evidence-based practices (EBPs) that is included in its Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOAs) (entitled Using Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs)). This language includes acknowledgement that, "EBPs have not been developed for all populations and/or service settings" thus encouraging applicants to "provide other forms of evidence" that a proposed practice is appropriate for the intended population. Specifically, the language states that applicants should: (1) document that the EBPs chosen are appropriate for intended outcomes; (2) explain how the practice meets SAMHSA's goals for the grant program; (3) describe any modifications or adaptations needed for the practice to meet the goals of the project; (4) explain why the EBP was selected; (5) justify the use of multiple EBPs, if applicable; and (6) discuss training needs or plans to ensure successful implementation. Lastly, the language includes resources the applicant can use to understand EBPs. Federal grants officers work in collaboration with the SAMHSA Office of Financial Resources to ensure that grantee funding announcements clearly describe the evidence standard necessary to meet funding requirements.

SAMHSA developed a manual, Developing a Competitive SAMHSA Grant Application, which explains information applicants will likely need for each section of the grant application. The manual has two sections devoted to evidence-based practices (p. 8, p. 26), including: 1) A description of the EBPs applicants plan to implement; 2) Specific information about any modifications applicants plan to make to the EBPs and a justification for making them; and 3) How applicants plan to monitor the implementation of the EBPs. In addition, if applicants plan to implement services or practices that are not evidence-based, they must show that these services/practices are effective.

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding purposes; did that framework prioritize rigorous research and evaluation methods; and did the agency disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY19?
(Example: What Works Clearinghouses)

6.3 Did the agency have a *user friendly tool* that disseminated information on rigorously evaluated, evidence-based solutions (programs, interventions, practices, etc.) including information on what works where, for whom, and under what conditions?

Until 2018, SAMHSA regarded the National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP) as the primary online user friendly tool for identifying evidence-based programs for grantee implementation. In January 2018, SAMHSA announced that it was "moving to EBP [evidence-based practice] implementation efforts through targeted technical assistance and training that makes use of local and national experts and will that assist programs with actually implementing services…." NREPP was taken offline in August 2018. In August 2019, the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative announced it had restored users' access to this information, which can be found in the Results First Clearinghouse.

6.4 Did the agency promote the *utilization* of evidence-based practices in the field to encourage implementation, replication, and application of evaluation findings and other evidence?

To date SAMHSA has produced 11 Evidence-Based Practice Knowledge Informing Transformation (KIT) guides to help move the latest information available on effective behavioral health practices into community-based service delivery. The KITs contain information sheets, introductory videos, practice demonstration videos, and training manuals. Each KIT outlines the essential components of the evidence-based practice and provides suggestions collected from those who have successfully implemented them.

In April 2018, SAMHSA launched the Evidence-Based Practices Resource Center (Resource Center) that aims to provide communities, clinicians, policy-makers and others in the field with the information and tools they need to incorporate evidence-based practices into their communities or clinical settings. The Resource Center contains a collection of science-based resources, including Treatment Improvement Protocols, toolkits, resource guides, and clinical practice guidelines, for a broad range of audiences. The Resource Center also directs users to nine issue-based or regionally-organized Technical Assistance projects, all of which promote the use of evidence-based practices in some way. For example, the purpose of the Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC) Network is disseminating and implementing evidence-based practices for mental disorders into the field.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

Score
6

Administration for Children and Families

7.1 Did the agency engage *leadership and staff* in its innovation efforts?

HHS has embarked on a process called ReImagine HHS, which has engaged leadership and staff from around the department to identify strategic shifts to transform how HHS operates. One part of this larger initiative, called Aim for Independence (AFI), is using a human centered design approach to rethink how ACF does work and how that work translates into long-lasting, positive outcomes for parents and children. Engagement activities have included a leadership retreat and opportunities for staff input.

ACF leadership has proposed new Opportunity and Economic Mobility Demonstrations to allow states to redesign safety net service delivery by streamlining funding from multiple public assistance and workforce development programs and providing services tailored to their populations' specific needs. The demonstrations would be subject to rigorous evaluation.

7.2 Did the agency have *policies* that promote innovation?

Several ACF grant programs are innovation projects, demonstration projects, or allow waivers. For example:

- The Health Profession Opportunity Grants program was authorized as a demonstration program with a mandated federal evaluation. ACF is conducting a multi-pronged evaluation to assess program implementation, systems change resulting from HPOG programs, and outcomes and impacts for participants.
- ACF's Office of Child Support Enforcement administers grant-funded demonstration projects and waivers with research components. Examples include: the Procedural Justice-Informed Alternatives to Contempt (PJAC) demonstration project; the Behavioral Interventions for Child Support Services Demonstration Program (BICS); the National Child Support Noncustodial Parent Employment Demonstration Project (CSPED); and Parenting Time Opportunities for Children in the Child Support Program (PTOC).
- 25 jurisdictions currently operate a child welfare demonstration project to develop and implement projects to improve outcomes for children in foster care or at risk for entry or re-entry into foster care. Through these demonstrations, ACF

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

waives provisions of law to allow flexible use of funding normally limited to foster care for other child welfare services. All demonstration projects are required to have a rigorous evaluation conducted by a third-party evaluator.

7.3 Did the agency have *processes, structures, or programs* to stimulate innovation?

ACF projects that support innovation include:

- ACF's Behavioral Interventions to Advance Self-Sufficiency (BIAS) project was the first major effort to apply a behavioral economics lens to programs that serve poor families in the U.S. The project conducted 15 rapid-cycle randomized tests of behavioral interventions. The Behavioral Interventions to Advance Self-Sufficiency-Next Generation (BIAS-NG) project continues ACF's exploration of the application of behavioral science to the programs and target populations of ACF. Additionally, the Behavioral Interventions Scholars (BIS) grant program supports dissertation research that applies a behavioral science lens to research questions relevant to social services programs and policies and other issues facing low-income families.
- ACF's Human Centered Design for Human Services project is exploring the application of human centered design across ACF service delivery programs at the federal, state, and local levels.
- Several ACF grant programs are innovation projects, demonstration projects, or allow waivers. See details below in the response to Sub-Criteria 4 below.

7.4 Did the agency evaluate its innovation efforts, including using rigorous methods?

The Behavioral Innovations to Advance Self-Sufficiency (BIAS) project and Behavioral Interventions to Advance Self-Sufficiency-Next Generation (BIAS-NG) project support rigorous random assignment evaluations of behavioral economics interventions.

The Health Profession Opportunity Grants program was authorized as a demonstration program with a mandated federal evaluation. ACF is conducting a multi-pronged evaluation to assess program implementation, systems change resulting from HPOG programs, and outcomes and impacts for participants.

ACF's Office of Child Support Enforcement administers grant-funded demonstration projects and waivers with research components. Examples include: the Procedural Justice-Informed Alternatives to Contempt (PJAC) demonstration project; the

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

Behavioral Interventions for Child Support Services Demonstration Program (BICS); the National Child Support Noncustodial Parent Employment Demonstration Project (CSPED); and Parenting Time Opportunities for Children in the Child Support Program (PTOC).

25 jurisdictions currently operate a child welfare demonstration project to develop and implement 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. All demonstration projects are required to have a rigorous evaluation conducted by a third-party evaluator.

The Personal Responsibility Education Innovative Strategies Program (PREIS) supports research and demonstration projects to implement and evaluate innovative strategies for the prevention of adolescent pregnancy, births, and STIs, including HIV/AIDS, among youth ages 10–19. Every PREIS project conducts their own independent evaluation supported by federal training and technical assistance. These rigorous evaluations are designed to meet the HHS Teen Pregnancy Prevention Evidence-Based Standards.

Score
5

Administration for Community Living

7.1 Did the agency engage *leadership and staff* in its innovation efforts?

Agency leadership promote innovation through requiring program offices to explain, in their annual funding proposals, how the proposed use of funds will identify innovative practices. In FY16, ACL established the Elder Justice Innovation Grants program to support the development and advancement of emerging practices to prevent and respond to the abuse of older adults and adults with disabilities. ACL also partially funds a Forum on Aging, Disability, and Independence which engages staff to foster discussions about innovation for coordinating and integrating aging and disability stakeholders. The most recent publication from his group, released in 2019 is Artificial Intelligence Applications for Older Adults and People with Disabilities: Balancing Safety and Autonomy: Proceedings of a Workshop—in Brief.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

7.2 Did the agency have *policies* that promote innovation?

There are several funding streams that support innovation. The Older Americans Act, which funds ACL's Administration on Aging, allows ACL to use up to 1% of its appropriations for nutrition innovation demonstrations designed to develop and implement evidence-based practices that enhance senior nutrition. One result is that, consistent with the Administrator's focus on identifying new ways to efficiently improve direct service programs, ACL is using $3.5 million to fund nutrition innovations and test ways to modernize how meals are provided to a changing senior population. One promising demonstration (entitled Double Blind Randomized Control Trial on the Effect of Evidence-Based Suicide Intervention Training on the Home-Delivered and Congregate Nutrition Program through the Atlanta Regional Commission), currently being carried out by the Georgia State University Research Foundation, is an effort to train volunteers who deliver home-delivered meals to recognize and report indicators of suicidal intent and other mental health issues so that they can be addressed.

State Councils on Developmental Disabilities (SCDD) are charged with identifying and addressing the most pressing needs of people with developmental disabilities in their state and territory. Councils work with different groups in many ways, including educating communities to welcome people with developmental disabilities; funding projects to show new ways that people with disabilities can work, play, and learn; and seeking information from the public as well as state and national sources.

7.3 Did the agency have *processes, structures, or programs* to stimulate innovation?

ACL uses innovation dollars provided under Title IV of the Older Americans Act as a means of testing new approaches to service delivery and developing replicable models that could then be embedded into core programs. In FY16, ACL established the Elder Justice Innovation Grants program to increase knowledge about effective prevention and intervention of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older adults, native elders, adults with disabilities, people who self-neglect, and guardianship abuse. In FY18, ACL monitored the second year of 2-year grants awarded to 5 non-profit organizations in FY17, totaling $2.2 million. In FY18, ACL awarded grants under the Alzheimer's Disease Programs to States and Communities HHS-2018-ACL-AOA-ADPI-0307 to pilot innovative dementia-capable home- and community-based services (HCBS) programs to states and communities.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

NIDILRR participates in the Small Business Innovation Research program to improve the lives of people with disabilities through research and development of innovative products generated by small businesses, and to increase the commercial application of NIDILRR-supported research results and development products.

The Engagement and Older Adults Resource Center, funded by ACL, provides technical assistance and serves as a repository for innovations designed to increase the aging network's ability to tailor social engagement activities to meet the needs of older adults.

7.4 Did the agency evaluate its innovation efforts, including using rigorous methods?

ACL has a number of model programs and demonstration grants that propose and test the use of innovative approaches. For example, ACL funded cooperative agreements for the development and testing of model approaches towards coordinated and comprehensive systems for enhancing and assuring the independence, integration, safety, health, and well-being of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities living in the community (i.e. Living Well Grants). While the evaluation of this program is not yet complete, initial findings about what works were integrated into the requirements of the funding announcement for the FY18 award cycle.

Score
8

U.S. Agency for International Development

7.1 Did the agency engage *leadership and staff* in its innovation efforts?

In FY2019, USAID appointed a new Chief Innovation Officer to advocate for innovation throughout development and national security strategies across USAID, the U.S. Government, and the international community. The Chief Innovation Officer promotes opportunities for entrepreneurs, implementing partners, universities, donors, and others to test and scale innovative solutions and approaches to development problems around the world. In FY2019, the U.S. Global Development Lab also engaged USAID

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

leadership and Mission staff from around the world at the Mission Directors Conference, the Contracting Officer and Controller Conference, the Foreign Service National Conference, and the Private Sector Engagement Forum.

For innovations specific to a particular sector, Agency leadership has supported technical staff in surfacing groundbreaking ideas, such as how the Bureau for Global Health's Center for Innovation and Impact (CII) used open innovation approaches to issue the Saving Lives at Birth Grand Challenge and identify promising, life-saving maternal and newborn health innovations.

7.2 Did the agency have *policies* that promote innovation?

In December 2018, USAID released its first Acquisition and Assistance Strategy to guide changes to policy and practice to increase flexibility, creativity, and adaptability in USAID partnering approaches. The strategy states: "USAID will increase our use of collaborative and co-creative approaches by 10 percentage points in terms of total dollars and awards in FY 2019." Building on past years of experimentation and innovation, USAID will challenge design and procurement officers to engage a much wider range of practices that emphasize collaboration and co-creation. USAID will diversify approaches to design, solicitation, and awards—designing activities less prescriptively and more collaboratively; simplifying access for new and local partners; and increasing usage of awards that pay for results, as opposed to presumptively reimbursing for costs.

In the same month, USAID released the first Private Sector Engagement Policy to transform how USAID engages the private sector throughout core operations across all sectors. The policy represents an intentional shift to pursue market-based approaches, investment, and private sector expertise and innovation to accelerate country journeys to self-reliance.

7.3 Did the agency have *processes, structures, or programs* to stimulate innovation?

Since 2014, the U.S. Global Development Lab has advanced science, technology, innovation, and partnerships to accelerate development impact. In FY 2019, the Lab's budget was $75 million with 76 direct hire staff (Civil Service and Foreign Service). The Lab is home to numerous innovation teams and programs, including those housed in the Center for Development Innovation.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

In addition, the Center for Innovation and Impact (CII)—the Bureau for Global Health's dedicated innovation office—takes a business-minded approach to fast-tracking the development, introduction, and scale-up of health innovations that address the world's most important health challenges, and assessing and adopting cutting-edge approaches (such as unmanned aerial vehicles and artificial intelligence).

USAID and its partners have launched eleven Grand Challenges for Development since 2011. Across the Grand Challenges portfolio, partners have jointly committed over $535 million ($155 million from USAID) in grants and technical assistance for over 528 innovators in 107 countries. To date, more than $614 million in follow-on funding has been catalyzed from external sources, a key measure of success.

Feed the Future Partnering for Innovation partners with agribusinesses to help them commercialize and scale new agricultural innovations to help improve the livelihoods of smallholder farmers, increasing their productivity and incomes. To date the program has worked with 59 partners in 20 different countries, investing more than $43 million in new technologies and services, and leveraging nearly $100 million in private sector investment. The program has helped commercialize over 118 innovations, which resulted in an estimated $99 million in sales.

7.4 Did the agency evaluate its innovation efforts, including using rigorous methods?

Within the U.S. Global Development Lab, the MERLIN program works to innovate on traditional approaches to monitoring, evaluation, research and learning. While innovative in themselves, these approaches can also be better suited to evaluating an innovation effort. Two examples include Developmental Evaluation, which aims to provide ongoing feedback to managers on implementation through an embedded evaluator, and Rapid Feedback, which allows implementers to test various methods to reach certain targeted results (more quickly than through traditional midterm or final evaluations).

Many of the agency's programs such as Grand Challenges and Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) have been reviewed by formal audit and other performance and impact interventions. DIV is USAID's tiered, evidence-driven open innovation program. It awards grants for innovative solutions to any development problem, on the basis of rigorous evidence of impact, cost-effectiveness, and a pathway to scale via the public and/or private sectors. The DIV model is designed to source breakthrough solutions, to minimize risk, and maximize impact by funding according to outcomes and milestones, to rigorously evaluate impact

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

and cost-effectiveness, and to scale proven solutions. Since 2010, DIV has supported 197 innovations in 45 countries with approximately $118 million. It has generated experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation studies of more than a third of those innovations. And a forthcoming working paper rigorously assesses the social rate of return of DIV's early portfolio.

Score

4

Corporation for National and Community Service

7.1 Did the agency engage *leadership and staff* in its innovation efforts?

Staff at all levels of the organization participate in work groups focused on implementing CNCS's Transformation and Sustainability Plan. The CEO has also conducted Service Jams to elicit feedback from staff to support the plan. Service Jam topics have focused on what a best-in class learning organization looks like and how CNCS could break down silos.

7.2 Did the agency have *policies* that promote innovation?

No examples available.

7.3 Did the agency have *processes, structures, or programs* to stimulate innovation?

CNCS continued to learn from its evidence-based planning grant program which "awards evidence-based intervention planning grants to organizations that develop new national service models seeking to integrate members into innovative evidence-based interventions." CNCS continued to learn from its research grantees, who receive grant funds to engage community residents and leaders in the development of new and innovative national service projects.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

7.4 Did the agency evaluate its innovation efforts, including using rigorous methods?

As part of the evaluation of the Social Innovation Program, which was designed to identify and rigorously test innovative approaches to social service problems, CNCS continues to receive evaluation reports from grantees. As of May 2019, CNCS has received 72 final SIF evaluation reports, of which 20 (28%) were experimental designs and 39 (54%) were quasi-experimental designs. Further, the evidence-based planning grant program and the research grant program both seek to generate innovative national service models. The planning grants require an evaluation plan. The research grants use evidence to inform action planning and solutions.

Score

4

U.S. Department of Education

7.1 Did the agency engage *leadership and staff* in its innovation efforts?

In FY19, the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education made strategic investments in innovative educational programs and practices and administered discretionary grant programs. In FY19, the Innovation and Improvement account received $1.035 billion. The Department reorganized in 2019, consolidating the Office of Innovation and Improvement into the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

7.2 Did the agency have *policies* that promote innovation?

ED uses the Experimental Sites Initiative under section 487A(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, to test the effectiveness of statutory and regulatory flexibility for participating institutions disbursing Title IV student aid. ED has waived specific statutory or regulatory requirements at the postsecondary institutions, or consortia of institutions, approved to participate in the experiments. The outcomes of experiments have the potential to benefit all postsecondary institutions and the students they serve.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

7.3 Did the agency have *processes, structures, or programs* to stimulate innovation?

The Education Innovation and Research (EIR) program is ED's primary innovation program for K–12 public education. EIR grants are focused on validating and scaling evidence-based practices and encouraging innovative approaches to persistent challenges. The EIR program incorporates a tiered-evidence framework that supports larger awards for projects with the strongest evidence base as well as promising earlier-stage projects that are willing to undergo rigorous evaluation. Funds may be used for: (1) early-phase grants for the development, implementation, and feasibility testing of an intervention or innovation, which prior research suggests has promise, in order to determine whether the intervention can improve student academic outcomes; (2) mid-phase grants for implementation and rigorous evaluation of interventions that have been successfully implemented under early-phase grants or have met similar criteria for documenting program effectiveness; and (3) expansion and replication of interventions or innovations that have been found to produce a sizable impact under a mid-phase grant or have met similar criteria for documenting program effectiveness.

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 including "Goal 2: Development and Innovation," which 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. The Small Business Innovation Research Program provides funds for rapid prototype development and evaluation as well as for product development and evaluation. The related ED Games Expo promotes emerging education technology by allowing for demonstration of game-based learning.

7.4 Did the agency evaluate its innovation efforts, including using rigorous methods?

ED is currently implementing the Experimental Sites Initiative to assess the effects of statutory and regulatory flexibility for participating institutions disbursing Title IV student aid. ED collects performance data from all participating institutions, and IES is currently conducting rigorous evaluations of selected Experimental Sites, including two related to short-term Pell grants.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

The Education Innovation and Research (EIR) program, ED's primary innovation program for K–12 public education, incorporates a tiered-evidence framework that supports larger awards for projects with the strongest evidence base as well as promising earlier-stage projects that are willing to undergo rigorous evaluation.

Score
6

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

7.1 Did the agency engage *leadership and staff* in its innovation efforts?

HUD has an Office of Innovation led by a Deputy Assistant Secretary. The office organized the five-day Innovative Housing Showcase on the national mall with federal and private sector partners in June 2019 to demonstrate new housing technology and discuss innovation barriers and opportunities. The entire local HUD staff was encouraged to attend and view the innovative technologies.

7.2 Did the agency have *policies* that promote innovation?

HUD administers five types of juried Secretary's Awards to encourage excellence in addressing housing and community development challenges: Public-Philanthropic Partnerships, Opportunity and Empowerment, Healthy Homes, Historic Preservation, and Housing and Community Design. An Innovation in Affordable Housing Competition engages multidisciplinary teams of graduate students in addressing a specific housing problem developed by an actual public housing agency.

The Office of Innovation is developing prize competitions to stimulate innovation in housing and HUD policy and programs.

7.3 Did the agency have *processes, structures, or programs* to stimulate innovation?

HUD established the Office of Innovation in 2019 to advance innovation in several domains. The office managed the 2019 Innovative Housing Showcase and is developing prize competitions to stimulate innovation in housing and HUD policy and

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

programs.

HUD's regulation of manufactured housing production is guided by a federal advisory committee, the Manufactured Housing Consensus Committee, to provide increased ability for the industry to produce some of the nation's most innovative, safe, and affordable housing.

7.4 Did the agency evaluate its innovation efforts, including using rigorous methods?

PD&R is conducting numerous random-assignment program demonstrations to test new, innovative program models, as described in PD&R's biennial report and online: the Family Self-Sufficiency Demonstration, First-Time Homebuyer Education and Counseling 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, Rental Assistance Demonstration, and the Small Area Fair Market Rent Demonstration.

HUD also is using random assignment and administrative data linkages to test the impact of education navigators on rates of application for federal student aid by young residents of public housing.

The Secretary's Awards competitions are juried by professionals.

In 2019, PD&R published an independent review of building technology innovation policies, programs, and strategies to increase the impact of federal research and development investments.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

Score
6

U.S. Department of Labor

7.1 Did the agency engage *leadership and staff* in its innovation efforts?

DOL's Chief Evaluation Office (CEO) Data Analytics team developed a secure data analysis platform accessible to all DOL staff, pre-loaded with common statistical packages and offering the capability to access and merge various administrative data for analysis. DOL supports staff in executing limitless web-based A/B testing and other behaviorally-informed trials, with the shared service of the advanced Granicus platform's GovDelivery communications tool, including free technical support. This tool enhances the Department's ability to communicate with the public, such as through targeted email campaigns, and to adjust these communications, informed by testing and data, to increase engagement on relevant topics. CEO also has developed toolkits and detailed resources for staff to effectively design behaviorally informed tests.

7.2 Did the agency have *policies* that promote innovation?

DOL is strongly committed to promoting innovation in our policies and practices. For example, the Employment & Training Administration's (ETA) competitive funding routinely funds innovative programming, since grantees typically bundle various program services and components to best meet the needs of the people being served by them in their local contexts. A particularly good example of where this innovation is happening is in the Administration's high priority area of apprenticeships. DOL is funding $150 million to support sector-based innovations in apprenticeship. DOL has invested more than $95 million through the ApprenticeshipUSA initiative - a national campaign bringing together a broad range of stakeholders, including employers, labor, and states as well as education and workforce partners, to expand and diversify registered apprenticeships in the United States. This includes more than $60 million for state-led strategies to grow and diversify apprenticeship, and state Accelerator Grants to help integrate apprenticeship into education and workforce systems; engage industry and other partners to expand apprenticeship to new sectors and new populations at scale; conduct outreach and work with employers to start new programs; promote greater inclusion and diversity in apprenticeship; and develop statewide and regional strategies aimed at building state capacity to support new apprenticeship programs. All of these grants include funding for data collection; additionally, ETA and CEO are conducting an evaluation of the American Apprenticeship Initiative.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

7.3 Did the agency have *processes, structures, or programs* to stimulate innovation?

DOL has built capacity for staff innovation through the Performance Management Center's Continuous Process Improvement (CPI) Program, an agency-wide opportunity which trains and certifies agency staff on Lean Six Sigma (LSS) methodologies through real-time execution of DOL process improvement projects. The program includes classroom sessions that prepare participants for LSS Black Belt certification examinations, including the American Society for Quality (ASQ) as well as DOL's own certification.

The Wage and Hour Division's (WHD) Transformation Team is one such example where continuous improvement efforts are driving innovation. Their work has identified potential areas where behavioral interventions and trials may inform program improvement. CEO is also working across agencies – including WHD, ETA, Women's Bureau, Veterans Employment & Training Service (VETS), Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP), and International Labor Affairs Bureau (ILAB) – to identify and assess the feasibility of other areas where insights from behavioral science can be used to improve the performance and outcomes of DOL programs.

7.4 Did the agency evaluate its innovation efforts, including using rigorous methods?

DOL typically couples innovation with rigorous evaluation to learn from experiments. For example, 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. An interim report will be released in FY19.

DOL has two pilot projects that tested use of a Pay for Success (PFS) financing model in pilot projects from 2013-2017, with a final report on the outcomes of this pilot expected by the end of calendar year 2019.

DOL routinely uses Job Corps' demonstration authority to test and evaluate innovative and promising models to improve outcomes for youth. Currently, CEO is sponsoring a rigorous impact evaluation to examine the effectiveness of one of these pilots, the Job Corps Experimental Center Cascades.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

Score
6

Millennium Challenge Corporation

7.1 Did the agency engage *leadership and staff* in its innovation efforts?

In 2014, MCC developed an internal "Solutions Lab" that was designed to encourage innovation in program development and implementation by engaging staff to come up with creative solutions to some of the biggest challenges MCC faces. MCC promotes agency-wide participation in its Solutions Lab through an internal portal. To further encourage staff who pursue innovative ideas throughout the compact lifecycle, MCC launched the annual MCC Innovation Award as a part of the Agency's Annual Awards Ceremony held each summer. The Innovation Award recognizes individuals who demonstrate "exemplary" leadership integrating innovation in project design, project implementation, and/or systems functionality and efficiency. Selections for the Innovation Award are based on a demonstrated ability to lead and implement innovative strategies from project conception that foster sustained learning and collaboration and add value to MCC and/or country partnerships.

7.2 Did the agency have *policies* that promote innovation?

MCC's approach to development assistance hinges on its innovative and extensive use of evidence to inform investment decisions, guide program implementation strategies, and assess and learn from its investment experiences. As such, MCC's Office of Strategic Partnerships offers an Annual Program Statement (APS) opportunity that allows MCC divisions and country teams to tap the most innovative solutions to new development issues. In FY19, the Monitoring and Evaluation division, using MCC's APS and traditional evaluation firms, has been piloting partnerships with academics and in-country think tanks to leverage innovative, lower cost data technologies across sectors and regions. These include:

- using satellite imagery in Sri Lanka to measure visible changes in investment on land to get early indications if improved land rights are spurring investment;
- leveraging big data and cell phone applications in Colombo, Sri Lanka to monitor changes in traffic congestion and the use of public transport;
- independently measuring power outages and voltage fluctuations using cell phones in Ghana, where utility outage data is unreliable, and where outage reduction is a critical outcome targeted by the Compact;

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

- using pressure loggers on piped water at the network and household levels to get independent readings on access to water in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; and
- using remote sensing to measure water supply in water kiosks in Freetown, Sierra Leone.

7.3 Did the agency have *processes, structures, or programs* to stimulate innovation?

MCC recently launched an internal Millennium Efficiency Challenge (MEC) designed to tap into the extensive knowledge of MCC's staff to identify efficiencies and innovative solutions that can shorten the compact and threshold program development timeline while maintaining MCC's rigorous quality standards and investment criteria.

In September 2014, MCC's Monitoring and Evaluation division launched the agency's first Open Data Challenge, which continued into FY19. The Open Data Challenge initiative is intended to facilitate broader use of MCC's U.S.-taxpayer funded data, encourage innovative ideas, and maximize the use of data that MCC finances for its independent evaluations.

MCC regularly engages in implementing test projects as part of its overall compact programs. A few examples include: (1) in Morocco, an innovative pay-for-results mechanism to replicate or expand proven programs that provide integrated support; (2) a "call-for-ideas" in Benin for information regarding potential projects that would expand access to renewable off-grid electrical power; (3) a regulatory strengthening project in Sierra Leone that includes funding for a results-based financing system; and (4) an Innovation Grant Program in Zambia to encourage local innovation in pro-poor service delivery in the water sector.

7.4 Did the agency evaluate its innovation efforts, including using rigorous methods?

Although MCC rigorously evaluates all program efforts, MCC takes special care to ensure that innovative or untested programs are thoroughly evaluated. In addition to producing final program evaluations, MCC is continuously monitoring and evaluating all programs throughout the program lifecycle, including innovation efforts, to determine if mid-program course-correction actions are necessary. This interim data helps MCC continuously improve its innovation efforts so that they can be most effective and impactful. Although 37% of MCC's evaluations use random-assignment methods, all of MCC's evaluations – both impact and performance – use rigorous methods to achieve the three-part objectives of accountability, learning, and results in the most cost-effective way possible.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

Score
3

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration

7.1 Did the agency engage *leadership and staff* in its innovation efforts?

SAMHSA participates in collaborations with other HHS agencies to promote innovative uses of data, technology and innovation across HHS to create a more effective government and improve the health of the nation, via the HHS IDEA Lab. SAMHSA has co-developed and submitted several innovative data utilization project proposals to the Ignite Accelerator of the HHS IDEA Lab, such as Rapid Opioid Alert and Response (ROAR), a project to monitor and prevent opioid overdoses by linking heroin users to resources and information.

7.2 Did the agency have *policies* that promote innovation?

Pursuant to the 21st Century Cures Act, SAMHSA established the National Mental Health and Substance Use Policy Laboratory (NMHSUPL) as an office, led by a Director, within the agency to promote evidence-based practices and service delivery models. NMHSUPL staff and programs engage in the following activities: 1) Facilitate the implementation of policy changes likely to improve mental health, mental illness, recovery supports, and the prevention and treatment of substance use disorder services; 2) Work with CBHSQ to evaluate and disseminate evidence-based practices; and 3) Carry out other activities to encourage innovation and disseminate evidence-based programs and practices.

7.3 Did the agency have *processes, structures, or programs* to stimulate innovation?

The SAMHSA Program Portal, a collection of technical assistance and training resources provided by the agency, provides behavioral health professionals with education and collaboration opportunities, and ample tools and technical assistance resources that promote innovation in practice and program improvement. Located within the Knowledge Network are groups such as the Center for Financing Reform and Innovation, which works with states and territories, local policy makers, providers, consumers, and other stakeholders to promote innovative financing and delivery system reforms.

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY19?
(Examples: Prizes and challenges; behavioral science trials; innovation labs/accelerators; performance partnership pilots; demonstration projects or waivers with rigorous evaluation requirements)

7.4 Did the agency evaluate its innovation efforts, including using rigorous methods?

SAMHSA does not list any completed evaluation reports on its evaluation website. Of the 10 evaluation reports found on the publications page, none appear to use experimental methods.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

7

Administration for Children and Families

8.1 What were the agency's 5 largest competitive programs and their appropriations amount (and were city, county, and/or state governments eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

In FY19, the 5 largest competitive grant programs are: 1) Head Start ($10 billion; eligible applicants: public or private non-profit organizations, including community-based and faith-based organizations, or for-profit agencies); 2) Unaccompanied Children Services ($1.3 billion; eligible applicants: private non-profit and for-profit agencies); 3) Preschool Development Grants ($250 million; eligible applicants: states); 4) Healthy Marriage Promotion and Responsible Fatherhood Grants ($148 million; eligible applicants: states, local governments, tribal entities, and community-based organizations, both for profit and not-for-profit, including faith-based); and 5) Runaway and Homeless Youth Program ($100 million; eligible applicants: community-based public and private organizations)

8.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in 5 largest competitive grant programs? (e.g., Were evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Was evidence a significant requirement?)

ACF evaluates Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood grant applicants based upon their proposed program performance plan; use of evidence-based, evidence-informed, or skill-based curriculum; LOI/MOU with a third-party local evaluator; demonstrated experience with comparable program evaluation; and statement about the relevance of their research to the field, among other factors.

The Head Start Designation Renewal System (DRS) determines whether Head Start/Early Head Start grantees are delivering high-quality comprehensive services to the children and families that they serve. These determinations are based on seven conditions, one of which looks at how Head Start classrooms within programs perform on the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), an observation-based measure of the quality of teacher-child interactions. When the DRS deems grantees to be underperforming, grantees are denied automatic renewal of their grant and must apply for funding renewal through a standard open competition process. In the most recent Head Start FOA language, grantees who are re-competing for Head Start funds

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

must include a description of any violations, such as deficiencies, areas of non-compliance, and/or audit finding in their record of Past Performance (p. 26). Applicants may describe the actions they have taken to address these violations. According to Head Start policy, in competitions to replace or potentially replace a current grantee, the responsible HHS official will give priority to applicants that have demonstrated capacity in providing effective, comprehensive, and well-coordinated early childhood education and development services and programs (see section 1304.20: Selection among applicants).

ACF evaluates Unaccompanied Children Services, Preschool Development Grant, and Runaway and Homeless Youth grant applicants based upon: their proposed program performance evaluation plan; how their data will contribute to continuous quality improvement; and their demonstrated experience with comparable program evaluation, among other factors.

8.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

ACF's template (see p. 14 in Attachment C) for competitive grant announcements includes standard language that funding opportunity announcement drafters may select to require 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.

ACF has an ongoing research portfolio that is building evidence in Head Start. Research sponsored through Head Start funding over the past decade has provided valuable information not only to guide program improvement in Head Start itself, but also to guide the field of early childhood programming and early childhood development. Dozens of Head Start programs have collaborated with researchers in making significant contributions in terms of program innovation and evaluation, as well as the use of systematic data collection, analysis and interpretation in program operations. As a condition of award, Head Start grantees are required to participate fully in ACF-sponsored evaluations, if selected to do so.

Unaccompanied Children Services (p. 33), Preschool Development Grants (p. 30), and Runaway and Homeless Youth (p.24) grantees are required to develop a program performance evaluation plan.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

As a condition of award, Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood grantees are required to sponsor a third-party local evaluation (descriptive or impact) of their project site. Grantees are also required to participate fully in any ACF-sponsored federal evaluation, if selected to do so. As such, ACF has an ongoing research portfolio building evidence related to Strengthening Families, Healthy Marriage, and Responsible Fatherhood, and has conducted randomized controlled trials with grantees in each funding round of these grants.

The 2003 Reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act called for a study of long-term outcomes for youth who are served through the Transitional Living Program (TLP). In response, ACF is sponsoring a study that will capture data from youth at program entry and at intermediate- and longer-term follow-up points after program exit and will assess outcomes related to housing, education, and employment. ACF is also sponsoring a process evaluation of the 2016 Transitional Living Program Special Population Demonstration Project.

8.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* competitive grant program?

ACF's Personal Responsibility Education Program includes three individual discretionary grant programs that fund programs exhibiting evidence of effectiveness, innovative adaptations of evidence-based programs, and promising practices that teach youth about abstinence and contraception to prevent pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections.

To receive funding through ACFs Sexual Risk Avoidance Education (SRAE) program, applicants must cite evidence published in a peer-reviewed journal and/or a randomized controlled trial or quasi-experimental design to support their chosen interventions or models.

8.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

As mentioned above, ACF is conducting a multi-pronged evaluation of the Health Profession Opportunity Grants Program (HPOG). Findings from the first cohort of HPOG grants influenced the funding opportunity announcement for the second round of HPOG (HPOG 2.0) funding. For example, based on the finding that many participants engaged in short-term training for low-wage, entry-level jobs, the HPOG 2.0 FOA more carefully defined the career pathways framework, described specific strategies

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

for helping participants progress along a career pathway, and identified and defined key HPOG education and training components. Applicants were required to more clearly describe how their program would support career pathways for participants. Based on an analysis, which indicated limited collaborations with healthcare employers, the HPOG 2.0 FOA required applicants to demonstrate the use of labor market information, consult with local employers, and describe their plans for employer engagement. The HPOG 2.0 FOA also placed more emphasis on the importance of providing basic skills education and assessment of barriers to make the programs accessible to clients who were most prepared to benefit, based on the finding that many programs were screening out applicants with low levels of basic literacy, reading, and numeracy skills.

ACF's Personal Responsibility Education Innovative Strategies Program (PREIS) grantees must conduct independent evaluations of their innovative strategies for the prevention of teen pregnancy, births, and STIs, supported by ACF training and technical assistance. These rigorous evaluations are designed to meet the HHS Teen Pregnancy Prevention Evidence-Based Standards and are expected to generate lessons learned so that others can benefit from these strategies and innovative approaches.

8.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

ACF's template (see p. 14 in Attachment C) for competitive grant announcements includes standard language instructing grantees to conduct evaluation efforts. Program offices may use this template to require grantees to collect performance data or conduct a rigorous evaluation. Applicants are instructed to include third-party evaluation contracts in their proposed budget justifications.

ACF's 2018 Preschool Development Grants funding announcement notes that "It is intended that States or territories will use a percentage of the total amount of their [renewal] grant award during years 2 through 4 to conduct the proposed process, cost, and outcome evaluations, and to implement a data collection system that will allow them to collect, house, and use data on the populations served, the implementation of services, the cost of providing services, and coordination across service partners."

ACF's rules (section 1351.15), allow Runaway and Homeless Youth grant awards to be used for "data collection and analysis."

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

5

Administration for Community Living

8.1 What were the agency's 5 largest competitive programs and their appropriations amount (and were city, county, and/or state governments eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

In FY19, the 5 largest competitive grants programs are: 1) Independent Living ($116 million; eligible grantees: nonprofits having a 501(c)(3) status with the IRS, other than institutions of higher education); 2) National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research ($109 million; eligible grantees: States, Tribes, local governments, nonprofits, education institutions, selected small businesses); 3) Alzheimer's Disease Program ($47 Million; eligible grantees: States, community-based service providers); 4) University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD) ($40 million; eligible grantees: selected universities); and 5) Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act Programs (MIPPA) ($38 million; eligible grantees: States and Tribes).

8.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in 5 largest competitive grant programs? (e.g., Were evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Was evidence a significant requirement?)

Independent Living (IL) programs include a mix of formula and discretionary grants. The Centers for Independent Living (CILs) Program provides 354 discretionary grants to centers that are consumer-controlled, community-based, cross-disability, nonresidential, private nonprofit agencies who provide IL services. While not explicitly using the term "evidence-based" applicants must describe the rationale for using the proposed intervention, including factors such as: "'lessons learned' for similar projects previously tested in your community, or in other areas of the country; factors in the larger environment that have created the 'right conditions' for the intervention (e.g., existing social or economic factors that you'll be able to take advantage of, etc.)." To continue receiving CIL program funding, eligible centers must provide evidence that they have previously had an impact on the goals and objectives for this funding.

The Long-Range Plan of the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR) funding announcements require scientifically rigorous research (p3 and p15). The long range plan describes the ways in which "NIDILRR

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

proposes to support competitions that build on prior investments that resulted in evidence of efficacy and effectiveness. These competitions will provide funding for further development and testing of practices and interventions in additional settings, or among new populations of people with disabilities. These efforts may support translational research to develop practical strategies for ensuring more widespread use of new evidence-based findings in the area of disability and rehabilitation research and development."

For Alzheimer's Disease Programs Initiative (ADPI) funding, "If the applicant has held an ADSSP grant between 2011 and 2017, they must explain the work of their previous dementia systems project." The funding announcement (page 12) requires that "All programs must identify, by name, and describe the dementia specific evidence-based or evidence informed intervention they propose to implement, how it fits into their proposed overall program and the intended beneficiaries."

UCEDDs are a nationwide network of independent but interlinked centers, representing an expansive national resource for addressing issues, finding solutions, and advancing research related to the needs of individuals with developmental disabilities and their families. According to the funding opportunity announcement applications are also reviewed based on their description of current or previous evidence of relevant experience.

MIPPA funds are awarded to State grantees and to the National Center for Benefits Outreach and Enrollment. To continue funding without restrictions, State grantees are required to submit state plans that ACL staff review for the specific strategies that grantees will employ to enhance efforts through statewide and local coalition building. The National Center applicants must describe the rationale for using the particular intervention, including factors such as evidence of intervention effectiveness. In 2019, the Center was awarded additional funding based on prior performance— specifically, assisting over 7.6 million individuals to identify over $29.6 billion in potential annual benefits.

8.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

Grantees are required to provide evidence that they are meeting grant program outcomes as well as lessons learned about what works and how they overcame challenges faced. For example, the Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers (RERC) Program for a RERC on Rehabilitation Strategies, Techniques, and Interventions is sponsored by NIDILRR. It engages in the

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

systematic application of engineering sciences to design, develop, adapt, test, evaluate, apply, and distribute technological solutions to problems confronted by people with disabilities in functional areas such as mobility, communications, hearing, vision, and cognition. ACL's Alzheimer's Disease Programs to States and Communities (HHS-2018-ACL-AOA-ADPI-0307) is informed by the work and recommendations of National Alzheimer's Project Act Advisory Committee. The Alzheimer's Disease Programs Initiative is implemented with authority contained within Title IV of the Older Americans Act. It is designed to pilot dementia-capable home- and community-based services (HCBS) programs to states and communities, evaluate program outcomes, and use program outcome data to garner support to sustain successful initiatives beyond the federal program period.

8.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* competitive grant program?

ACL requires that grant officers attend training regarding ways to include information about evidence building into funding opportunity announcements. This includes information about text that can be included in funding announcements: 1) describing requirements for developing measurable outcomes; 2) explaining how the inclusion of evidence and evidence building plans can be used to score grant applications; and 3) instructing grant reviewers regarding rating applicants' presentation of evidence and evidence building plans. The training was recorded and is available to all staff.

8.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

NIDILRR participates in the Small Business Innovation Research program to improve the lives of people with disabilities through research and development of innovative products generated by small businesses, and to increase the commercial application of NIDILRR-supported research results and development products.

-

ACL's Alzheimer's Disease Supportive Services Program (ADSSP) encourages the translation of dementia specific interventions for use in communities. Examples include: the Savvy Caregiver (evidence-based) psychoeducational intervention focused on training family caregivers about the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to handle the challenges of caring for a family member with Alzheimer's disease and to be an effective caregiver; Cuidando con Respeto (evidence-informed), Spanish version of the original Savvy Caregiver Program; and Savvy Caregiver Express (evidence-informed), a condensed version of the original

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Savvy Caregiver Program. ACL's requirement for inclusion of dementia specific evidence-based interventions is demonstrated in the 2018 funding opportunity announcement entitled Alzheimer's Disease Programs to States and Communities.

ACL released a funding opportunity in 2019 titled Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (RRTC) on Improving Employment Outcomes for People with Psychiatric Disabilities. This is based on Individual Placement and Support (IPS), which is an evidence-based supported employment model that has been demonstrated to improve employment outcomes for people with psychiatric disabilities. In 2019, ACL will fund up to three projects as cooperative agreements for the development and testing of one or more model approaches of a coordinated and comprehensive system that includes two interrelated core components for enhancing and assuring the independence, integration, safety, health, and well-being of individuals living in the community. ACL made similar grants in 2017 and 2018 and is evaluating the outcomes of those grants. Initial results suggest that these models include a range of promising practices.

8.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

Funding opportunity announcements and grant reviews stress the need for strong performance measurement and evaluation. ACL's technical assistance centers— the National Resource Center on Nutrition and Aging (NRC), the Alzheimer's Disease Supportive Services Program (ADSSP) and the University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service— promote the use and generation of evidence with ACL grantees. Grantees manuals also include information about the importance of and requirements for evaluation (see the Administration on Aging: Title VI Resource Manual). Staff of ACL's Office of Performance and Evaluation make presentations regarding the importance of evidence with regional staff who are in frequent contact with State grantees and at grantee conferences (see ACL Track: The ACL Older Americans Act (OAA) Performance System – Crossing the Finish Line and ACL/CMS Track: Raising the Bar in Medicaid HCBS & Community Inclusion – Showcasing Transformation presented at the 2019 home- and community-based services (HCBS) conference; ACL Track: Assuring the Health & Welfare of Medicaid HCBS Beneficiaries: Federal Findings, Investments, & Promising Practices in Systems Change and ACL Track: Innovative Housing & Health & Human Services Collaborations: A Game-Changer in Supportive Housing & Community Living presented at the 2018 HCBS conference).

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Score
10

U.S. Agency for International Development

8.1 What were the agency's 5 largest competitive programs and their appropriations amount (and were city, county, and/or state governments eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

USAID's top five program accounts based on actual appropriation amounts in FY18 are: 1) International Disaster Assistance ($4.3 billion; eligible grantees: any U.S. or non-U.S. organization, individual, nonprofit, or for-profit entity that meets the requirements described in ADS 303); Economic Support Fund ($3.9 billion; eligible grantees: any U.S. or non-U.S. organization, individual, non-profit, or for- profit entity that meets the requirements described in ADS 303); Migration and Refugee Assistance ($3.4 billion; eligible grantees: any U.S. or non-U.S. organization, individual, nonprofit, or for-profit entity that meets the requirements described in ADS 303); Global Health (USAID) ($3 billion; eligible grantees: any U.S. or non-U.S. organization, individual, nonprofit, or for-profit entity that meets the requirements described in ADS 303); Development Assistance ($3 billion; eligible grantees: any U.S. or non-U.S. organization, individual, nonprofit, or for-profit entity that meets the requirements described in ADS 303).

See the U.S. Foreign Assistance Reference Guide for more information on each of these accounts. More information can also be found in the FY2020 Congressional Budget Justification (page 2, column 4). USAID generally does not limit eligibility when awarding grants and cooperative agreements; eligibility may be restricted for an individual notice of funding opportunity in accordance with the procedures in ADS 303.

8.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in 5 largest competitive grant programs? (e.g., Were evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Was evidence a significant requirement?)

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's Program Cycle Policy ensures evidence from monitoring, evaluation and other sources informs funding decisions at all levels, including during strategic planning, project and activity design, procurement and implementation.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

USAID's Senior Obligation Alignment Review (SOAR) helps to ensure the Agency is using evidence to design and approve funding for innovative approaches to provide long-term sustainable outcomes and provides oversight on the use of grant or contract mechanisms and proposed results.

USAID includes past performance to comprise 30 percent of the non-cost evaluation criteria for contracts. As part of determining grant awards, USAID's policy requires an applicant to provide a list of all its cost-reimbursement contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements involving similar or related programs during the past three years. The grant Selection Committee chair must validate the applicant's past performance reference information based on existing evaluations to the maximum extent possible, and make a reasonable, good faith effort to contact all references to verify or corroborate how well an applicant performed.
For assistance, as required by 2 CFR 200, USAID also does a risk assessment to review an organization's ability to meet the goals and objectives outlined by the agency. Internal procedures for conducting the risk assessment are found in ADS 303.3.9, with guidance on how to look for evidence of effectiveness from potential grantees. Per the ADS, this can be done through reviewing past performance and evaluation/performance reports such as the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS).

Even though there is no federal requirement (as there is with CPARS), USAID has recently created a process, detailed in ADS 303 (p. 66), to assess grantee past performance for use when making funding decisions. Per USAID's ADS 303 policy, before making an award of any grant or cooperative agreement the Agreement Officer must state in the memorandum of negotiation that the applicant has a satisfactory record of performance. When making the award, the Agreement Officer may consider withholding authority to proceed to the next phase of a grant until provided evidence of acceptable performance within a given period.

USAID was recognized by GAO in its recent report published on September 5, 2018, Managing for Results: Government-wide Actions Needed to Improve Agencies' Use of Performance Information in Decision Making (GAO-18-609SP) as one of four agencies (out of 23 surveyed) with proven practices for using performance information. USAID was also the only CFO Act agency with a statistically significant increase in the Agency Use of Performance Information Index since 2007.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

8.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

Grantees are required to report on the progress of activities through documentation such as Activity Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Plans, periodic performance reporting, and external and internal evaluation reports (if applicable). These reports help USAID remain transparent and accountable and also help the Agency build evidence of what does and doesn't work in its interventions. Any internal evaluation undertaken by a grantee must also be provided to USAID for learning purposes. All datasets compiled under USAID-funded projects, activities, and evaluations are to be submitted by grantees to the USAID Development Data Library. All final evaluation reports must also be submitted to the Agency's Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC), unless they receive a waiver to the USAID's public dissemination requirements. These are rare and require the concurrence of the Director of the Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research.

8.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* competitive grant program?

USAID is actively engaged in utilizing evidence of effectiveness to allocate funds. For example, Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) invests in innovations that demonstrate evidence of impact, cost-effectiveness, and a viable pathway to scale. DIV provides four types of grants: 1) proof of concept, 2) positioning for scale, 3) scaling proven solutions, and 4) evidence grants.

The more funding requested (up to $5 million dollars), the more DIV requires in an innovation's evidence base, the deeper the due diligence process, and the greater the expectation that the applicant will be able to demonstrate development impact and potential to scale. After a decision is made to allocate funding, 98% of all DIV awards are structured as fixed amount pay-for-performance grants, ensuring that awards maximize the impact of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Over the past 8 years, DIV has invested $118 million in nearly 200 innovations across 45 countries.

8.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

A mid-term, whole of project evaluation of USAID/Rwanda's Community Health and Improved Nutrition (CHAIN) project found positive results from its approach to coordination and collaboration among implementing partners carrying out CHAIN's activities.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

For example, as a result of collaboration, many implementing partners exceeded their targets, found cost-savings from carrying out joint trainings, and improved relationships with local government officials, given their work toward a common goal. CHAIN's Project Management Team continues to support learning and to adapt the collaboration approach based on evaluation findings.

The Better Coffee Harvest project was a public-private partnership that worked to improve the livelihoods of smallholder coffee farmers in El Salvador and Nicaragua. Through Collaborative Learning, and Adapting (CLA) approaches, the project more effectively leveraged monitoring and evaluation activities to engage stakeholders and share information, ideas, and connections with sector actors. This approach helped the project meet its key performance targets and improve coordination across the larger coffee industry. A team-led focus on data for reflection and learning meant project leadership had the inputs, feedback, and time necessary to make informed decisions. The project's efforts to convene stakeholders to discuss findings also had a significant effect on the sector. After participating in roundtables where project results were discussed, industry stakeholders signed new sales contracts, formed new partnerships, and launched private-sector initiatives to address long-standing challenges in the sector.

8.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

USAID's Program Cycle Policy states that "[f]unding may be dedicated within a project or activity design for implementing partners to engage in an internal evaluation for institutional learning or accountability purposes."

USAID's Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) specifically references evaluations and rigorous evidence in the official solicitation: "Larger scale Stage 2 innovations (over $500,000) must include or test the evidence of impact of an innovation. This evidence of impact must be causal and rigorous—the grantee must either have rigorous underlying evidence already established, use this funding to run an evaluation with an evaluation partner, or run an evaluation with its own funding during the grant period." More on DIV's funding framework can be found in its evaluation criteria (see page 6 in DIV's most recent Annual Program Statement for the 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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Score
13

Corporation for National and Community Service

8.1 What were the agency's 5 largest competitive programs and their appropriations amount (and were city, county, and/or state governments eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

CNCS is operating two competitive grant programs in FY19: 1) the AmeriCorps State and National program (excluding State formula grant funds) ($250,750,005 million; eligible grantees: nonprofit organizations, state governments, tribal governments, local governments, institutions of higher education); and 2) Senior Corps RSVP program ($50,355,000 million; eligible grantees: nonprofit organizations, local governments). The Social Innovation Fund (SIF) grants were integrated into the Office of Research and Evaluation in FY19.

8.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in 5 largest competitive grant programs? (e.g., Were evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Was evidence a significant requirement?)

CNCS's AmeriCorps State and National grants program (excluding State formula grant funds), allocated up to 44 out of 100 points to organizations that submit applications supported by performance and evaluation data in FY19. Specifically, up to 28 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 16 points can be assigned for an applicant's incoming level of evidence, the quality of the evidence, and the applicant's evaluation capacity. Further, in 2019 CNCS prioritized the funding of specific education interventions with moderate or strong levels of evidence.

Since CNCS's implementation of a scoring process that assigns specific points for level of evidence, the percentage of grant dollars allocated to strong, moderate, preliminary, and no evidence categories has shifted over time (see chart below), such that more FY19 grant dollars were awarded to applicants with strong and moderate levels of evidence for proposed interventions, and fewer grant dollars were awarded to applicants with little to no evidence of effectiveness.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Percentage of competitive AmeriCorps grant funds that support evidence-based projects	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
Strong	20%	18%	26%	27%
Moderate	14%	11%	11%	14%
Preliminary	44%	45%	34%	31%
No Evidence	22%	26%	29%	28%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

In FY18, Senior Corps RSVP embedded evidence into their grant renewal processes by offering supplemental funding, "augmentation grants," to grantees interested in deploying volunteers to serve in evidence-based programs. More than $3.3 million of Senior Corps program dollars were allocated, over three years, toward new evidence-based programming augmentations. Grantees will be operating with their augmentations through fiscal year 2021.

- In a survey completed in FY19, Senior Corps grantees reported that more than 390 Senior Corps grants (about 38% of total grants), and more than 21,000 Senior Corps volunteers (about 11% of all Senior Corps volunteers) were engaged in evidence-based programming.

8.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

AmeriCorps State and National grantees are required to evaluate their programs as part of the grant's terms and conditions. Grantees receiving more than $500,000 required to conduct an independent, external evaluation (see page 17 of the FY19 notice of funding for a description of these requirements).

8.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* competitive grant program?

CNCS administers only two competitive grant programs, described above.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

8.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

CNCS has summarized the accomplishments of its competitive grant programs in a series of research briefs that describe the core components of effective interventions in the areas of education, economic opportunity, and health. The education brief was used to justify the FY19 funding priority for evidence-based interventions in the AmeriCorps State and National competition. All interventions described in these briefs illustrate how CNCS competitive grant recipients have achieved better outcomes and built knowledge about what works.

8.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

AmeriCorps State and National grantees, including city, county, tribal, and state governments, are required to use their AmeriCorps funds to evaluate their programs. In FY19, CNCS awarded $8.5 million for the Commission Investment Fund that supports State Commissions, which are typically housed within state government– approximately one third of these grants will focus on building the capacity of State Commissions and their grantees to collect and use performance and evaluation data.

2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Score
13

U.S. Department of Education

8.1 What were the agency's 5 largest competitive programs and their appropriations amount (and were city, county, and/or state governments eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

ED's five largest competitive grant programs in FY19 are: (1) TRIO ($1.06 billion; eligible grantees: institutions of higher education, public and private organizations); (2) Charter Schools Program ($440 million; eligible grantees: local charter schools); (3) GEAR UP ($360 million; eligible grantees: state agencies; partnerships that include IHEs and LEAs); (4) Teacher and School Leader Incentive Program (TSL) ($200 million; eligible grantees: local education agencies, partnerships between state and local education agencies); and (5) Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants ($190 million; eligible grantees: state education agencies).

8.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in 5 largest competitive grant programs? (e.g., Were evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Was evidence a significant requirement?)

ED uses evidence of effectiveness when making awards in its largest competitive grant programs.

- The vast majority of TRIO funding in FY19 was used to support continuation awards to grantees that were successful in prior competitions that awarded competitive preference priority points for projects that proposed strategies supported by moderate evidence of effectiveness.
- Under the Charter Schools Program, ED generally requires or encourages applicants to support their projects through logic models – however, applicants are not expected to develop their applications based on rigorous evidence. Within the CSP program, the Grants to Charter School Management Organizations for the Replication and Expansion of High-Quality Charter Schools (CMO Grants) supports charter schools with a previous track record of success.
- For the 2019 competition for GEAR UP State awards, ED used a competitive preference priority for projects implementing activities that are supported by promising evidence of effectiveness.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-aside; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

- The TSL statute requires applicants to provide a description of the rationale for their project and describe how the proposed activities are evidence-based, and grantees are held to these standards in the implementation of the program.
- The Comprehensive Literacy Development (CLD) statute requires that grantees provide subgrants to local educational agencies that conduct evidence-based literacy interventions. ESSA requires ED to give priority to applicants demonstrating strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence.

8.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

The Evidence Leadership Group (ELG) advises program offices on ways to incorporate evidence in grant programs through encouraging or requiring applicants to propose projects that are based on research and by encouraging applicants to design evaluations for their proposed projects that would build new evidence.

ED's grant programs require some form of an evaluation report on a yearly basis to build evidence, demonstrate performance improvement, and account for the utilization of funds. For examples, please see the annual performance reports of TRIO, the Charter Schools Program, and GEAR UP, which all explicitly require annual performance reports. The Teacher and School Leader Incentive Program is required by ESSA to conduct a national evaluation. The Comprehensive Literacy Development Grant requires evaluation reports. In addition, IES is currently conducting rigorous evaluations to identify successful practices in TRIO-Upward Bound, TRIO-Educational Opportunities Centers, and GEAR UP.

8.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* competitive grant program?

The Education and Innovation (EIR) program supports the creation, development, implementation, replication, and taking to scale of entrepreneurial, evidence-based, field-initiated innovations designed to improve student achievement and attainment for high-need students. The program uses three evidence tiers to allocate funds based on evidence of effectiveness, with larger awards given to applicants who can demonstrate stronger levels of prior evidence and produce stronger evidence of effectiveness through a rigorous, independent evaluation. The FY19 competition included checklists and PowerPoints to help applicants clearly understand the evidence requirements.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

The Department incorporates the evidence standards established in EDGAR as priorities and selection criteria in many competitive grant programs.

8.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

The Education and Innovation (EIR) program 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. IES released The Investing in Innovation Fund: Summary of 67 Evaluations, which can be used to inform efforts to move to more effective practices. The Department is exploring the results to determine what lessons learned can be applied to other programs.

8.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

In 2016, ED released non-regulatory guidance to provide state educational agencies, local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, educators, and partner organizations with information to assist them in selecting and using "evidence-based" activities, strategies, and interventions, as defined by ESSA, including carrying out evaluations to "examine and reflect" on how interventions are working. However, the guidance does not specify that federal competitive funds can be used to conduct such evaluations. Frequently, though, programs do include a requirement to evaluate the grant during and after the project period.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

6

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

8.1 What were the agency's 5 largest competitive programs and their appropriations amount (and were city, county, and/or state governments eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

In FY19 HUD's largest competitive programs are: 1) Continuum of Care ($2.2 billion; eligible grantees: state and local governments and coalitions); 2) Lead Hazard Reduction Grants ($234 million; eligible grantees: local governments); 3) Choice Neighborhoods Implementation ($150 million; eligible grantees: state and local governments); 4) Indian Housing ($200 million; eligible grantees: tribes and tribally designated housing entities); 5) Section 202 Service Coordinators ($90 million; eligible grantees: housing providers).

8.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in 5 largest competitive grant programs? (e.g., Were evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Was evidence a significant requirement?)

The Continuum of Care program (CoC) provides homelessness assistance awards on the basis of system performance measures focused on outcomes and evidence of effectiveness. This includes up to 56 points (out of 200) for past "performance related to reducing homelessness" and 4 points for "reallocat[ing] lower performing projects to create new higher performing projects that is based on performance review of existing projects."

Lead Hazard Reduction Grants require applicants to demonstrate a strategic approach to address low-income neighborhoods having concentrated lead hazards for children. The grant requires the grantees to use evidence-based lead hazard control methods and meet cost-savings, productivity, and grant compliance benchmarks. The application assigns 13 points (out of 100) based on grantees' past performance. Past research showing large returns on investment supported HUD's decision to request a 26 percent increase in program funding for FY20.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

The Indian Housing competitive grant program was established to address issues of overcrowded and physically inadequate housing identified by a PD&R needs assessment completed in 2017, Housing Needs of American Indians and Alaska Natives in Tribal Areas.

8.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

As a condition of grant award, all HUD competitive grantees are required to cooperate (p. 5) in any HUD-sponsored research or evaluation studies.

The Continuum of Care program is supported by the National Homeless Data Analysis Project, which provides communities with resources to improve data collection and consistent reporting about individuals experiencing homelessness to support national Annual Homeless Assessment Reports.

HUD Lead Paint grantees are required to integrate clearance testing of all housing units treated. Technical studies strengthen detection, evaluation, and control technologies, and rigorous evaluation has demonstrated the large return on investment related to children's health from controlling lead hazards.

All HUD-funded programs require recipients to submit, not less than annually, a report documenting achievement of outcomes under the purpose of the program and the work plan in the award agreement for accountability purposes and to build evidence of effective practices in the field.

8.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* competitive grant program?

HUD's Housing Counseling Grant Program ($43m in FY19) provides counseling services to tenants and homeowners. One of the program's main objectives is to "Distribute federal financial support to housing counseling agencies based on past performance." As such, the program allocates seven points (out of 100) for past performance based on the "the positive impacts that an Applicant's housing counseling services had on clients." HUD scores this item based on its own performance records.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-aside; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

8.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

Continuum of Care programs are the nation's primary structure for assisting people experiencing homelessness. Over more than a decade, increased CoC effectiveness has been supported by Homeless Management Information Systems and evidence-based funding of increased permanent supportive housing. As a result, the estimated number of chronically homeless individuals in 2018 was 16 percent less than the number in 2010. Following the Interagency Council on Homelessness guidelines, 72 communities and 3 states have effectively ended veteran homelessness.

8.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

As a condition of grant award, all HUD competitive grantees are required to cooperate in any HUD-sponsored research or evaluation studies. Eligible activities using grant funds are limited to those allowed by law. HUD also provides technical assistance to strengthen performance management capacity.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

6

U.S. Department of Labor

8.1 What were the agency's 5 largest competitive programs and their appropriations amount (and were city, county, and/or state governments eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

In FY19, the 5 largest competitive programs and their appropriation amounts were: Scaling Apprenticeship Through Sector-Based Strategies ($183,800,000; eligible grantees: public/private partnerships where lead applicants are institutions of higher education (IHE) representing a consortium of IHEs, or a state system of higher education, such as a community college system office or single state higher education board); Expanding Opportunity Through Industry Recognized Apprenticeship Programs (IRAP) ($150,000,000; expected Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) release FY19); Apprenticeships: Closing the Skills Gap ($100,000,000; eligible grantees: public/private partnerships where lead applicants are IHEs or an IHE representing a consortium of IHEs, a state system of higher education, such as a community college system office or a single state higher educational board, a nonprofit trade, industry, or employer association, labor unions, or labor-management organizations); Reentry Projects ($82,000,000; eligible grantees: non-profit organizations, state or local governments, Indian and Native American entities eligible for grants under Section 166 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)); and YouthBuild ($80,000,000; eligible grantees: private non-profit or public agencies including community and faith-based organizations, local workforce development boards or one-stop center partner programs, educational institutions, community action agencies, state or local housing development agencies, any Indian and Native American entity eligible for grants under Section 166 of WIOA, community development corporations, state or local youth service conservation corps, and any other public or private non-profit entity that is eligible to provide education or employment training under a federal program and can meet the required elements of the grant).

8.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in 5 largest competitive grant programs? (e.g., Were evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Was evidence a significant requirement?)

The Reentry Projects funding opportunity provides up to eight points (out of 100) for past performance. Grant applicants must specifically provide information on their performance goals. The application states, "[a]ll applicants must specifically address the

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

placement in education or employment and certificate/degree attainment outcomes."

The Employment & Training Administration's (ETA) YouthBuild applicants are also awarded points based on past performance (a possible 28 points out of 100), viewing these metrics as important to demonstrating successful career outcomes for youth.

8.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

All five of DOL's largest grant programs have been or will be involved in evaluations designed by the Chief Evaluation Office (CEO) and the relevant DOL agencies. In each case DOL required or encouraged (through language in the funding announcement and proposal review criteria) grantees to use evidence-based models or strategies in grant interventions and/or to participate in an evaluation, especially to test new interventions that theory or research suggest are promising.

For example, DOL will conduct an implementation evaluation of the Sector Based Apprenticeship Program. This evaluation will also include the development of an impact evaluation design options paper that identifies areas of opportunity for testing the impacts of apprenticeship strategies on employment or other outcomes. The objective of this study is to identify innovative and promising models, practices, and partnership strategies to expand apprenticeship opportunities in high-growth occupations and industries to build the evidence on apprenticeship. There are options for more rigorous evaluations in the contract as appropriate.

Additionally, DOL currently has an evaluation underway of the Reentry Projects grant program. The Reentry Projects grant program used a tiered evidence framework to require applicants to propose evidence-based and informed interventions, or new interventions that theory or research suggests are promising, (or a combination of both) that lead to increased employment outcomes for their target populations and must frame their goals and objectives to address this issue. The evaluation will identify and evaluate promising practices used in reentry employment programs through both an implementation and impact study among select grantees to understand their effectiveness in improving participant outcomes such as employment, earnings, and recidivism.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

8.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* competitive grant program?

DOL includes requirements of demonstrated effectiveness in the allocation of funds, as well as the commitment to building new evidence in order to receive funds, both of which are of equal importance given the fact that many DOL-funded programs lack a sufficient body of evidence to only support those that are already evidence-based. For example, among current Employment & Training Administration (ETA) competitive grant programs, this has involved requiring: (1) a demonstration of an approach as being evidence-based or promising for receipt of funds (i.e., Reentry Funding Opportunity Announcement) or for potential to receive additional funds (ie., TechHire); (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 an evaluation as well as rigorous grantee (or local) evaluations. Additionally, applicants for the International Labor Bureau's (ILAB) competitive funding opportunities must provide evidence of the effectiveness of proposed strategies and are required to conduct and/or participate in evaluations as a condition of award.

8.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

DOL funded a 36-month evaluation of Linking Employment Activities Pre-Release (LEAP) Program which included an implementation study of LEAP pilot programs that provided jail-based American Job Centers (AJCs) to individuals preparing to re-enter society after time in jail. DOL worked to better understand client flow and services provided, partnerships involved, coordination with full-service and satellite One-Stop Career Centers/AJCs, and administrative and reporting strategies adopted to manage activities, staff, and results.

In Laying a Foundation: Four Year Results from the National YouthBuild Evaluation, DOL evaluated 75 programs across the country and 4,000 young people who enrolled in YouthBuild in 2011-2013. This evaluation examined YouthBuild's effects on the young people it served, assessing effects on a wide range of outcomes, including education and training, work and earnings, youth development, and involvement in the criminal justice system. An earlier process study, and an interim report, which presented effects through 30 months, informed the final report. An impact study tracked participants for four years, and a cost study examined the costs of operating and running YouthBuild compared with the potential benefits.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

8.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

DOL has a formal Evaluation Policy. Guidance on using funds to conduct and or participate in program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation–building efforts can be found in each grant funding opportunity, and is a condition of each grant. The "Special Program Requirements" section of the respective grant funding opportunity notifies grantees of this responsibility. Generally, this section states: "As a condition of grant award, grantees are required to participate in an evaluation, if undertaken by DOL. The evaluation may include an implementation assessment across grantees, an impact and/or outcomes analysis of all or selected sites within or across grantees, and a benefit/cost analysis or assessment of return on investment. Conducting an impact analysis could involve random assignment (which involves random assignment of eligible participants into a treatment group that would receive program services or enhanced program services, or into control group(s) that would receive no program services or program services that are not enhanced). We may require applicants to collect data elements to aid the evaluation. As a part of the evaluation, as a condition of award, grantees must agree to: (1) make records available to the evaluation contractor on participants, employers, and funding; (2) provide access to program operating personnel, participants, and operational and financial records, and any other pertaining documents to calculate program costs and benefits; (3) in the case of an impact analysis, facilitate the assignment by lottery of participants to program services (including the possible increased recruitment of potential participants); and (4) follow evaluation procedures as specified by the evaluation contractor under the direction of DOL, including after the period of operation. After award, grantees will receive detailed guidance on ETA's evaluation methodology, including requirements for data collection. Grantees will receive technical assistance to support their participation in these activities."

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Score
15

Millennium Challenge Corporation

8.1 What were the agency's 5 largest competitive programs and their appropriations amount (and were city, county, and/or state governments eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

MCC awards all of its agency funds through two competitive grants: (1) the compact program ($631.5 million in FY19; eligible grantees: developing countries) and (2) the threshold program ($45.0 million in FY19; eligible grantees: developing countries).

8.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in 5 largest competitive grant programs? (e.g., Were evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Was evidence a significant requirement?)

For country partner selection, as part of the compact and threshold competitive programs, MCC uses 20 different indicators within the categories of economic freedom, investing in people, and ruling justly to determine country eligibility for program assistance. These objective indicators of a country's performance are collected by independent third parties.

When considering granting a second compact, MCC further considers whether countries have (1) exhibited successful performance on their previous compact; (2) improved Scorecard performance during the partnership; and (3) exhibited a continued commitment to further their sector reform efforts in any subsequent partnership. As a result, the MCC Board of Directors has an even higher standard when selecting countries for subsequent compacts. Per MCC's policy for Compact Development Guidance (p. 6): "As the results of impact evaluations and other assessments of the previous compact program become available, the partner country must use this use data to inform project proposal assessment, project design, and implementation approaches."

8.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

Per its Policy for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), MCC requires independent evaluations of every project to assess progress in

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

achieving outputs and outcomes and program learning based on defined evaluation questions throughout the lifetime of the project and beyond. As described above, MCC publicly releases all these evaluations on its website and uses findings, in collaboration with stakeholders and partner countries, to build evidence in the field so that policymakers in the United States and in partner countries can leverage MCC's experiences to develop future programming. In line with MCC's Policy for M&E, MCC projects are required to submit quarterly Indicator Tracking Tables showing progress toward projected targets.

8.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* competitive grant program?

MCC uses evidence of effectiveness to allocate funds in all its competitive grant programs as noted above.

8.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

Based on the results of a rigorous impact evaluation, MCC's compact in Burkina Faso improved educational infrastructure, by renovating 396 classrooms in 132 primary schools and funding ancillary educational needs for students (e.g., latrines, school supplies, and food) and adults (e.g., teachers' housing and gender-sensitivity training). Students in intervention schools had overall student enrollment rates increase by 6%, with girls' enrollment increasing by 10.3%; higher test scores; higher primary school graduation rates; and lower early marriage rates. In completing this program, MCC learned that addressing the factors that specifically threaten female education helps girls access and remain in school. Additionally, addressing schools' weak educational quality (e.g., curriculum, faculty, management), coupled with improving the quality of students' access to and facilities for education, should further improve students' learning. This learning has since been applied in current education investments.

8.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

As described above, MCC develops a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Plan for every grantee, which describes the independent evaluations that will be conducted, the key evaluation questions and methodologies, and the data collection strategies that will be

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

employed. As such, grantees use program funds for evaluation.

MCC's Policy for Monitoring and Evaluation stipulates that the "primary responsibility for developing the M&E Plan lies with the MCA [grantee] M&E Director with support and input from MCC's M&E Lead and Economist. MCC and MCA Project/Activity Leads are expected to guide the selection of the indicators at the process and output levels that are particularly useful for management and oversight of activities and projects." The M&E policy is intended primarily to guide MCC and partner country staff decisions to utilize M&E effectively throughout the entire program life cycle in order to improve outcomes. All MCC investments also include M&E capacity-building for grantees.

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

6

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration

8.1 What were the agency's 5 largest competitive programs and their appropriations amount (and were city, county, and/or state governments eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

SAMHSA's five largest competitive grant programs in FY19 are: (1) State Opioid Response Grants ($1.5 billion in FY19) (eligible grantees: states); (2) Children's Mental Health Services ($125 million in FY19); (3) Strategic Prevention Framework ($119.5 million in FY19) (eligible grantees: public and private nonprofit entities); (4) Targeted Capacity Expansion – General ($100.2 million in FY19) (eligible grantees: domestic public and private nonprofit entities); and (5) Project AWARE ($92 million in FY19) (eligible grantees: State education agencies).

8.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in 5 largest competitive grant programs? (e.g., Were evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Was evidence a significant requirement?)

The 2018 State Opioid Response Grants application (the latest available) required states to use evidence-based practices to address opioid use disorder, as 1 of 5 evaluation criteria; however the application did not allot points for those criteria (p. 19). The FY19 Targeted Capacity Expansion Grants application gave applicants 25 out of 100 points for proposing evidence-based services or practices (p. 19).

The FY19 Project AWARE State Education Agency Grants application gave applicants 25 out of 100 points for the following: "Identify the Evidence-Based Practice(s) (EBPs) that will be used in each of the three LEAS. Discuss how each EBP chosen is appropriate for your population(s) of focus and the outcomes you want to achieve. Describe any modifications that will be made to the EBP(s) and the reason the modifications are necessary" (p. 23).

The FY19 Strategic Prevention Framework Grants application states that applicants must use evidence-based practices (p. 9), but this does not factor in the scoring of applications (pp. 15-16).

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 FY19? (Examples: Tiered-evidence frameworks; evidence-based funding set-asides; priority preference points or other preference scoring for evidence; Pay for Success provisions)

8.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

The FY19 Strategic Prevention Framework Grants application states that SAMHSA may negotiate additional terms and conditions with applicants prior to grant award, including "requirements relating to participation in a cross-site evaluation" (p. 51).

The FY19 Targeted Capacity Expansion Grants application states that SAMHSA may negotiate additional terms and conditions with applicants prior to grant award, including "requirements relating to participation in a cross-site evaluation" (p. 57).

The FY19 Project AWARE State Education Agency Grants application states that SAMHSA may negotiate additional terms and conditions with applicants prior to grant award, including "requirements relating to participation in a cross-site evaluation" (p. 61).

8.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* competitive grant program?

No examples available.

8.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

No examples available.

8.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

No examples available.

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Score
7

Administration for Children and Families

9.1 What were the agency's 5 largest non-competitive programs and their appropriation amounts (and were city, county, and/or state governments are eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

In FY19, ACF's 5 largest non-competitive grant programs are: 1) Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) ($16.4 billion; eligible entities: states); 2) Child Care and Development Fund (Block Grant and Entitlement to States combined) ($8.2 billion; eligible entities: states); 3) Foster Care ($5.3 billion; eligible entities: states); 4) Child Support Enforcement Payments to States ($4.6 billion; eligible entities: states); and 5) Low Income Home Energy Assistance ($3.7 billion; eligible entities: states, tribes, territories).

9.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to allocate funds in largest 5 non-competitive grant programs? (e.g., Are evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Is evidence a significant requirement?)

The Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA) (Division E, Title VII of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018), funded under the Foster Care budget, newly enables States to use Federal funds available under parts B and E of Title IV of the Social Security Act to provide enhanced support to children and families and prevent foster care placements through the provision of evidence-based mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services, in-home parent skill-based programs, and kinship navigator services. FFPSA requires an independent systematic review of evidence to designate programs and services as "promising," "supported," and "well-supported" practices. Only interventions designated as evidence-based will be eligible for federal funds.

9.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

TANF Grant Program: ACF has a long-standing and ongoing research portfolio in service of building evidence for the TANF Grant Program. Since FY17, Congress has designated 0.33% of the TANF Block Grant for research, evaluation, and technical

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

assistance related to the TANF Block Grant. ACF conducts research and evaluation projects in collaboration with TANF grantees, typically in areas where TANF grantees are facing challenges, innovating, or carrying out demonstration projects. This ongoing work includes building evidence around career pathways training programs, subsidized employment approaches, job search approaches, and employment coaching interventions. These are all program approaches used by state and county TANF grantees to meet their employment goals.

Child Care Development Block Grant Program: The Child Care Development Block Grant Act allows for up to one-half of one percent of CCDBG funding for a fiscal year to be reserved to conduct research and evaluation of the CCDBG grant program. ACF manages this ongoing research portfolio to build evidence for the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program (CCDBG), conducting research and evaluation projects in collaboration with CCDBG grantees, typically in areas where CCDBG grantees are facing challenges, innovating, or carrying out demonstration projects. Major projects in recent years include the National Survey of Early Care and Education; assessment of evidence on ratings in Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS); and several research partnerships between CCDF lead agencies and researchers.

Child Welfare Grant Programs: ACF has an ongoing research portfolio on the Title IV-E foster care grant program and related grant programs. ACF conducts research and evaluation in collaboration with child welfare grantees, typically focusing on areas in which grantees are facing challenges, innovating, or conducting demonstrations. Examples include strategies for prevention of maltreatment, meeting service needs, and improving outcomes for children who come to the attention of child welfare. Major projects include the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW) and a Supporting Evidence Building in Child Welfare project to increase the number of evidence-supported interventions grantees can use to serve the child welfare population.

Child Support Enforcement Research and Evaluation Grant Program: Section 1115 of the Social Security Act provides unique authority for research and evaluation grants to child support enforcement grantees to "improve the financial well-being of children or otherwise **improve the operation of the child support program**." ACF manages the child support enforcement research portfolio and administers a variety of research/evaluation components to understand more about cost and program effectiveness. Research and evaluation within the portfolio have consisted of 1) supporting large multi-state demonstrations which include random assignment evaluations (described in criteria question 7.4), 2) funding a supplement to the Census

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Bureau's Current Population survey, and 3) supporting research activities of other government programs and agencies by conducting matches of their research samples to the NDNH.

9.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* non-competitive grant program?

States applying for funding from ACF's Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) grant program must "demonstrate an emphasis on promoting the increased use and high quality implementation of evidence-based and evidence-informed programs and practices." The Children's Bureau 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 directed towards evidence-based and evidence-informed practices.

9.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how non-competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

ACF's Office of Child Care drew on research and evaluation findings related to eligibility redetermination, continuity of subsidy use, use of dollars to improve the quality of programs, and more to inform regulations related to Child Care and Development Block Grant reauthorization.

ACF's Welfare Research work has produced findings from numerous randomized controlled trials providing evidence on strategies that TANF agencies can use such as subsidized employment and job search strategies.

9.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

The 2019 Program Instruction for the Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) grant program states that CBCAP funds made available to states must be used for the financing, planning, community mobilization, collaboration, assessment,

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 FY19?
(Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

information and referral, startup, training and technical assistance, information management and reporting, and reporting and evaluation costs for establishing, operating, or expanding community-based and prevention-focused programs and activities designed to strengthen and support families and prevent child abuse and neglect, among other things.

Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 says states are required to spend not less than 7, 8, and 9 percent of their CCDF awards ("quality funds") (for years 1-2, 3-4, and 5+ after 2014 CCDBG enactment, respectively – see 128 STAT. 1987) on activities to improve the quality of child care services provided in the state, including:

- 1B: Supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce through…incorporating the effective use of data to guide program improvement (see 128 STAT 1988)
- 3: Developing, implementing, or enhancing a quality rating system for child care providers and services, which may support and assess the quality of child care providers in the State (A) and be designed to improve the quality of different types of child care providers (C) (see 128 STAT 1988)
- 7: Evaluating and assessing the quality and effectiveness of child care programs and services offered in the State, including evaluating how such programs positively impact children (see 128 STAT 1990)

ACF requires all CCDF lead agencies to annually report on how their CCDF quality funds were expended, including the activities funded and the measures used by states and territories to evaluate progress in improving the quality of child care programs and services. ACF released a Program Instruction for state and territorial lead agencies to provide guidance on reporting the authorized activities for the use of quality funds.

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

3

Administration for Community Living

9.1 What were the agency's 5 largest non-competitive programs and their appropriation amounts (and were city, county, and/or state governments are eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

Nutrition Services ($906 million; eligible grantees: states and territories); 2) Home and Community-Based Supportive Services ($345 million; eligible grantees: states and territories); 3) Family Caregiver Support Services ($181 million; eligible grantees: states and territories); 4) State Councils on Developmental Disabilities ($76 million; eligible grantees: states); and 5) Developmental Disabilities – Protection and Advocacy ($40 million; eligible grantees: states and territories).

9.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to allocate funds in largest 5 non-competitive grant programs? (e.g., Are evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Is evidence a significant requirement?)

States that receive Older Americans Act Home and Community-Based Supportive Services Title III-D funds are required to spend those funds on evidence-based programs to improve health and well-being, and reduce disease and injury. In order to receive funding, states must utilize programs that meet ACL's definition of evidence-based or are defined as evidence-based by another HHS operating division.

9.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

FY12 Congressional appropriations included an evidence-based requirement for the first time. OAA Title III-D funding may be used only for programs and activities demonstrated to be evidence-based. Consistent with the Administrator's focus on identifying new ways to efficiently improve direct service programs, ACL is using its 1% Nutrition authority to fund $3.5 million for nutrition innovations and to test ways to modernize how meals are provided to a changing senior population. One promising demonstration currently being carried out by the Georgia State University Research Foundation (entitled Double Blind Randomized Control Trial on the Effect of Evidence-Based Suicide Intervention Training on the Home-Delivered and Congregate

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Nutrition Program through the Atlanta Regional Commission) has drawn widespread attention is an effort to train volunteers who deliver home-delivered meals to recognize and report indicators of suicidal intent and other mental health issues so that they can be addressed.

9.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* non-competitive grant program?

The Older Americans Act state plans require grantees to provide information about past performance, including "information on the extent to which the area agency on aging met the objectives" related to "providing services to older individuals with greatest economic need, older individuals with greatest social need, and older individuals at risk for institutional placement."

9.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how non-competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

Since 2017, ACL has awarded Innovations in Nutrition grants to 11 organizations to develop and expand evidence-based approaches to enhance the quality and effectiveness of nutrition programming. ACL is currently overseeing five grantees for innovative projects that will enhance the quality, effectiveness, and outcomes of nutrition services programs provided by the national aging services network. The grants total $1,197,205 for this year with a two-year project period. Through this grant program, ACL aims to identify innovative and promising practices that can be scaled across the country and to increase the use of evidence-informed practices within nutrition programs.

9.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

All funding opportunity announcements published by ACL include language about generating and reporting evidence about their progress towards the specific goals set for the funds. Grantee manuals include information about the importance of and requirements for evaluation (see the Administration on Aging: Title VI Resource Manual). The National Ombudsman Resource Center, funded by ACL, provides self-evaluation materials for Long-Term Care Ombudsman Programs (LTCOP) funded under Title VII of the Older Americans Act.

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 FY19?
(Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

N/A

U.S. Agency for International Development

USAID does not administer non-competitive grant programs (score for criteria #8 applied).

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 FY19?
(Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Score
6

Corporation for National and Community Service

9.1 What were the agency's 5 largest non-competitive programs and their appropriation amounts (and were city, county, and/or state governments are eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

CNCS operates one formula grant program in FY19, the AmeriCorps State formula grants program ($174,250,005; eligible grantees: states). CNCS also operates four direct grant programs in FY19: 1) AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC) ($32 million; eligible grantees: nonprofit organizations); 2) AmeriCorps VISTA ($92 million; eligible grantees: nonprofit organizations, state, tribal, and local governments, institutions of higher education); 3) Senior Corps Foster Grandparents ($110 million; eligible grantees: nonprofit organization, local governments); and 4) Senior Corps Senior Companion Program ($46 million; eligible grantees: nonprofit organizations, local governments).

9.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to allocate funds in largest 5 non-competitive grant programs? (e.g., Are evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Is evidence a significant requirement?)

In FY18, Senior Corps Foster Grandparents and Senior Companion Program embedded evidence into their grant renewal processes by offering supplemental funding, "augmentation grants," to grantees interested in deploying volunteers to serve in evidence-based programs. More than $3.3 million of Senior Corps program dollars were allocated, over three years, toward new evidence-based programming augmentations. Grantees will be operating with their augmentations through fiscal year 2021.

In a survey completed in FY 2019, Senior Corps grantees reported that more than 390 Senior Corps grants (about 38% of total grants), and more than 21,000 Senior Corps volunteers (about 11% of all Senior Corps volunteers) were engaged in evidence-based programming.

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

9.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

In FY19, Senior Corps completed an evaluation with an independent firm to produce case studies and comparative analyses of select grantees that received an evidence based-programming augmentation to understand successes, challenges, and other issues. CNCS anticipates that this management report will be used to inform Senior Corps' approach to replicating this augmentation initiative, as well as the training/technical assistance needs of grantees. Senior Corps and the Administration for Community Living have also initiated a dialogue about how to build and broaden the evidence base for various programs designed for older adults. CNCS relies on ACL's list of evidence-based programs for its augmentation grants and is exploring how to collect the same information from its grantees and how to share information about other evidence-based programs Senior Corps grantees may be using.

AmeriCorps NCCC is investing in a Service Project Database with the aim of creating a qualitative database of all NCCC projects completed since 2012. The database will thematically organize projects, classify project frameworks, and categorize the outcomes of these service initiatives. NCCC is investing in an evaluation of NCCC's impact. This research project was initiated in FY18 and is focused on evaluating member retention, studying how NCCC develops leadership skills in its members and teams, and the program's ability to strengthen communities. Finally, NCCC will continue to invest in research grants to better understand the outcomes of its disaster response efforts.

9.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* non-competitive grant program?

CNCS only administers five non-competitive grant programs, as described above.

9.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how non-competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

Senior Corps and the Office of Research and Evaluation completed a longitudinal evaluation of the Foster Grandparents and Senior Companion Programs in FY19 that demonstrated the positive health outcomes associated with volunteering. A 50 year

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

retrospective review of the research conducted on Senior Corps programs will be completed by the end of FY19.

9.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

No examples available.

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

13

U.S. Department of Education

9.1 What were the agency's 5 largest non-competitive programs and their appropriation amounts (and were city, county, and/or state governments are eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

(1) Title I Grants to LEAs ($15.76 billion; eligible grantees: state education agencies); (2) IDEA Grants to States ($12.4 billion; eligible grantees: state education agencies); (3) Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants ($2.1 billion; eligible grantees: state education agencies); (4) Impact Aid Payments to Federally Connected Children ($1.19 billion; eligible grantees: local education agencies); and (5) 21st Century Community Learning Centers ($1.2 billion; eligible grantees: state education agencies).

9.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to allocate funds in largest 5 non-competitive grant programs? (e.g., Are evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Is evidence a significant requirement?)

ED worked with Congress in FY16 to ensure that evidence played a major role in ED's large non-competitive grant programs in the reauthorized ESEA. As a result, section 1003 of ESSA requires states to set aside at least 7% of their Title I, Part A funds for a range of activities to help school districts improve low-performing schools. School districts and individual schools are required to create action plans that include "evidence-based" interventions that demonstrate strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence.

9.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

ESEA requires a National Assessment of Title I– Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged. In addition, Title I Grants require state education agencies to report on school performance, including those schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Federal law (ESEA) requires states receiving funds from 21st Century Community Learning Centers to "evaluate the effectiveness of programs and activities" that are carried out with federal funds (section 4203(a)(14)), and it requires local recipients of those funds to conduct periodic evaluations in conjunction with the state evaluation (section 4205(b)).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the implementing office for IDEA grants to states, has revised its accountability system to shift the balance from a system focused primarily on compliance to one that puts more emphasis on results through the use of Results Driven Accountability.

9.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* non-competitive grant program?

Section 4108 of ESEA authorizes school districts to invest "safe and healthy students" funds in Pay for Success initiatives. Section 1424 of ESEA authorizes school districts to invest their Title I, Part D funds (Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk) in Pay for Success initiatives; under the section 1415 of the same program, a State agency may use funds for Pay for Success initiatives.

9.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how non-competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

States and school districts are beginning to implement the requirements in Title I of the ESEA regarding using evidence-based interventions in school improvement plans. Some States are providing training or practice guides to help schools and districts identify evidence-based practices.

9.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

In 2016, ED released non-regulatory guidance to provide state educational agencies, local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, educators, and partner organizations with information to assist them in selecting and using "evidence-based" activities, strategies,

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 FY19?
(Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

and interventions, as defined by ESSA, including carrying out evaluations to "examine and reflect" on how interventions are working. However, the guidance does not specify that federal non-competitive funds can be used to conduct such evaluations.

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 FY19?
(Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Score
3

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

9.1 What were the agency's 5 largest non-competitive programs and their appropriation amounts (and were city, county, and/or state governments are eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

HUD's budget contains three large formula grant programs for public housing authorities (PHAs): 1) the Public Housing Operating Fund ($4.6 billion in FY19); 2) the Public Housing Capital Grants ($2.7 billion); and 3) Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Administrative Fees ($1.8 billion).

Another two formula grant programs serve cities or tribes: 1) Community Development Block Grant Entitlement/Non-Entitlement ($3.3 billion in FY19); and 2) HOME Investment Partnerships ($1.4 billion).

9.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to allocate funds in largest 5 non-competitive grant programs? (e.g., Are evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Is evidence a significant requirement?)

Although the funding formulas are prescribed in statute, evaluation-based interventions are central to each program. HUD used 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's funding of public housing is being radically shifted through the evidence-based Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD), which enables accessing private capital to address the $26 billion backlog of capital needs funding. Based on demonstrated success of RAD, for FY19 HUD proposed removing the cap on the number of public housing developments to be converted to Section 8 contracts. HUD is also conducting a Rent Reform demonstration and a Moving To Work (MTW) demonstration to test efficiencies of changing rent rules and effects on tenant outcomes.

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

9.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

Evidence-building is central to HUD's funding approach through the use of prospective program demonstrations. These include the Public Housing Operating Fund's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD), the Public Housing Capital Grants' Rent Reform demonstration, and the Housing Choice Voucher program's Moving To Work (MTW) demonstration grants. As Congress moved to expand MTW flexibilities to additional public housing authorities (PHAs), HUD sought authority to randomly assign cohorts of PHAs to provide ability to rigorously test specific program innovations.

Program funds are provided to operate demonstrations through the HCV account, Tenant-Based Rental Assistance. These include the Tribal HUD-VA Supportive Housing (Tribal HUD-VASH) demonstration of providing permanent supportive housing to Native American veterans and the FSS-Family Unification Program demonstration that tests the effect of providing vouchers to at-risk young adults who are aging out of foster care.

9.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* non-competitive grant program?

No examples available.

9.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how non-competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

To address a severe backlog of capital needs funding for the nation's public housing stock, the Rental Assistance Demonstration was authorized in 2011 to convert the properties to project-based Section 8 contracts to attract an infusion of private capital. The 2016 interim report on the RAD evaluation showed that conversions successfully obtained $2.2 billion of private funding, representing a 9:1 leverage ratio. Based on the successes, the limit on the number of public housing conversions was increased to 455,000 units in 2018, nearly half of the stock, and HUD proposed to eliminate the cap in FY19. Additionally, HUD extended the conversion opportunity to legacy multifamily programs through RAD 2.

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

9.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

Communities receiving HUD block grant funding through Community Development Block Grants, HOME block grants, and other programs are required to consult local stakeholders, conduct housing needs assessments, and develop needs-driven Consolidated Plans to guide their activities. They then provide Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports (CAPERs) to document progress toward their Consolidated Plan goals in a way that supports continued community involvement in evaluating program efforts.

HUD's Community Development Block Grant program, which provides formula grants to entitlement jurisdictions, increases local evaluation capacity. Specifically, federal regulations (Section 24 CFR 507.200) authorize CDBG recipients (including city and state governments) to use up to 20% of their CDBG allocations for administration and planning costs that may include evaluation-capacity building efforts and evaluations of their CDBG-funded interventions (as defined in 507.205 and 507.206).

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

7

U.S. Department of Labor

9.1 What were the agency's 5 largest non-competitive programs and their appropriation amounts (and were city, county, and/or state governments are eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

In FY19, the 5 largest non-competitive grant programs at DOL are in the Employment and Training Administration: Adult Employment and Training Activities ($845,000,000; eligible grantees: city, county, and/or state governments), Youth Activities ($903,416,000; eligible grantees: city, county, and/or state governments), Dislocated Worker Employment and Training activities ($1,040,860,000; eligible grantees: city, county, and/or state governments), UI State Administration ($2,137,945,000; eligible grantees: city, county, and/or state governments), Employment Security grants to States ($663,052,000; eligible grantees: city, county, and/or state governments).

9.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to allocate funds in largest 5 non-competitive grant programs? (e.g., Are evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Is evidence a significant requirement?)

A signature feature of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) (Pub. L. 113-128), is its focus on the use of data and evidence to improve services and outcomes, particularly in provisions related to states' role in conducting evaluations and research, as well as in requirements regarding data collection, performance standards, and state planning. Conducting evaluations is a required statewide activity, but there are additional requirements regarding coordination (with other state agencies and federal evaluations under WIOA), dissemination, and provision of data and other information for Federal evaluations.

9.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

Section 116(e) of WIOA describes how the state, in coordination with local workforce boards and state agencies that administer the programs, shall conduct ongoing evaluations of activities carried out in the state under these state programs. These

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

evaluations are intended to promote, establish, implement, and utilize methods for continuously improving core program activities in order to achieve high-level programs within, and high-level outcomes from, the workforce development system.

Additionally, WIOA's evidence and performance provisions: (1) increased the amount of WIOA funds states can set aside and distribute directly from 5-10% to 15% and authorized them to invest these funds in Pay for Performance initiatives; (2) authorized states to invest their own workforce development funds, as well as non-federal resources, in Pay for Performance initiatives; (3) authorized local workforce investment boards to invest up to 10% of their WIOA funds in Pay for Performance initiatives; and (4) authorized states and local workforce investment boards to award Pay for Performance contracts to intermediaries, community based organizations, and community colleges.

9.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* non-competitive grant program?

Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessments (RESEA) funds must be used for interventions or service delivery strategies demonstrated to reduce the average number of weeks of unemployment insurance a participant receives by improving employment outcomes. The law provides for a phased implementation of the new program requirements over several years. In FY19, DOL awarded $130 million to states to conduct RESEA programs that met these evidence of effectiveness requirements. Beginning in FY23, states must also use no less than 25 percent of RESEA grant funds for interventions with a high or moderate causal evidence rating that show a demonstrated capacity to improve outcomes for participants; this percentage increases in subsequent years until after FY26, when states must use no less than 50 percent of such grant funds for such interventions.

9.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how non-competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

Institutional Analysis of American Job Centers: the goal of the evaluation was to understand and systematically document the institutional characteristics of American Job Centers (AJCs), and to identify variations in service delivery, organization structure, and administration across AJCs.

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Career Pathways Descriptive and Analytical Study: WIOA requires DOL to "conduct a multistate study to develop, implement, and build upon career advancement models and practices for low-wage healthcare providers or providers of early education and child care." In response, DOL conducted the Career Pathways Design Study to develop evaluation design options that could address critical gaps in knowledge related to the approach, implementation, and success of career pathways strategies generally, and in early care and education specifically. The Chief Evaluation Office (CEO) has recently begun the second iteration of this study. The purpose of this project is to build on the evaluation design work CEO completed in 2018 to build evidence about the implementation and effectiveness of career pathways approaches and meet the WIOA statutory requirement to conduct a career pathways study. It will include a meta-analysis of existing impact evaluation results as well as examine how workers advance through multiple, progressively higher levels of education and training, and associated jobs, within a pathway over time, and the factors associated with their success.

Analysis of Employer Performance Measurement Approaches: the goal of the study was to examine the appropriateness, reliability and validity of proposed measures of effectiveness in serving employers required under WIOA. It included knowledge development to understand and document the state of the field, an analysis and comparative assessment of measurement approaches and metrics, and the dissemination of findings through a report, as well as research and topical briefs.

9.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

The Employment & Training Administration's (ETA) RESEA grantees may use up to 10% of their grant funds for evaluations of their programs. ETA is releasing specific evaluation guidance later in FY19 to help states understand how to conduct or cause to conduct evaluations of their RESEA interventions with these grant funds. The goal of the agency guidance, along with the evaluation technical assistance being provided to states and their partners, is to build states' capacity to understand, use, and build evidence.

Section 116 of WIOA establishes performance accountability indicators and performance reporting requirements to assess the effectiveness of states and local areas in achieving positive outcomes for individuals served by the workforce development system's core programs. Section 116(e) of WOIA requires states to "employ the most rigorous analytical and statistical methods

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 FY19?
(Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

that are reasonably feasible, such as the use of control groups" and requires that states evaluate the effectiveness of their WOIA programs in an annual progress which includes updates on (1) current or planned evaluation and related research projects, including methodologies used; (2) efforts to coordinate the development of evaluation and research projects with WIOA core programs, other state agencies and local boards; (3) a list of completed evaluation and related reports with publicly accessible links to such reports; (4) efforts to provide data, survey responses, and timely visits for Federal evaluations; (5) any continuous improvement strategies utilizing results from studies and evidence-based practices evaluated. States are permitted to use WOIA grant funds to perform the necessary performance monitoring and evaluations to complete this report.

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 FY19?
(Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

N/A

Millennium Challenge Corporation

MCC does not administer non-competitive grant programs (score for criteria #8 applied).

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

Score

6

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration

9.1 What were the agency's 5 largest non-competitive programs and their appropriation amounts (and were city, county, and/or state governments are eligible to receive funds from these programs)?

SAMHSA's five largest noncompetitive grant programs in FY19 are: (1) Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant Program ($1.86 billion; eligible grantees: states); (2) Community Mental Health Block Grant Program ($722.5 million; eligible grantees: states); (3) Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH) Program ($64.6 million; eligible grantees: states);; and (4) Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness (PAIMI) Program ($36.1 million; eligible grantees: states).

9.2 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to allocate funds in largest 5 non-competitive grant programs? (e.g., Are evidence-based interventions/practices required or suggested? Is evidence a significant requirement?)

In FY19, Congress maintained the 10 percent set-aside for evidence-based programs in SAMHSA's Mental Health Grant Block (MHBG) grant to address the needs of individuals with early serious mental illness, including psychotic disorders, regardless of the age of the individual at onset (see p. 48 of the FY18-FY19 Block Grant application). In the FY20 budget request (p. 3), SAMHSA expressed its desire to continue the set-aside.

The FY18-FY19 Block Grant application requires states seeking Mental Health Block Grant (MHBG) and Substance Abuse and Treatment Prevention Block Grant (SAGB) funds to identify specific priorities. For each priority, states must identify the relevant goals, measurable objectives, and at least one-performance indicator for each objective, which must include strategies to deliver evidence-based individualized treatment plans (p. 21); evidence-based interventions for substance use or dependence (p. 21); building provider capacity to deliver evidence-based, trauma-specific interventions (p. 22); evidence-based programs, policies, and practices in prevention efforts (p. 22); evidence-based models to prevent substance misuse (p. 23).

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 FY19? (Examples: Evidence-based funding set-asides; requirements to invest funds in evidence-based activities; Pay for Success provisions)

9.3 Did the agency use its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs to *build evidence*? (e.g., requiring grantees to participate in evaluations)

The FY18-FY19 Block Grant application requires states applying for Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment funds to create an evaluation plan, which must include at least five specified evaluation elements. Additionally, the application specifies that SAMHSA will work with the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) to plan for program evaluation and data collection related to demonstrating program effectiveness of the Mental Health Block Grant.

9.4 Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness to *allocate funds* in *any* non-competitive grant program?

No examples available.

9.5 What are the agency's 1-2 strongest examples of how non-competitive grant recipients achieved better outcomes and/or built knowledge of what works or what does not?

No examples available.

9.6 Did the agency provide guidance which makes clear that city, county, and state government, and/or other grantees can or should use the funds they receive from these programs to conduct program evaluations and/or to strengthen their evaluation capacity-building efforts?

The FY18-FY19 Block Grant Application clarified that "Section 1921 of the PHS [Public Health Services] Act (42 U.S.C.§ 300x-21) authorizes the States to obligate and expend SABG [Substance Abuse and Treatment Prevention Block Grant] funds to plan, carry out and evaluate activities and services designed to prevent and treat substance use disorders" (p. 16). The Application further clarifies that states "may utilize SABG funds to train personnel to conduct fidelity assessments of evidence-based practices" (p. 35).

2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

Score

4

Administration for Children and Families

10.1 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective practices or interventions used within programs or by grantees?

Findings from the evaluation of the first round Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) program influenced the funding opportunity announcement for the second round of HPOG funding. Namely, the scoring criteria used to select HPOG 2.0 grantees incorporated knowledge gained about challenges experienced in the HPOG 1.0 grant program. For example, based on those challenges, applicants were asked to clearly demonstrate—and verify with local employers—an unmet need in their service area for the education and training activities proposed. Applicants were also required to provide projections for the number of individuals expected to begin and complete basic skills education. Grantees must submit semi-annual and annual progress reports to ACF to show their progress in meeting these projections. If they have trouble doing so, grantees are provided with technical assistance to support improvement or are put on a corrective action plan so that ACF can more closely monitor their steps toward improvement.

10.2 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective policies used within programs or by grantees?

No examples available.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

10.3 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *grantees*?

In FY12, ACF significantly expanded its accountability provisions with the establishment of the Head Start Designation Renewal System (DRS). The DRS was designed to determine whether Head Start and Early Head Start programs are providing high quality comprehensive services to the children and families in their communities. Where they are not, grantees are denied automatic renewal of their grant and must apply for funding renewal through an open competition process. Those determinations are based on seven conditions, one of which looks at how Head Start classrooms within programs perform on the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), an observation-based measure of the quality of teacher-child interactions. Data from ACF's Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) and Quality Features, Dosage, Thresholds and Child Outcomes (Q-DOT) study were used to craft the regulations that created the DRS and informed key decisions in its implementation. This included where to set minimum thresholds for average CLASS scores, the number of classrooms within programs to be sampled to ensure stable program-level estimates on CLASS, and the number of cycles of CLASS observations to conduct. At the time the DRS notification letters were sent out to grantees in 2011, there were 1,421 non-tribal active grants, and of these, 453 (32%) were required to re-compete (p. 19).

10.4 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *programs*? (e.g., eliminations or legislative language in budget requests)

No examples available.

10.5 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from consistently ineffective *products and services*?

No examples available.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

Score
6

Administration for Community Living

10.1 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective practices or interventions used within programs or by grantees?

ACL uses a quality review system (QRS) for developmental disability programs under ACL's/Administration for Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AIDD). The QRS uses a three-tiered model to review program compliance, outcomes (i.e., evidence), and fiscal operations to review results to target and coordinate technical assistance. The first tier is an annual standardized review. The second tier is standardized, in-depth review involving a team of reviewers. These reviews are conducted on a periodic basis. Tier three is customized monitoring for programs that ACL has significant concerns in terms of compliance and performance. ACL continues development of a formula grant monitoring framework for Older Americans Act Title III and VII state formula grants. The framework combines assessments of grantee's progress toward program goals and objectives with identification of risk or instances of fraud, waste and abuse. These reviews allow ACL, if warranted, to restrict grant funding based on findings of insufficient evidence of performance.

10.2 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective policies used within programs or by grantees?

The Paralysis Resource Center State Pilot Program is part of an effort to ensure program efficiency and to test two approaches for making subawards to community-based organizations that provide long-term services and supports to people with paralysis, their families, and their support networks. Outcomes from the pilot will help ACL assess the most effective and efficient ways to make such subawards and will determine how ACL funds this effort going forward.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

10.3 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *grantees*?

ACL is using a tool developed in FY 2018 to help grant officers more easily monitor the degree to which Chronic Disease Self-Management (CDSME) and Falls Prevention grantees are meeting their ACL approved program completion targets. ACL staff will use this information to either fully release or restrict grant funds over the life of the multi-year awards. Grant scores comprise the following three components:

- Goal 1: Intervention Level – assesses progress towards meeting the target number of program completers (for CDSME grants) or participants (for Falls Prevention grants).
- Goal 2: Sustainability Level – assesses progress towards establishing a sustainable program.

Grantee Challenges – presents challenges identified by grantees and assesses the strategies proposed to resolve the challenges.

Combined, these elements provide Project Officers and staff with an overall Grant Score and Status for each grant. The Grant Score provides a numeric indicator of grantee performance. The Grant Status indicates whether the grant is at “Low”, “Medium,” or “High” risk of eventually requiring a no-cost extension, based on the Grant Score. The tool also includes several features for designated administrative users to manage core information pertinent to supporting the manage grantee and grant performance data functionality.

In addition, the Innovations in Nutrition Programs and Services grants will be monitored using a new tool that enables Project Officers to quickly assess grant status and proactively identify and engage with grantees that would benefit from technical assistance, to ensure that grants are completed on time.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

10.4 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *programs*? (e.g., eliminations or legislative language in budget requests)

While much of ACL's funding is based on formula grants, and therefore cannot be reallocated to other programs, ACL is working with GSA's Office of Evaluation Sciences (OES) to test methods for improving outcomes for its congregate meals programs. Under the Older Americans Act, congregate meal sites are required to accept donations from meal recipients. But there has been a concern regarding how to balance the collection of funds that can be used towards meal service and making meal recipients that cannot afford to donate uncomfortable, thus suppressing attendance. This study, being conducted in FY19, will offer concrete evidence to improve program operations.

10.5 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from consistently ineffective *products and services*?

While much of ACL's funding is based on formula grants, and therefore cannot be reallocated to other programs, evaluation staff work closely with program staff to identify ways to translate evaluation findings into technical assistance and other types of program support. For example, based on early results from and evaluation of the Tribal Grant program, ACL has developed new program support materials to improve the delivery of Tribal Caregiver programs.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

Score
7

U.S. Agency for International Development

10.1 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective practices or interventions used within programs or by grantees?

Through the Program Cycle, USAID encourages managing projects and activities adaptively, responding to rigorous data and evidence and shifting design and/or implementation accordingly. For example, USAID's Lowland Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) activity works to accelerate access to improved WASH in three rural lowland regions in Ethiopia. A mid-activity data review highlighted several disappointing results that prompted a program team (USAID/Ethiopia staff and implementing partner) to rethink their approach. The team utilized pause and reflect, strategic collaboration, adaptive management, and monitoring and evaluation for learning. Using this intentional CLA process, the team initiated a virtuous cycle of learning. Soon the team realized that, in these communities dominated by (semi-) pastoralist groups, the operating conditions for effective, sustained behavior change are highly variable. A CLA approach helped the program team define, pivot, and re-design activities that addressed program effectiveness.

10.2 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective policies used within programs or by grantees?

In April 2019, USAID released its new Policy Framework which articulates USAID's approach to providing development and humanitarian assistance and the Agency's programmatic and operational priorities that follow from it. These priorities and approaches are based on evidence and inform issue-specific development policies, strategies, and vision papers; budget requests and allocations; country and regional strategic plans; good-practice documents and project designs; evaluations and

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

learning agendas; and overall engagement with partners.

The Framework requires a reorientation of USAID's programmatic approach to foster self-reliance more effectively. This approach marks a new direction for USAID, but draws on deep experiences and the lessons it has learned. The new approach is grounded in three principles that underpin why it provided assistance to each country, what assistance will be most effective, and how it can ensure the sustainability of its results. These principles are Advance Country Progress, Invest for Impact, and Sustain Results. Ultimately, the framework serves to shift policy to improve program effectiveness in supporting partner countries in their journey to self-reliance.

10.3 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *grantees*?

USAID shifts funds away from ineffective grantees. For example, the Securing Water for Food Grand Challenge is designed with a Technical Assistance Facility to consult and work with grantees to identify specific growth barriers, and then connect them with vetted service providers that bring expertise and capabilities to help these grantees overcome their strategic barriers. The Technical Assistance Facility provides tailored financial and acceleration support to help these grantees improve their market-driven business development, commercial growth, and scaling.

If a grantee is unable to meet specific performance targets, such as number of customers or product sales, further funding is not granted and the grantee is re-categorized into the program's group of unsuccessful alumni. The Securing Water for Food Grand Challenge used milestone-based grants to terminate 15 awards that were not meeting their annual milestones and shifted that money to both grants and technical assistance for the remaining 25 awards in the program.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

10.4 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *programs*? (e.g., eliminations or legislative language in budget requests)

The Agency continuously works to improve upon its programming based on the best-available evidence. In one example, the findings of a mid-term evaluation of Reproductive, Maternal, Neonatal, Child, and Adolescent Health (RMNCH+A) activities resulted in shifting resources towards a more effective implementation of the interventions. Taking lessons from the first phase of the project, and based on the evaluation recommendation, the project decided to focus on limited technical areas where activities have sufficient feedback loops and opportunities for learning and continuous improvements. For example, the project will continue to cover maternal, newborn, and child health areas, but the adolescent health interventions will be done through other USAID funded projects.

10.5 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from consistently ineffective *products and services*?

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 some examples where USAID has shifted funds and/or programming decisions based on performance:

- An evaluation of an education project in El Salvador revealed the need to improve effectiveness by better matching interventions with individual target school and community needs to serve out-of-school youth. As a result, the project changed how it is working with the Ministry of Education.
- USAID Acceleration programs use a pilot and pivot approach to test out different services and vendors to help its innovators accelerate their work. These services and vendors are held to high customer satisfaction minimums, if the vendors are not constantly scoring a 90/100 or higher they are removed from the service offering.
- USAID's INVEST program is designed for constant feedback loops around the partner performance. Not only are under-performing partners dropped, but new partners can be added dynamically, based on demand. This greatly increases USAID's new partner base and increases the performance standard across the board.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

Score

3

Corporation for National and Community Service

10.1 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective practices or interventions used within programs or by grantees?

No examples available.

10.2 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective policies used within programs or by grantees?

In recent years, the Senior Corps program has invested over $1 million in various management analyses that are informing operations, programming, and its research agenda moving forward. Information was used to revise policies and regulations in FY19 by allowing grantees more flexibility in how they allocate their funds to programming that shifts resources from administrative activities to activities that directly serve communities.

10.3 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *grantees*?

AmeriCorps State and National will reallocate $500,000 to provide intensive technical assistance to grantees with insufficient evidence. Special conditions were placed on these grants so that funding is contingent on grantees engaging in evaluation capacity building activities. This will provide additional training and technical assistance to move grantees with preliminary evidence along the evidence continuum. Specifically, this technical assistance is designed to increase the evidence base for these grantees through coaching and technical assistance from NORC at the University of Chicago. If grantees fail to move

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

along the continuum when they recompete for funding they will either receive less money or no funding depending on the reasons for the evidence stagnation.

10.4 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *programs*? (e.g., eliminations or legislative language in budget requests)

No examples available.

10.5 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from consistently ineffective *products and services*?

CNCS began migrating to shared services in August 2019. This decision was made in alignment with Goal One of the agency's Transformation and Sustainability plan (Strengthen core business functions). The agency made this decision to achieve: improved accountability in internal business practices; increased capacity across operational areas and better support for the work of CNCS awardees; and improved core operational functions to provide a stronger foundation for increasing national service impact across the country. CNCS has entered into an interagency agreement with the Department of Treasury's Administrative Resource Center (ARC) to shift some procurement, accounting, and human capital processes to ARC's shared services environment.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

Score

6

U.S. Department of Education

10.1 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective practices or interventions used within programs or by grantees?

ED uses evidence in competitive programs to encourage the field to shift away from less effective practices and toward more effective practices. For example, the Education Innovation and Research (EIR) program 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. IES released The Investing in Innovation Fund: Summary of 67 Evaluations, which can be used to inform efforts to move to more effective practices. The Department is exploring the results to determine what lessons learned can be applied to other programs.

10.2 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective policies used within programs or by grantees?

In 2015, Congress included a new provision in ESEA, limiting school districts receiving Title II-A funds (Supporting Effective Instruction) to reducing class size to a level that is evidence-based, to the extent evidence is available, based in part on past research findings that indicated class-size reduction is most effective for low-income students in early grades.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

10.3 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *grantees*?

Program officers review discretionary grantees annually to determine whether they are making substantial progress. If a grantee has not made substantial progress, the Department may reduce an award in a subsequent year or decline to continue funding the grantee.

ED is implementing a number of Pay for Success projects which seek to shift resources away from grantees that fail to meet project goals:

- Career and Technical Education (CTE): $2 million to support the development of PFS projects to implement new or scale up existing high-quality CTE opportunities.
- Early Learning: $3 million for Preschool Pay for Success feasibility pilots to support innovative funding strategies to expand preschool and improve educational outcomes for 3- and 4- year-olds. These grants are allowing states, school districts, and other local government agencies to explore whether Pay for Success is a viable financing mechanism for expanding and improving preschool in their communities.

ED seeks to shift program funds to support more effective practices by prioritizing the use of evidence as a requirement when applying for a competitive grant. For ED's grant competitions where there is data about current or past grantees, or where new evidence has emerged independent of grantee activities, ED typically reviews such data to shape the design of future grant competitions.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

10.4 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *programs*? (e.g., eliminations or legislative language in budget requests)

The President's FY20 Budget eliminates, streamlines or reduces 39 discretionary programs that duplicate other programs, are ineffective, or are supported with state, local, or private funds. Major eliminations and reductions in the FY20 Budget proposal include:

- Supporting Effective Instruction State grants (Title II-A), a savings of $2.1 billion. The program is proposed for elimination because the program lacks evidence of improving student outcomes (see pp. C-16 to C-19 of the FY20 budget request). It also duplicates other ESEA program funds that may be used for professional development.
- 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, a savings of $1.2 billion. The program lacks strong evidence of meeting its objectives, such as improving student achievement. Based on program performance data from the 2014-2015 school year, more than half of program participants had no improvement in their math and English grades and nearly 60% of participants attended centers for fewer than 30 days (see pp. C-21 to C-26 in the FY20 budget request).

In the previous administration, ED worked with Congress to eliminate 50 programs, saving more than $1.2 billion, including programs like Even Start (see pp. A-72-73) (-$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.

10.5 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from consistently ineffective *products and services*?

As noted earlier, program officers review discretionary grantees annually to determine whether they are making substantial progress. If a grantee has not made substantial progress, the Department may reduce an award in a subsequent year or decline to continue funding the grantee.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

Score

8

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

10.1 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective practices or interventions used within programs or by grantees?

In recent years HUD has reduced the role of transitional housing in favor of rapid re-housing as a cost-effective alternative for families experiencing homelessness that have low barriers and can benefit from shorter interventions.

CDBG-DR (Disaster Recovery) is a large and growing program funded by emergency appropriations outside of HUD's regular budgeting process. In FY 2018, HUD started promoting mitigation activities for disaster-prone communities, allocating $16 billion of the $28 billion in emergency disaster recovery funds for disaster mitigation in previously disaster-stricken communities. By investing in mitigation activities, rather than paying to rebuild existing infrastructure in its previous form, HUD shifted funds in order to help to break the cycle of publicly-funded rebuilding and repeated loss.

10.2 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective policies used within programs or by grantees?

Evaluation of the Housing First model of rehousing chronically homeless individuals with serious mental illness supported a policy shift toward first achieving housing stability to provide a platform for social services. Based on such evidence, HUD continues to encourage the use of more cost-effective rapid rehousing approaches combined with increased permanent supportive housing that is integrated with mainstream services provided by HHS, VA, and others.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

10.3 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *grantees*?

HUD grant programs typically provide for recapture of funds that are not committed in a timely fashion, or that remain unexpended after the limits. Effective management by grantees can be especially crucial for timely completion of complex housing development projects, such as with the Capital Fund for public housing and Housing Trust Fund for states. Such funds are reallocated to more effective grantees.

Preference points used by competitive programs favor grantees that provide evidence of successful outcomes and strategies. The Continuum of Care program awards points that shift funds toward grant applications that have demonstrated better outcomes, that rank and fund better-performing projects, and that take over programs from small and struggling recipients. As noted in the notice of funding: "To encourage CoC mergers and mitigate the potential adverse scoring implications that may occur when a high performing CoC merges with one or more lower performing CoC(s), HUD will award up to 25 bonus points to CoCs that completed a merger..."

10.4 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *programs*? (e.g., eliminations or legislative language in budget requests)

No examples available.

10.5 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from consistently ineffective *products and services*?

No examples available.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

Score

6

U.S. Department of Labor

10.1 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective practices or interventions used within programs or by grantees?

DOL has made targeted investments in evidence-based programs to help workers remain competitive and gain access to family sustaining jobs by focusing on its highest priority functions and disinvesting in programs that are duplicative, unproven, non-essential, or ineffective. The reform of the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program is an example of such efforts. A 2012 evaluation of TAA found that only 37% of participants became employed in the occupations for which they received training. DOL's FY20 budget request refocuses TAA on apprenticeship and other work-based job training to ensure that participants are preparing for in-demand jobs and industries.

10.2 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective policies used within programs or by grantees?

Reforming Job Corps provides an example of such efforts to repurpose resources based upon a rigorous analysis of available data. As part of this reform effort, DOL's FY20 budget request ends the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) involvement in the program, unifying responsibility in DOL. Workforce development is not a core USDA role, and the 25 centers it operates are overrepresented in the lowest performing cohort of centers.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

10.3 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *grantees*?

The Employment & Training Administration's (ETA) prospective YouthBuild and Job Corps grant applicants are selected, in part, based on their past performance. These programs consider the entity's past performance of demonstrated effectiveness in achieving critical outcomes for youth. For the Job Corps reform, the Department's FY20 budget request also proposes new legislative flexibilities that would enable the Department to more expediently close low-performing centers, target the program to groups more likely to benefit, and make the necessary capital investments to ensure successful pilot programs. These reforms would save money and improve results by eliminating ineffective centers and finding better ways to educate and provide skills instruction to youth.

10.4 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *programs*? (e.g., eliminations or legislative language in budget requests)

DOL's FY20 budget request eliminates funding for the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP). SCSEP has a goal of transitioning half of participants into unsubsidized employment within the first quarter after exiting the program, but has struggled to achieve even this modest goal.

10.5 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from consistently ineffective *products and services*?

A rigorous 2012 evaluation of the Trade Readjustment Assistance (TAA) Program demonstrated that workers who participated in the program had lower earnings than the comparison group at the end of a four-year follow-up period, in part because they were more likely to participate in long-term job training programs rather than immediately reentering the workforce. However, this training was not targeted to in-demand industries and occupations, and, as found in Mathematica's evaluation of the TAA program, only 37% of participants became employed in the occupations for which they trained. In the FY20 budget request, the

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

Department addresses these issues by continuing to propose reauthorization of the TAA Program that refocuses TAA on apprenticeship and on-the-job skills development strategies, ensuring participants are learning skills for in-demand occupations.

Score
6

Millennium Challenge Corporation

10.1 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective practices or interventions used within programs or by grantees?

In a number of cases, MCC has repurposed investments based on real-time evidence. In MCC's first compact with Lesotho, MCC cancelled the Automated Clearing House Sub-Activity within the Private Sector Development Project after monitoring data determined that it would not accomplish the economic growth and poverty reduction outcomes envisioned during compact development. The remaining $600,000 in the sub-activity was transferred to the Debit Smart Card Sub-Activity, which targeted expanding financial services to people living in remote areas of Lesotho. In Tanzania, the $32 million Non-Revenue Water Activity was re-scoped after the final design estimates on two of the activity's infrastructure investments indicated higher costs that would significantly impact their economic rates of return. As a result, $13.2 million was reallocated to the Lower Ruvu Plant Expansion Activity, $9.6 million to the Morogoro Water Supply Activity, and $400,000 for other environmental and social activities. In all of these country examples, the funding is either reallocated to activities with continued evidence of results or returned to MCC for investment in future programming.

10.2 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective policies used within programs or by grantees?

MCC also consistently monitors the progress of compact programs and their evaluations across sectors, using the learning from this evidence to make changes to MCC's operations. For example, as part of MCC's Principles into Practice initiative, in

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

November 2017 MCC undertook a review of its portfolio investments in roads in an attempt to better design, implement, and evaluate road investments. Through evidence collected across 16 countries with road projects, MCC uncovered seven key lessons including the need to prioritize and select projects based on a road network analysis, to standardize content and quality of road data collection across road projects, and to consider cost and the potential for learning in determining how road projects are evaluated. In FY19, the lessons from this analysis are being applied to road projects in compacts in Côte d'Ivoire and Nepal as MCC roads investments see a shift toward increased maintenance investments. Critically, the evidence also pointed to MCC shifting how it undertakes road evaluations which led to a new request and re-bid for proposals for MCC's roads evaluations based on new guidelines and principles.

10.3 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *grantees*?

MCC has established a Policy on Suspension and Termination that lays out the reasons for which MCC may suspend or terminate assistance to partner countries, including if a country "engages in a pattern of actions inconsistent with the MCC's eligibility criteria," by failing to achieve desired outcomes such as:

- A decline in performance on the indicators used to determine eligibility;
- A decline in performance not yet reflected in the indicators used to determine eligibility; or
- Actions by the country which are determined to be contrary to sound performance in the areas assessed for eligibility for assistance, and which together evidence an overall decline in the country's commitment to the eligibility criteria.

Of the compacts that have been selected by MCC's Board of Directors, 12 have had their partnerships ended due to concerns about country commitment to MCC's eligibility criteria. MCC's Policy on Suspension and Termination also allows MCC to reinstate eligibility when countries demonstrate a clear policy reversal, a remediation of MCC's concerns, and an obvious commitment to MCC's eligibility indicators, including achieving desired results. For example, in March 2012, MCC suspended Malawi's compact prior to Entry into Force as MCC determined that the Government of Malawi had engaged in a pattern of actions inconsistent with MCC's eligibility criteria. Thereafter, the new Government of Malawi took a number of decisive steps to

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

improve the democratic rights environment and reverse the negative economic policy trends of concern to MCC, which led to a reinstatement of eligibility for assistance in June 2012.

10.4 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *programs*? (e.g., eliminations or legislative language in budget requests)

MCC essentially operates only two programs, compact and threshold, which are so tied to core service delivery that they could not be eliminated as such.

10.5 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from consistently ineffective *products and services*?

No examples available.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

Score
4

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration

10.1 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective practices or interventions used within programs or by grantees?

The State Opioid Response Grants program required states and subgrantees to only use evidence-based treatments, practices, and interventions. As such, SAMHSA disallowed the use of medical withdrawal (detoxification) in isolation since it "is not the standard of care for OUD, is associated with a very high relapse rate, and significantly increases an individual's risk for opioid overdose and death if opioid use is resumed" (p. 6). And SAMHSA clarified: "SAMHSA will monitor use of these funds to assure that they are being used to support evidence-based treatment and recovery supports, and will not permit use of these funds for non-evidence-based approaches" (p. 7). Further, under Standard Funding Restrictions, SAMHSA included: "non-evidence-based treatment approaches" (p. 54).

10.2 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective policies used within programs or by grantees?

No examples available.

10.3 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *grantees*?

No examples available.

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY19, did the agency shift funds away from or within any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
(Examples: Requiring low-performing grantees to re-compete for funding; removing ineffective interventions from allowable use of grant funds; incentivizing or urging grant applicants to stop using ineffective practices in funding announcements; proposing the elimination of ineffective programs through annual budget requests; incentivizing well-designed trials to fill specific knowledge gaps; supporting low-performing grantees through mentoring, improvement plans, and other forms of assistance; using rigorous evaluation results to shift funds away from a program)

10.4 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from ineffective *programs*? (e.g., eliminations or legislative language in budget requests)

No examples available.

10.5 Did the agency shift funds/resources away from consistently ineffective *products and services*?

In January 2018, SAMHSA announced it would shift resources away from the National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP) toward targeted technical assistance and training for implementing evidence-based practices. The reasoning was that NREPP had flawed and skewed presentation of evidence-based interventions, which "did not address the spectrum of needs of those living with serious mental illness and substance use disorders."