Program Description Forms: Guidance and examples

EXAMPLES OF WHAT GOOD LOOKS LIKE - FROM FY 2020 AWARD WINNERS
Purpose of document

To provide guidance on completing the FY21 Program Description form and examples of past program description forms to help show “what good looks like”
Achieving superior and sustained organizational performance and health requires a disciplined, data-driven process.

1. Set strategic direction & objectives
2. Establish measures and clear accountabilities
3. Create targets, plans, and budgets
4. Track performance
5. Hold robust, fact-based performance dialogues
6. Decide actions, rewards, and consequences

Superior and sustained organizational performance and health
Good measures follow the “SMART” principle

**Simple**
- Does it have a clear definition?
- Is it straightforward and easy to understand?

**Measurable**
- Is it easy to measure?
- Do we have or can we collect the data required?
- Can it be benchmarked against other organizations or outside data?
- Can the measurement be defined in an unambiguous way?

**Achievable**
- Do we understand the drivers that are behind the measure?
- Can the team responsible for the measure actually influence it?
- Can we mitigate the impact of drivers beyond our control?

**Relevant**
- Is the measure aligned with the department’s strategy and objectives?
- Is the measure relevant to a program’s specific goal?
- Does it support other higher-level objectives (e.g., themes)?

**Timely**
- Can the measure be monitored at a frequency that enables the team to take action based upon the information and affect the measure?
- When will we monitor it? Can the measure move between periods?
# FY21 Program Description Forms

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>HB Section(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is found in the following core budget(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a. What **strategic priority** does this program address?

1b. **What does this program do?**

2a. Provide an **activity** measure(s) for the program.

2b. Provide a measure(s) of the program’s **quality**.

2c. Provide a measure(s) of the program’s **impact**.

2d. Provide a measure(s) of the program’s **efficiency**.

3. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years and planned expenditures for the current fiscal year. *(Note: Amounts do not include fringe benefit costs.)*

### Program Expenditure History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 17 Actual</th>
<th>FY 18 Actual</th>
<th>FY 19 Actual</th>
<th>FY 20 Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Graph Image]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **COR**
- **FEDERAL**
- **OTHER**
- **TOTAL**

4. What are the sources of the “Other” funds?

5. **What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.?** *(Include the federal program number, if applicable.)*

6. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

7. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.
1 a. What strategic priority does the program address?

- Use the strategic theme in the department’s strategic “placemat” that is supported by the program.

1 b. What does the program do?

- Limit the first paragraph to no more than 3 sentences. Focus what is most important.

- Provide a succinct description that explains what a program is designed to do, how it works, and its goals. Therefore, a good description puts helps identify what the measures will in Sections 2 a-d:
  - **Activity**: What does the program do?
  - **Quality**: Is it done well?
  - **Impact**: Did it achieve the expected outcome?
  - **Efficiency**: Were resources optimized?

- Write for a regular reader, not an expert. Avoid acronyms and jargon. Ask a colleague outside your program to review for clarity.

- Use formatting (e.g., bullets, underlining, etc.) as needed to make easier to read.

- If needed, include more technical or detailed information after the opening paragraph.
2 a-d: FY21 Program Description Forms will include four types of measures

**Activity:** Is the organization doing what it said it would do in the program description?
- Examples: Frequency, rates, numbers of actions completed, clients served, etc.
- *Select the activity measure or measures that best communicate the most important dimension of the program and department priorities to the General Assembly and Missouri citizens.*

**Quality:** Is the activity done well?
- Examples: Satisfaction levels, assessment against benchmarks, etc.

**Impact:** Does the program deliver? Is the activity achieving the program’s goals as presented in the Program Description?
- Examples: Outcomes, effectiveness; return on investment; reduction in risk factors, change in behavior; compliance with standards and regulations; proportion of clients or customers showing improved well-being; success in a targeted population

**Efficiency:** Is it worth it? How much effort is invested to achieve the impact?
- Examples: Productivity; return on investment; cost per unit; cycle times; accuracy rates
- *Typically measured in a ratio*
We provide here 7 examples of program description forms from the FY20 Budget. They come from the winners for Best Overall & Honorable Mention - Program Description Form.

None of these program description forms are perfect. But together they help show what good can look like.

In considering these examples – and in developing your own program description form – consider these questions:

• Is the program description clear and concise? Does it point the way to the measures?
• Does the description avoid jargon?
• Do the measures convey what the program does?
• Do they include targets – both baseline and stretch?
• Do the measures follow SMART principles?
• Do the measures use footnotes with brief definitions and explanations when appropriate to ensure clear communication?

Please use these examples, not as definitive, but as guidance and a source for ideas to improve your program’s description and measures.
## FY20 BEST OVERALL WINNERS (3)

**Program Description Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESE – First Steps</td>
<td><a href="https://oa.mo.gov/sites/default/files/dese_first_steps.pdf">https://oa.mo.gov/sites/default/files/dese_first_steps.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY20 Best Overall 1: DOLIR – Unemployment Insurance Programs

### Department of Labor and Industrial Relations

**Program Name:** Unemployment Insurance Programs (Benefits)

**Program is found in the following core budget(s):** Employment Security Administration

### 1a. What strategic priority does this program address?

Growth: Foster a business environment to support economic development. Pay unemployment benefits to eligible claimants allowing them to maintain economic security while they seek employment.

### 1b. What does this program do?

- Processes Unemployment Insurance (UI) claims which provide temporary financial assistance for eligible workers allowing them to maintain economic security during economic changes and natural disasters.
- Audits claims for potential fraud to preserve the integrity of the UI program.
- Establishes and collects overpaid UI benefits to help maintain the solvency of the UI Trust Fund.
- Reviews, identifies and resolves issues to determine eligibility, verify information and prevent fraud.

### 2a. Provide an activity measure(s) for the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016 Projected</th>
<th>FY 2016 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2017 Projected</th>
<th>FY 2017 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2018 Projected</th>
<th>FY 2018 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total unemployment insurance (UI) benefits paid</td>
<td>$303.9M</td>
<td>$297M</td>
<td>$408M</td>
<td>$268M</td>
<td>$286M</td>
<td>$286M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial, renewed &amp; reopened claims filed</td>
<td>327,579</td>
<td>299,490</td>
<td>297,252</td>
<td>239,123</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>217,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals receiving regular UI benefits</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>94,713</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>95,382</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>89,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud overpayments assessed against individuals</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>9,566</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>6,491</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of fraud overpayments recovered</td>
<td>$10.0M</td>
<td>$9.99M</td>
<td>$10.0M</td>
<td>$7.19M</td>
<td>$8.0M</td>
<td>$5.83M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of fraud overpayments recovered</td>
<td>$10.0M</td>
<td>$9.99M</td>
<td>$10.0M</td>
<td>$7.19M</td>
<td>$8.0M</td>
<td>$5.83M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Projected figures for the number of initial, renewed and reopened claims filed are based upon the most recent USDOL UI Data Summary Publication.
2. Actual figures are from the USDOL UI Data Summary Publication, which includes only state Regular UI claims.
3. Projected figures represent Regular UI only, and are based on the most recent information available in the USDOL UI Data Summary Publication.

### How: Example Measures and Targets

- Simple
- Easy to understand
- A clear and concise program description leads to the appropriate measures and vice versa
- Activities correlate with description in 1b
- Provides appropriate footnotes

- Matches Dept’s strategic priority
DOLIR – Unemployment Insurance Programs

HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS

- Simple
- Easy to read graphics
- Includes base and stretch targets
- Includes benchmarks
- Might define “improperly paid” for clarity

2b. Provide a measure(s) of the program's quality.

Percentage of Unemployment Claims That Were Improperly Paid

- FY 2016: 7.54%
- FY 2017: 5.83%
- FY 2018: 5.62%
- FY 2019: 4.00%
- FY 2020: 4.00%
- FY 2021: 4.00%

The agency estimates 49% of unemployment benefits improperly paid were due to fraud.

Target: Rank 2 of 52 Jurisdictions by FY 2019

2c. Provide a measure(s) of the program's impact.

Eligible Claimants who Receive First Payment within 14 days of 1st Compensable Week

- FY 2016: 84.10%
- FY 2017: 87.00%
- FY 2018: 87.00%
- FY 2019: 87.00%
- FY 2020: 87.00%
- FY 2021: 87.00%

Target: Top 20 of Jurisdictions by FY 2019

Comparative data: Missouri ranks 37 out of 53 Jurisdictions (USDOL, June 30, 2018)
DOLIR – Unemployment Insurance Programs

**HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS**

- Simple
- Easy to read graphic
- Includes targets
- Includes benchmarks
- Clear explanation of variance

**Non-monetary Determinations Issued Within 21 Days**

Comparative data: Missouri ranks 22 out of 53 Jurisdictions (USDOL, June 30, 2018)

- **FY 2016**: Actual 63.0% (Base Target 80%)
- **FY 2017**: Actual 61.2% (Base Target 80%)
- **FY 2018**: Actual 83.3% (Base Target 80%)
- **FY 2019**: Actual 85% (Base Target 87%)
- **FY 2020**: Actual 85% (Base Target 87%)
- **FY 2021**: Actual 85% (Base Target 87%)

Target: Top 20 of Jurisdictions by FY 2019

The Division experienced an increase in performance in FY 2018 due to prioritization of work items and stabilization of the new system which allowed for more timely issuance of non-monetary determinations.
## FY20 Best Overall 2: DESE – First Steps

**HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS**

- Good, but could be more clear
- Put key activities first (see example)
- Try to state what the program does in 3 or fewer clear and concise sentences
- If additional information is important, keep it brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Elementary and Secondary Education</th>
<th>HB Section(s): 2.190</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Steps</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is found in the following core budget(s): First Steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a. What strategic priority does this program address? Access, Opportunity, Equity

1b. What does this program do?

The First Steps program provides therapy and educational services to families of infants and toddlers with disabilities to help children reach developmental milestones and ensure equitable access to natural learning opportunities. Infants and toddlers learn best during everyday activities with familiar people, which is why First Steps services are provided in the child's home or other natural setting. First Steps services are provided in accordance with state laws and the federal Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

First Steps is the Early Intervention System in the State of Missouri for infants and toddlers, birth to age three, who have delayed development or diagnosed conditions associated with developmental disabilities. The First Steps goal is to make sure that families have the necessary services and resources needed to help their child learn, grow, and reach developmental milestones. First Steps works with Missouri families to ensure coordinated services are provided as conveniently as possible. For each child, IDEA requires a team of professionals and the child’s parent create an individualized family service plan (IFSP). This plan includes one or more of the following services: Applied Behavior Analysis, Assistive Technology, Audiology, Counseling, Nursing Services, Nutrition Services, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Psychological Services, Social Work, Special Instruction, Speech Therapy, and Vision Services.

The program:
- Enhances the development of infants and toddlers with disabilities and minimizes their potential for developmental delay
- Reduces school age educational costs by minimizing the need for special education and related services upon reaching kindergarten
- Increases the capacity of families to meet the special needs of their child

**EXAMPLE** (pulled from text above):

**Put key activities first.**

First Steps is an early intervention program that provides therapy and educational services to infants and toddlers with disabilities to help... learning opportunities.

An individualized family service plan (IFSP) is created for each child by a team of professionals and the child’s parent that includes one or more of the following services: [list services here]

[Add additional information here, if needed.]
DESE – First Steps

**HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS**

- Good indication of activity
- Review the graphic presentation – some of the graph is cut off

### 2a. Provide an activity measure(s) for the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Utilized First Steps Direct Services to Help Children Learn, Grow, and Reach Developmental Milestones</th>
<th>FY16 Units Authorized</th>
<th>FY17 Units Authorized</th>
<th>FY18 Units Authorized</th>
<th>FY19 Projected Units Authorized</th>
<th>FY20 Projected Units Authorized</th>
<th>FY21 Projected Units Authorized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>373,474</td>
<td>543,163</td>
<td>618,102</td>
<td>679,912</td>
<td>747,903</td>
<td>822,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>538,613</td>
<td>566,225</td>
<td>609,121</td>
<td>657,851</td>
<td>710,479</td>
<td>767,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>512,610</td>
<td>522,633</td>
<td>527,757</td>
<td>554,145</td>
<td>581,852</td>
<td>610,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Therapy</td>
<td>784,219</td>
<td>824,627</td>
<td>876,249</td>
<td>937,556</td>
<td>1,003,217</td>
<td>1,073,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Instruction</td>
<td>749,463</td>
<td>856,923</td>
<td>853,973</td>
<td>879,582</td>
<td>905,980</td>
<td>933,159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: One unit is generally equal to 15 minutes of direct therapy service. Overall, in FY18 First Steps authorized 4,280,911 units of direct services.*

### Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19 Proj</th>
<th>FY20 Proj</th>
<th>FY21 Proj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Children Referred and Evaluated for Eligibility (associated cost even if child is determined not eligible for Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) in First Steps program)</td>
<td>13,945</td>
<td>14,742</td>
<td>15,333</td>
<td>15,640</td>
<td>15,984</td>
<td>16,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children with an active Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) as of December 1 for federal reporting</td>
<td>5,828</td>
<td>6,453</td>
<td>6,589</td>
<td>7,346</td>
<td>7,851</td>
<td>8,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO Population (Ages 0-3)</td>
<td>223,433</td>
<td>224,400</td>
<td>224,900</td>
<td>225,350</td>
<td>225,650</td>
<td>225,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Population served through an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) in the First Steps program</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: According to a recent study performed by Phillips & Associates, Inc. on child count trends, the First Steps program will serve 3.72% of the population through an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) by 2021. The CDC estimates approximately 15% of children have a developmental disability.*

---

**Percent of Population Served Through An Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP)**

- 2.65% in FY16
- 2.88% in FY17
- 2.93% in FY18
- 3.26% in FY19 Proj
- 3.48% in FY20 Proj
- 3.72% in FY21 Proj
DESE – First Steps

HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS

- Appropriate quality measures
- Survey response rate is helpful
- Survey questions are informative

### First Steps (FS) Compliance Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Steps (FS) Compliance Data</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18 Proj</th>
<th>FY19 Proj</th>
<th>FY20 Proj</th>
<th>FY21 Proj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Complaints resolved within 60 day timeline</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals completed within 45 day federal required timeline</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFSP services provided within 30 day federal required timeline</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School district was notified of child approaching age 3 within 90 days timeline</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition conference between FS and school held within 90 days timeline</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State reported data that are timely and accurate</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** FY18 data won't be available until December 2019.

### First Steps (FS) Family Satisfaction Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Steps (FS) Family Satisfaction Survey Results</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19 Proj</th>
<th>FY20 Proj</th>
<th>FY21 Proj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of families that agree the Primary Provider in First Steps helps them teach their child</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of families that agree the First Steps providers work with them to help their child in everyday activities</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of families that agree First Steps providers are knowledgeable and professional</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of families that agree First Steps helps their child learn new skills</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** FY18 Family Survey Response Rate was 17% (429 responses out of 2,551 surveys).
2c. Provide a measure(s) of the program’s impact.

**First Steps Early Childhood Outcomes - Increased Use of Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18 Proj</th>
<th>FY19 Proj</th>
<th>FY20 Proj</th>
<th>FY21 Proj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of children with skills below age expectation when they entered First Steps who had substantially increased their acquisition and use of knowledge and skills at the time of exiting First Steps.</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Mean Score of All States for this Outcome</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early Childhood Outcome Data - Increased Use of Knowledge**

- **Percent of children with skills below age expectation when they entered First Steps who had substantially increased their acquisition and use of knowledge and skills at the time of exiting First Steps.**
- **National Mean Score of All States for this Outcome**

- **First Steps Early Childhood Outcomes - Improved Social-Emotional Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18 Proj</th>
<th>FY19 Proj</th>
<th>FY20 Proj</th>
<th>FY21 Proj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of children with skills below age expectation when they entered First Steps who had substantially improved their positive social-emotional skills the time of exiting First Steps.</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Mean Score of All States for this Outcome</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early Childhood Outcomes - Improved Social-Emotional Skills**

- **Percent of children with skills below age expectation when they entered First Steps who had substantially improved their positive social-emotional skills the time of exiting First Steps.**
- **National Mean Score of All States for this Outcome**

### Observations:
- **Good relevant data**
- **Graphs are clear and easy to understand**
- **Includes benchmarks and targets**
- **Appropriate footnotes included**
- **Charts provide the same information as the graphs and are not needed**
- **It is not clear that the mean line in the graphs have a different scale - confusing**
Can you say why the goal is $3,500 and why the average cost is < $3,500?

Suggest add some context to show why this represents program efficiency.
FY20 Best Overall 3: DMH – In-Home Supports

1a. What strategic priority does this program address?
   Strengthen and Integrate Community Services.

1b. What does this program do?
   The Division of Developmental Disabilities (DD) provides ongoing supports to individuals and their families to enable persons with developmental disabilities (DDs) to live in their communities. These supports are approved and monitored through the Division’s regional offices. Traditional in-home support services are provided for 14,541 individuals who reside in their own home or with their own family, but who do not receive residential services. This program allows family members to have a personal and financial commitment to care for their children and adults in their homes to be supported in their care-giving and decision-making roles. In-home supports include but are not limited to respite, transportation, personal assistance, day habilitation, community integration, employment training and support, autism parent training, and behavior services.

   The goal of in-home supports is to preserve the natural family structure through an individualized service plan. This service plan identifies state services needed as well as generic supports available at the local level, giving families a choice in selecting support services which meet their needs, allowing consumers and families to participate in their community and access employment.

   The community program’s funding includes state and Federal authority to draw down funds for MO HealthNet programs that provide the support services such as the Comprehensive Waiver, Community Support Waiver, Missouri Children with Developmental Disabilities Waiver (MOCDD), Partnership for Hope Waiver and for Targeted Case Management which funds the support coordinators who develop service plans and monitor the services provided.

   Medicaid Waivers, listed below, are specialized Medicaid programs approved for specific populations. The Waivers listed below are administered by the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DD) Social Services.

   • The Comprehensive Waiver for persons with developmental disabilities, with or without additional services. The Division of DD uses General Revenue (GR) funds to match Federal share. This waiver supports individuals in all settings such as group homes, supported living, and family homes. The Comprehensive Waiver during FY 2018 of which 7,515 received residential services were available, this waiver served all eligible individuals. Currently, only individuals with significant care needs can be served if no other waiver is suitable.

   • The Community Support Waiver which began in July 2003, serves individuals living in the community. This waiver provides a wide range of supports for individuals. The total cost of the Community Support Waiver is $443,330,000 annually except in special circumstances. Individuals presenting to the division for the Community Support Waiver. In FY 2016, 3,620 individuals were served.

   • The MOCDD Waiver is a MO HealthNet waiver operated by the DD Social Services. The guidelines require parental income and resources to be considered in determining eligibility for services. The waiver serves DD individuals who are eligible based on their need and are not served in other waivers.

   • The Partnership for Hope (PfH) Waiver is a county-based waiver for individuals who are experiencing a crisis. Services are available only in counties with a waiver. In FY 2018 there were 2,365 individuals in this waiver. The total cost of waiver services paid $7,900,000.

EXAMPLE (pulled from text above and measures):
   The Division of Developmental Disabilities provides ongoing supports to developmentally disabled (DD) individuals and their families to enable persons with DDs to live in their community at their fullest desired potential.

   The program provides an individualized service plan that identifies state services needed as well as generic supports available at the local level. Supports include but are not limited to respite, transportation, personal assistance, day habilitation, community integration, employment training and support, autism parent training and behavior services.

   The Division’s regional offices offer a community-based service delivery system with the following objectives:
   • Preserve the natural family structure
   • Promote individual self-sufficiency
   • Allow DD individuals to participate in as many life experiences as possible, including employment
   • Promote a high level of community integration

[Add additional information here, if needed.]
### DMH – In-Home Supports

**2a. Provide an activity measure(s) for the program.**
- Increase in-home supports to individuals and their families to enable persons with developmental disabilities to live in their communities.

**Types of In-Home Services Provided**
- Specialized Equipment Supply (3%)
- Transportation (5%)
- Professional Services (2%)
- Community Integration (6%)
- Day Services (20%)
- Employment (2%)
- Personal Assistant (54%)
- Respite (2%)
- Other (1%)

**Number of consumers served in the following MO HealthNet waivers by fiscal year:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waiver</th>
<th>FY 2016 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2017 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2018 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2019 Projected</th>
<th>FY 2020 Projected</th>
<th>FY 2021 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Waiver</td>
<td>8,575</td>
<td>8,612</td>
<td>8,619</td>
<td>8,705</td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>8,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support Waiver</td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>3,801</td>
<td>3,991</td>
<td>4,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Waiver</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,990</td>
<td>14,693</td>
<td>15,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo Children with DD Waiver</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Hope Waiver</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>2,687</td>
<td>2,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Autism Waiver expired 06/30/2017. See section 1b above for an explanation of each Waiver.*

**To increase the number of individuals receiving services who live in their natural home.**

**Percent of Total Served**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,010</td>
<td>11,010</td>
<td>12,253</td>
<td>14,341</td>
<td>15,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The Percent of Total Served is based on the Residential Information Services Project (RISP). RISP data for 2017 and 2018 is not yet available. More consumers are receiving services in their homes enabling them to fully be included in all aspects of home, school and community life.*

**To allow families to care for their family member in their own home by directing their own services, thereby avoiding out of home placement and segregated services.**

**Number of Individuals Served in Self-Directed Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2017 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2018 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2019 Projected</th>
<th>FY 2020 Projected</th>
<th>FY 2021 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How: Example Measures and Targets**

- Good indicators of activity
- Graphs are clear and easy to understand
- Targets and benchmarks included
- Appropriate footnotes included

**4. Are these projections or program targets for increasing those in self directed services?**
DMH – In-Home Supports

**2b. Provide a measure(s) of the program’s quality.**

- Overall, are you satisfied with the services and supports your family currently receives?

**2017 Adult Satisfaction Survey**

- **Graph is clear and easy to understand**
- **Benchmark included**
- **Appropriate footnotes included**
- **What is Missouri’s target?**

Note: Overall, 252 surveys were completed in Missouri. For this particular question, Missouri received 239 responses. Nationally, 10,797 responses were received for this question.

**To improve satisfaction of individuals with developmental disabilities.**

- “Satisfied that services and supports help me live a good life”

**Graph is clear and easy to understand**

- **Benchmark included**
- **Appropriate footnotes included**
- **What is Missouri’s target?**

Note: Based on National Core Indicators (NCI) survey results. The NCI is a voluntary effort by public developmental disabilities’ agencies to measure and track their own performance. NCI survey data for this population was first available for FY 2017.

Note: Overall, Missouri conducts 400 Adult Consumer Surveys (now the Adult In-Person Survey) every year. For this particular measure, Missouri had 242 responses in FY 2017. Nationally, there were 14,068 responses in FY 2017.
DMH – In-Home Supports

HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS

- Easy to understand
- Relevant to program objectives
- Good explanation of measure
- Includes a stretch target; what is the base target?
- Stretch targets could be incremental
Standing alone, this is not an efficiency measure
- The measure needs context to show how the program is increasing in-home vs. residential services to achieve cost savings and/or more satisfied customers
- What percent of the program is in self-directed services vs. in-home? What is the target?
- Consider showing how much $ savings achieved if more are in self-directed services
- Might refer to Number of Individuals Served in Self Directed Services under activity measures.
FY20 HONORABLE MENTION (4)
Program Description Form

DSS – Family Support Staff Training
https://oa.mo.gov/sites/default/files/dss_fsd_staff_training.pdf

DPS – State Cyber Crime Grant Program
https://oa.mo.gov/sites/default/files/dps_state_cyber_crime_grant.pdf

DOLIR – Administration (Director and Staff)
https://oa.mo.gov/sites/default/files/dolir_director_and_staff.pdf

DED – Workforce Programs (program moved to DHE)
https://oa.mo.gov/sites/default/files/dhe_workforce_programs.pdf
FY20 Honorable Mention 1: DSS – Family Support Staff Training

Good description of what the program does, however, it could be more clear and concise – easier to read

Avoid the why and focus on the what

Put key activities first (see example)

If additional information is important, keep it brief

HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS

EXAMPLE (pulled from text above and measures):
The Family Support Division (FSD) Training and Development Unit is responsible for creating and implementing basic orientation and program training for Child Support and Income Maintenance Staff (including the merit-staffed call center). The Training Unit improves staff performance, and by extension, outcomes for Missouri families by teaching basic curriculum to new team members and training existing team members on various system, law, and policy changes that occur throughout the year. The Training Unit manages the online Employee Learning Center (ELC), and any lodging and travel costs associated with training. Additionally, this unit conducts and tracks several training modules required by state and federal law. The unit utilizes both traditional classroom trainings and innovative on-line training delivery methods to improve staff performance and support the mission and goals of the division.

The FSD Training & Development Unit completed significant work upgrading online lessons to better supplement classroom training. Modern technologies for on-line lessons have also reduced time spent on computer based training (CBT). Online lessons are used as pre and post classroom teachings so staff can spend classroom time completing hands on practice in the training region. Online videos have also allowed FSD to teach existing staff with regular rapid reinforcement videos.

The Training unit:
- Teaches basic curriculum to new team members
- Provides ongoing training on various system, law and policy changes that occur throughout the year
- Manages the online Employee Learning Center
- Conducts and tracks several training modules required by state and federal law

[Add additional information here, if needed.]
HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS

- Good indicators of activity
- Graphs are clear and easy to understand
- Base and stretch targets included
- Appropriate footnotes included
- Trainings by type is informative
- Question: do number of trainings = individuals trained? Could be more clear
DSS – Family Support Staff Training

2b. Provide a measure(s) of the program’s quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainer Effectiveness</th>
<th>Satisfaction With Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>FY 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretch</td>
<td>Stretch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019</td>
<td>FY 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020</td>
<td>FY 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2021</td>
<td>FY 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSD has a new evaluation system, implemented in FY 2018. The scale is 1-5, with 5 being the most effective or most satisfied. This is completed by participants at the end of each training session.

2c. Provide a measure(s) of the program’s impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Average Competency Test Score (Child Support)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Training participants complete a final assessment at the end of each classroom training to measure competency. This is a new measure. Income Maintenance will implement assessments in FY 2019.

- Good indicators of quality & impact
- Graphs are clear and easy to understand
- Base and stretch targets included
- Appropriate footnotes included
DSS – Family Support Staff Training

HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS

- Graphs are informative and relevant
- Unclear whether this is the cost per person or cost per training session
- Base and stretch targets included
- Appropriate footnotes included
- Would it be more informative to breakout cost of classroom training from cost of online training?
FY20 Honorable Mention 2: DPS – State Cyber Crime Grant Program

**Department:** Department of Public Safety  
**Program Name:** State Cyber Crime Grant (SCCG) Program  
**Program is found in the following core budget(s):** Cyber Crime Task Force Grants

1a. What strategic priority does this program address?  
- Make Missouri safer and more secure

1b. What does this program do?  
The SCCG Program issues grants to multi-jurisdictional cyber crime task forces. Funds are awarded to state and local law enforcement task forces to identify, combat, and prevent Internet sex crimes against children to include, but not limited to, child pornography, child solicitation/enticement, sexual exploitation of a minor, child trafficking, child prostitution, child molestation, sexual abuse of a child, and statutory rape/sodomy of a child. The goal is to improve public safety through investigations, forensics, and education/prevention. The subawards are 1 year project periods (June 1 - May 31).

**NOTE:** The Department of Public Safety administers the grant monies to subrecipients, and the subrecipients implement the program and utilize the funding. The Department of Public Safety is not involved in the delivery of services or the outputs of such services.

2a. Provide an activity measure(s) for the program.  
- Measure: make grant funding available to the cyber task forces that exist in Missouri
- Base Target: support the existing cyber task forces that request funding
- Stretch Target: explore areas of consolidation and/or expansion to ensure effective coverage of the entire State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of SCCG Grant Cyber Crime Task Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20 Projection</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Should match Dept’s strategic priorities**  
- **Protection and service?**
- **Clear and concise program description**
- **The note is relevant**
- **This is a good example for grant programs**

- **Good activity measure**
- **Base target is 12? Can the stretch target be a number?**
- **Suggest incorporate the targets in the graph**
- **Could you identify the number of areas of the state that are covered and show the target number of new areas?**
DPS – State Cyber Crime Grant Program

2b. Provide a measure(s) of the program’s quality.
FY19 is Year 2 of a 3-Year plan started by DPS in FY18 to impose minimum goals and objectives for task forces receiving SCCG funds. The intent is to ensure all SCCG-funded cyber task forces possess the minimum level of training to perform cyber investigations and forensics, have adopted policies and procedures to ensure efficient and effective operational activities, and are proactively engaging the public to bring better awareness to the subject of internet sex crimes against children. FY20 will be Year 3 of the 3-Year plan, and all SCCG-funded cyber task forces are expected to be compliant with the goals and objectives. Failure to be compliant could result in reduction in funding until such time that compliance is met.

Measure: compliance with goals and objectives established for all cyber task forces
Base Target: 100% compliance

Grantees’ Completion of Minimum Training Standards
NOTE: Minimum training standards include: 1) completion of the online "ICAC Program Operation and Investigative Standards" course and 2) completion of competency courses to be a field investigator, online investigator, mobile forensic examiner, and/or computer forensic examiner.

Grantees’ Adoption of Cyber Tips Handling Protocol
NOTE: A cyber tip handling protocol details the approximate timeframe, triaging system, and follow-up involved for handling cyber tips. Cyber tips are received by the cyber task forces from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) and require investigative action thereafter. The subject/substance of the cyber tip dictates the urgency of the cyber tips handling (e.g., child in immediate danger) so cyber task forces need a protocol in place that dictates how they will manage those submissions. NCMEC requires feedback following submission.

- The text here falls under 1b – What does this program do, and should be included there (ensure funded cyber task forces...)
- Good and appropriate measures
- Easy to understand
- Notes are informative to explain the measure
- Targets included
DPS – State Cyber Crime Grant Program

**2c. Provide a measure(s) of the program’s impact.**

Realistically, Internet sex crimes against children is not a problem that will be eradicated. Rather, as a result of the program quality measures, the hope is to further identify Internet sex crimes against children that are occurring and to prevent further Internet sex crimes against children from occurring. This can be achieved (in part) through the arrest of perpetrators and the identification, and subsequent protection, of child victims. This can also be achieved (in part) through education/training to businesses, general public/civic organizations, law enforcement agencies, public events, schools, etc.

**Measure:** number of arrests made, number of child victims identified, and number of attendees at education programs/presentations

**Base Target:** make as many arrests as possible, identify as many child victims as possible, and educate as many persons as possible (it should never be the target to increase or decrease these numbers because neither an increase nor a decrease is indicative of the problem that exists)

**Stretch Target:** make as many arrests as possible, identify as many child victims as possible, and educate as many persons as possible (it should never be the target to increase or decrease these numbers because neither an increase nor a decrease is indicative of the problem that exists)

- **Grantees’ Number of Arrests**
  - FY16: 263
  - FY17: 300
  - FY18: 321

- **Grantees’ Number of Child Victims Identified**
  - FY16: 228
  - FY17: 79
  - FY18: 48
  - Without images (photos portraying victimization do not exist or were not used to identify child internet sex crime)

- **Grantees’ Number of Attendees at Education Program/Presentations**
  - FY16: 2352
  - FY17: 2862
  - FY18: 2576

Each case presents unique circumstances and the statistics below depict that while the caseload may not be increasing, the evidence involved in the cases is growing, which depicts the growing victimization that is occurring within Missouri with each individual case.

**Measure:** number of cyber tips received, number of new cases opened, number of forensic examinations completed on computers and media devices, and the number of cell phones analyzed

**Base Target:** open as many new cases as possible following receipt of a cyber tip and/or proactive investigations and perform examinations to identify the evidence in order to proceed with the investigation (it should never be the target to increase or decrease these numbers because neither an increase nor a decrease is a clear indicator of the problem that exists)

**Stretch Target:** open as many new cases as possible following receipt of a cyber tip and/or proactive investigations and perform examinations to identify the evidence in order to proceed with the investigation (it should never be the target to increase or decrease these numbers because neither an increase nor a decrease is a clear indicator of the problem that exists)

- **Grantees’ Number of Attendees at Education Program/Presentations**
  - FY16: 2352
  - FY17: 2862
  - FY18: 2576

**HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS**

- **Good and appropriate impact measures**
- **Easy to understand**
- **The lengthy commentary is unnecessary; consider replacing with a short footnote explaining why targets are not appropriate**
- **Consider reducing text and adding a brief footnote**
2d. **Provide a measure(s) of the program’s efficiency.**

The Department of Public Safety administers the grant monies to subrecipients, and the subrecipients implement the program and utilize the funding. The Department of Public Safety is not involved in the delivery of services or the outputs of such services. As a result, there are no efficiency measures that can be captured.

- Are there efficiency measures available in the administration of the program?
- Suggest % administrative cost to total grant funding, with base and stretch targets
FY20 Honorable Mention 3: DOLIR – Administration (Director and Staff)

**Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**

**Program Name:** Administration

**Program is found in the following core budget(s):** Director & Staff

**1a. What strategic priority does this program address?**

- **Opportunity. Invest in our workforce for today and tomorrow.**

**1b. What does this program do?**

- Provides centralized support functions to the six divisions of the Department including: Administrative Services (procurement, forms, building management, and supply), Financial Management, Human Resources, Legal Services, Public Information, Legislative Affairs, and Research and Analysis in order to ensure smooth day-to-day operations of the Department.
- Ensures compliance with State and Federal laws for expenditure requirements, documentation and reporting, security of data and records, and program management to promote good stewardship of taxpayer funds and accountability for the services delivered by the department.

**HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS**

- **Simple**
- **Easy to understand**

---

**2a. Provide an activity measure(s) for the program.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Training Completed by Employees(^1)</td>
<td>8,767</td>
<td>8,986</td>
<td>9,216</td>
<td>9,457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Trained</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Sessions Conducted</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Unduplicated Vendors Paid(^2)</td>
<td>7,201</td>
<td>7,483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) All types of training are counted (on-line, classroom, external, and specialized). The Department implemented a Learning Management System (LMS) in FY 2018 to better track staff training and allow employees to access a wider variety of training on-line. The LMS also makes training accessible any time, without the requirement of a trainer or travel to training.

\(^2\) The actual numbers were recalculated from previous years, and now include payments to individuals who participate in DOLIR programs (Second Injury Fund Payments, Tort Victims Compensation, Line of Duty Payments, etc.) as well as expense and equipment, since those payments also require the processing of SAM II documents by staff.
DOLIR – Administration (Director and Staff)

- This might fit better as an impact measure
- Consider a survey of your customers to gauge quality overall on important functions

- Graphs are clear and easy to understand
- Targets included
- Appropriate footnotes included

HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS

Voluntary Employee Turnover Rates by Tenure

- Resigned Agency or Resigned State
- This might fit better as an impact measure
- Consider a survey of your customers to gauge quality overall on important functions
- Graphs are clear and easy to understand
- Targets included
- Appropriate footnotes included

FY 2018 Staff Training Participant Survey Results - 558 Respondents

How do you rate the overall session?

- Excellent 68%
- Good 28%
- Average 3%
- Poor 1%

Compliance with Management Training Rule

- The data for Management Training Rule compliance is tracked on a calendar year basis, therefore, the graph depicts the data in this manner.
This is an efficiency measure, not impact.
Consider an employee retention measure.
DOLIR – Administration (Director and Staff)

HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS

- Good and appropriate administrative efficiency measures
- Graphs are clear and easy to understand
- Legends on line charts should match for improved clarity
- Targets included
- Appropriate footnotes included
FY20 Honorable Mention 4: 
DED – Workforce Programs (program moved to DHEWD)

1a. What specific priority does this program address?
- Meaningful Work
  - Should match Dept’s strategic priorities

1b. What does this program do?
- Workforce Programs provide skill development, workforce preparation and job placement services to unemployed and under-employed individuals to ensure they are no longer solely reliant on public assistance. The participant may visit our Missouri Job Center or our self-serve website.
- Workforce Programs provide business services to employers, assisting them to develop and maintain a workforce.
- These funds are federal pass through dollars distributed according to federal and state regulations to sub recipients, primarily the Local Work Development Boards.

- Does the program select sub-recipients or monitor compliance for minimum standards or services of those receiving the funding?

2a. Provide an activity measure(s) for the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants Served</td>
<td>288,002</td>
<td>369,660</td>
<td>282,240</td>
<td>309,049</td>
<td>219,578</td>
<td>175,839</td>
<td>172,753</td>
<td>169,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants Served In Person</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>254,008</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>224,081</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>89,666</td>
<td>85,746</td>
<td>84,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants Served On Line</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>115,662</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>84,988</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>88,873</td>
<td>87,007</td>
<td>85,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Number of individuals served represents customers receiving a service through the Missouri Job Centers and our self-serve website. The number of individuals seeking services is dependent on the current state of the economy. The unemployment rate and the number of citizens on public assistance directly affects the number of individuals served.
Note 2: Projections are based on the assumption the economy will remain stable and fewer individuals will be in need of reemployment services.

- Good indicator of activity
- Appropriate footnotes included
- Suggest break out by type of service, if available
- How many employers participate? What services provided?
- Simple
- Easy to understand
- For clarity, suggest adding information on the Wagner Peyser program referenced in the measures
**DED – Workforce Programs** (program moved to DHE)

**HOW: EXAMPLE MEASURES AND TARGETS**

- Suggest a survey of job seeker’s satisfaction/needs met
- If the program selects sub-recipients or monitors compliance for minimum standards or services of those receiving the funding, perhaps compliance or participation measures would be appropriate

### Table: Employer Satisfaction Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note 1: Percentage of surveyed employers satisfied with the workforce services received through staff assistance. 375 employers participated in the survey for FY18.*

- Easy to understand
- Notes are informative
- Targets included
- Survey response rate is helpful
- Survey questions would be informative – see pg. 15, First Steps survey data
**DED – Workforce Programs** (program moved to DHE)

- **Entered Employment Rate**
  - FY2016: 66%
  - FY2017: 64%
  - FY2018: 65%
  - FY2019: 63%
  - FY2020: 69%
  - FY2021: 71%

- **Annual Median Wages**
  - FY2018: $19,908
  - FY2019: $21,000
  - FY2020: $22,000
  - FY2021: $23,000

**Notes**
- Note 1: Percentage of job seekers enrolled in the Wagner Peyser program that were employed 6 months after receiving workforce services. The Wagner Peyser program establishes and supports the job centers and job center services.
- Note 2: The Division for Workforce Development's Federally negotiated rate for FY19 is 67%.
- Note 3: Midwestern Average is reported by the US Dept. of Labor for the reporting period of 7/1/2017-3/31/2018. These states consist of Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.
- **Midwestern Average**
  - Entered Employment Rate: 71%
  - Annual Median Wages: $24,112

**GOOD AND APPROPRIATE IMPACT MEASURES**
- Graphs are clear and easy to understand
- Base and stretch targets included
- Appropriate footnotes included
DED – Workforce Programs (program moved to DHE)

- Are there costs to administer the program? If yes, an appropriate efficiency measure might be % administrative cost to total funding, with base and stretch targets.

- Good and appropriate impact measure
- Graph is clear and easy to understand
- Base and stretch targets included
- Appropriate footnotes included
Contact information

Drew Erdmann, Chief Operating Officer for the State of Missouri
  ▪ Drew.Erdmann@governor.mo.gov

Dan Haug, Director, OA – Budget & Planning
  ▪ Dan.Haug@oa.mo.gov

Tony Roberts, Assistant Director for Budget, OA – Budget & Planning
  ▪ Tony.Roberts@oa.mo.gov

Marianne Mills, Assistant Director for Budget, OA – Budget & Planning
  ▪ Marianne.Mills@oa.mo.gov

Melissa Hope, Planner/Budget Analyst, OA – Budget & Planning
  ▪ Melissa.Hope@oa.mo.gov

Questions for OA Budget and Planning:
Contact your Department’s assigned Budget Analyst