

STRATEGIC GOAL 3: INCREASE THE HEALTH AND PROSPERITY OF COMMUNITIES AND TRIBES

RATIONALE

Strong neighborhoods and communities provide positive, healthy environments for children and families. ACF achieves its goal of increasing the health and prosperity of communities and Tribes by strengthening local community partnerships, improving civic participation, and working with Tribes and Native American communities to build capacity and infrastructure for social and economic development.

ACF supports a variety of activities in its community-based programs. These include strategies to create jobs in economically disadvantaged communities, to help communities develop comprehensive service networks for supporting local residents, to empower residents to leverage local assets and to assist communities in their efforts to respond to energy emergencies and to prevent family violence.

The LIHEAP request for an increase of \$300 million over the FY 2003 President's Budget will enable States to meet energy emergencies of our most vulnerable populations (the elderly, households with small children and persons with disabilities) due to extremes in temperature, either during severe cold weather in the winter or sustained heat waves in the summer. The request for an increase of \$843,000 for the Domestic Violence Hotline will assure adequate responsiveness to increased calls due to public awareness messages.

OBJECTIVES AND MAJOR PROGRAM AREAS

7. Build healthy, safe and supportive communities and Tribes

Community Services Block Grant
Family Violence Prevention Program
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance
Native Americans Programs

7. BUILD HEALTHY, SAFE AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES AND TRIBES

Approach for the Strategic Objective: Strengthen local communities through community partnerships and improving civic participation; increase community development investments so that families can lead healthy, safe and productive lives; and work with Tribes and Native American communities to develop strategies and programs to promote social and economic development and self-sufficiency.

The Secretary of HHS created a Rural Task Force to examine how HHS programs can be strengthened to better serve rural communities. ACF supports that effort and has identified strengthening rural families and communities as one of its key priorities. Additionally, ACF is working with the Office of the Secretary and other HHS Operating Divisions (OpDivs) -- particularly Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) -- to ensure that the

Secretary's Rural Initiative Task Force gives appropriate attention to human services policy and program matters. Among other activities, ACF will support the new HHS Advisory Committee on Rural Health and Human Services by providing information for a Department-wide clearinghouse on rural issues, exploring the possibility of using geographic information system technology for agency-wide planning on rural issues, and assisting HRSA in its' mplementation of State-wide and local-level demonstration projects to provide human services and health services in rural areas.

7.1 COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

Program Purpose and Legislative Intent

The purpose of the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Program is to assist States and local communities to reduce poverty, revitalize low-income communities and empower low-income families and individuals to become more self-sufficient. Ninety percent of the CSBG funds pass through States to local eligible entities, most of which are Community Action Agencies (CAAs). Based on local needs assessment, local agencies use CSBG funds to leverage resources to coordinate and develop programs filling gaps in their community service system with a wide variety of programs, services and activities.

CSBG provides the core funding to communities to develop the capacity to ameliorate the conditions and causes of poverty. State and local agencies supplement the resources of the CSBG through volunteers and other financial resources in order to carry out the many activities required to reduce poverty. Therefore, an important measure of the capacity of States and local CSBG service providers to carry out this program is whether they are successfully building the capacity to leverage resources to provide needed services and activities.

Summary Table

Performance Measures	Targets	Actual Performance	Reference (page # in printed document)
<i>PROGRAM GOAL: Ensure that low-income people have a stake in their community.</i>			
7.1a. Increase by two percent over the previous year the number of volunteer hours contributed by CSBG consumers in one or more community groups (in million of hours).	FY 04: Increase 2% FY 03: 30.07 FY 02: 29.48 FY 01: 27.7 FY 00: 28.9 FY 99: 28.6	FY 04: 12/05 FY 03: 12/04 FY 02: 12/03 FY 01: 30.3* FY 00: 30.7 FY 99: 27.46 FY 98: 26.86 FY 97: 27 FY 96: 28.06	Px 130 HHS 6.4
*50 States Reporting			

Performance Measures	Targets	Actual Performance	Reference (page # in printed document)
<i>PROGRAM GOAL: Conditions in which low-income people's lives are improved.</i>			
7.1b. Increase by two percent over the previous year the amount of non-Federal resources brought into low-income communities by the Community Services Network (in billions of leveraged non-Federal funds).	FY 04: Increase 2% FY 03: \$1.7 FY 02: \$1.68 FY 01: \$1.66 FY 00: \$1.38 FY 99: \$1.36	FY 04: 12/05 FY 03: 12/04 FY 02: 12/03 FY 01: \$2.5** FY 00: \$1.83 FY 99: \$1.92 FY 98: \$1.64 FY 97: \$1.26 FY 96: \$1.20	Px 130 HHS 6.4
**(51 States Reporting)			
Total Funding (dollars in millions) See detailed Budget Linkage Table in Part I for line items included in funding totals.	FY 04: \$495.0 FY 03: \$570.0 FY 02: \$650.0 FY 01: \$657.7 FY 00: \$584.3 FY 99: \$553.3	Bx: budget just. Section Px: page # performance plan	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND CONTEXT

At the heart of CSBG is ROMA – Results Oriented Management and Accountability – that began prior to the passage of GPRA to focus on increasing the capacity of local providers to increase program performance. ROMA is an interagency initiative, which promotes outcome-based management strategies for community, State and Federal programs participating in the CSBG programs. It not only provides the opportunity for States and local agencies to measure results but more importantly, it provides a framework for examining agency mission and goals and evaluating progress for all of the family and community development programs delivered by the Community Action Agencies. The implementation of ROMA is one of the most effective ways for OCS to encourage program improvement in a devolved block grant environment. ROMA measures progress and allows partners at each level – local, State and Federal – to focus on the training and technical assistance required for achieving the six national goals:

- Low-income people become more self-sufficient;
- Conditions in which low-income people live are improved;
- Low-income people own a stake in their community;
- Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved;
- Agencies increase their capacity to achieve results; and
- Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive systems.

Funds have been provided to develop and implement cutting-edge management and measurement tools such as (a) scales that measure incremental progress of families and communities; (b) entry-level training in performance measurement and strategic planning; (c) the development of an advanced train-the-trainer program; and (d) innovative data collection tools. OCS worked closely with national, State and local partners to effectively share the findings and products of these efforts.

Flexibility to tailor services and activities to individual family and local community need is the key to any successful delivery system. A major challenge in developing ROMA was to retain the legislatively intended flexibility at the local level while maintaining a tool for national accountability. During this development phase, ROMA allowed localities and States to collaborate on the best incremental measures for their programs while developing a system for aggregating data at the national level.

ROMA has been adopted by a significant portion of the Community Services Network. OCS is in the process of identifying six to ten outcome measures across the six goals that best reflect community action programs. These outcomes will be required of all community action agencies in all States and information will be collected based upon the services of all the programs and services within an agency that contribute to achieving the outcome, not just CSBG. OCS is establishing plans and timetables in collaboration with States and localities to have this additional ROMA requirement in place by Fiscal Year 2004.

Program Partnerships

Given CSBG's anti-poverty focus, the program relies on partnerships at the State and local level to achieve its mission. Crosscutting partnerships enable CSBG to provide its clients with a broad spectrum of activities aimed at ameliorating the causes and conditions of poverty. However, CSBG's programmatic diversity also raises one of the primary challenges to program effectiveness, a challenge that demands continuous attention and nurturing on the part of program staff at all levels.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

The 1998 Reauthorization Act required that by FY 2001 all agencies should begin implementing ROMA. As a response, OCS identified core activities to States to measure ROMA progress. OCS encouraged States and eligible entities to use core ROMA activities to assess their own progress and to identify what work would need to be completed by FY 2003.

States currently engage in several key activity areas: (1) to provide technical assistance in the form of statewide partnership grants for statewide implementation of ROMA; (2) to use five-year grants to strengthen the capacity of State CAA Associations; (3) to assist eligible entities through special State technical assistance grants to address complex issues relating to ROMA implementation; (4) to provide a Train-the-Trainer institute on ROMA; and (5) to provide a National Academy to help agencies build their leadership and financial management capacity.

As indicated, because CSBG provides the core funding in communities used to develop their capacity to ameliorate the conditions and causes of poverty, OCS expects agencies to supplement CSBG resources through volunteers and other leveraged financial resources. Therefore, States must be successful in filling the gaps for services and activities. OCS also holds CAAs accountable for achieving two of the key national goals:

- The extent to which local residents volunteer to work with the CSBG-supported agencies; and
- The extent to which Community Action Agencies are able to "leverage" funds from other programs to enhance their efforts to achieve one or more of the six national CSBG goals.

The first measure – the number of hours of volunteer work contributed by the community residents – reflects how well the local Community Action Agency has engaged its target population and community, and the degree to which its programs reflect community needs and interests. This connection with the community distinguishes CSBG from other programs focused on anti-poverty and economic development work.

The second measure – the amount of non-Federal funds leveraged by Community Action Agencies – points to three key attributes. First, it reflects the willingness of other State, local and private partners to collaborate and to invest in the agencies. Second, it recognizes that the broader goals of self-sufficiency and community economic development require strong partnerships across public, private and non-profit sectors of the community. Third, it acknowledges that CSBG cannot support all the work of community action, but plays a critical role in partnership development.

Performance Report

CSBG networks have achieved consistently high levels of volunteer contributions (measure 7.1a). However, the contributions have fluctuated over the last several years, declining from a high of 28 million hours in 1996 to 26.8 million hours in 1998 and then rising from 27.4 million hours in 1999 to 30.3 million hours in 2001. This increase is 2.6 million above the FY 2001 projected target. ACF expects that the volunteer contribution will continue to increase as agencies develop new volunteer opportunities. Pilots have been initiated in several States to address volunteerism and the populations of the aged and disabled, striving to help seniors and disabled populations obtain public benefits. With the help of faith- and community-based organizations, houses of worship, and youth – and working in partnership with the National Council on the Aging – volunteers will help individuals within these populations to access public benefits.

A four-year (1994-97) trend analysis of local networks' resources revealed that there has been a decline in non-CSBG resources, largely due to the elimination or reduction of Federal funding in discretionary domestic programs for low-income individuals and communities. Many programs, historically administered by CAAs and other community-based organizations, were eliminated while others were drastically reduced. The steady growth in resources in all other sectors kept the network from a precipitous loss of capacity to respond to the needs of the low-income community.

The levels of non-Federal funding consistently increased since FY 1997. The measure (7.1b) identifies non-Federal funds, which increased to \$1.92 billion in 1999 from \$1.20 billion in 1996. In FY 2001, non-Federal funding exceeded the target by \$84 million. This is an increase of \$67 million from the FY 2000 actual because the number of States reporting increased from 49 to 51 in FY 2001. ACF expects that CSBG grantees will continue their efforts to leverage increases in non-Federal funds.

The following table illustrates how ACF is investing FY 2002 resources to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Community Services Block Grant Program at the State and community levels.

**BUDGET TABLE LINKING INVESTMENT OF
ACTIVITIES/OUTPUTS/OUTCOMES**

Investments*	Activity	Outputs	Outcomes
\$2,500,000	Training and Technical Assistance	Statewide Partnership Grants and Regional Collaboration	Statewide Implementation of ROMA
\$2,300,000	Develop and Implement Management and Measurement Tools	Ability to Measure Incremental Progress	Strengthen Capacity of State CAA Associations to Implement a Performance Measurement System
\$1,158,000	Develop Advanced Train-the-Trainers Program	Trained Professionals	Increased Training at the Local Level
\$700,000	Develop Data Collection Tools	Improved Data Collection	Accurate, Valid Date Collection System

* When integrating budget and performance information, ACF programs were encouraged to focus on primary investments used to accomplish program outcomes. Some ACF programs use mainly training and technical assistance resources, while others factor in total budget figures when measuring program impacts. Investment data presented in this table reflect the most appropriate resource base for the program.

Data Issues

Data collected for CSBG are collected through the CSBG Information System (CSBG/IS) survey, which is administered by the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCS). OCS and NASCS have worked closely to ensure that the survey captures the required information. Because the CSBG is a Block Grant and States have flexibility in determining their program years, there is substantial time lag in reporting. NASCS and OCS have worked closely to ensure that reporting by States is more timely and complete by providing better survey tools and reporting processes. Over the past two years, the time lag in reporting has decreased by six months. OCS' goal is to receive CSBG data by the next fiscal year. Technology continues to be a major concern for States and local agencies in providing quality data collection and reporting. However, local agencies, typically non-profit organizations whose

funds are primarily dedicated to and invested in providing service, view developing and investing in technology as a secondary concern. With the need to track outcomes for families and clients over longer periods of time comes the need for more sophisticated tools. Much of the technical assistance provided by OCS and the States in the past several years has focused on assisting States and agencies in meeting this challenge.

Performance Plan

Performance Measures for FY 2004 and Final Measures for FY 2003

PROGRAM GOAL: Ensure that low-income people have a stake in their community.

7.1a. FY 2003: *Increase by two percent over the previous year the number of volunteer hours contributed by CSBG consumers in one or more community groups.*

FY 2004: *Increase by two percent over the previous year the number of volunteer hours contributed by CSBG consumers in one or more community groups.*

PROGRAM GOAL: Use Federal funds as leverage to improve conditions where low-income people live.

7.1b. FY 2003: *Increase by two percent over the previous year the amount of non-Federal resources brought into low-income communities by the Community Services Network.*

FY 2004: *Increase by two percent over the previous year the amount of non-Federal resources brought into low-income communities by the Community Services Network.*

States and agencies are continuing to develop and test a menu of performance measures that reflect impact on low-income families and communities. In FY 2004, this menu will be refined and consolidated to provide a more detailed picture of the results achieved. Several CSBG partners have begun experimenting with community-level measures, e.g., "increase in affordable housing available" and "increase in the amount of property tax generated as a result of rehabilitation projects." Additional measures will be considered for inclusion in future annual performance plans as the Network gains more experience and sophistication in determining the most appropriate indicators for measuring community revitalization results.

7.2 FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION

Program Purpose and Legislative Intent

The purpose of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (FVPSA) is to assist States and Indian Tribes in their efforts to respond to and prevent family violence. ACF's Family Violence

Prevention and Services Program (FVPSP) is responsible for the administration and oversight of a number of activities pertaining to family violence. FVPSA allocates funds to support the provision of immediate shelter and related assistance for victims of family violence and their dependents. Funding is also allocated to carry out coordination, research, training, technical assistance, and clearinghouse activities.

The Family Violence Prevention and Services Act was enacted as title III of the Child Abuse Amendments of 1984, and was reauthorized and amended most recently by the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 103-322).

Summary Table

Performance Measures	Targets	Actual Performance	Reference (page # in printed document)
<i>PROGRAM GOAL: Build healthy, safe and supportive communities and Tribes that increase the ability of family violence victims to plan for safety.</i>			
<i>Objective: Support programs to provide immediate shelter and related assistance for victims of family violence and their dependents.</i>			
7.2a. Increase the number of Federally recognized Indian Tribes that have family violence prevention programs.	FY 04: 200 FY 03: 195 FY 02: 190 FY 01: 189 FY 00: 174 FY 99: 162	FY 04: FY 03: FY 02: 184 FY 01: 181 FY 00: 187 FY 99: 174 FY 98: 174 FY 96: 120	Px 137
<i>PROGRAM GOAL: Ensure that victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, their family and friends, and others interested in their safety and support, have a source of comprehensive and timely information, crisis services, and assistance.</i>			
7.2b. Increase the capacity of the National Domestic Violence Hotline to respond to an increase in the average number of calls per month.	FY 04:12,500 FY 03:12,000 FY 02:11,500 FY 01:11,000 FY 00: NA FY 99: NA	FY 04: FY 03: FY 02: 12,500 FY 01: 13,800 FY 00: 11,000 FY 99: 11,000 FY 98: 8,000	Px 137
<i>Objective: Build the capacity of the National Domestic Violence Hotline to receive and respond to calls from sexual assault victims/survivors and their family/friends.</i>			

7.2c. Increase the amount of training hours provided to advocates to handle sexual assault calls. (Developmental)	FY 04: 384 FY 03: 192	FY 04: FY 03: FY 02: Baseline	Px 135
Total Funding (dollars in millions) See detailed Budget Linkage Table in Part I for line items included in funding totals.	FY 04: \$127.4 FY 03: \$126.7 FY 02: \$126.7 FY 01: \$119.1 FY 00: \$103.5 FY 99: \$ 90.5	Bx: budget just. section Px: page # performance plan	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND CONTEXT

Family violence is a broad term, encompassing all forms of violence within the context of family or intimate relationships, including domestic violence, child abuse and elder abuse. The primary focus of the FVPSA has been supporting intervention and prevention efforts targeting domestic violence, or violence and abuse between adult intimate partners. Most commonly, domestic violence involves the abuse of a female by a male partner or ex-partner, current or former spouse, or date. Domestic violence is an issue of increasing concern because of its far-reaching and negative effects on all family members, including children. Domestic violence is not confined to any one socioeconomic, ethnic, religious, racial, or age group, and occurs in rural, urban and Tribal communities. It is the leading cause of injury to women in the United States, where they are more likely to be assaulted, injured, raped or killed by a male partner than by any other type of assailant.

Statistics show that nearly 30 percent of all violence against women by a single offender is committed by an intimate – a husband (3.4 percent), ex-husband (1.6 percent), boyfriend/ex-boyfriend/well-known-to-victim (24.6 percent). Estimates from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) indicate that the number of female victims declined from 1993 to 1998. In 1998 women experienced about 900,000 violent offenses at the hands of an intimate, down from 1.1 million in 1993. Estimates from a compilation of data maintained by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Federal Bureau of Investigation on violence and reported in March of 1998 showed a similar decline in the number of victimizations experienced by women at the hands of an intimate partner. Data on the rates of intimate partner violence considered by age category indicate that from 1993 to 1998, women ages 16 to 24 experienced the highest per capita rates of intimate partner violence (19.6 per 1,000 women).

Accurate information on the extent of domestic violence is difficult to obtain because of extensive under-reporting. Using the above estimates as evidence of reported incidence, domestic violence experts project that each year in this country between one and four million women are abused to the point of injury by a male partner or ex-partner. About one-fourth of all hospital emergency room visits by women result from domestic assaults.

The National Violence Against Women (NVAW) also reported that rates of intimate partner violence vary significantly among women and men of diverse racial backgrounds. Results from the NVAW Survey in July 2000 indicate that African American and American Indian/Alaska

Native women and men report more violent victimization than do women and men of other racial backgrounds. The survey also found that Asian/Pacific Islander women and men tend to report lower rates of intimate partner violence than do women and men of other minority backgrounds. In response to the NVAW statistical data, several initiatives have been implemented through FVPSA to facilitate and improve its outreach, information gathering, and service response to under-served communities. Such initiatives include the mobilization of researchers, academicians, and practitioners around issues of family violence that affects these particular communities. These efforts have resulted in the development of the Institute on Domestic Violence in the African American Community, the National Symposium on Domestic Violence in the Latino Community, the Women of Color Network, and the Asian American Institute on Domestic Violence.

This violence takes a devastating toll on children who are exposed to its cruelty. Three to four million children witness parental violence every year. Children whose mothers are victims of wife battery are twice as likely to be abused as those children whose mothers are not victims of abuse. When children witness violence in the home, they have been found to suffer many of the symptoms that are experienced by children who are directly abused.

Components of FVPSA are State and Tribal Programs, Discretionary Program and activities, the Domestic Violence Resource Network (DVRNetwork), and the National Domestic Violence Hotline (NDVH).

State and Tribal Programs: The FVPSA State and Tribal grants program authorized by Section 303 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act serves as the primary Federal mechanism for encouraging State, Tribal and local support for implementing, maintaining, and expanding programs and projects to prevent family violence. FVPSA funds continue to supplement many already established community-based family violence prevention and services activities. In particular, these funds have been instrumental in promoting and supporting the development of services in rural and other underserved areas.

Discretionary Program and Activities: Each fiscal year, FVPSA discretionary funding supports public agencies and nonprofit organizations in establishing, maintaining, and expanding programs and projects to prevent incidents of family violence and provide immediate shelter and related assistance to victims and their families. Discretionary funding is typically limited to applicants who specify goals and objectives having national and local relevance. Moreover, the programs must demonstrate applicability to the coordination efforts of national, Tribal, State and community-based organizations.

There are more than 1500 domestic violence shelters in the United States that provide emergency shelter and intervention services for victims of domestic violence and their dependents. Shelters vary in size, preferred location, range and scope of services offered to clients, and in physical capacity. Physical capacity may dictate shelter operations and whom they serve. Shelters are not required to serve a set number of programs. However, all domestic violence shelters will provide a core set of services that include: physical shelter for the protection and safety of the victim and children; crisis intervention hotline services; individual and group counseling; and information and referral services.

The Domestic Violence Resource Network (DVRNetwork): The DVRNetwork was established in 1993 as part of the 1992 amendments to the FVPSA. The FVPSP initially provided funding for the development and operation of a National Resource Center on Domestic Violence and three special issue resource centers – the Battered Women’s Justice Project (focusing on civil and criminal justice issues), the Health Resource Center on Domestic Violence, and the Resource Center on Domestic Violence: Child Protection and Child Custody. In 1997, funding was made available to establish a fourth special issue resource center (The Sacred Circle) focusing on the technical assistance and training needs of Tribes and Native American communities.

National Domestic Violence Hotline (NDVH): The NDVH became operational in 1996 as a project of the Texas Council on Family Violence and serves as a critical partner in the prevention and resource assistance efforts of the Domestic Violence Resource Network (DVRNetwork).

The toll-free, 24-hour NDVH provides:

- Crisis intervention to help callers identify problems and possible solutions, including development of emergency safety plans;
- Information about sources of assistance for individuals and their families, friends, and employers wanting to learn more about domestic violence, child abuse, sexual assault, intervention programs for batterers, criminal and civil justice system issues, and other critical concerns; and
- Referrals to battered women’s shelters and programs, social services agencies, legal programs, and other groups and organizations willing to help.

The Hotline is committed to meeting the needs of diverse communities and provides bilingual Spanish-English staff, text telephones for callers who are hearing impaired, access to translators in 139 languages, and materials in a variety of languages and formats.

Program Partnerships

ACF recognizes that coordination and collaboration at the local level among the police, prosecutors, the courts, victim services providers, child welfare and family preservation services, TANF agencies, and medical and mental health providers facilitate a more responsive network of protection and support for families dealing with domestic violence. To help develop a more comprehensive and integrated services delivery approach, HHS urges State agencies and Indian Tribes receiving funds under FVPSA to coordinate planning activities with new and existing State, local, and private sector agencies.

State Domestic Violence Coalitions: The FVPSP administers grants to statewide private nonprofit domestic violence coalitions to conduct activities that promote domestic violence prevention and intervention and the increase in public awareness of domestic violence issues. Needs assessment and planning activities conducted by coalitions are designed to document gaps in current response and prevention efforts and help guide future endeavors. FVPSA funding also enables State coalitions to provide technical assistance to State agencies and organizations on

policy and practice related to domestic violence intervention and prevention, as well as ongoing training and support to local domestic violence programs, many of whom receive State allocated FVPSA funds.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

With each amendment of the legislation, the FVPSA responsibilities have grown. In addition to overseeing State and Tribal activities, the FVPSA administers grant programs for State domestic violence coalitions carrying out technical assistance, training and prevention efforts. Moreover, the FVPSA provides ongoing support for the Domestic Violence Resource Network, which now includes the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, four special issue resource centers, and the National Domestic Violence Hotline.

The National Domestic Violence Hotline (Hotline) is a significant entity in facilitating victims' access to shelter and services. The Hotline answered more than 720,000 calls since the inception in February 1996. Each year the number of calls to the Hotline have increased in addition to the number of calls responded to by the Hotline advocates. Hotline staff and volunteers provide victims of domestic violence and those calling on their behalf with crisis intervention, information about domestic violence and referrals to local service providers. The services of the Hotline are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week and not one day of service has been missed. One call to the Hotline summons help in English or Spanish. Hotline staff and volunteers have access to translators in 139 languages. The Hotline data collection program collects, analyzes and disseminates national data on the nature, scope and impact of family violence in the United States for professionals and policy makers at the local, State and national levels. This data on Hotline callers has not been available before. Assistance through e-mail is available at ndvh@ndvh.org.

Performance Report

During the past decade, there has been an expansion in the number of grants to Indian Tribes for preventing family violence. The FVPSA programs on Tribal trust lands and reservations are in the process of evolving towards a more stable and comprehensive set of activities. In FY 2002, the target for measure 7.1a, increasing the number of Federally recognized Indian Tribes that have family violence prevention programs, was not attained. Staff turnover and failure to submit applications by eight Alaskan Native Villages negatively affected this measure. As a result, the Alaskan Native Villages will receive increased attention.

There are several activities underway in an attempt to improve Tribal reporting of family violence intervention and prevention activities. ACF now has the assistance of a newly-funded resource center, Sacred Circle, providing comprehensive technical assistance, support and training to Tribes, Native American communities, and advocates working with Indian women. Sacred Circle has begun working directly with Tribes receiving FVPSA grants both in the collection of data for reporting purposes and to assist them in administering their programs.

Measure 7.1b: In FY 2001, the National Domestic Violence Hotline's capacity to receive and respond to calls was expanded due to a one-time grant from a corporate contributor. This resulted

in exceeding the projected target by 2,800 calls. In FY 2002, the Hotline responded to 12,500 calls, 1,000 more than projected.

Additional funding enabled the NDVH to provide responses to sexual assault as well as domestic violence calls. As a result, measure 7.2c was added to track the increased amount of training hours needed for advocates to handle these sexual assault calls.

**BUDGET TABLE LINKING INVESTMENTS TO
ACTIVITIES/OUTPUTS/OUTCOMES**

Investments*	Activity	Outputs	Outcomes
\$501,213	Training and Technical Assistance	Number of FVPSA grants to Tribes	Increased participation in FVPSA programs by Tribes and Tribal Organizations
\$107,850	Training and Technical Assistance	Increased number of calls responded to by the Hotline	Improved response to domestic violence by Hotline advocates
\$107,850	Training and Technical Assistance	Improved ability to identify cases of sexual assault	Improved response to sexual assault by Hotline advocates

* When integrating budget and performance information, ACF programs were encouraged to focus on primary investments used to accomplish program outcomes. Some ACF programs use mainly training and technical assistance resources, while others factor in total budget figures when measuring program impacts. Investment data presented in this table reflect the most appropriate resource base for the program.

Data Issues

Through the Documenting Our Work project the family violence program has initiated several efforts designed to assist in developing performance indicators and outcome measures for the various programs and activities supported with FVPSA funds. This activity is currently being piloted in several States. There is currently considerable variation in the type and comparability of program information and data reported by State and Tribal grantees, State coalitions and discretionary grantees. This is due in part to the variation in services and activities funded within each State or locality, given other Federal, State and local funding that might be available, as well as the varying reporting capacity and requirements of grantees to provide extensive data. This FVPSA effort require collaboration with the States, State domestic violence coalitions, the national resource center network, and Federal-level partners to reach consensus.

Support for the Documenting Our Work project is provided by the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (NRC). The NRC formed a working group and completed an extensive number of focus group conference calls to assist in building common, but sufficiently inclusive, definitions of the “services” provided by local domestic violence programs. Representatives of the State domestic violence coalitions are participating in the focus groups and initiating a review of the current data elements reported by States and shelters to identify baseline elements.

Performance Plan

Performance Measures for FY 2004 and Final Measures for FY 2003

The following program performance goals have been developed in two program areas where sufficient data is available to track performance: Tribal program development and the National Domestic Violence Hotline.

PROGRAM GOAL: Build healthy, safe and supportive communities and Tribes that increase the ability of family violence victims to plan for their safety.

Objective: Support programs to provide immediate shelter and related assistance for victims of family violence and their dependents.

7.2a *FY 2003: Increase to 195 the number of Federally recognized Indian Tribes that have family violence prevention programs.*

FY 2004: Increase to 200 the number of Federally recognized Indian Tribes that have family violence prevention programs.

The FVPSA program will provide technical assistance and information to 25 percent of the States and 10 percent of the Indian Tribes aimed at increasing the number of Indian Tribes that sponsor family violence prevention programs. A collaborative effort among the national resource center network and selected State domestic violence coalitions will sponsor the technical assistance activity for States and Tribes as an ongoing activity for this initiative.

Program Goal: Ensure that victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, their families and friends, and others interested in their safety and support, have a source of comprehensive and timely information, crisis information, services and assistance.

7.2b *FY 2003: Increase the capacity of the National Domestic Violence Hotline to respond to an average of 12,000 calls per month.*

FY 2004: Increase the capacity of the National Domestic Violence Hotline to respond to an average of 12,500 calls per month.

The largest challenge to the Hotline is staffing. To adequately respond to 12,000 calls per month requires 26 full- and part-time advocates, 20 relief advocates and 30 volunteer advocates. Staff resources are constrained by factors that inhibit all labor-intensive activities, such as turnovers, work schedules, compensation, and competition with better paying jobs in the local area of the Hotline operation.

Program Objective: Build the capacity of the National Domestic Violence Hotline to respond to calls from sexual assault victims/survivors and their family/friends.

Developmental Measure

7.2c FY 2003: Increase the amount of training hours provided to advocates to handle sexual assault calls.

FY 2004: Increase the amount of training hours provided to advocates to handle sexual assault calls.

ACF has found that with additional training in “active listening,” the advocates are better able to recognize the sexual assault calls. ACF will provide additional training during FY 2004 to the advocates to provide them with a more structured manner and basis to respond to the calls. ACF anticipates 384 hours of training for the advocates in this effort.

7.3 LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (LIHEAP)

Program Purpose and Legislative Intent

The purpose of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) is to assist low-income households that pay a high proportion of household income for home energy to meet their immediate home energy needs. States, Federally or State-recognized Indian Tribes/Tribal organizations, and Insular Areas receive Federal LIHEAP block grants to administer the program at the community level.

LIHEAP's legislative intent is to ensure that LIHEAP benefits are targeted to those low-income households with the highest energy costs or needs, taking into account family size. The LIHEAP statute identifies two priority groups of low-income households needing energy assistance:

- **Vulnerable Households:** Households with frail older individuals, individuals with disabilities, or very young children that meet LIHEAP income-eligibility standards.
- **High Energy-Burden Households:** Households with the lowest incomes and highest home energy costs.

REACH: The Human Services Amendments of 1994 (Pub. L. 103-252) added Section 2607B(b) to the LIHEAP statute to establish the Residential Energy Assistance Challenge Option Program (REACH) funded for the first time in FY 1996. REACH awards are used to implement innovative plans through local community-based agencies to help LIHEAP-eligible households reduce their energy vulnerability. The purpose of REACH is to minimize the health and safety risks that result from high energy burdens on low-income Americans; to prevent homelessness as a result of inability to pay energy bills; to increase the efficiency of energy usage by low-income families; and to target energy assistance to individuals who are most in need.

Summary Table

Performance Measures	Targets	Actual Performance	Reference (page # in printed document)
<i>PROGRAM GOAL: Increase the availability of LIHEAP fuel assistance to vulnerable and high energy burden households whose health and/or safety is endangered by living in a home without sufficient heating or cooling.</i>			
7.3a. Increase the targeting index of LIHEAP elderly households.	FY 04: 92 FY 03: 91 FY 02: 90:64	FY 04: 11/04 FY 03: 11/03 FY 02: 90:64 FY 01: 90:64	Px 145 HHS 6.1
7.3b. Increase the targeting index of LIHEAP young child households.	FY 04: 110 FY 03: 109 FY 02: 109:64	FY 04: 11/04 FY 03: 11/03 FY 02: 109:64 FY 01: 108:64	Px 145 HHS 6.1
<p>In FY 2001-2002, the target was expressed as a comparison of vulnerable household to eligible but non-vulnerable households. FY 01 and FY 02 targeting indices are baseline data.</p> <p>In FY 2003-2004, a targeting index of 100 for a specific group of households indicates that group's representation in the LIHEAP recipient population is the same as that group's representation in the LIHEAP eligible population. A targeting index below or above 100 indicates a lower or higher representation rate for a recipient population group.</p> <p>Elderly households are those LIHEAP eligible households having at least one member 60 years or older. Young child households are those LIHEAP eligible households having at least one member five years or younger.</p>			
7.3c. Increase the targeting index of LIHEAP recipient high-energy-burden households compared to LIHEAP recipient low-energy-burden households.	FY 03: Dropped FY 02: NA		
Total Funding (dollars in millions) See detailed Budget Linkage Table in Part I for line items included in funding totals.	FY 04: \$2000.0 FY 03: \$1700.0 FY 02: \$2000.0 FY 01: \$1855.7 FY 00: \$1844.4 FY 99: \$1275.3	Bx: budget just. section Px: page # performance plan	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND CONTEXT

OCS has a limited role in determining how LIHEAP block grant funds are spent. LIHEAP grantees have the flexibility to determine how to implement or target their programs and how best to carry out the purposes of LIHEAP. Grantees can spend LIHEAP funds on the following types of benefits for eligible low-income households:

- Heating or cooling assistance (i.e., fuel subsidies) for recipients to increase the affordability of heating or cooling their homes;

- Energy crisis intervention to assist recipients to cope with weather-related and supply-shortage home energy emergencies, and other household energy-related emergencies; and
- Low-cost residential weatherization and other energy-related home repairs.

Although the LIHEAP statute requires grantees to conduct outreach services, OCS cannot prescribe how such services are delivered. However, OCS can improve the program's performance by making more vulnerable households and high energy burden households aware of LIHEAP benefits. Given that such households have a high need for energy assistance, OCS is initiating a Federal LIHEAP outreach effort to reach more of these households. OCS will assess whether its Federal outreach effort is an effective way to improve program performance in serving vulnerable households. OCS' underlying assumption is that increased program participation by vulnerable households will contribute to the ACF strategic goal of building healthy, safe and supportive communities and Tribes.

OCS will use the following resources, activities, and strategies in initiating its LIHEAP targeted outreach project:

- Develop a generic LIHEAP brochure that includes information that relates health and safety issues to vulnerable and high energy-burden households' need for energy assistance;
- Collaborate with key Federal agencies that assist vulnerable low-income households in disseminating OCS' LIHEAP outreach brochure through their community-based programs;
- Develop an indicator to measure LIHEAP targeting performance to vulnerable and high energy burden households that can be used to compare these households to other eligible households;
- Collect data needed to measure LIHEAP targeting performance to vulnerable, high energy burden and other eligible households;
- Analyze the results of LIHEAP targeting performance to vulnerable and high energy burden households; and
- Use targeting performance results to manage further OCS LIHEAP outreach efforts.

REACH: The REACH program is designed to provide services through local community-based organizations (CBO) to help LIHEAP eligible households reduce their energy vulnerability. The States, Tribes, Tribal Organizations and certain Insular Areas are funded to implement innovative initiatives designed to provide for: a reduction in energy costs on participating households over one or more fiscal years; an increase in regularity of home energy bill payments; and an increase in energy vendor contributions towards reducing energy burdens of eligible households. Energy affordability in the 68 grants, funded for \$35.7 million between 1996 and 2001, has been addressed through aggregation, family development, energy education, and collaboration and negotiation. OCS ensures that targeting is geared to the eligible households through its various communication channels including print and electronic media, and its network of technical support provided at conferences, and one-to-one meetings.

Program Partnerships

Partnerships at the Federal level are key to assuring OCS' LIHEAP outreach information reaches the community level. Beginning in FY 2003, OCS will disseminate its LIHEAP outreach

brochure through the community-based networks of the Administration on Aging for elderly households, Head Start for young children, and the Administration on Developmental Disabilities for persons with disabilities. Additional Federal programs that serve vulnerable households will be included in the dissemination process during FY 2003 and FY 2004.

OCS will build on its partnerships with national organizations and Federal programs in support of its targeted outreach project. Existing partnerships include the following:

- **The National Energy Assistance Directors' Association (NEADA):** The Association has worked closely with OCS on LIHEAP performance measurement and can provide OCS with feedback from State LIHEAP programs on the OCS' outreach project. In addition, NEADA has embarked on its own LIHEAP outreach campaign.
- **OCS Community Services Block Grant Program (CSBG):** This program delivers a range of community-based services to low-income individuals through Community Action Agencies. These agencies serve low-income vulnerable households through various Federal funds. In addition, the LIHEAP statute requires LIHEAP grantees to conduct outreach activities to assure that eligible households are made aware of any similar energy-related assistance available under CSBG.
- **The Department of Energy (DOE) Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP):** This program is mandated to target vulnerable households.

REACH: REACH grantees are encouraged to form linkages and partnerships with participating CBOs, utilities, and other agencies to leverage additional resources. REACH is also encouraging its grantees to seek additional resources from the Department of Agriculture's Rural Partnership Office, Rural Development Fund, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Energy; Department of Labor and others. REACH funds can be used creatively in energy-related endeavors to identify and maximize resources for the program.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

LIHEAP grantees are required by law to conduct outreach activities designed to assure that eligible households, especially households with at least one member who is frail elderly, disabled, or a young child, and households with high home energy burdens, are made aware of LIHEAP assistance. However, LIHEAP is not an entitlement program. Approximately 3.9 million households received heating assistance in FY 2001 representing about 13 percent of all households with incomes under the Federal maximum LIHEAP income standard (29.9 million households).

Of the 3.9 million households receiving heating assistance in FY 2001, approximately 1.4 million of these households contained at least one member 60 years or older. Approximately one million of these households contained at least one child five years or younger. Some of these households contained both an elderly person and a young child.

LIHEAP's targeting index is a proxy measure for health and safety outcomes. Improving targeting performance for eligible vulnerable households can help such households avoid serious health risks if they cannot afford to adequately heat or cool their homes. Health risks can include

death from hypothermia or hyperthermia and increased susceptibility to other health conditions such as strokes and heart attacks. Improved targeting performance for eligible high-energy-burden households can help such households avoid safety risks in their homes if they cannot afford to adequately heat or cool their homes. Safety risks can include use of makeshift heating sources or inoperative/faulty heating or cooling equipment that can lead to fires or asphyxiation.

OCS completed its LIHEAP outreach brochure in November 2002, and printed approximately 50,000 copies of the brochure. OCS has held preliminary discussions with the Administration on Aging, Head Start, and the Administration on Developmental Disabilities about their interest and ability to disseminate the LIHEAP outreach brochure for the FY 2003 winter season. The three agencies agreed to assist in OCS' LIHEAP outreach effort.

To quantify LIHEAP targeting performance, OCS has developed a **targeting index** as a performance indicator. The targeting index for a specific group of households is computed by dividing the percent of the assisted target group within the LIHEAP recipient population by the percent of the eligible target group within the LIHEAP eligible population. For example, if 25 percent of the assisted households are elderly households, but eligible elderly households represent 40 percent of the eligible population, the targeting index for eligible elderly households is 63 (100 times 25 divided by 40). This would indicate that eligible elderly households are served at a 37 percent lower rate than they are represented in the eligible population.

A targeting index of 100 for a specific group of households indicates that group's representation in the LIHEAP recipient population is the same as that group's representation in the LIHEAP eligible population. A targeting index below or above 100 indicates a lower or higher representation rate for a recipient population group.

OCS collects data from the Bureau of the Census's annual March Current Population Survey (CPS) on vulnerable households and the receipt of energy assistance. OCS also has collected data from the Department of Energy's 2001 Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) on high energy burden households and the receipt of energy assistance. (RECS is conducted every four years).

Calculating the targeting indexes of elderly and young child (vulnerable) households are based on weighted estimates obtained from the March CPS. The most recent data available are from the March 2002 CPS. OCS will analyze the targeting indexes for vulnerable households by Census division to identify those Census divisions where eligible vulnerable households are underserved. (targeting indexes are not calculated for households with a disabled member as States define disability differently.)

For those vulnerable households that are under-served in particular Census divisions, OCS plans to have its LIHEAP outreach brochures distributed to clients of the local programs funded by Head Start, the Administration on Developmental Disabilities, and the Administration on Aging during the FY 2003 winter season. For other parts of the country, the brochures will be distributed only to program staff of the three federal programs. OCS hypothesizes that the greatest increases in targeting performance can be realized through the targeting of outreach

information to those areas of the country in which targeted households are under-served (measures 7.3a and 7.3b).

OCS is unable to measure LIHEAP targeting of high-energy-burden households beyond FY 2001 (measure 7.3c). Funds were unavailable for OCS to do a follow-up survey in FY 2002 with the sample of LIHEAP recipient households that were included in the 2001 RECS. Consequently, this measure has been dropped for FY 2003. Instead, OCS is planning to conduct an evaluation study in FY 2003 to determine whether the LIHEAP program is targeting eligible high energy burden households. The study will use weighted data from the 2001 RECS.

REACH: REACH programs' performance in reaching their goals are supported through careful targeting of LIHEAP eligible households, reporting out conferences and by publishing lessons learned. Programs are reviewed by independent evaluators and results reported through various media. Evaluation reports have been completed for the first two cycles and their findings have contributed to subsequent program announcements and action transmittals. Programs have been encouraged to demonstrate better targeting, seek other resources that can contribute to addressing and remedying causes of the lack of affordable energy, and to seek new ways and alternative energy sources for addressing the energy problem for this population.

Performance Report

The FY 2001 winter season serves as the baseline in which there was no federal LIHEAP outreach. The FY 2002 winter season served as extended baseline in which there also was no federal LIHEAP outreach. Instead, OCS sent LIHEAP grantees a LIHEAP Information Memorandum in November 2001, reminding grantees of the statutory requirement to target LIHEAP benefits to eligible vulnerable households and eligible high-energy burden households. The targeting index for LIHEAP elderly households remained the same (90) for FY 2001 and FY 2002. However, the targeting index for LIHEAP young households increased from 108 to 109. It is unclear as to what accounts for this increase. This result will need to be taken into account in determining whether LIHEAP targeting performance improves for the FY 2003 winter, as a result of federal targeting of LIHEAP information.

State LIHEAP grantees report annually on the number of LIHEAP-assisted households with at least one member who is elderly, disabled, or five years of age or younger. The following table shows the percent of assisted households nationally for FY 1999-2001 that included elderly members or young children. The variability in the data from one year to the next will need to be taken into account in measuring LIHEAP targeting performance.

**PERCENT OF LIHEAP HEATING ASSISTED HOUSEHOLDS
CONTAINING AT LEAST ONE ELDERLY MEMBER OR YOUNG CHILD,
AS REPORTED BY STATES (FY 1999-FY 2001)**

Type of vulnerable household member	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02
Elderly*	33%	35%	32%	July 03
Young children**	33%	25%	23%	July 03

*An elderly member is a person who is 60 years or older.

**A young child is a person who is under six years of age. Data on households with a young child were not as reliable for FY 99 as for subsequent fiscal years due to reporting problems and should be used with caution.

BUDGET TABLE LINKING INVESTMENTS TO ACTIVITIES/OUTPUTS/OUTCOMES

Investments*	Activity	Outputs	Outcomes
\$14,000	Development of brochure	50,000 copies produced and disseminated	Vulnerable households will be made aware of their susceptibility to energy-related health and safety issues and the availability of LIHEAP fuel assistance.
\$5,000	Contractual assistance to OCS on measuring LIHEAP targeting performance, using March CPS and RECS data	LIHEAP targeting indices	Improved targeting indexes in underserved Census divisions for vulnerable households compared to non-vulnerable households
\$10,000	Contractual assistance to OCS on assessing the statistical reliability and validity of targeting indices	Reliability and validity assessment	Determination of whether LIHEAP targeting indexes can be used for managing for results.

* When integrating budget and performance information, ACF programs were encouraged to focus on primary investments used to accomplish program outcomes. Some ACF programs use mainly training and technical assistance resources, while others factor in total budget figures when measuring program impacts. Investment data presented in this table reflect the most appropriate resource base for the program.

Data Issues

The LIHEAP targeting indices rely on the use of household survey data. These data present the following problems:

- The reliability of household survey data is subject to sampling and non-sampling errors. Consequently, differences in data from one year to the next, between groups of households, and between sections of the country need to be examined.
- Household survey data on public assistance programs undercount the number of assisted households when compared to State-reported data. Likewise, the number of LIHEAP recipient households is undercounted when compared to aggregate data from the program's *LIHEAP Household Report*. The undercount may bias the March CPS and RECS estimates of the percentage of vulnerable households or high energy burden households that received LIHEAP heating assistance. To check for bias, the March CPS and RECS percentages will be compared against each other and state-reported data from the *LIHEAP Household Report*.

The comparisons will be based on data from the previous fiscal year because finalized data from the *LIHEAP Household Report* are not available until approximately 10 months after the end of the fiscal year. The data comparisons may result in adjustments to the March CPS and RECS data.

- Verification of State-reported data on LIHEAP-recipient households is difficult. There are no federal quality control or audit requirements for data reported in the States' *LIHEAP Household Report*.
- OCS needs to examine the reliability and validity of the targeting indices.
- OCS will need to recalculate the targeting indexes for FY 2001 and FY 2002 so that the data will be comparable with subsequent March CPS data that use weights from the 2000 Decennial Census.

REACH: While the process and program evaluations report data on REACH projects, the need to classify and develop approaches for measuring performance in a more rigorous way is being addressed and will become part of future evaluations and reporting.

Performance Plan

Performance Measures for FY 2004 and Final Measures for FY 2003

PROGRAM GOAL: Increase the availability of LIHEAP fuel assistance to vulnerable and high energy burden households whose health and/or safety is endangered by living in a home without sufficient heating and cooling.

7.3a. FY 2003: Increase the targeting index of LIHEAP elderly households.

FY 2004: Increase the targeting index of LIHEAP elderly households.

7.3b. FY 2003: Increase the targeting index of LIHEAP young child households.

FY 2004: Increase the targeting index of LIHEAP young child households.

Data Source: Annual March CPS

7.3c. FY 2003: Increase the targeting index of LIHEAP recipient high energy burden households compared to LIHEAP recipient low-energy burden households. (Dropped)

This measure has been dropped due to issues relating to the lack of annual follow-up data from a sample of RECS households.

7.4 NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS

Program Purpose and Legislative Intent

The purpose of the Administration for Native Americans (ANA) discretionary grant programs is to promote social and economic development, language preservation and environmental

enhancement. ANA achieves its mission through grants, training, and technical assistance to eligible Tribes and Native American organizations representing 2.2 million individuals.

Summary Table

Performance Measures	Targets	Actual Performance	Reference (page # in printed document)
<i>PROGRAM GOAL: Support and encourage the role of Tribal elders in the community; promote efforts to involve elders in work as mentors with youth and children, e.g., teaching culture and language in Head Start and other child care programs.</i>			
7.4a. Increase the number of grants that include elder participation.	FY 04: 98 FY 03: 94 FY 02: 70 FY 01: 65 FY 00: 60 FY 99: 44	FY 04: FY 03: FY 02: 114 FY 01: 88 FY 00: 62 FY 99: 55 FY 98: 52 FY 97: 44	Px 150
<i>PROGRAM GOAL: Increase the provision of training and technical assistance services to the diverse Native American population, with particular emphasis on urban organizations, rural and non-federally recognized Tribes.</i>			
7.4b. Maintain the number of TA visits per year to the diverse Native American population, with emphasis on urban Native organizations, rural & non-federally recognized Tribes.	FY 03: Dropped FY 02: 1500 FY 01: 1500 FY 00: 1450 FY 99: 1400	FY 02: 1562 FY 01: 1515 FY 00: 1450 FY 99: 1450 FY 98: 1190 FY 97: 1014	
<i>PROGRAM GOAL: The number of Tribes and Native American organizations receiving economic development-related services.</i>			
7.4c. The number of Tribes and Native American organizations receiving economic development related services. (Developmental)	FY 04: FY 03: NA	FY 04: FY 03: Baseline	Px 151
Total Funding (dollars in millions) See detailed Budget Linkage Table in Part I for line items included in funding totals.	FY 04: \$45.1 FY 03: \$45.2 FY 02: \$45.8 FY 01: \$46.0 FY 00: \$35.4 FY 99: \$34.9		Bx: budget just. Section Px: page # performance plan

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND CONTEXT

Promoting the goal of social and economic self-sufficiency through local self-determination is the cornerstone of ANA's program philosophy. Self-sufficiency is that level of development at which a Native American community can control and internally generate resources to provide for the needs of its members and meet its own economic and social goals. Social and economic underdevelopment is the paramount obstacle to the self-sufficiency of Native American communities and families.

In 1981, ACF collaborated with Tribes and Native communities to develop the innovative Social and Economic Development Strategies (SEDS) program. SEDS is based on the premise that a local community has the primary responsibility for determining its own needs, planning and implementing its own programs, and using its own natural and human resources. In initiating the SEDS approach, ACF developed a framework of three interrelated goals:

- Assist Native American leadership in exercising control over their resources;
- Foster the development of stable, diversified local economies which provide jobs, promote economic well-being, and reduce dependency on social services; and
- Support local access to, and coordination of, programs and services that safeguard the health and well-being of people, essential elements for a thriving and self-sufficient community.

Through this direct grant funding relationship, Tribes and Native communities have created administrative systems to operate their own social and economic programs in much the same way as State and local governments. Support for the unique government to government relationship that exists between Tribal governments and the federal government is reflected in this approach.

ANA faces unique challenges in formulating goals and measuring results. As a discretionary grant program funding projects designed and implemented at the local level, the differences between projects are considerable in terms of size, scope, community goals, and funding levels. Because Tribes and Native American communities set their own goals and priorities, ACF requests objective progress reports throughout the project period of the grant and an objective evaluation report once the grant has ended. This system provides information on goals and measures, but these are unique to the Tribe or community. Each grantee is at different stage of social and economic development. Administrative and organizational capacity varies greatly among grantees, making more difficult the prospect of developing uniform measures.

Many ANA grants are aimed at capacity-building and infrastructure development for Tribes and organizations, particularly through developing legal codes and courts systems and revising existing Tribal constitutions. Capacity-building encompasses not only economic development (creation and expansion of businesses and jobs), but also efforts to create new programs as a result of welfare reform. This emphasis on capacity-building ties into the larger ACF goal to facilitate the changes effected by welfare reform by working together in innovative ways. For both economic and social development, capacity-building and infrastructure development are key factors. ANA will continue to work with its partners to develop meaningful GPRA

measures--within the context of sovereignty--for job creation, economic well-being, and reducing dependency on social services across a diverse mix of project types, Tribes, and Native American organizations.

ANA will launch a new initiative for FY 2003 including a series of economic development forums to be held by the ANA Commissioner for the purpose of consultation, dialog and feedback designed to take economic development in Indian country to the next level. ANA has included a new developmental measure to track this activity.

Program Partnerships

ANA coordinates with all ACF program offices on Native American issues. These offices include Head Start, Office of Community Services (Tribal TANF), and the Child Care Bureau. ANA has provided a leadership role on a number of issues within ACF and throughout the Department including the development of the HHS Tribal Consultation Plan, the Tribal Colleges and Universities Plan, and other initiatives involving Native populations. The HHS Intra-Departmental Council on Native American Affairs (IDCNAA), chaired by the ANA Commissioner, coordinates numerous activities and initiatives with HHS agencies, such as the Indian Health Service (IHS), and external departments such as the Department of Interior (DOI).

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

In prior years, ANA funded over 225 competitive grants annually totaling over \$34 million in several grant programs including Social and Economic Development, Environmental Regulatory Enhancement and Native Languages Preservation and Enhancement. ANA's grant award process is highly competitive: approximately one-third of applications received are funded each year. The FY 2001 budget increase provided \$10.6 million to fund an increase in grants under ANA programs. This increase provided funds for 91 additional new grants in FY 2001. This level of funding was sustained for FY 2002.

ANA regularly selects new program goals and priorities. For example, ANA continues to play a key role in the Department's Tribal consultation policy implementation and is the ACF lead organization in implementing the Tribal Colleges/Universities (TCU) Executive Order. Through the TCU effort, ANA provided financial assistance in the form of grants to the colleges and universities. ANA also modified its grant eligibility statement to allow TCUs direct competition for funding in addition to Tribes' eligibility.

ANA's new economic development initiative was developed, in part, to address socioeconomic trends indicating that American Indians have higher unemployment rates than the U.S. population. As reported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) 1999 Indian Labor Force Report (most recent data available), unemployment was at 43 percent in 1999 and the poverty level among the 556 Federally recognized Tribes increased to 33 percent. It is important to note that individual Tribal data have consistently indicated higher unemployment rates.

ANA anticipates a complete review and validation of existing ANA performance measures in FY 2003 under the new ANA Commissioner's leadership. ANA began this process in FY 2001

based on quarterly meetings with the national training and technical assistance contract providers.

Performance Report

ANA exceeded its targets for FY 2001 and met all targets for FY 2002 by providing consistent technical assistance and emphasizing the role of Tribal elders in Indian communities. Elders play a key role in Tribal culture by protecting and preserving Tribal cultural heritage, including language, traditions and life ways. They also play a critical role in guiding youth. Increased elder participation (measure 7.4a) occurred due to their inclusion in the native language grants awarded and in various SEDS projects that focus on culture. In 1998, with the addition of the Pacific region, the number of T/TA contractors increased from five to six. New contract performance requirements led all contractors to expand the variety of technical assistance delivery methods they use. In addition to on-site assistance, contractors offer walk-up, worldwide web, telephone, fax, e-mail and other state-of-the-art delivery mechanisms. Other initiatives under consideration include on-line chats and threaded discussions, electronic newsletters, and CD-ROM training programs.

BUDGET TABLE LINKING INVESTMENTS TO ACTIVITIES/OUTPUT/OUTCOMES

Investments*	Activity	Outputs	Outcome
\$5,505,926	Elder Participation	Increase in number of grants with Elder participation	Preserve/protect key role of Elders in Tribal culture
\$378,869	Training and Technical Assistance (T/TA)	Maintain number of On-Site visits	Enhance Quality of Technical Assistance
\$Baseline	Economic Development Projects	Number of Tribes receiving services	Catalyst for positive change to lower unemployment rate

* When integrating budget and performance information, ACF programs were encouraged to focus on primary investments used to accomplish program outcomes. Some ACF programs use mainly training and technical assistance resources, while others factor in total budget figures when measuring program impacts. Investment data presented in this table reflect the most appropriate resource base for the program.

Data Issues

The primary source for data collection on the above performance measures is the Grant Award Tracking and Evaluation System (GATES). The grantee information entered into the GATES system includes a full project description, project periods, award amounts, approved objectives, as well as contact information so reports can be generated based on zip code, type of award and other data variables. Recent developments with the latest generation of GATES allow for better interface with other data collecting software thereby enhancing ANA's ability to design and perform systematic validation surveys of grant proposals regarding: the types of projects and proposed participants, including trends and changes from other periods, potential applicants' use of technology, and training and technical assistance providers' outcomes and delivery levels. It is

ANA's goal to design and implement a comprehensive data management system that will allow ANA to realize the full potential of the data contained in grant applications, funded and unfunded, and grantee Program Progress Reports. This Oracle-based software will be built expressly for ANA's data collection needs and will work with GATES to identify data elements in existing documents. The electronic capture of information will greatly enhance ANA's data collection capabilities.

ANA has developed a strategy that utilizes the data management system described above to validate the data it collects. ANA is currently working with other ACF programs to identify and develop standardized, cross-program measures.

Performance Plan

Performance Measures for FY 2004 and Final Measures for FY 2003

PROGRAM GOAL: Support and encourage the role of Tribal elders in the community; promote efforts to involve elders as mentors with youth and children, e.g., teaching culture and language in Head Start, other child care programs and adult programs.

7.4a. FY 2003: Increase to 94 the number of grants that include elder participation from the 1997 baseline level of 44 grants.

FY 2004: Increase to 98 the number of grants that include elder participation from the 1997 baseline level of 44 grants.

Tribal elder involvement was selected as a key measure of program performance because the role of Tribal elders is essential in all aspects of Tribal and community life. Supporting Tribal elders and providing a voice for their concerns has been an important emphasis area. Through the Tribal Elders Initiative, elders meet regularly with ANA/ACF officials and staff. Based on the rate of elders' participation in prior years, ANA expects by FY 2004 to increase elder participation by approximately 10 new grant projects. The funding will expand training and technical assistance and increase grant application rates and awards to Tribes and organizations that have not received assistance in the past.

PROGRAM GOAL: Maintain the provision of training and technical assistance services (T/TA) to the diverse Native American population, with particular emphasis on urban organizations, rural and non-federally recognized tribes.

7.4b. FY 2003: Maintain at 1,500 the number of technical assistance contacts per year by Tribal T/TA contractors to the diverse Native American population, with particular emphasis on urban Native organizations, rural and non-federally recognized Tribes. (Dropped)

The training and technical assistance measure is being dropped in FY 2003 and replaced by the developmental measure, 7.4c, to focus on increasing economic development ventures.

Developmental Measure

7.4c. FY 2004: The number of Tribes and Native American organizations receiving economic development related services.

From 1979 – 1999, the poverty rate among American Indians climbed from 27 percent to 33 percent, far exceeding the national rate. Unemployment rates are also higher than the U.S. population. All the social health and well-being indicators are lower than other population groups.

Effective strategies for economic development and job creation are critical as Tribes implement the next phase of welfare reform. Native American communities are in varying stages of implementing economic development strategies and building governmental and organization capacity. The ANA Commissioner is planning a series of economic development forums to improve the business capacity of Native American communities. This will include consultation and discussion of successful practices and strategies in the areas of small business, manufacturing and energy development used by successful Native American economic development businesses. Feedback from the Commissioner's forums will help to identify quantifiable measures of success as well as baseline data. ANA grants will provide seed money for building governmental infrastructure and strategic planning skills in economic and business development, as well as for small business "incubator" projects. Data collected for measure 7.4c will allow us to assess the impact of this technical assistance effort and grant award process. Even a small percentage increase in economic development-related services will be considered a success since these incubators tend to be small rather than large scale capital investment projects.