RESULTS FOR AMERICA

FEDERAL INVEST IN WHAT WORKS INDEX (2017)

CRITERIA	Administration for Children and Families (HHS)	Corporation for National and Community Service	Millennium Challenge Corporation	Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (HHS)	U.S. Agency for International Development	U.S. Department of Education	U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development	U.S. Department of Labor
TOTAL SCORE (Out of a possible 100)*	80	73	85	70	83	83	76	83
1. Leadership: Did the agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them in FY17?	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	⑩
2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY17?	9	8	9	7	8	9	8	9
3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY17?(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)	7	7	⑩	9	⑩	7	6	8
4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals and aligned program objectives and measures, and did it frequently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other dimensions of performance in FY17?	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	9
5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY17?	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	9
6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY17?	9	8	8	7	8	⑩	7	9
7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY17?	8	7	9	8	9	8	8	8
8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY17?	7	7	8[1]	7	8[2]	9	7	8
9. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Non-Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs in FY17? (Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)	7	7	N/A	8	N/A	8	7	7
10. Repurpose for Results: In FY17, did the agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes? (Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)	8	4	8	1	7	7	7	6

* These scores are based on information provided by the 8 federal departments and agencies included in this index. You can find this background information - as well as a description of how RFA developed these scores - at http://results4america.org/tool/index/
[1] MCC only administered competitive grant programs (and no non-competitive grant programs) in FY17. Therefore, to tally a final 2017 Score, we doubled the 2017 Score for Question #8 (8x2=16) and awarded 0 points for Question #9.
[2] USAID only administered competitive grant programs (and no non-competitive grant programs) in FY17. Therefore, to tally a final 2017 Score, we doubled the 2017 Score for Question #8 (8x2=16) and awarded 0 points for Question #9.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Leadership: Did the agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them in FY17?

ACF:
- ACF's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning, Research, and Evaluation oversees its Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) and supports evaluation and other learning activities across the agency. ACF's budget for research and evaluation in FY17 is approximately $165 million. ACF's evaluation policy gives the OPRE Deputy Assistant Secretary "authority to approve the design of evaluation projects and analysis plans; and… authority to approve, release and disseminate evaluation reports." OPRE's staff of 44 includes experts in research and evaluation methods as well as ACF programs and policies and the populations they serve. OPRE engages in on-going collaboration with program office staff and leadership to interpret research and evaluation findings and to identify their implications for programmatic and policy decisions. OPRE also provides written summaries of emerging findings and discusses their implications with agency and program leadership.
- While OPRE oversees most of ACF's evaluation activity and provides overall coordination, some ACF program offices also sponsor evaluations. ACF's evaluation policy states, "In order to promote quality, coordination and usefulness in ACF's evaluation activities, ACF program offices will consult with OPRE in developing evaluation activities. Program offices will discuss evaluation projects with OPRE in early stages to clarify evaluation questions and methodological options for addressing them, and as activities progress OPRE will review designs, plans, and reports. Program offices may also ask OPRE to design and oversee evaluation projects on their behalf or in collaboration with program office staff."

CNCS:
- CNCS's Office of Research and Evaluation Director (R&E) oversees the development of social science research designed to measure the impact of CNCS programs and shape policy decisions; encourage a culture of performance and accountability in national and community service programs; provide information on volunteering, civic engagement, and volunteer management in nonprofit organizations; and assist in the development and assessment of new initiatives and demonstration projects. The R&E Director, who is overseeing R&E's $4 million budget and a staff of 9 in FY17, reports directly to the CNCS Chief of Staff and is a member of CNCS's Leadership Team and Policy Council. The R&E Director also meets regularly with CNCS Program Directors to identify areas where evidence can be generated and used for various decisions.
- The R&E Director meets annually with all CNCS program offices to identify priorities and negotiate which pools of funds are need to support the year's priorities. The FY17 plan was developed through a series of formal and informal conversations.

MCC:
- MCC's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Division, which falls within the Department of Policy and Evaluation (DPE), has a staff of 23 and an estimated FY17 budget of $21.2 million in due diligence (DD) funds. These resources are used to directly measure high-level outcomes and impacts in order to assess the attributable effects of MCC's programs and activities. Departments throughout the agency have a total of $71.9 million in DD funds in FY17. The M&E Managing Director, as well as the Vice President for the Department of Policy and Evaluation, have the authority to execute M&E's budget and inform policy decisions affecting independent evaluations. The M&E Managing Director participates in technical reviews of proposed investments as well as in regular monitoring meetings in order to inform policy and investment decisions. The Vice President sits on the Agency's Investment Management Committee which examines the evidence base for each investment before it is approved by the MCC Board and conducts regular oversight over the compact (i.e., grant program) development process. The MCC also recently appointed a new Chief Economist in DPE to oversee and strengthen the economic evidence base used for program development, including economic growth diagnostics, beneficiary analyses, and cost-benefit analyses.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Leadership: Did the agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them in FY17?	SAMHSA: • The director of SAMHSA's Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality (CBHSQ) Division of Evaluation, Analysis and Quality (DEAQ) serves as the agency's evaluation lead with key evaluation staff housed in this division. In addition, the agency's chief medical officer (CMO), as described in the 21st Century Cures Act, plays a key role in addressing evaluation approaches and the utilization of evidence-based programs and practices among grantees; at this time, a collaborative approach between CBHSQ and the Office of the CMO is being established to ensure broad agency evaluation oversight by senior staff. The Office of the CMO is housed within the agency's emerging Mental Health Policy Lab (currently the Office of Policy, Planning and Innovation) and will influence evaluation policy decisions across the agency in a more systematic manner as the new Policy Lab is stood up in January 2018. • SAMHSA's Office of Policy, Planning and Innovation provides policy perspectives and guidance to raise awareness around SAMHSA's research and behavioral health agenda. OPPI also facilitates the adoption of data-driven practices among other federal agencies and partners such as the National Institutes for Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. • At this time, evaluation authority, staff, and resources are decentralized and found throughout the agency. SAMHSA is composed of four Centers, the Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS), the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT), the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) and the Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality (CBHSQ). CMHS, CSAT, and CSAP oversee grantee portfolios and evaluations of those portfolios. Evaluation decisions within SAMHSA are made within each Center specific to their program priorities and resources. Each of the three program Centers uses their program funds for conducting evaluations of varying types. CBHSQ, SAMHSA's research arm, provides varying levels of oversight and guidance to the Centers for evaluation activities. CBHSQ also provides technical assistance related to data collection and analysis to assist in the development of evaluation tools and clearance packages. Within CBHSQ's DEAQ, the Quality, Evaluation, Performance Branch (QEPB) builds internal capacity for "developing more rigorous evaluations conducted" internally and externally to assess the "impact of its behavioral health programs… and treatment measures," and the Analysis and Services Research Branch (ASRB) focuses on effective delivery and financing of health care and services. • SAMHSA evaluations are funded from program funds that are used for service grants, technical assistance, and for evaluation activities. Evaluations have also been funded from recycled funds from grants or other contract activities. Given the broad landscape of evaluation authority and funding, a variety of evaluation models have been implemented. These include recent evaluations funded and managed by the program Centers (e.g., First Episode Psychosis, FEP); evaluations funded by the Centers but directed outside of SAMHSA (e.g., Assisted Outpatient Treatment, AOT), and those that CBHSQ directly funds and executes (e.g., Primary and Behavioral Health Care Integration, PBHCI, and the Cures-funded Opioid State Targeted Response funding). Evaluations require different degrees of independence to ensure objectivity and the models above afford SAMHSA the latitude to enhance evaluation rigor and independence on a customized basis. • In 2016, CBHSQ conducted a summer review of evaluation activities with the program Centers and presented its findings to the SAMHSA Executive Leadership Team (ELT). As a result, SAMHSA revised and finalized a new Evaluation Policy and Procedure (P&P) grounded in an earlier evaluation P&P and is currently developing a Learning Agenda to prioritize activities to address gaps in data collection, data analysis and the identification of evidence based practices in high profile areas (e.g. SMI, SED, Opioids, Marijuana, Suicide, Health Financing, among others.) The new Evaluation P&P requires Centers to identify research questions and appropriately match the type of evaluation to the maturity of the program. A new workgroup, the Cross-Center Evaluation Review Board (CCERB), composed of Center evaluation experts, will now review significant evaluations at critical milestones in the planning and implementation process, providing specific recommendations to the Center Director having the lead for the evaluation. SAMHSA's Cross Center Evaluation Review Board (CCERB) works with the four centers within SAMHSA: CSAP, CMHS, CSAT, and CBHSQ to advise, conduct, collaborate, and coordinate on all evaluation and data collection activities that occur within SAMHSA. CCERB staff provides support for program-specific and administration-wide evaluations. SAMHSA's CMO will also play a key role in reviewing evaluation proposals and clearing final reports.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
1. Leadership: Did the agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them in FY17?	USAID: • USAID's Office of Learning, Evaluation and Research (LER) in the Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning (PPL) provides guidance, tools and technical assistance to USAID staff and partners to support monitoring, evaluation and learning practices, some of which can be found online. The LER Director oversaw approximately 20 staff and an estimated $17 million budget in 2017. • LER, bureaus, and independent offices hold several contracts that USAID missions and offices can use for building staff capacity in monitoring, evaluation and learning, and for commissioning evaluations and monitoring services directly. For example, LER manages the Monitoring and Evaluation Services Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (EVAL-ME IDIQ) contract, which allows USAID missions and Washington Offices, using their own funds, to competitively bid statements of work among 14 pre-approved companies that have been selected for their monitoring and evaluation capabilities, shortening and simplifying the process for contracting an independent evaluation team. LER also manages a classroom training program in monitoring and evaluation for USAID staff. • The LER Director participates in the USAID Administrator's Leadership Council (ALC), a senior level bi-weekly meeting chaired by the USAID Administrator and attended by Assistant Administrators and select Agency Senior Staff, when the agenda includes issues related to evaluation. The LER Director also informs policy decisions across the agency by providing input into working groups and reviewing statements, draft memos and other policy products. • One of LER's primary objectives is to strengthen USAID's capacity in the fields of program monitoring, evaluation, and learning. For example, through a contract commissioned by LER to expand monitoring and evaluation capacity at USAID individual USAID, Offices and Missions can access experts for short term assistance or longer term fellows with expertise in monitoring, evaluation, learning, and project design. Fellows work with a specific mission or office for 6 months to up to 2 years. Another contract managed by LER provides organizational learning support, including helping USAID offices develop learning agendas and use monitoring and evaluation for learning and program adaptation. To build staff capacity in designing or commissioning impact evaluations funded by missions or offices, LER has hosted clinics on Impact Evaluation to provide USAID staff with tools, resources and hands-on support to design an impact evaluation for a future program activity. In addition to providing general capacity-building services in the form of training, clinics, technical assistance, and fellowships, LER staff occasionally manage evaluations directly or participate on evaluation teams for evaluations funded by LER or for those funded by other parts of the Agency. LER also coordinates several cross-agency working groups organized to support Learning champions and monitoring and evaluation specialists throughout the Agency.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Leadership: Did the agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them in FY17?

USED:

- ED's Institute of Education Sciences (IES), with a budget of $605.3 million in FY17, has primary responsibility for education research, evaluation, and statistics. The IES Director is appointed by the President and confirmed by the U.S. Senate, and advises the U.S. Education Secretary on research, evaluation and statistics activities. Four Commissioners support the IES Director, including the Commissioner for the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), who is responsible for planning and overseeing ED's major evaluations. IES employed approximately 180 full-time staff in FY 2017, including approximately 25 staff in NCEE.
- The Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development's (OPEPD) Program and Policy Studies Services (PPSS) has a staff of 20 and serves as the Department's internal analytics office. PPSS conducts short-term evaluations to support continuous improvement of program implementation and works closely with program offices and senior leadership to inform policy decisions with evidence. While some evaluation funding – such as that for Special Education Studies and Evaluations – is appropriated to IES ($10.8 million in FY17), most evaluations are supported by funds appropriated to ED programs. NCEE and PPSS staff work closely with program offices to design program evaluations that reflect program priorities and questions. IES and PPSS provide regular briefings on results to help ensure information can be used by program offices for program improvement.
- IES and PPSS staff collaborate closely through ED's Evidence Planning Group (EPG) with other senior staff from the ED's Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development (OPEPD), including Budget Service, and the Office of Innovation and Improvement (OII). EPG supports programs and advises Department leadership on how evidence can be used to improve Department programs. EPG has coordinated, for example, the development of revised evidence definitions and related selection criteria for competitive grant programs that align with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (P.L. 114-95) (ESSA). EPG has also facilitated cross-office alignment of evidence investments in technical assistance and pooling program funds for evaluations.
- Senior officials from IES, OPEPD, and OII are part of ED's leadership structure. Officials from OPEPD and OII weigh in on major policy decisions. OPEPD leadership plays leading roles in the formation of the Department's annual budget requests, recommendations for grant competition priorities, including evidence, and providing technical assistance to Congress to ensure that evidence informs policy design.

USHUD:

- HUD's Office of Policy Development & Research (PD&R) informs HUD's policy development and implementation by conducting, supporting, and sharing research, surveys, demonstrations, program evaluations, and best practices. PD&R achieves this mission through three interrelated core functions: (1) collecting and analyzing national housing market data (including with the Census Bureau); (2) conducting research, program evaluations, and demonstrations; and (3) providing policy advice and analytic support to the HUD Secretary and program offices. PD&R is led by an Assistant Secretary who oversees six offices, about 149 staff including a team of field economists that work in HUD's 10 regional offices across the country, and a budget of $113 million in FY17. The Assistant Secretary ensures that evidence informs policy development through frequent personal engagement with other principal staff, the Secretary, and external policy officials; HUDstat performance review meetings (see Question #4 below for a description); speeches to policy audiences, sponsorship of public research briefings, and policy implications memoranda. The Assistant Secretary also regularly engages with each HUD program office to ensure that metrics, evaluations, and evidence inform program design, budgeting, and implementation.
- Periodic PD&R meetings with program offices enable PD&R to share knowledge about evaluation progress and program offices to share knowledge about emerging needs for research, evaluation, and demonstrations to advance program policy.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
1. Leadership: Did the agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them in FY17?	**USDOL:** • DOL's Chief Evaluation Officer is a senior official with responsibility for all activities of the Chief Evaluation Office (CEO), and coordination of evaluations Department-wide. In 2016, DOL's Chief Evaluation Officer was converted to a career position, a change which more fully cements the principle of independence and reflects the Department's commitment to institutionalizing an evidence-based culture at DOL. Evaluation results and products are approved and released by the Chief Evaluation Officer (as per the CEO Evaluation Policy), and disseminated in various formats appropriate to practitioners, policymakers, and evaluators. • The CEO includes 15 full-time staff plus a small number of contractors and 1-2 detailees at any given time. This staff level is augmented by staff from research and evaluation units in other DOL agencies. For example, the Employment and Training Administration has 9 FTE's dedicated to research and evaluation activities with which CEO coordinates extensively. CEO staff have expertise in research and evaluation methods as well as in DOL programs and policies and the populations they serve. CEO also employs technical working groups on the majority of evaluation projects whose members have deep technical and subject matter expertise. Further, CEO staff engage and collaborate with program office staff and leadership to interpret research and evaluation findings and to identify their implications for programmatic and policy decisions. • In FY17, the CEO will directly oversee an estimated $40 million in evaluation funding (this includes the direct appropriation, the set aside amount and other funds that come from programmatic accounts where evaluations are co-funded). The $40 million includes the appropriated budget for the Departmental Program Evaluation (over $8 million in FY17) and the Department's evaluation set-aside funds (of up to 0.75% of select department accounts), which will be approximately $24 million in FY17. CEO also collaborates with DOL and other Federal agencies on additional evaluations being carried out by other offices and/or supported by funds appropriated to DOL programs such as Employment and Training Administration (ETA) pilots, demonstrations and research and evaluations of large grant programs including the Performance Partnership Pilots (P3), American Apprenticeship Initiative (AIA), the Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT) Grant Program, and Reentry Programs for Ex-Offenders. • The CEO also participates actively in the performance review process during which each operating agency meets with Department leadership to review progress on performance goals established for the year required under Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). • The CEO's role is to incorporate evidence and evaluation findings as appropriate and to identify knowledge gaps that might be filled by evaluations or convey evidence that can inform policy and program decisions or performance. DOL's Chief Evaluation Officer and senior staff are part DOL's leadership structure and weigh in on major program and policy decisions and play a role in the formation of the DOL's agencies' annual budget requests, recommendations around including evidence in grant competitions, and providing technical assistance to the Department leadership to ensure that evidence informs policy design. There are a number of mechanisms set up to facilitate this: CEO participates in quarterly performance meetings with DOL leadership and the Performance Management Center (PMS); CEO reviews agency operating plans and works with agencies and the PMS to coordinate performance targets and measures and evaluations findings; Quarterly meetings are held with agency leadership and staff as part of the Learning Agenda process; and meetings are held as needed to strategize around addressing new priorities or legislative requirements.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY17?

ACF:

- ACF's evaluation policy addresses the principles of rigor, relevance, transparency, independence, and ethics and requires ACF program, evaluation, and research staff to collaborate. For example, the policy states, "ACF program offices will consult with OPRE in developing evaluation activities." And, "There must be strong partnerships among evaluation staff, program staff, policy-makers and service providers." ACF established its Evaluation Policy in November 2012, and published it in the Federal Register in August 2014.
- ACF's Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) proposes an evaluation plan to the Assistant Secretary each year in areas in which Congress has provided authority and funding to conduct research and evaluation.
- ACF's annual portfolio reviews describe recent work and ongoing learning agendas in the areas of family self-sufficiency, child and family development, and family strengthening, including work related to child welfare, child care, Head Start, Early Head Start, strengthening families, teen pregnancy prevention and youth development, home visiting, self-sufficiency, welfare and employment. Examples include findings from Head Start CARES; the BIAS project; multiple reports from the first nationally representative study of early care and education in over 20 years; early findings on the Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting program; and a report on challenges and opportunities in using administrative data for evaluation.
- ACF's evaluation policy requires that "ACF will release evaluation results regardless of findings...Evaluation reports will present comprehensive findings, including favorable, unfavorable, and null findings. ACF will release evaluation results timely – usually within two months of a report's completion." ACF has publicly released the findings of all completed evaluations to date. In 2016, OPRE released nearly 100 publications.

CNCS:

- CNCS has an evaluation policy that presents 5 key principles that govern the agency's planning, conduct, and use of program evaluations: rigor, relevance, transparency, independence, and ethics.
- CNCS has an evaluation plan/learning agenda that is updated annually based on input from agency leadership as well as from emerging evidence from completed studies. This agenda is reflected in the CNCS Congressional Budget Justifications each year (see Fiscal Year 2016 (pp. 55-56) and Fiscal Year 2017 (pp. 5-6, 55-56)).
- The CNCS Office of Research and Evaluation has built a portfolio of evidence around the agency's mission and its programs through research studies conducted by university-based scholars, program evaluations conducted by independent third parties, agency performance metrics, and analyses of nationally representative statistics. A report synthesizing findings from FY16 and early FY17 may be found here. In terms of the agency's research and learning agenda for Fiscal Year 2017 and beyond, there are a few examples worth noting. Two projects – Building Evidence for Service Solutions and Scaling Evidence Based Models – each have project periods of 5 years (a base year with up to 4 option years) and reflect the goal of learning across agency programs and systematically building evidence where there is little or none and bringing to scale effective models as demonstrated through scientific evidence. Similarly, the agency's second Research Grant competition builds on the first cohort of grantees (3 year study periods) and encourages knowledge building around the agency's mission and its programs.
- CNCS creates four types of reports for public release: research reports produced directly by research and evaluation staff, research conducted by third party research firms and overseen by research and evaluation staff, reports produced by CNCS-funded research grantees, and evaluation reports submitted by CNCS-funded program grantees. All reports completed and cleared internally are posted to the Evidence Exchange, an electronic repository for reports. This virtual repository was launched in September 2015. Since it launched, a total of 79 research reports have been made available to the public (eight in FY15; 43 in FY16; and 28 in FY17 thus far.)
- In FY16 CNCS developed Evaluation Core Curriculum Courses which are presented to its grantees through a webinar series and is available on the CNCS website along with other evaluation resources. The courses are designed to help grantees and other stakeholders easily access materials to aid in conducting or managing program evaluations. In addition to these courses, R & E staff hosted workshops for all 4 regional (staff) trainings in FY17 that focused on how to apply findings from research and evaluation studies to daily operations (i.e., AmeriCorps and Senior Corps programs).

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/ learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY17?	MCC: • In March 2017, MCC published a revised Policy for Monitoring and Evaluation that further codifies MCC's experience ensuring all programs develop and follow comprehensive Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) plans that adhere to MCC's standards. Further, this new policy ensures MCC alignment with the recently passed Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016. The monitoring component of the M&E Plan lays out the methodology and process for assessing progress towards Compact (i.e., grant) objectives. It identifies indicators, establishes performance targets, and details the data collection and reporting plan to track progress against targets on a quarterly basis. The evaluation component identifies and describes the evaluations that will be conducted, the key evaluation questions and methodologies, and the data collection strategies that will be employed. Pursuant to MCC's M&E policy, every project must undergo an independent evaluation to assess MCC's impact. Once evaluation reports are finalized, they are published on the MCC Evaluation Catalog. To date, 78 interim and final reports have been publicly released, with several additional evaluations expected to be completed and released in the coming months. MCC also produces periodic reports for internal and external consumption on results and learning, and holds agency-wide sessions that help to translate evaluation results into lessons learned for future compact development. • MCC extended its efforts to facilitate open access to its de-identified evaluation data by expanding the number of documented evaluations to 120 studies, and by documenting the procedures it has established to ensure both confidentiality protections and the usefulness of these public data. These procedures were developed to ensure a consistent approach across all of MCC's evaluation data to balancing the dual objectives of protecting the survey respondents' confidentiality while maintaining acceptable levels of comparability to the original data. MCC posted a public access version of its Microdata Documentation and De-Identification Guidelines on its website in February 2017 to provide guidance to those preparing and using its public access evaluation data. And in March 2017 MCC published a paper that details the processes MCC has established and discusses key lessons learned in seeking to achieve a consistent, optimal balance between benefits and risks when releasing evaluation data to the public. • For fiscal year 2017, MCC has pursued a robust research and learning agenda around better use of its data and evidence for programmatic impact. Broadly, the Department for Policy and Evaluation is focused on learning around MCC's promotion of policy and institutional reforms (PIR). This includes analytical efforts around cost-benefit analysis of PIR, implementation modalities of PIR, and the sustainability of PIR as a result of MCC compacts. After a sustained learning agenda around its evaluations, this year the M&E division is focused on the use of its monitoring data for real-time learning within compacts. They are seeking to better understand how and when monitoring data are used and how its results can feed back into compact decisions. Finally, the newly launched Star Report is an Agency-wide learning effort to systematically capture how and why compacts achieved certain results. The Star Report includes learning formal inflection points at each stage of the compact – development, implementation, and closure – to promote and disseminate learning and evidence for compacts in implementation and future compacts.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY17?	SAMHSA: • SAMHSA's Evaluation Policy and Procedure (P&P), revised and approved in May 2017, provides guidance across the agency regarding all program evaluations. Specifically, the Evaluation P&P describes the demand for rigor, compliance with ethical standards, and compliance with privacy requirements for all program evaluations conducted and funded by the agency. The Evaluation P&P serves as the agency's formal evaluation plan and includes a new process for the public release of final evaluation reports, including findings from evaluations deemed significant. The Evaluation P&P sets the framework for planning, monitoring, and disseminating findings from significant evaluations. • Results from significant evaluations will be available on SAMHSA's website, a new step SAMHSA is taking with its newly-approved Evaluation P&P, starting in the Fall of 2017. Significant evaluations include those that have been identified by the Center Director as providing compelling information and results that can be used to make data driven, evidence-based, and informed decisions about behavioral health programs and policy. The following criteria is used to determine whether an evaluation is significant: 1) whether the evaluation was mandated by Congress; 2) whether there are high priority needs in states and communities; 3) whether the evaluation is for a new or congressionally-mandated program; 4) the extent to which the program is linked to key agency initiatives; 5) the level of funding; 6) the level of interest from internal and external stakeholders; and 7) the potential to inform practice, policy, and/or budgetary decision-making. • CBHSQ is currently leading agency-wide efforts to build SAMHSA's learning agenda. Via this process, we have developed agency-wide Learning Agenda templates in the critical topic areas of opioids, serious mental illness, serious emotional disturbance, suicide, health economics and financing, and marijuana; learning agendas focused on other key topic areas such as alcohol are underway as well. Other topics, such as cross-cutting issues related to vulnerable populations, are interwoven through these research plans. Through this multi-phased process, CBHSQ is systematically collecting information from across the agency regarding research and analytic activities, analyzing and organizing this information into a guiding framework to be used for decision-making related to priorities and resource allocation. SAMHSA began this process in early 2017 and plans to complete it in the winter of 2018. SAMHSA has developed a template for the issue of opioid abuse, the first topic we tackled in this effort and thus the most complete at this point in time and has been used in determining research questions along with the current activities underway across the agency that are relevant to these areas. The template follows the construct outlined by OMB in the publication entitled Analytical Perspectives; Budget of the U.S. Government; Fiscal Year 2018. • SAMHSA's Data Integrity Statement outlines how CBHSQ adheres to federal guidelines designed to ensure the quality, integrity, and credibility of statistical activities. • SAMHSA's National Behavioral Health Quality Framework, aligned with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' National Quality Strategy, is a framework to assist providers, facilities, payers, and communities better track and report the quality of behavioral health care. Through this framework, SAMHSA "proposes a set of core measures to be used in a variety of settings and programs, as well as in the evaluation and quality assurance efforts." These metrics are focused primarily on high-rate behavioral health events such as depression, alcohol misuse, and tobacco cessation, all of which impact health and health care management and thus affect a large swath of the U.S. population.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY17?	USAID: • USAID has an agency-wide Evaluation Policy published in 2011, which was updated in October 2016 to reflect revisions made to USAID's Automated Directives System (ADS) Chapter 201: Program Cycle Operational Policy, released in September 2016. The policy updates changed evaluation requirements to simplify implementation and increase the breadth of evaluation coverage. The updates also seek to strengthen evaluation dissemination and utilization. The agency released a report in 2016 to mark the five-year anniversary of the policy. • All final USAID evaluation reports are available on the Development Experience Clearinghouse except for a small number of evaluations that are not. For FY2015 and FY2016, USAID has created infographics that show where evaluations took place, across which sectors, and include short narratives that describe findings from selected evaluations and how that information informed decision-making. • USAID field missions are required to have an evaluation plan, and all USAID missions and offices provide an internal report on an annual basis on completed, ongoing and planned evaluations, including evaluations planned to start anytime in the next three fiscal years. • All Washington Bureaus may develop annual evaluation action plans that review evaluation quality and use within the Bureau, and identify challenges and the priorities for the year ahead, including support to Missions. LER works with bureau M&E points-of-contact to review implementation of these action plans on a quarterly basis and provides support as appropriate and feasible. LER uses the evaluation action plans as a source for Agency-wide sharing of successes and challenges to improving evaluation quality and use. • Given USAID's decentralized structure, individual programs, offices, bureaus and missions may develop learning agendas to guide their research and evaluation efforts. USAID's current learning agenda efforts are decentralized and vary in focus, centering on regions, technical areas (e.g. democracy and governance, health systems, and food security), or cross-cutting efforts. In March 2017, LER published a report titled, "Learning Agenda Landscape Analysis" which provides a summary of 19 learning agendas across USAID and compiles promising practices for developing and using learning agendas. Learning agendas enable USAID to identify knowledge gaps and identify how monitoring, evaluation, field research, and other learning activities can be designed to fill those gaps, thereby generating evidence that - when coupled with adaptive management practices - improves decision-making and facilitates continuous organizational improvement. • LER is in the process of developing a learning agenda to answer a few priority questions on how Program Cycle policy requirements are being perceived and implemented across the Agency. The answers to those questions will help USAID better target capacity building support to staff and partners for more effective programs and may inform future updates to the policy. • All final USAID evaluation reports are available on the Development Experience Clearinghouse except for approximately five percent of evaluations completed each year that are not public due to principled exceptions to the presumption in favor of openness guided by OMB Bulletin 12-01 Guidance on Collection of U.S. Foreign Assistance Data. For FY2015 and FY2016, USAID began to visualize where evaluations took place and across which sectors. The graphic also includes short narratives that describe findings from selected evaluations and how that information informed decision-making. • Beginning in 2016, USAID's Office of Policy, within PPL, began conducting assessments of the implementation of the Agency's suite of development policies to understand how a policy has impacted Agency programming and processes. So far two assessments have been completed, examining implementation of the Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy and the Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance Strategy; and two more policies are undergoing assessment: the Development Response to Violent Extremism and Insurgency Policy and the Youth in Development Policy. • Since September 2016, USAID multi-year Country Development Cooperation Strategies now require a learning plan that outlines how missions will incorporate learning into their programming, including activities like regular portfolio reviews, evaluation recommendation tracking and dissemination plans, and other analytic processes to better understand the dynamics of their programs and their country contexts. In addition to mission strategic plans, all projects and activities are now also required to have integrated monitoring, evaluation, and learning plans.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY17?	**USED:** • ED has a scientific integrity policy to ensure that all scientific activities (including research, development, testing, and evaluation) conducted and supported by ED are of the highest quality and integrity, and can be trusted by the public and contribute to sound decision-making. The policy may be accessed here. • IES, and PPSS, in concert with the EPG, work with program offices and ED leadership on the development of ED's annual evaluation plan. This plan is implemented through ED's annual spending plan process. • In addition, IES prepares and submits to Congress a 2-year biennial, forward-looking evaluation plan covering all mandated and discretionary evaluations of education programs funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (P.L. 114-95) (ESSA). IES and PPSS work with programs to understand their priorities, design appropriate studies to answer the questions being posed, and share results from relevant evaluations to help with program improvement. This serves as a research and learning agenda for ED. • ED's FY 2016 Annual Performance Report and FY 2018 Annual Performance Plan includes a list of ED's current evaluations, organized by subject matter area. IES publicly releases findings from all of its completed, peer-reviewed evaluations on the IES website and also in the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). IES announces all new evaluation findings to the public via a Newsflash and through social media. Finally, IES regularly conducts briefings on its evaluations for ED, the Office of Management and Budget, Congressional staff, and the public. • Finally, IES manages the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) program, which supports districts, states, and boards of education throughout the United States to use research and evaluation in decision making. The research priorities are determined locally, but IES approves the studies and reviews the final products. All REL studies are made publicly available on the IES website. **USHUD:** • HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) has published an evaluation policy that establishes core principles and practices of PD&R's evaluation and research activities. The six core principles are rigor, relevance, transparency, independence, ethics, and technical innovation. • PD&R's evaluation policy guides HUD's research planning efforts, known as research roadmapping. Key features of research roadmapping include reaching out to internal and external stakeholders through a participatory approach; making research planning systematic, iterative, and transparent; driving a learning agenda by focusing on research questions that are timely, forward-looking, policy-relevant, and leverage HUD's comparative advantages and partnership opportunities; and aligning research with HUD's strategic goals and areas of special focus. HUD also employs its role as convener to help establish frameworks for evidence, metrics, and future research. • HUD's original "Research Roadmap FY14-FY18" and "Research Roadmap: 2017 Update" constitute the core of HUD's learning agenda. The roadmaps are strategic, five-year plans for priority program evaluations and research to be pursued given a sufficiently robust level of funding. PD&R also integrated its evaluation plan into HUD's FY14-FY18 Strategic Plan (see pp. 57-63) to strengthen the alignment between evaluation and performance management. During FY16, PD&R used similar principles and methods to refresh the Roadmap to address emerging research topics. PD&R's fiscal year budget requests include annual research plans drawn from the Roadmap. Actual research activities are substantially determined by Congressional funding and guidance. • The Research Roadmap serves as a long-term evaluation plan and the core of HUD's learning agenda. HUD also develops annual evaluation plans, consisting of a list of specific research priorities, as requested by Congress. • PD&R's policy (p.87950) is to publish and disseminate all evaluations that meet standards of methodological rigor in a timely fashion. Additionally, PD&R includes language in research and evaluation contracts that allows researchers to independently publish results, even without HUD approval, after not more than 6 months. PD&R has occasionally declined to publish reports that fell short of standards for methodological rigor. Completed evaluations and research are summarized in HUD's Annual Performance Report (see pp.123–131) at the end of each fiscal year, and reports are posted on PD&R's website, HUDUSER.gov.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
2. Evaluation and Research: Did the agency have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s) and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations in FY17?	USDOL: • DOL has an Evaluation Policy Statement that formalizes the principles that govern all program evaluations in the Department, including methodological rigor, independence, transparency, ethics, and relevance. In addition, the Chief Evaluation Office publicly communicates the standards and methods expected in DOL evaluations in formal procurement statements of work. • DOL also develops, implements, and publicly releases an annual Evaluation Plan (i.e., Department-level learning agenda) which includes planned projects with each of DOL's operating agencies. Agency learning agendas, developed by CEO in partnership with each operating agency, form the basis for the DOL's Evaluation Plan. The 2016 Evaluation Plan was posted in the Federal Register. The 2017 plan will be posted on the CEO website once finalized before the end of the fiscal year. • Once contracts are awarded for new evaluation studies, they are posted on the Current Studies page of CEO's website for the public to see everything currently underway as well as timelines for study completion and publication of results. • All DOL reports and findings are publicly released and posted on the complete reports section of CEO website. The Chief Evaluation Officer has the "authority to approve, release, and disseminate evaluation reports" (as per the DOL Evaluation Policy). DOL agencies also post and release their own research and evaluation reports.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY17?
 	
(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)
	ACF:
	• In FY17, ACF plans to spend $162 million on evaluations, representing 0.3% of ACF's $56.5 billion budget in FY17 (in addition to investments in evaluations by ACF grantees). This spending includes a $30 million increase in welfare research funds appropriated by Congress. The amount of ACF's spending on evaluation is largely determined by Congress. For example, in FY 2017, Congress designated 0.33% of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant for research, evaluation, and technical assistance.
	
	CNCS:
	• CNCS plans to spend a total of $6.3 million, representing .6% of CNCS's $1 billion budget in FY17, on evaluation and evaluation capacity building activities (R&E evaluation and program funds combined), including:
	   • $540,375 of FY17 evaluation funds will be awarded in grants to universities that focus on the economic and social outcomes of the AmeriCorps program (continuation dollars);
	   • $1,617,525 of FY17 AmeriCorps funds have been awarded in Commission Investment Fund grants for building commission capacity to support grantees (formula grantees) in the areas of evaluation and performance measurement;
	   • $3.14 million of FY17 Senior Corps funds will be spent on evaluation and evidence-building activities (representing 1.6 percent of Senior Corps' $202.11 million FY17 budget); and
	   • $1,000,797.70 of FY17 evaluation funds have been awarded for AmeriCorps grantee evaluation capacity building.
	MCC:
	• MCC's FY17 investment in monitoring and evaluation to date is $15.1 million, which amounts to 5% of Compact spending for FY17 ($302.5 million). This investment exceeds the FY16 spending in which MCC invested over $14.4 million in M&E, roughly 3.4% of Compact spending for FY16 ($428.2 million).
	
	SAMSHA:
	• SAMHSA will have spent $31.5 million on sixteen evaluations by the end of FY2017. This represents .8 percent of SAMHSA's $3.78 billion budget appropriated for FY2016.
	
	USAID:
	• In FY 2016, USAID missions and offices reported completing 145 evaluations with resources totaling approximately $49 million and managing another 323 ongoing evaluations, many that span more than one year, with total ongoing budgets estimated to reach $201 million. Overall spending on evaluations completed or ongoing in FY16 ($250 million) represents about 1.1% of USAID's $23 billion FY16 program budget.
	• This amount does not include the budget for the Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research which primarily focuses on monitoring, evaluation, and learning capacity building and technical assistance ($16 million FY 2016) or the investment in the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) ($189 million total in FY13-FY18) or surveys funded by other sector programs that often make up some of the underlying data used in many evaluations.

RESULTS FOR AMERICA

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY17? *(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)*	USED: • Overall spending on evaluation ($144 million in FY16) and evaluation technical assistance and capacity-building ($58 million in FY16) represents 0.4% of ED's $45.6 billion discretionary budget (without Pell Grants) in FY16. (FY17 estimates are forthcoming.) This total includes impact studies, implementation studies, rapid cycle evaluations, evaluation technical assistance, and capacity-building funded through IES and OII. • ED spent about $144 million on program evaluations in FY16, including funding evaluation projects under IES' research grant programs. It is important to note that the timing of evaluation projects and the type of research projects proposed by the field results in year-to-year fluctuations in this amount, and does not reflect a change in ED's commitment to evaluation. • It is worth noting that much of ED's investment in evaluation is directed toward supporting states and school districts so that they can conduct studies of their own education policies and programs. For example, IES runs annual grant competitions to support researcher-practitioner partnerships between state and local education officials and research institutions, including a new program for low-cost, short duration evaluations. IES also provides large grants to states to develop longitudinal data systems for purposes of tracking students through the educational system and conducting state-sponsored evaluations. (To date 47 states have received IES funding for this purpose.) Finally, the Regional Education Laboratories provide extensive technical assistance on evaluation and support research alliances that conduct implementation and impact studies on education policies and programs in ten geographic regions of the U.S., covering all states, territories, and the District of Columbia. • OII emphasizes evaluation and the building of evidence in a number of its grant programs through requirements that grantees conduct or participate in evaluations. This emphasis on evaluation continues even for programs supported by an existing evidence base, as the evaluation design for these programs looks at impact with new settings, different populations, and project-specific implementation. In many instances, during grant competitions, this evaluation criterion is reviewed and scored by evaluation experts familiar with the What Works Clearinghouse standards, ensuring proposed evaluation plans are of the appropriate design and rigor. Additionally, a number of OII programs dedicate resources to evaluation technical assistance and program level evaluations. The Investing in Innovation (i3) and the Supporting Effective Educator Development programs utilize technical assistance contractors that support grantees in the design and implementation of their project-level evaluations, as well as the development of evaluation resources that are now being shared publicly on the What Works Clearinghouse and program websites. • IES and OII grantees are expected to make the results of their evaluations public through Education Resources Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) and other grant-funded dissemination activities. In addition, all impact evaluations funded by IES and OII are reviewed by the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), which plays a major role in summarizing and disseminating findings from the most rigorous studies to ED and the broader field. • In addition, some programs encourage their grantees to conduct project-level evaluations. One of the key lessons from the Investing in Innovation program (i3) has been that high-quality technical assistance for grantees on project-level evaluations is critical to producing credible information on project outcomes. In FY16 i3 invested more than $4 million of its appropriation in evaluation technical assistance, and the Regional Educational Laboratories continued to provide States and districts with technical assistance on evaluations and data use – virtually no other competitive grant programs at ED have the authority or means to fund such a robust vehicle for technical assistance. ED is working to identify and align its technical assistance efforts on the use of evidence in education at the state and local level. • ED has an opportunity to significantly increase its annual investment in program evaluation through the reauthorized ESEA pooled evaluation authority, which makes available up to $40 million annually from ESEA programs funded by Congress that can be used to evaluate any ESEA program included in the biennial evaluation plan prepared by IES.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
3. Resources: Did the agency invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations in FY17? *(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)*	**USHUD:** • In FY17, HUD plans to spend $89 million on evaluations, representing 0.19% of HUD's $48 billion discretionary budget in FY17. • For FY17, Congress appropriated $89 million for the Office of Policy Development and Research's (PD&R's) Research & Technology account, including $50 million for core research activities; $16 million for research, evaluations, and demonstrations; and $23 million for technical assistance. The total represents an FY17 investment in evaluations and evidence amounting to 0.19 percent of HUD's $48 billion gross discretionary budget authority for FY17. The funding for core research is used primarily for the American Housing Survey, other surveys, and data acquisition that indirectly support evaluation of HUD's mission activities in domains such as affordable housing and housing finance. • PD&R's FY17 appropriation of $24 million for Salaries and Expenses also supports evidence in the form of PD&R's in-house research and evaluation program, economic analyses, data linkage initiatives, and management of housing surveys and contract research and evaluation. **USDOL:** • In FY 17, DOL's CEO will directly oversee an estimated $40 million in evaluation funding. This represents approximately 0.3% of DOL's FY17 discretionary budget of $12.8 billion. However in addition to this, many DOL evaluations are supported by funds appropriated to DOL programs and/or are carried out by other offices within DOL. For example, in addition to CEO, most agencies and program offices conduct and support evaluation activities with their dollars. Further, several DOL agencies also have separate evaluation appropriations. DOL studies funded through individual agencies and program offices also coordinate with DOL's CEO. DOL's Chief Evaluation Office directly funds evaluations and also combines CEO funds with agency funds to jointly sponsor some evaluations. • In many areas where DOL is undertaking evaluation activities, the evaluation budget far exceeds 1% of the budget for the program (e.g., the budgets for the evaluations of a number of recent grant programs are between 3% and 5% of the programmatic budget). • The Administration's FY14-FY17 budget requests recommended allowing the U.S. Secretary of Labor to set aside up to 1% of all operating agencies' budgets for evaluations, coordinated by CEO. In FYs 2012-2015, Congress authorized the Secretary to set aside up to 0.5% of these funds for evaluations, in addition to the separate evaluation funds that exist in many DOL agencies. In FY16 and FY17, Congress authorized DOL to set aside up to 0.75% of operating agency budgets for use by CEO for evaluations. • The development of States' capacity to conduct evaluations is a long-range and iterative process. Significant resources are dedicated to aiding these efforts through various forms of technical assistance and guidance. A primary goal initially will be to enhance capacity by building knowledge among State staff regarding various methodologies, approaches for enlisting expertise, and the potential role of evaluations and research in meeting State goals and priorities. During FY17, ETA hosted three National Convenings in Washington, DC, Dallas TX, and San Diego, CA. ETA included sessions on Research and Evaluation under WIOA in coordination with the performance accountability sessions. More technical assistance is planned. • In order to support the workforce system in being prepared to meet evaluation and reporting requirements under their WIOA grants, DOL has invested in evaluation and evaluation capacity-building activities, including: (1) DOL has launched a Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act implementation study to document and describe how critical state activities under WIOA are being implemented, particularly the core programs in titles I and III, and identify possibly areas on which further technical assistance, guidance, or policies might be needed in order to help states implement the law. The WIOA state implementation study will build on both past and ongoing studies, including: 1) the ongoing random assignment evaluation of the adult and dislocated worker programs under the Workforce Investment Act, 2) studies involving data analytics on workforce program services, 3) an ongoing institutional analysis of AJCs, and 4) an ongoing study on AJC customer experiences. (2) In response to the WIOA's requirement to measure effectiveness in serving employers as a primary indicator of performance, DOL is piloting three approaches designed to gauge three critical workforce needs of the business community: (1) Retention with the same employer; (2) Repeat business customers; and (3) Employer Penetration Rate. States must select two of the three approaches to pilot, and may develop an additional State-specific approach. DOL will evaluate State experiences with the various approaches and plan to identify a standardized indicator that the Departments anticipate will be implemented no later than the beginning of Program Year 2019.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals and aligned program objectives and measures, and did it frequently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other dimensions of performance in FY17?

ACF:
- ACF's performance management framework focuses on outcomes and aims for coordinated and results-oriented management and operations across all ACF programs.
- ACF aims to develop performance measures that are meaningful and can be used by program managers, leadership, outside stakeholders, and Congress to assess and communicate progress. Results for these metrics are reported annually in the ACF Congressional Budget Justification. ACF reports on 150 performance measures (90 outcome measures and 60 output measures) in the FY18 Congressional Budget Justification.
- ACF is an active participant in the HHS Strategic Review process, an annual assessment of progress on key performance measures. In addition, ACF participated in data-driven reviews as part of the Agency Priority Goal process, including face-to-face meetings between agency and Department leadership to examine performance. Finally, individual ACF programs regularly analyze and use performance data, administrative data, and evaluation data to improve performance. During 2017 ACF is participating in the development of HHS's FY 2018–2022 strategic plan, which will include ACF-specific objectives.

CNCS:
- CNCS's performance management framework is described in the Congressional Budget Justification for Fiscal Year 2016 (p.3) and Fiscal Year 2017 (p.6).
- CNCS has a focused set of Agency-Wide Priority Measures derived from the 2011-2015 Strategic Plan. Every CNCS Program contributes to the Agency-Wide Priority Measures. There are also specific grantee/sponsor measures that roll up into the Agency-Wide Priority Measures, which can be found in the Agency-Wide Priority Measures chart. Grantees are required to select at least one national performance measure, and they are required to report performance measures data annually. CNCS encourages grantees to use these measure for continuous program improvement. CNCS uses the agency-wide priority measures to assess its own progress toward attaining the goals and objectives of its strategic plan.
- New metrics ("Fast Facts") were developed in FY17 to provide stakeholders, including government representatives and the public, with clear metrics on how and to what degree CNCS programs get things done for America. Together, Fast Facts provides a meaningful picture of our core activities and investments, as it aligns with the CNCS Mission. These are expected to be released for the first time in FY17.
- Additionally, CNCS produces state profile reports, which provide a picture of agency resources in each state at a given point. These reports contain a number of priority indicators, including the number of participants engaged in national service activities as well as the amount of non-CNCS resources generated by the agency's programs. Along with its stakeholders, CNCS uses this information to understand the capacity of service available in different geographic regions and discuss related implications with key service partners.
- CNCS's Chief Operating Officer (COO) has been piloting a proof of concept performance management framework that aligns with GPRA since the fourth quarter of FY16, which is notable since CNCS is not subject to GPRA requirements. The COO pilot will help inform an update to the agency's strategic plan and performance framework as part of its response to Executive Order 13781 and related Administration guidance to federal agency heads, which focus on making agencies more efficient, effective, and accountable.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals and aligned program objectives and measures, and did it frequently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other dimensions of performance in FY17?

MCC:
- MCC monitors progress towards compact results on a quarterly basis using performance indicators that are specified in each Compact's M&E Plans. The M&E Plans specify indicators at all levels (process, output, and outcome) so that progress towards final results can be tracked. Every quarter each partner country submits an Indicator Tracking Table (ITT) that shows actual performance of each indicator relative to the baseline level that was established before the activity began and the performance targets that were established in the M&E Plan. Key performance indicators and their accompanying data by country are updated every quarter and published online. MCC reviews this data every quarter to assess whether results are being achieved and integrates this information into project management decisions.
- MCC also supports the creation of multidisciplinary 'compact development teams' to manage the development and implementation of each Compact program. Teams usually include the following members: Coordinator, economist, private sector development specialist, social inclusion and gender integration specialist, technical specialists (project specific), M&E specialist, environmental and social performance specialist, Legal, and financial management and procurement specialists. From the earliest stages, these teams develop project logics and M&E frameworks supported by data and evidence, and use them to inform the development of the projects within each Compact program. Teams meet frequently to gather evidence, discuss progress, make project design decisions, and solve problems. They are encouraged to use the lessons from completed evaluations to inform their work going forward.
- MCC is in the process of implementing a new reporting system that will enhance MCC's credibility around results, transparency, and accountability. The "Star Report" captures key information that will provide a framework for results and improve the reporting process for compact lifecycles. For each compact, systematic evidence will be collected on performance indicators, evaluation results, partnerships, sustainability efforts, and learning, among other elements; and critically, this information will all be available in one report. Through this new reporting system, MCC will be able to provide better reporting of compact performance to public audiences, such as Congress, other development agencies, and the academic community. Each compact will have a Star Report published roughly three months after completion. The next MCC compact to close under this new system will be Cabo Verde in November 2017.
- MCC hosts regular "colleges" in which MCC counterparts from partner countries are invited to a weeklong set of meetings and workshops to discuss best practices, strengthen collaboration, and improve strategies for effectively implementing projects. MCC held such an event in March 2017 focused on Monitoring & Evaluation and Economic Analysis. Thirty-nine M&E Directors and Economists were in attendance from 23 partner countries, in addition to MCC staff and colleagues representing other USG agencies. MCC also hosts "colleges" for MCC and MCA staff in areas of sector expertise at which M&E staff present results of recent evaluations in the sector as a learning opportunity.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals and aligned program objectives and measures, and did it frequently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other dimensions of performance in FY17?	**SAMHSA:** • In 2016, SAMHSA's Office of Financial Resources (OFR) established a Program Integrity Review Team (PIRT) staffed by representatives from each of its four Centers and managed by OFR. On a quarterly basis, three SAMHSA discretionary grant portfolios (one from each of the three program Centers) conduct a self-analysis to examine grantee performance based on objective performance data, financial performance and other factors. Program staff present their program self-assessments to the PIRT and receive feedback on, for example, targets of concern. In one instance, grantees were surpassing their targets by 200-300%, resulting in the board suggesting that the targets be re-examined as appropriate for these high-performing grantees. In addition, the Centers have historically managed internal performance review boards to periodically review grantee performance and provide corrective actions as needed. • A new unified data collection system, SAMHSA's Performance Accountability & Reporting Systems (SPARS), was put into place in early 2017. Historically, the three program Centers had independent data collection systems that did not allow for global reviews of agency activities. The new system allows for greater transparency about grantee performance across Centers. SAMHSA aligns program objectives and measures through its utilization of SPARS, SAMHSA's online data entry, reporting, technical assistance request, and training system for grantees to report timely and accurate data. SPARS is a mechanism by which SAMHSA meets requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010. • SAMHSA's strategic plan _Leading Change 2.0: Advancing the Behavioral Health of the Nation 2015–2018_ outlines six strategic initiatives for fiscal years 2015-2018. These initiatives are linked to SAMHSA's policy, programmatic, and financial planning that support innovative, evidence-based practices that show promising results and best expertise and knowledge around treatment and prevention of mental health and behavioral challenges for a variety of stakeholders (see p. 5). • Pursuant to the 21st Century Cures Act, SAMHSA is required to establish standards for grant programs that, among other factors, addresses the extent to which grantees must collect and report on required performance measures, and SAMHSA must advance the use of performance metrics recommended both by the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) (Sec. 6002, pp. 464-465) and the Director of CBHSQ (Sec. 6004, p. 470). In addition, SAMHSA's Chief Medical Officer is required to coordinate with ASPE to assess the use of performance metrics in evaluation activities, and coordinate with the Assistance Secretary to ensure programs consistently utilize appropriate performance metrics and evaluation designs (Sec. 6003, p. 468). The Assistant Secretary must also submit a biennial report to Congress that assesses the extent to which its programs and activities meet goals and appropriate performance measures (Sec. 6006, p. 477). **USAID:** • USAID partners with the U.S. Department of State to jointly develop and implement clear strategic goals and objectives. Indicators measuring progress on strategic goals and objectives from across the Agency are collected, in part, through the Performance Plan Report (PPR) and reported through the Annual Performance Report (APR). In FY2016, USAID and the U.S. Department of State's annual reporting system, FACTS Info, and processes were redesigned to improve data collection and ease of data use for continuous improvement. • USAID's Performance Improvement Officer (PIO) leads Agency efforts to use data for decision-making and improve performance and operational efficiency and effectiveness. Angelique M. Crumbly serves as the USAID Performance Improvement Officer. The PIO coordinates tracking of Cross Agency Priority (CAP) and Agency Priority Goal (APG) progress; leverages performance management reviews to conduct deep-dives into evidence; and oversees business process reviews and other assessments to ensure that the Agency more efficiently and effectively achieves its mission and goals. • USAID's strategic plan, annual performance plan and report, and other performance reports are publicly available. USAID and the U.S. Department of State are in the process of developing the Joint Strategic Plan for FY18 - FY22. The most recent reports are: Agency Financial Report (APR) and Annual Performance Report (APR).

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals and aligned program objectives and measures, and did it frequently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other dimensions of performance in FY17?	USAID (cont):
	
	• USAID is actively engaged in the President's Management Council which is developing the next generation of CAP goals. USAID reports on APG and CAP goals on www.performance.gov. These goals help the Agency improve performance, efficiency, and effectiveness, while holding the Agency accountable to the public. USAID assesses progress and challenges toward meeting the goals quarterly during data-driven reviews with Agency leadership. USAID will develop new APGs as part of the FY 2018-2022 Joint Strategic Plan.
	• USAID field missions develop Country Development Cooperation Strategies (CDCS) with clear goals and objectives and a performance management plan that identifies expected results, performance indicators to measure those results, plans for data collection and analysis, and periodic review of performance measures to use data and evidence to adapt programs for improved outcomes.
	• In addition to measuring program performance, USAID measures operations performance management to ensure that the Agency achieves its development objectives and aligns resources with priorities.
	
	USED:
	• ED develops a four-year strategic plan and holds quarterly data-driven progress reviews of the goals and objectives established in the plan, as required by the Government Performance and Results Act Modernization Act (GPRAMA) of 2010. ED's FY14-18 Strategic Plan includes a goal on the continuous improvement of the United States education system with objectives focused on enhancing the use of data, research, evaluation, and technology (see pp. 37-43 of the Strategic Plan). GPRMA also requires agencies to develop agency priority goals (APGs) and submit information on those goals to OMB on a quarterly basis. APGs reflect the top near-term performance priorities that agency leadership aims to accomplish within a two-year period. ED established an APG on enabling evidence-based decision-making. Strategic objective 5.3 in the Department's current four-year strategic plan, which is part of the continuous improvement goal referenced above, includes the metrics for the evidence APG. The Department's FY 2016 Annual Performance Report and FY 2018 Annual Performance Plan includes the FY 2016 performance results for the APG and strategic objective 5.3. Although many of the metrics in the strategic plan are annual, the Department uses the quarterly reviews to discuss data available and milestones achieved.
	• In addition, ED has emphasized continuous improvement in evidence-based decision-making among States and districts. In 2016, ED released non-regulatory guidance, Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments, which recommends a five-step decision-making process to promote continuous improvement and improvement and support better outcomes for students. This guidance has served as a framework for the ED's technical assistance related to implementation of ESSA's evidence provisions, such as the State Support Network's community of practice on evidence-based practices that supports 11 states with selection of interventions. ED has conducted outreach to build awareness of the guidance with stakeholder groups. In addition, ED included tailored guidance for these five steps in its guidance on Title II, Part A, and Title IV of the ESEA. These resources supplement ED's substantial evidence-focused technical assistance efforts, such as:
	   • Regional Educational Laboratories work in partnership with policymakers and practitioners in their regions to evaluate programs and to use evaluation findings and other research to improve academic outcomes for their students.
	   • Comprehensive Centers provide support to States in planning and implementing interventions through coaching, peer-to-peer learning opportunities, and ongoing direct support.
	   • The State Implementation and Scaling Up of Evidence-Based Practices Center provides tools, training modules, and resources on implementation planning and monitoring.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

4. Performance Management/Continuous Improvement: Did the agency implement a performance management system with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals and aligned program objectives and measures, and did it frequently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other dimensions of performance in FY17?	**USHUD:** • HUD conducts regular data-driven performance reviews—"HUDStat" meetings—that focus on quarterly progress toward achieving each of HUD's priority goals. The HUD Secretary and senior leadership from throughout the agency, and sometimes from partner agencies, attend these meetings to address challenges, review metrics, improve internal and external collaboration, and increase performance. A new strategic framework is being developed in FY17 as provided by OMB Circular A-11 (see section 200.23). HUD documents alignment between strategic goals and supporting objectives and metrics in the Annual Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report, and identifies the staff assigned lead responsibility for each objective. **USDOL:** • DOL's Performance Management Center (PMC) is responsible for the Department's extensive performance management system, which includes over 400 measures whose results are reviewed quarterly by Department leadership. PMC leads the Department's Continuous Process Improvement (CPI) Program which supports agencies in efforts to gain operational efficiencies and improve performance. The program directs customized process improvement projects throughout the department and grows the cadre of CPI practitioners through Lean Six Sigma training. • PMC's activities are intended to improve DOL's program performance through data-driven analysis, sharing best practices, and implementing activities associated with the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 (GPRA). Using a PerformanceStat-type reporting and dashboard system, PMC coordinates quarterly meetings between the Deputy Secretary and each agency head, to review performance results contributing to DOL's strategic goals, to make commitments related to performance improvement, and to follow up on the progress of previous performance improvement commitments. PMC also oversees the Strategic Planning process and analyzes performance data in collaboration with agencies to achieve continuous performance improvement. CEO actively participates in the quarterly performance reviews to incorporate findings from evaluations as appropriate. • One of the most important roles that DOL's CEO plays is to facilitate the interaction between program and evaluation analysts, and performance management and evaluation. Learning agendas updated annually by DOL agencies in collaboration with DOL's CEO include program performance themes and priorities for analysis needed to refine performance measures and identify strategies for improving performance. The quarterly reviews with leadership routinely include specific discussions about improving performance and findings from recent evaluations that suggest opportunities for improvement. • To promote the use of evidence based strategies DOL's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) also continues to manage the Workforce Systems Strategies website, which identifies a range of potential strategies informed by research evidence and peer exchanges to support grantees in providing effective services to customers.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY17?	ACF: • ACF has made numerous administrative and survey datasets publicly available for secondary use, such as data from the National Survey of Early Care and Education, Child Care and Development Fund, National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being, and Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System, among many other examples. • ACF's Interoperability Initiative supports data sharing through developing standards and tools that are reusable across the country, and addressing common privacy and security requirements to mitigate risks. In 2016, ACF established a new Division of Data and Improvement providing federal leadership and resources to improve the quality, use, and sharing of data. ACF has developed resources such as the National Human Services Interoperability Architecture, which proposes a framework to facilitate information sharing, improve service delivery, prevent fraud, and provide better outcomes for children and families; an Interoperability Toolkit to help state human services agencies connect with their health counterparts; and a Confidentiality Toolkit that supports state and local efforts by explaining rules governing confidentiality in ACF and certain related programs, by providing examples of how confidentiality requirements can be addressed, and by including sample Memoranda of Understandings and data sharing agreements. • Several ACF divisions have also been instrumental in supporting cross-governmental efforts, such as the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) that will enable human services agencies to collaborate with health, education, justice, and many other constituencies that play a role in the well-being of children and families. • ACF's National Directory of New Hires has entered into data sharing agreements with numerous agencies. For example, DOL's CEO and ETA have interagency agreements with HHS-ACF for sharing and matching earnings data on 9 different formal net impact evaluations. The NDNH Guide for Data Submission describes an agreement with the Social Security Administration to use its network for data transmission. Also, ACF Administers the Public Assistance Reporting Information System, a platform for exchange of data on benefits receipt across ACF, Department of Defense, and Veterans Affairs programs. This platform entails data sharing agreements between these three federal agencies and between ACF and state agencies.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	

5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY17?	CNCS:
	
	• As the nation's largest grant maker for service and volunteering, CNCS collects data about service program members, volunteers, and the organizations in which members and volunteers are placed. Member/volunteer demographic, service experience, and outcome data are collected in a variety of ways – both through administrative processes and through surveys:
	
	   • In FY17, data collected from a revised member exit survey allowed CNCS to generate more accurate reports on key experiences and anticipated college, career, and civic engagement outcomes, which were shared internally. Survey results are being shared with program and agency leadership in FY17 for program improvement purposes. In FY17, R&E finalized a data request form and an MOU template so that program-level and state-level data sets and reports can be shared with partners. The agency is working on protocols to share these data on our open data platform.
	
	   • The agency launched 2 Open Data projects in FY17. Volunteering statistics were made available through this interactive platform for the first time as well as service location data. The goal was to make these data more accessible to all interested end-users. Additional projects will be identified in FY17.
	
	   • A report summarizing cross-sectional survey findings on Senior Corps Foster Grandparents and Senior Companion Program volunteers was posted in FY17. A longitudinal survey of volunteers in these 2 Senior Corps programs was implemented in FY15, and preliminary findings (year one follow up data) have been shared internally and are expected to be released as an interim report in FY17.
	
	   • The dataset of alumni identified for the alumni outcome survey pilot will be shared with the Census and matched with the LEHD survey data, with findings expected in late FY17. This administrative data match between alumni records and the Census' LEHD dataset to obtain employment and employment sector outcomes for AmeriCorps alumni will help the agency reduce its reliance on traditional survey methods so that key economic outcomes can be obtained from more objective sources and for less cost.
	
	   • CNCS worked closely with the U.S. Census Bureau in FY17 to revise the Current Population Survey supplements to improve the data quality of these instruments. One supplement was created based on a thorough literature review, psychometric testing, cognitive interviews, and public comment. The instrument is being reviewed by OIRA and data collection is planned for September 2017.
	
	   • VISTA has initiated a qualitative study involving a document review of a sample of Volunteer Assignment Descriptions (VADs) and VISTA Annual Project Progress Reports (PPRs). The twofold purpose of the project is (A) to support VISTA's efforts to assess the concurrence between the volunteer's work assignments and their actual duties; and (B) assess the quality, consistency, utility, depth and completeness of their qualitative records and data. Specifically, VISTA seeks to evaluate required project records to determine the extent to which these records can be used to inform program reports, evaluations and impact assessments and policy discussions.
	
	   • The purpose of the Disaster Services Unit member deployment survey is to obtain AmeriCorps Disaster Response team (ADR-T) members' perception of their deployment experience so that supervisors and DSU can monitor members' experience and make the necessary changes to improve deployments. The survey has questions pertaining to their general experiences with the logistics, safety, their experiences working with team members, supervisors, other individuals such as families and other organizations and how meaningful those experiences were for the members, and an assessment of the training provided and skills learned. The survey will be implemented as a pilot and the final version will be part of DSU's clearance package that will be submitted to OMB in December 2017. The expectation is that each ARD-T member will take the survey at the end of their deployment and that their supervisor may also ask some open ended questions 30 days after the deployment.
	
	   • The Social Innovation Fund's Pay for Success Administrative Data Pilot launched in FY17 will increase access to administrative data sets for evaluation purposes, and findings will be available by the end of the fiscal year.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY17?

MCC:

- MCC's M&E Division oversees the publication of anonymized evaluation data to MCC's public Evaluation Catalog. In the Catalog, partner countries, as well as the general public, can access the microdata and results of independent evaluations for MCC-funded projects, and public use versions of the data used in those evaluations. The M&E plans and tables of key performance indicators are available online by compact and by sector. All evaluation data is meticulously reviewed by MCC's internal Disclosure Review Board prior to posting to ensure that respondents' privacy is protected.
- MCC's Economic Analysis division publishes constraints analysis reports and interactive, downloadable Economic Rate of Return (ERR) spreadsheets that include the description of the project, including its economic rationale; the expected project impacts, including detailed cost and benefit estimates; and a tool allowing users to modify key assumptions and study the effects of those modifications on the project's returns.
- As part of its Data2x commitment, MCC and other donors are increasing the amount of gender data released and helping to improve international data transparency standards.
- MCC is a founding partner of the Governance Data Alliance, a collaborative effort by governance data producers, consumers, and funders to improve the quality, availability, breadth, and use of governance data.
- MCC has a partnership with the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) which is helping to increase the availability and quality of development-related data in selected countries. The Data Collaboratives for Local Impact program supports innovative and country-led approaches that promote evidence-based decision-making for programs and policies that address HIV/AIDS, global health, gender equality, and economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa. Data Collaboratives projects are strengthening the availability and use of data to improve lives and empower citizens to hold governments and donors more accountable for results. The program aligns with broader U.S. government efforts to maximize the effectiveness of U.S. foreign assistance and with the Global Data Partnership's efforts to promote data collaboration to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

SAMSHA:

- SAMHSA has five data collection initiatives: National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH): population data; Treatment Episode Data Set – Admissions: client level data; National Survey of Substance Abuse Treatment Services (N-SSATS): substance abuse facilities data; Drug Abuse Warning Network: emergency department data; and the National Mental Health Services Survey (N-MHSS) and has made numerous administrative and survey datasets publicly available for secondary use. Each data collection can be sorted by metadata parameters such as geography, methodology, spotlights, data reviews, and data tables. CBHSQ oversees these data collection initiatives and provides publicly available datasets so that some data can be shared with researchers and other stakeholders while preserving client confidentiality and privacy. Some restricted data cannot be shared beyond federal staff.
- CBHSQ prepares specialized reports on a range of mental health and substance use issues relevant to government officials and policymakers at the state, federal, and community levels. These are publicly available at the National Library of Medicine and the SAMHSA website.
- SAMHSA's Data Integrity Statement articulates the administration's Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality (CBHSQ), a Federal Statistical Unit, adherence to the federal common set of professional and operational standards that ensure the "quality, integrity, and credibility" of statistical activities.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY17?	SAMHSA (cont): • SAMHSA's Performance and Accountability and Reporting System (SPARS) hosts the data entry, technical assistance request, and training system for grantees to report performance data to SAMHSA. SPARS serves as the repository for the Administration's 3 centers, Center for Substance Abuse and Prevention (CSAP), Center for Mental health Services (CMHS), and Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT). Due to concerns about confidentiality and privacy, the current data transfer agreement limits the use of grantee data to internal reports so that data collected by SAMHSA grantees will not be available to share with researchers or stakeholders beyond SAMHSA and publications based on grantee data will not be permitted. We expect to revisit the issue once the Commission on Evidence Base Policymaking releases their findings in September 2017. Enhancements to the existing data collection system to improve data transparency and sharing of administrative and performance data are being planned. The foundational system went live in February 2017. Going forward, changes will allow for analytic reports to be shared with grantees so that performance successes and gaps can be better tracked, both by the project officers overseeing the grantees and by the grantees themselves. It is anticipated that this will improve communication and oversight as well as offer more real-time opportunities for program performance. • SAMHSA's Performance and Accountability and Reporting System (SPARS) hosts the data entry, technical assistance request, and training system for grantees to report performance data to SAMHSA. SPARS serves as the repository for the Administration's 3 centers, Center for Substance Abuse and Prevention (CSAP), Center for Mental health Services (CMHS), and Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT). Due to concerns about confidentiality and privacy, the current data transfer agreement limits the use of grantee data to internal reports so that data collected by SAMHSA grantees will not be available to share with researchers or stakeholders beyond SAMHSA and publications based on grantee data will not be permitted. We expect to revisit the issue once the Commission on Evidence Base Policymaking releases their findings in September 2017.SAMHSA's Substance Abuse and Mental Health Data Archive (SAMHDA) contains substance use disorder and mental illness research data available for restricted and public use. SAMHDA promotes the access and use of SAMHSA's substance abuse and mental health data by providing public-use data files and documentation for download and online analysis tools to support a better understanding of this critical area of public health. • SAMHSA's Substance Abuse and Mental Health Data Archive (SAMHDA) contains substance use disorder and mental illness research data available for restricted and public use. SAMHDA promotes the access and use of SAMHSA's substance abuse and mental health data by providing public-use data files and documentation for download and online analysis tools to support a better understanding of this critical area of public health. • Per SAMHSA's Evaluation Policy & Procedure (P&P), CBHSQ will work with CMHS, CSAT, and CSAP Center Directors and other program staff to develop a SAMHSA Completed Evaluation Inventory of evaluations completed between FY11 and FY17. This inventory and the evaluation final reports will then be made available on SAMHSA's intranet and internet sites. In addition, data files from completed evaluations will be made available on the intranet, and via a restricted access mechanism such as SAMHSA's Substance Abuse and Mental Health Data Archive (SAMHDA). USAID: • USAID has an open data policy which in addition to setting requirements for how USAID data is tagged, submitted, and updated, also established the Development Data Library (DDL) as the Agency's repository of USAID-funded, machine readable data created or collected by the Agency and its implementing partners. • In FY16, USAID began developing the *Development Information Solution (DIS)* – a suite of IT tools designed to harness the richness of USAID's data across our offices and operating units, improve efficiencies across the entire Program Cycle, and support the ability to tell one cohesive story about how well USAID's activities are achieving their goals.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY17?	USAID (cont.): • USAID is committed to advancing the many efforts that are currently underway to increase the transparency of funding and programming, with the understanding that quality information and reporting can help stakeholders manage and monitor aid resources more effectively. In November 2011, the United States became a signatory to the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) - a voluntary, multi-stakeholder initiative that created a data standard for publishing foreign assistance spending data and allowing comparison across publishers. In July 2015, USAID produced a cost management plan (CMP) in order to improve the number of fields reported to IATI as well as to institutionalize the process by which the Agency reports its data. • USAID also created and maintains the Foreign Aid Explorer, a site that reports comprehensively on U.S. government foreign assistance, from 1946 - present. • USAID's Economic Analysis and Data Services (EADS) unit has a public web site to share data and also provides data analysis tools, including the aforementioned Foreign Aid Explorer. EADS also provides USAID staff, partners, and the public with analytical products and a platform for querying data. EADS also provides a training available to all USAID staff called Finding and Using Development Data, focused on helping USAID staff best utilize development data in their specific fields. • The USAID GeoCenter uses data and analytics to improve the effectiveness of USAID's development programs by geographically assessing where resources will maximize impact. The GeoCenter team works directly with field missions and Washington-based bureaus to integrate geographic analysis into the strategic planning, design, monitoring, and evaluation of USAID's development programs. The GeoCenter also provides important data-centered trainings to USAID staff. • USAID's Economic Analysis and Data Services (EADS) unit has a public web site to share data and also provides data analysis tools, including the aforementioned Foreign Aid Explorer. EADS also provides USAID staff, partners, and the public with analytical products and a platform for querying data. EADS also provides a training available to all USAID staff called Finding and Using Development Data, focused on helping USAID staff best utilize development data in their specific fields. • USAID uses data and evidence to inform policy formulation, strategic planning, project design, project management and adaptation, program monitoring and evaluation, and learning what works, through a framework called the Program Cycle. • USAID's Monitoring Country Progress (MCP) system is an empirical analytical system which tracks and analyzes country progress to facilitate country strategic planning including country graduation from USG foreign assistance programs. • USAID also publishes spending data alongside program results on the Dollars to Results page of the USAID website. Dollars to Results provides illustrative information on USAID's impact around the world by linking annual spending to results. • To help inform the U.S. Government's aid transparency agenda, USAID conducted three aid transparency country pilot studies in Zambia (May 2014), Ghana (June 2014), and Bangladesh (September 2014). The final report summarizes findings from the three pilots and USAID is implementing many of the recommendations. For example, USAID tested the streamlining of direct IATI data reporting into Bangladesh's Aid Information Management Systems (AIMS). This effort led to improved data quality, more comprehensive reporting and a decrease in the reporting burden for the mission.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	

5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY17?	USED:
	
	• ED has several resources to support the high-quality collection, analysis, and use of high-quality data in ways that protect privacy. IES' National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) serves as the primary federal entity for collecting and analyzing data related to education. Almost all of ED's K-12 statistical and programmatic data collections are now administered by NCES via EDFacts. NCES also collects data through national and international surveys and assessments. Administrative institutional data and statistical sample survey data for postsecondary education is collected through NCES in collaboration with the Federal Student Aid Office (FSA). Some data are available through public access while others only through restricted data licenses. ED's Office for Civil Rights conducts the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) on key education and civil rights issues in our nation's public schools. Additionally, the Data Strategy Team helps to coordinate data activities across the Department and the Disclosure Review Board, the Family Policy Compliance Office (FPCO), the ED*Facts* Governing Board, and the Privacy Technical Assistance Center all help to ensure the quality and privacy of education data. NCES data are made publicly available online and can be located in the ED Data Inventory. In FY2017, ED continued to maintain and grow the Data Inventory, ensuring the information for ED contacts are up to date and expanding the library to include additional years of existing data sets as well as adding new data sets. Additionally, ED is exploring ways to leverage revisions to a technical system to use the data generated through information collection approval process to populate new entries within the Data Inventory.
	• ED made concerted efforts to improve the availability and use of its data in FY17. With the release of the new College 2016 Scorecard, the Department now provides newly combined data in a tool that helps students choose a school that is well-suited to meet their needs, priced affordably, and consistent with their educational and career goals. Additionally, the College 2016 Scorecard promotes the use of open data by providing the underlying data in formats that researchers and developers can use. In fall 2017, the Department will update the Scorecard as part of its annual data refresh.
	• The College 2016 Scorecard effort is a model for future releases of education data, and led to ED's new effort, InformED, to improve Department capacity to release data in innovative and effective ways to improve public use of data. Through InformED, the Department has:
	   • Secured hosting to enable the Office of Civil Rights—for the first time—to post the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) dataset online for direct download.
	   • Established critical infrastructure for a more robust Department API program and, through ED's newly-launched GitHub platform, provides developers with needed information and resources. This includes the creation and release of a new set of APIs providing developers with access to the CRDC, and My Brother's Keeper data (including student outcomes in high school, college, and beyond by race/ethnicity and gender).
	   • Built an interactive data story template and used it to deliver rich and accessible data narratives around the CRDC. The Department's June 2016 data story, Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation's Schools, generated substantial attention among the field and press.
	   • Revamped how users find the Department's data resources by updating the agency's data landing page to be more comprehensive and interactive.
	• ED also participated in the Opportunity Project initiative, now coordinated by the U.S. Department of Commerce. In 2016, ED participated in the initiative's federal agency cohort of projects and worked with external developers to support the development of three online tools focused on equity gaps:
	   • Kitamba & Data Society built the Philadelphia School Community Resource Mapper to help school leaders identify and connect with opportunities for community partnerships.
	   • GreatSchools & Education Cities used college readiness data from ED's Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) to measure and display gaps in access to educational opportunities across student groups (to be released shortly).
	   • LiveStories built district- and school-level comparison tool "LiveStories IQ" and customizable data briefs using CRDC data to help local school districts and education foundations to discover and share compelling data narratives.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY17?	USED (cont.): • In 2017, ED is supporting development of a tool to support homeless youth to access resources, including education. • ED partnered with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to develop a resource supporting data-sharing between public housing agencies and school districts: Data Sharing Road Map: Improving Student Outcomes through Partnerships between Public Housing Agencies and School Districts. • Additionally, ED administers the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) program ($32.3 million in FY17), which provides grants to states to develop their education-related data infrastructure and use these data for education improvement. USHUD: • The HUDUSER.gov web portal continues to provide researchers, practitioners, and the public with PD&R datasets including the American Housing Survey, HUD median family income limits and Fair Market Rents, and Picture of Subsidized Households tabulations of administrative tenant records at multiple geographic levels. HUD sponsors custom tabulations of American Community Survey data that make standard adjustments of household incomes and units for household size to enable researchers and practitioners to analyze state and local housing needs. HUD provides researchers with microdata from experimental program demonstrations and research initiatives on topics such as housing discrimination, the HUD-insured multifamily housing stock, and the public housing population. To help users identify which data are useful to them, reference guides identify datasets and characterize their relevance and usefulness for research in designated categories. HUD partnered with the Census Bureau to enhance public access to the American Housing Survey with a new custom table creator and infographics to summarize results. • HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) has authority to enter into cooperative agreements with research organizations, including both funded Research Partnerships and unfunded Data License Agreements, to support innovative research projects that leverage HUD's data assets and inform HUD's policies and programs. A dedicated subject-matter expert is available to answer questions for those seeking a data license. Data licensing protocols ensure that confidential information is protected. • PD&R partnered with the National Center for Health Statistics at the Centers for Disease Control to link HUD administrative data for assisted renters with respondents to two national health surveys and made the linked data available to researchers to begin building a picture of tenant health issues. Data access through the research data center ensures that confidential information is protected. • A PD&R partnership with the Department of Education to link administrative records for assisted renters and student aid applications is supporting three low-cost random-assignment experiments that test the impact of various nudges and informational supports on application completion and college attendance. • HUD is involved in a wide array of data-sharing agreements described under Data Infrastructure in the Roadmap Update (see pp.52–56). Notably, HUD and the Census Bureau have entered an interagency agreement for the Bureau's Center for Administrative Records Research and Applications (CARRA) to link data from HUD's tenant databases and randomized control trials with the Bureau's survey data collection and other administrative data collected under its Title 13 authority. These RCT datasets are the first intervention data added to Federal Statistical RDCs by any federal agency, and strict protocols ensure that confidential information is protected.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
5. Data: Did the agency collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data - consistent with strong privacy protections - to improve (or help other entities improve) federal, state, and local programs in FY17?	USDOL: • DOL makes the majority of its administrative and survey datasets publicly available for secondary use. For more information, see CEO's Public Use Datasets and ETA's repository of public use datasets. • DOL's Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) (approximately $600 million in FY17) serves as the principal Federal agency responsible for measuring labor market activity, working conditions, and price changes in the economy. BLS has 110 Cooperative Agreements with 50 States and 4 Territories for labor market and economic data sharing. For calendar year 2016, there were 513 "letters of agreement" on data usage with academics to conduct statistical research, and 8 data sharing agreements with the Bureau of Economic Analysis and the Census Bureau, for a total of 521 agreements. • DOL's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) has agreements with 52 States and Territories for data sharing and exchange of wage data for performance accountability purposes. In FY15 DOL's ETA began work with the Department of Education's Office of Career Technical and Adult Education, Rehabilitative Services Administration and Office of the General Counsel to revise and renegotiate the agreements that ETA shares with 52 States and Territories to facilitate better access to quarterly wage data by States for purposes of performance accountability and Research and Evaluation requirements under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). This work aims to expand access to wage data to Education's Adult and Family Literacy Act programs (AEFLA) and Vocational Rehabilitation programs among others. This work has continued through FY17 and is being conducted in collaboration with State agencies who are subject to the performance accountability and research and evaluation requirements of WIOA and the State Unemployment Insurance Agencies. • DOL's CEO, Employment Training Administration (ETA), and the Veterans Employment and Training Service (VETS) have worked with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to develop a secure mechanism for obtaining and analyzing earnings data from the Directory of New Hires. In this past year DOL has entered into interagency data sharing agreements with HHS and obtained data to support 10 job training and employment program evaluations. • DOL's worker protection agencies have open-data provisions on enforcement activity for firms from DOL's five labor enforcement agencies online and accessible through the Enforcement Data Base (Mine Safety and Health Administration, Wage and Hour Division, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the Employee Benefits Security Administration). • The privacy provisions for BLS and DOL's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) are publicly available online. • In FY17, DOL continued efforts to improve the quality of and access to data for evaluation and performance analysis through the Data Analytics Unit in DOL's CEO office, and through new pilots beginning in BLS to access and exchange state labor market and earnings data for statistical and evaluation purposes. The Data Analytics unit has also updated its Data Exchange and Analysis Platform (DEAP) with high processing capacity and privacy provisions to share, link, and analyze program and survey data across DOL programs and agencies and with other agencies. Internal use of DEAP is available now and public access will be available in the future. • The Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) calls for aligned indicators of performance for WIOA authorized programs. DOL's Employment and Training Administration has worked within DOL and with the U.S. Department of Education to pursue the deepest WIOA alignment possible, including indicators definitions, data elements, and specifications to improve the quality and analytic value of the data. DOL chose to include several additional DOL programs in this process, which will result in unprecedented alignment of data and definitions for 13 federal programs (11 DOL and 2 Education). DOL and ED have issued five WIOA Final Rules, which all became effective October 18, 2016. The regulations cover WIOA programs under Title I, II, III, and IV, in addition to other miscellaneous changes. The aligned indicators of performance are included in the DOL-ED Joint Rule for WIOA, part 677. • ETA continues funding and technical assistance to states under the Workforce Data Quality Initiative to link earnings and workforce data and education data longitudinally. ETA and DOL's Veteran's Employment and Training Service have also modified state workforce program reporting system requirements to include data items for a larger set of grant programs, which will improve access to administrative data for evaluation and performance management purposes. An example of the expanded data reporting requirements is the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program FY16 grants.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY17?	ACF: • ACF has established a common evidence framework adapted for the human services context from the framework for education research developed by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation. The ACF framework, which includes the six types of studies delineated in the ED/NSF framework, aims to (1) inform ACF's investments in research and evaluation, and (2) clarify for potential grantees and others the expectations for different types of studies. • ACF maintains an online clearinghouse of evidence reviews of human services interventions. These reviews rate the quality of evaluation studies using objective standards vetted by technical experts and applied by trained, independent reviewers, and similar to those used by other agencies such as the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse and the U.S. Department of Labor's CLEAR. The clearinghouse includes results of the reviews in a searchable format as well as comprehensive details about the review standards and process. Reviews to date have covered teen pregnancy prevention; home visiting; marriage education and responsible fatherhood; and employment and training; and include both ACF-sponsored and other studies. CNCS: • CNCS also adapted the evidence framework used by its Social Innovation Fund and the Investing in Innovation Fund at ED and included it as part of the AmeriCorps State and National program's FY16 and FY 17 grant competitions. The evidence framework used in the FY16 and 17 AmeriCorps competition was revised from FY15 to make it more consistent with what is used in other federal agencies. • In March 2015, CNCS released Phase I of the CNCS Evidence Exchange, a virtual repository of reports intended to help CNCS grantees and other interested stakeholders find information about evidence- and research- based national service and social innovation programs. Phase 1 includes a database of single study reports with some additional descriptive information about the study, as well as a systematic review of the national service evidence base. Phase 2 in FY16 added studies as grantees completed their independent evaluations and submitted reports to CNCS. In FY17 CNCS focused on disseminating final reports as studies were completed and ensuring that the functionality of the site made the information as accessible as possible. MCC: • MCC uses common, rigorous, evidence-based selection criteria to ensure objectivity in country selection for grant awards. To be eligible for selection, countries must first pass the MCC 2017 Scorecard – a collection of 20 independent, third-party indicators that objectively measure a country's policy performance in the areas of economic freedom, investing in people, and ruling justly. The criteria for passing the 2017 Scorecard are applied universally to all low- and lower-middle-income candidate countries. MCC's Board of Directors then considers 3 key factors for selecting countries: 1) a country's performance on the 2017 Scorecard; 2) the opportunity to reduce poverty and generate economic growth; and 3) availability of funds. An in-depth description of the country selection procedure can be found in the annual Selection Criteria and Methodology report. • MCC's model is based on a set of core principles deemed essential for development assistance to be effective – good governance, country ownership, focus on results, and transparency. In pursuing these, MCC has created a Principles into Practice series which describes how to make these principles operational. All of MCC's evaluations are published on the MCC Evaluation Catalog. Associated data, upon which evaluations are based, are published when confidentiality concerns are adequately addressed. • MCC is undertaking internal research and analysis to understand where and how its published evaluations and datasets are utilized. This effort underscores MCC's commitment to transparency and learning as MCC seeks to widen the understanding and use of the evidence it produces. The results of this analysis will guide future efforts on evidence-based learning. MCC will finalize baseline metrics around learning and evaluation utilization in September 2017 and then continue tracking global use of MCC knowledge products on a quarterly basis.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY17?	**MCC (cont.):** • In FY17, MCC sought to strengthen its outreach and dissemination of results in more innovative ways. In July 2016 MCC held its first evidence workshop in El Salvador with more than 180 policymakers, practitioners, and researchers. The workshop – Closing the Gap: Strengthening the Ties between Evaluation and Policy – was an opportunity for MCC, the Government of El Salvador, and other partners to share evaluation results in education and investment climate projects and find ways to incorporate that knowledge into new programs and policies. As part of the workshop, participants committed to use the lessons learned to improve education, gender, and legal and regulatory policy to make the business climate more competitive and help ensure that better educated students can find higher paying jobs in El Salvador. MCC has worked closely with the implementing entity in El Salvador and the President's Technical Secretariat to organize follow-up M&E trainings, scheduled for the summer 2017. • To further bring attention to MCC's evaluation and evidence focus, MCC launched an evaluation newsletter called Statistically Speaking in January 2017. This newsletter highlights recent evidence and learning from MCC's programs with a special emphasis on how MCC's evidence can offer practical policy insights for policymakers and development practitioners in the United States and in partner countries. It also seeks to familiarize a wider audience with the evidence and results of MCC's investments. • Finally, MCC is developing an enhanced results framework that will better communicate the full picture of the impact of its programs and enrich programmatic learning. Currently in draft form, the framework will help MCC consolidate impacts across projects, compacts, and sectors to assess overall impact at an organizational level. **SAMSHA:** • There is great diversity across SAMHSA programming, ranging from community-level prevention activities to residential programs for pregnant and post-partum women with substance misuse issues. While this diversity allows SAMHSA to be responsive to a wide set of vulnerable populations, it limits the utility of a common evidence framework for the entire agency. Within Centers (the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, and the Center for Mental Health Services), consistent evidence frameworks are in use and help to shape the process of grant-making (e.g., Center staff are familiar with the pertinent evidence base for their particular portfolios). At the programmatic level, staff review the state-of-the-art for a particular topic area to facilitate grantee adoption and implementation of evidence-based practices (EBPs). While staff awareness of EBPs varies, a systematic approach to evidence classification remains to be developed. Most Center staff rely on the National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices to identify evidence-based programs for grantee implementation. • SAMHSA has universal language about using evidence-based practices (EBPs) that is included in its Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOAs) (entitled Using Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs)). This language includes acknowledgement that, "EBPs have not been developed for all populations and/or service settings" thus encouraging applicants to "provide other forms of evidence" that a proposed practice is appropriate for the intended population. Specifically, the language states that applicants should, 1) document that the EBPs chosen are appropriate for intended outcomes, 2) explain how the practice meets SAMHSA's goals for the grant program, 3) describe any modifications or adaptations needed for the practice to meet the goals of the project, 4) explain why the EBP was selected, 5) justify the use of multiple EBPs, if applicable, and 6) discuss training needs or plans to ensure successful implementation. Lastly, the language includes resources the applicant can use to understand EBPs. Federal grants officers work in collaboration with the SAMHSA Office of Financial Resources to ensure that grantee funding announcements clearly describe the evidence standard necessary to meet funding requirements. • In 2011, based on the model of the National Quality Strategy, SAMHSA developed the National Behavioral Health Quality Framework (NBHQF). With the NBHQF, SAMHSA proposes a set of core measures to be used in a variety of settings and programs, as well as in evaluation and quality assurance efforts. The proposed measures are not intended to be a complete or total set of measures a payer, system, practitioner, or program may want to use to monitor quality of its overall system or the care or activities it provides. SAMHSA encourages such entities to utilize these basic measures as appropriate as a consistent set of indicators of quality in behavioral health prevention, promotion, treatment, and recovery support efforts across the nation.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY17?	SAMHSA (cont.): • SAMHSA's National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices (NREPP) is an online registry for over 450 substance use and mental health interventions that meet minimum review requirements. Its purpose is to "help people learn more about available evidence-based programs and practices and determine which of these may best meet their needs." By providing a clearinghouse for evidence-based practices, SAMHSA is working to provide timely and relevant scientific knowledge for practical application. In 2015/2016, NREPP underwent a significant set of revisions to ensure a more rigorous review process prior to posting to the registry. While NREPP previously accepted only voluntarily submitted programs, resulting in key gaps due to non-submission for a variety of reasons, the new approach allows SAMHSA to fill registry gaps. • Before being posted to NREPP, interventions undergo a review process that ensures reliability by "tak[ing] into account the methodological rigor of evaluation studies, the size of the program's impact on an outcome, the degree to which a program was implemented as designed, and the strength of the program's conceptual framework." The review process results in an "outcome evidence rating" of Effective, Promising, Ineffective, and Inconclusive. Additionally NREPP provides tools to help decision makers use the information in the best way possible. • In addition, the NREPP Learning Center was revamped and launched in June 2017 as a companion site to the more traditional registry focused on emerging practices and uptake and adoption of evidence-based programs and practices. Stakeholder input from diverse individuals was sought to guide the development of the new Learning Center. With its June launch, the Learning Center now provides a home for emerging practices and programs of critical interest to vulnerable populations that may not have the resources to engage in rigorous evaluation or for whom traditional evaluation techniques are not culturally appropriate. In addition, the Learning Center engages stakeholders interested in selecting, adopting and implementing a new program, offering a variety of learning tools including videos that describe the activities from implementer and developer perspectives.

RESULTS FOR AMERICA

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY17?	USAID: • USAID has a scientific research policy that sets out quality standards for research. USAID's Program Cycle policy includes specific evidence standards for strategic planning, project design, monitoring, and evaluation. For example USAID policy requires evidence and data to assess the development context, challenges, and opportunities in all of USAID's country strategies. Similarly, all USAID projects must include a detailed analytical phase in the Project Appraisal Document. • USAID does most of its Agency-wide engagement around evidence and frameworks for "what works" through its board membership and funding (along with other donors) of the International Initiative for Impact Evaluations (3ie) which funds impact evaluations and systematic reviews that generate evidence on what works in development programs and why. Rather than creating a separate "what works" clearinghouse, USAID has chosen to work with 3ie and other development partners to support 3ie's database of impact evaluations relevant to development topics (includes over 2,500 entries to date), knowledge gap maps and systematic reviews that pull the most rigorous evidence and data from across donors. 3ie also houses a collection of policy briefs that examine findings from its database of impact evaluations on overarching policy questions to help policymakers and development practitioners improve development impact through better evidence. Various USAID bureaus or operating units have funded 3ie to produce evidence gap maps on topics such as: science, technology, innovation and partnership; state-society relations; and productive safety nets. • USAID technical bureaus provide guidance based on evidence of "what works" by sector that applies to all relevant Agency programs. USAID's Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA), for example, includes the Center of Excellence on Democracy, Rights, and Governance, which publishes evidence-based standards for what works in this field. The DRG Center convenes leading scholars from a range of fields to work with USAID to study, analyze, and assess the effectiveness of its initiatives and programs in DRG, using this data to shape programming. In addition, USAID established the Evaluating Democracy and Governance Effectiveness (EDGE) Initiative, to supply and apply sophisticated tools to measure the impact of democracy, human rights, and governance work, and infuse evidence-based programmatic decision-making throughout the DRG portfolio. In another example, USAID's Global Health Bureau has a strategic framework that presents details in Annex 1 on specific evidence-based strategies, targets, and approaches for achieving goals within each technical area under the health priorities. • Several USAID Bureaus also synthesize all the evaluations relevant to a specific sector to summarize key findings and identify gaps in knowledge that then inform sector learning agendas. For example, in March 2016, the Bureau for Food Security (BFS) published a synthesis report summarizing findings from 196 evaluations of Feed the Future projects that focused on the six themes outlined in the *Feed the Future Learning Agenda*. Across the themes, the synthesis illuminated trends and patterns summarized in the points found below the graphic. BFS shared these trends with relevant staff and stakeholders engaged in designing new projects, or updating sector strategies and policies. The synthesis also identified gaps where more evaluation research is needed, helping to inform the design of future evaluations that can contribute to the body of knowledge on food security to improve the design and management of interventions in the agriculture, resilience, and nutrition sectors by specifically addressing Learning Agenda questions. The synthesis helped to inform the Feed the Future Global Performance Evaluation, and the Global Food Security Strategy.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY17?	**USED:** • ED's evidence standards for its grant programs, as outlined in the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), build on ED's What Works Clearinghouse™ (WWC) evidence standards. ED may include these evidence standards in its discretionary grant competitions to direct funds to applicants proposing to implement projects that have evidence of effectiveness and/or to build new evidence through evaluation (see Question #8 below for more detail). As noted above, EPG has coordinated the development of revised evidence definitions and related selection criteria for competitive programs that align with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and streamline and clarify provisions for grantees. These revised definitions align with ED's suggested criteria for States' implementation of ESSA's four evidence levels, included in ED's non-regulatory guidance, Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments. • Additionally, IES and the National Science Foundation issued a joint report that describes six types of research studies that can generate evidence about how to increase student learning in 2013. These principles are based, in part, on the research goal structure and expectations of IES's National Center for Education Research (NCER) and National Center for Special Education Research (NCSER). NCER and NCSER communicate these expectations through their Requests for Applications and webinars that are archived on the IES website and available to all applicants. • ED's What Works Clearinghouse™ (WWC) identifies studies that provide valid and statistically significant evidence of effectiveness of a given practice, product, program, or policy (referred to as "interventions"), and disseminates summary information and reports on the WWC website. The WWC has reviewed more than 10,000 studies that are available in a searchable database, including a commitment to review all publicly available evaluation reports generated under i3 grants. In FY 2016, 37 i3 grant evaluation reports, containing 48 studies were reviewed and are included in the searchable database. In fall 2016, ED revised and enhanced the WWC website to make evidence easier to access, including through the "Find What Works" tool that makes it easier to find relevant educational programs and interventions, and improving navigation. **USHUD:** • HUD's Policy Development and Research (PD&R) office provides evidence of "what works" primarily through HUD USER, a portal and web store for program evaluations, case studies, and policy analysis and research; the Regulatory Barriers Clearinghouse; and through initiatives such as Innovation of the Day, Sustainable Construction Methods in Indian Country, and the Consumer's Guide to Energy-Efficient and Healthy Homes. This content is designed to provide current policy information, elevate effective practices, and synthesize data and other evidence in accessible formats. Through these resources, researchers and practitioners can see the full breadth of work on a given topic (e.g., rigorous established evidence, case studies of what's worked in the field, and new innovations currently being explored) to inform their work.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

6. Common Evidence Standards/What Works Designations: Did the agency use a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and did it disseminate and promote the use of evidence-based interventions through a user-friendly tool in FY17?	USDOL: • DOL uses the Cross-agency Federal Evidence Framework for evaluation planning and dissemination. • DOL's Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR) is an internet-based evidence clearinghouse of evaluation reports that reviews designs, methodologies, and findings according to specific standards developed by technical work groups. Each study is 2016 Scored and given a "causal evidence rating" according to the scoring rubric in the standards. CLEAR is a user-friendly, searchable website, that includes academic quality reviews for each study included in the system, appropriate for peer academic researchers, potential evaluation contractors submitting technical proposals, program practitioners seeking information on "what works", policy makers, and the general public. • DOL uses the CLEAR evidence guidelines and standards when discretionary program grants awarded using evidence-informed or evidence-based criteria. The published guidelines and standards are thus used in grants for evidence-based programs demonstrations and in reviewing evaluations in the structured evidence reviews conducted in CLEAR. Requests for proposals also indicate the CLEAR standards apply to all CEO evaluations. Also, DOL has a "Department Evaluation Policy Statement" that formalizes the principles that govern all program evaluations in the Department, including methodological rigor, independence, transparency, ethics, and relevance. In addition, CEO publicly communicates the standards and methods expected in all DOL evaluations, and the standards are incorporated into formal procurement statements of work, with scoring for awards based on the standards. • Additionally, DOL collaborates with other agencies (HHS, ED-IES, NSF, CNCS) on refining cross-agency evidence guidelines and developing technological procedures to link and share reviews across clearinghouses. The Interagency Evidence Framework conveys the categories of evaluations, the quality review of evaluation methodologies and results, and the use of evaluation finings. The framework is accepted Department-wide.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY17?	**ACF:** • ACF's Behavioral Innovations to Advance Self-Sufficiency (BIAS) project is the first major effort to apply a behavioral economics lens to programs that serve poor families in the U.S. Since its inception in 2010, the project has conducted 15 rapid-cycle randomized tests of behavioral innovations in seven states with nearly 100,000 sample members. • ACF's Behavioral Interventions for Child Support Services (BICS) demonstration project is applying behavioral insights to child support contexts, developing promising behavioral interventions, and building a culture of regular, rapid-cycle evaluation and critical inquiry within the child support community. • ACF has actively participated in the HHS IDEA Lab, an entity within HHS launched in 2013, to invest in internal innovation, leverage external innovation, and build collaborative communities to tackle cross-cutting issues of strategic importance. Recent projects include the ACF Administration for Native Americans' *Application Toolkit* and *DataQuest: Making ACF Native Data Visible and Useful*, the ACF Office of Family Assistance's *Understanding Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Through Data Vizualization*, and the ACF Office of Head Start's *Partnership Alignment Information Response System*. **CNCS:** • CNCS awarded 7 AmeriCorps Evidence-Based Planning grants (an investment of $500,000 in evaluation funds) in FY17. These one-year planning grants were awarded to encourage the identification of a new evidence-based program or practice and develop a strategy for integrating national service into the effective model. In addition, awardees will develop an evaluation plan to assess the innovation should it be funded in future grant competitions. Research & Evaluation staff will conduct a process evaluation of these grantees to systematically assess the successes and challenges of implementing these grants. • CNCS awarded another round of Commission Investment Fund grants in FY17. Overall, .3% of these grants (totaling $5,391,750 in AmeriCorps funding) will focus on building the capacity of State Commissions and their grantees to collect and use performance and evaluation data. Research & Evaluation staff are completing a process evaluation of these grantees that will identify the successes and challenges of implementing these grants. These findings will be made public in FY17 and used to inform the second cohort of funded grantees. • R & E developed and pilot-tested an organizational capacity assessment tool with the goal of providing grantees one instrument to track data across CNCS programs. Encouraged by findings from the SIF National Assessment (which demonstrated the effectiveness of the initiative for improving organizational capacity in the areas of evidence and evaluation), CNCS seeks to assess its impact on organizations more systematically. The instrument will be available for OIRA clearance in FY17.

FEDERAL INVEST IN WHAT WORKS INDEX (2017)

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY17?	MCC:
	
	• MCC recently launched a new Millennium Efficiency Challenge to encourage innovation specifically in the compact development phase. The challenge is designed to tap into the extensive knowledge of MCC's staff to identify efficiencies and innovative solutions that can shorten the compact development timeline while maintaining MCC's rigorous quality standards and investment criteria. Winning ideas will be integrated into the compact development process starting in 2018 and could have lasting impact on MCC for years to come.
	• In September 2014, MCC's Monitoring and Evaluation division launched the agency's first Open Data Challenge, a call-to-action to Masters and PhD students working in economics, public policy, international development, or other related fields who were interested in exploring how to use publicly available MCC-financed primary data for policy-relevant analysis. The Challenge was intended to facilitate broader use of MCC's US-taxpayer funded data. Due to the success of the first Open Data Challenge, a second Open Data Challenge was launched in February 2016 in order to encourage innovative ideas and maximize the use of data that MCC finances for its independent evaluations. For the second Open Data Challenge, MCC announced $1000 prizes for the best papers from students around the world whose work contributed significantly to agency learning and innovation. By August 31, 2017, MCC will announce up to six selected papers and begin planning for public presentation of papers at MCC.
	• In 2014, MCC launched an internal "Solutions Lab" that was designed to encourage innovation by engaging staff to come up with creative solutions to some of the biggest challenges MCC faces. To further encourage staff who pursue innovative ideas throughout the compact lifecycle, MCC launched the annual MCC Innovation Award. (MCC promotes agency-wide participation in its Solutions Lab through an internal intranet portal. MCC's new Innovation Award is a part of the Agency's Annual Awards Ceremony held each summer.) The Innovation Award recognizes individuals who demonstrate "exemplary" leadership integrating innovation in project design, project implementation, and/or systems functionality and efficiency. Selections for the Innovation Award are based on a demonstrated ability to lead and implement innovative strategies from project conception that foster sustained learning and collaboration and add value to MCC and/or country partnerships. Award nominees must meet at least one of the following criteria:
	    • Integrating innovation in projects which rigorously assess and scale up pilot projects or new technologies tested by other development institutions, universities, research institutions businesses or non-profit organizations;
	    • Implementing projects or initiatives which enhance MCC's ability to effectively carry out its mission, to include introduction and adoption of new technologies in MCA countries, implementation of transformational IT projects, and/or improvement to needed system controls for enhanced functionality or compliance; or
	    • Leading new types of collaborative partnerships to leverage MCC resources and bolster the development impact and sustainability of projects in MCA countries.
	• The PEPFAR/MCC Partnership has an innovation challenge. The Data Collaboratives for Local Impact Innovation Challenge identifies, supports, and involves country-based youth, developers, programmers, and solution providers through targeted challenge competitions that address specific programmatic challenges with data — for example, engaging with communities to lower their risk of contracting HIV/AIDS. In December 2016, the Data Lab also held a mapathon that focused on Tanzanian districts where vulnerable adolescent girls and young women are susceptible to HIV infection. By improving maps, volunteers contributed directly to valuable datasets that can inform the understanding of HIV/AIDS prevalence in priority districts, as well as health facility and antiretroviral drug accessibility. DCLI also hosted a mapathon in Washington in July 2017, bringing together more than 100 people from the US government, the Data Lab, and the private sector to map over 2,000 kilometers of roads and nearly 4,000 buildings in Côte d'Ivoire and Togo, two of MCC's partner countries. The information is now public and can be used by governments, donors, and investors to make better data-driven decisions when planning for critical services like health clinics, schools, and utilities.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY17?	MCC cont: • MCC is conducting an "Innovation Grant Program" in Zambia in order to encourage local innovation in pro-poor service delivery in the water sector through grants to community-based organizations, civil society, and/or private sector entities. • MCC recently launched an evaluation of an innovative infrastructure grant facility in Cabo Verde to understand whether funding opportunities could incentivize utilities to reform and improve the sustainability of infrastructure investments. This evaluation represents MCC's commitment to innovate new approaches and use evidence to test whether those new approaches produce results. • MCC regularly engages in implementing pilot projects as part of its overall Compact programs. A few examples include: 1) in Morocco, an innovative pay for results (PFR) mechanism to replicate or expand proven programs that provide integrated support including short-term (one to six months) job readiness skills training, technical training, job matching, follow-up to ensure longevity, and other services; 2) a "call-for-ideas" in Benin in 2015 that extended an invitation to interested companies and organizations from around the world to submit information regarding potential projects that would expand access to renewable off-grid electrical power in Benin; and 3) a regulatory strengthening project in Sierra Leone that includes funding for a results-based financing system designed to strengthen the regulator's role, incentivize performance by the utilities, and enhance accountability. • MCC has signed a five-year, $450m grant with the Kingdom of Morocco, called the Morocco Employability and Land Compact. The focus of the Compact is on making improvements toward land productivity and employability to create new economic opportunities, improve workforce skills, and strengthen the business environment. The Labor Market Impact Evaluation Lab is a key component of the compact aimed at improving labor market outcomes through the use of rigorous quantitative research. The Lab will finance rigorous impact evaluations and other rigorous empirical studies, as well as policy-research engagements, to build the capacity of the Moroccan government to commission/generate such studies. This is the first time MCC has pursued a country-led Lab focused on impact evaluations and policy research.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY17?	SAMHSA: • The SAMHSA Knowledge Network, a collection of technical assistance and training resources provided by the agency, provides behavioral health professionals with education and collaboration opportunities, and ample tools and technical assistance resources that promote innovation in practice and program improvement. Located within the Knowledge Network are groups such as the Center for Financing Reform and Innovation, which works with states and territories, local policy makers, providers, consumers, and other stakeholders to promote innovative financing and delivery system reforms. • In addition, SAMHSA participates in collaborations with other HHS agencies to promote innovative uses of data, technology and innovation across HHS to create a more effective government and improve the health of the nation, via the HHS IDEA Lab. SAMHSA has co-developed and submitted several innovative data utilization project proposals to the Ignite Accelerator of the HHS IDEA Lab, such as a project to monitor and prevent opioid overdoses by linking heroin users to resources and information. • The agency is currently exploring the use of tiered-evidence frameworks in its award decision-making to actively encourage innovation at the grantee/program level. In addition, pursuant to the 21st Century Cures Act, SAMHSA is establishing the National Mental Health and Substance Use Policy Laboratory (Policy Lab) (Sec. 7001, p.501), by restructuring the current Office of Policy, Planning, and Innovation (OPPI). The new Policy Lab will review programs and activities operated by the agency to identify programs and activities that are duplicative, identify programs and activities that are not evidence-based or effective, and formulate recommendations for coordinating, elimination, or improving such programs (Sec 7001, pp.502-503). • To further promote innovation, per the Cures Act, SAMHSA's Assistant Secretary may coordinate with the Policy Lab to award grants to states, local governments, tribes and tribal organizations, and other eligible organizations to develop evidence-based interventions. These grants can help support the evaluation of models and interventions that show promise, or the expansion, replication, or scaling up of interventions that have been established as evidence-based (Sec. 7001, pp. 503-504). USAID: • USAID established the U.S. Global Development Lab (the Lab) in 2014 to increase the application of science, technology, innovation, and partnerships to extend the Agency's development impact in helping to end extreme poverty. The Lab does this by working closely with colleagues across the Agency and by bringing together a diverse set of partners to discover, test, and scale breakthrough innovations to solve development challenges faster, cheaper and more sustainably. The Lab is the home for the Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning Innovations program (MERLIN) to source, co-design, implement and test solutions that innovate on traditional approaches to monitoring, evaluation, research and learning. • In the past six years, through the Global Development Lab, USAID and its partners have launched eight Grand Challenges for Development: Saving Lives at Birth (2011), All Children Reading (2011), Powering Agriculture: An Energy Grand Challenge for Development (2012), Making All Voices Count (2012), Securing Water for Food (2013), Fighting Ebola (2015), Combating Zika and Future Threats (2016), Scaling Off-Grid Energy (2016), and Ensuring Effective Health Supply Chains (2017). GCDs are robust partnerships that leverage each partner's strengths to engage new solvers through incentive prizes, challenge grant funding, and crowdsourcing to capture learnings, acceleration support services, and generate awareness to identify the most promising solutions, test them, and scale those that are proven to work. • Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) is USAID's tiered, evidence-based innovation fund. It awards grant financing to innovative solutions to development challenges on the basis of rigorous evidence of impact, cost-effectiveness, and potential to scale via the public and/or private sectors. It awards funding across three stages, ranging from under $100,000 for piloting early-stage innovations to up to $15 million for scaling evidence-backed innovations. The DIV model is designed to find breakthrough solutions, minimize risk and maximize impact through staged financing, rigorously test impacts and cost-effectiveness, and scale proven solutions. To date, DIV-supported innovations have impacted 12.6 million beneficiaries and mobilized external financing of $446 million, a nearly 5:1 leverage ratio on DIV's approximately $90 million in grants awarded. Of the over 90 DIV grants that have been completed, over 90% of grantees collected evidence of impact and more than 60% of innovations had attributable, causal positive impact on development outcomes. (In July 2017, USAID announced it would no longer be accepting applications for new DIV awards, until further notice.)

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY17?	USAID (cont.): • USAID also supports innovation through the external Global Innovation Fund (GIF), a private fund co-founded by USAID and based on the DIV model. Like DIV, GIF invests in social innovations to improve the lives of millions of people in the developing world, but, as a private fund, GIF is also able to provide debt and equity financing. • USAID is working with the Australian Department of Foreign Assistance and Trade (Australian Aid), the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA), and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to fund and promote the Global Innovation Exchange (the Exchange), a free, online platform that connects social entrepreneurs with the funding and other resources they need to be impactful. Already home to nearly $123.8 million funding opportunities, more than 5,500 innovations, and more than 18,500 users, the Exchange is rapidly expanding, reaching nearly every corner of the world. • The Innovation Design and Advisory Team (iDesign) helps advance USAID's culture of innovation and intrapreneurship through testing, application and mainstreaming of innovative design and problem-solving processes. iDesign offers customized advisory services and training programs to help Agency offices determine when, how, and with whom to innovate in programs to achieve more cost-effective impact. It applies the latest models for open and collaborative program design, human-centered design and systems thinking, pay for results tools, venture fund models and lean and adaptive management principles. • USAID's Applied Innovation team works with programs and implementing partners, including contractors and grantees, to capture learning and accelerate innovations supported by USAID. The Applied Innovation team is working to expand innovation adoption across USAID's programming, and test the theory that innovations can enhance development impact, save time and resources, and improve programmatic efficiencies. • USAID's Higher Education Solutions Network (HESN) program is a partnership with seven competitively awarded universities working with partners worldwide. Leveraging nearly equal investments from each institution, the universities have established eight Development Labs that have built a global research network of 685 partners from 69 countries. Through HESN, USAID has been able to harness the ingenuity of students and faculty to create or test over 300 innovations, which have helped USAID missions reach their development goals and improved the lives of 2.3 million beneficiaries. • USAID's Research and Development (R&D) Hub for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) helps agency staff discover when emerging M&E approaches may be appropriate for their particular learning needs, working within the space of complexity-aware M&E, context monitoring, monitoring without indicators, and M&E for adaptive management. While champions in USAID and implementing partners have been experimenting with emerging approaches, evidence-based, practical resources on how to apply these approaches have not been systematically created and shared. The R&D Hub for M&E in LER plays the role of connector by linking champions and conducting research on and documenting emerging M&E approaches that have been helpful in various circumstances. The R&D Hub collects data on the use of innovative approaches to M&E within the agency; the US Global Development Lab's MERLIN is one example of a partner in learning. • USAID's Research and Development (R&D) Hub for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) helps agency staff determine best fit for emerging M&E approaches to specific contexts and programs.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY17?	<u>USED</u>: • The Investing in Innovation program (i3) is ED's signature innovation program for K–12 public education. i3 grants are focused on validating and scaling evidence-based practices, and to encourage innovative approaches to persistent challenges. These "Development" grants are the most prevalent type of i3 grant, comprising 115 out of the 172 i3 grants, and 10 of the 15 new i3 grants made in FY16. i3's successor program is the Education Innovation and Research (EIR) program, which published notices for the three tiers of grants under that program in December 2016 and will make awards in September 2017. One unique aspect of the EIR notices for the Mid-phase and Expansion tiers was the inclusion of a field-initiated innovation priority that allowed applicants to propose a project of their choosing, as long as it met the evidence requirement for that competition. • ED is participating in the Performance Partnership Pilots for Disconnected Youth initiative. These pilots give state, local, and tribal governments an opportunity to test innovative new strategies to improve outcomes for low-income disconnected youth ages 14 to 24, including youth who are in foster care, homeless, young parents, involved in the justice system, unemployed, or who have dropped out or are at risk of dropping out of school.\ • ED is continuing to promote the use of data in innovative ways by engaging with developers. This includes launching a new Developer Hub and GitHub platform, which provides developers with needed information and resources, and the creation of new APIs. Additionally, ED continues to be an active participant on the Opportunity Project, which encourages the use of federal data for social good by providing a process for developers, data enthusiasts, policy leaders, and communities to co-create innovative tech solutions that expand opportunity. • The White House Social and Behavioral Sciences Team conducted several behavioral science studies related to ED's work, including looking at the impact of text message reminders for students about key tasks related to college matriculation, such as completing financial aid paperwork, and about notices to student borrowers about income-driven repayment plans. • ED is currently implementing the Experimental Sites Initiative to assess the effects of statutory and regulatory flexibility for participating institutions disbursing Title IV student aid • The IES Research Grants Program supports the development and iterative testing of new, innovative approaches to improving education outcomes. IES makes research grants with a goal structure. "Goal 2: Development and Innovation" supports the development of new education curricula; instructional approaches; professional development; technology; and practices, programs, and policies that are implemented at the student-, classroom-, school-, district-, state-, or federal-level to improve student education outcomes. • On behalf of ED, IES also administers the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program, which competes funding to small business that propose developing commercially viable education technology projects that are designed to support classroom teaching and student learning. Projects must go through an iterative development process and conduct research to determine promise of effectiveness. • ED has funded a number of tools in FY16 and FY17 to support innovation and rigorous evaluation in the field, including: • RCT-YES is a free software tool that uses cutting-edge statistical methods to help users easily analyze data and report results from experimental and quasi-experimental impact studies of education programs. • Downloadable programs help users build logic models and create ongoing plans for monitoring, measuring, and tracking outcomes over time to measure program effectiveness. • A guide for researchers on how to conduct descriptive analysis in education to help identify and describe trends in populations, create new measures, or describe samples in studies aimed at identifying causal effects • to help identify and describe trends in populations, create new measures, or describe samples in studies aimed at identifying causal effects. • The Ed Tech Rapid Cycle Evaluation Coach, a free online tool that helps users plan, conduct, and report findings from experimental and quasi-experimental impact studies of education technology products. The tool is optimized for non-technical users and employs unique statistical methods that allow findings to be presented.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	

7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY17?	USED (cont.):
	• ED is implementing a number of Pay for Success projects in FY17:
	   • Career and Technical Education (CTE): $2 million to support the development of PFS projects to implement new or scale up existing high-quality CTE opportunities.
	   • English Language Acquisition: $293,000 contract to conduct a feasibility study that will identify at least two promising school sites that are using evidence-based interventions for early learning dual language models where a PFS project could take shape to help scale the interventions to reach more students those who need them.
	   • Early Learning: $3 million for Preschool Pay for Success feasibility pilots to support innovative funding strategies to expand preschool and improve educational outcomes for 3- and 4- year-olds. These grants will allow states, school districts and other local government agencies to explore whether Pay for Success is a viable financing mechanism for expanding and improving preschool in their communities.
	   • Technical Assistance: The Office of Special Education Programs is collaborating with early childhood technical assistance centers to educate and build capacity among state coordinators in IDEA Part C and Part B to explore using PFS to expand or improve special education services for young children. In addition, we have conducted a Pay for Success webinar series for the Comprehensive Centers.
	
	USHUD:
	• HUD's Policy Development and Research (PD&R) office is conducting a number of evaluated, random-assignment program demonstrations to test new program models, which can be found in PD&R's biennial report: the Family Self-Sufficiency Demonstration, Pre-Purchase Homeownership Counseling Demonstration, Support and Services at Home (SASH) Demonstration for elderly households, Supportive Services Demonstration for health services in elderly housing, Rent Reform Demonstration, and the Small Area Fair Market Rent Demonstration. The latter demonstrations are in early or middle stages; interim results and long-term follow-up results generally will be reported through HUD USER during the next 2–4 years.
	• PD&R also is collaborating with the General Services Administration and U.S. Department of Education to link tenant data with records of students and individuals submitting Free Applications for Federal Student Aid. Through this partnership, three phases of low-cost behaviorally informed experiments are being conducted to increase access of HUD tenants to higher education, through mailed outreach communications (see p.12), mailed plus electronic communications, and HUD-funded education navigators.
	• PD&R houses the Office of International and Philanthropic Innovation, and administers five types of Secretary's Awards to encourage excellence: Public-Philanthropic Partnerships, Opportunity and Empowerment, Healthy Homes, Historic Preservation, and Housing and Community Design. The competitions are judged by juries of professionals, and bring visibility to the nation's most compelling solutions for addressing housing and community development challenges.
	• PD&R sponsors an Innovation in Affordable Housing Competition to engage multidisciplinary teams of graduate students in addressing a specific housing problem developed by an actual public housing agency. The competition increases the nation's future human capacity to address the affordable housing crisis by exposing future designers, administrators, and policymakers to real-world challenges of a specific legal and community context, with their proposals to be evaluated by an expert jury.
	• In FY16, HUD's National Disaster Resilience Competition provided funding for resilient housing and infrastructure projects to states and communities that suffered major disasters. Collaborative teams were assisted in extensively researching and developing their proposals by nine Resilience Academies developed by the Rockefeller Foundation in partnership with HUD. The in-depth, juried process helped ensure that the $1 billion of resources available for these communities will result in more resilient housing and infrastructure and bridge the gap between social and physical vulnerabilities.
	• HUD promotes innovation among staff members through social media sites, and in PD&R, through staff-led Knowledge Collaboratives that focus on selected policy or technical fields to share knowledge and work together on in-house research projects (for examples of in-house work, see footnote 8 in Roadmap Update).

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
7. Innovation: Did the agency have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve the impact of its programs in FY17?	USDOL: • DOL is participating in the Performance Partnership Pilots (P3) for innovative service delivery for disconnected youth which includes not only waivers and blending and braiding of federal funds, but gives bonus points in application reviews for proposing "high tier" evaluations. DOL is the lead agency for the evaluation of P3. • DOL recently completed a number of behavioral science evaluations—three in unemployment insurance, two in OSHA, one in OFCCP, and one in EBSA for pension contributions (see the CEO website), and is in the planning phase for a number of others. For more DOL's work in this area, see DOL's Behavioral Insights page. • DOL is using Job Corps' demonstration authority to test and evaluate innovative and promising models that could improve outcomes for youth. In 2016 DOL awarded a contract for a Job Corps pilot program, the Cascades Job Corps College and Career Academy. The pilot will test alternative strategies for the operation of Job Corps for younger participants (ages 16 and 21). Past research on the program showed that while Job Corps increased the education and earnings of program participants, it was more beneficial for youth over age 20 than for its younger participants. This pilot uses DOL's demonstration authority to test innovative and promising strategies (which include using a career pathway program approach of integrated academic and technical training, workforce preparation skills and support services) to better meet the needs of this population. CEO is sponsoring a rigorous impact evaluation to examine the effectiveness of the pilot. See the study overview here. • DOL has two pilot projects testing use of a Pay for Success (PFS) financing model. In 2013, DOL awarded 2 grants of approximately $12 million to two states, Massachusetts and New York, to test a PFS model where private for-profit and philanthropic investors pay the up-front costs of delivering an intervention designed to achieve specific outcomes within a given timeframe. In return for accepting the risk of funding the project, the investors may expect a return if the project is successful; however, repayment by the government is contingent on the validated achievement of results. Both pilots are employing a random assignment methodology to measure results, which are due in 2017. DOL is sponsoring a process study to document project implementation and provide information on the PFS approach for policymakers and program administrators. The first report from this study was released in 2016, documenting the development of pilots and first year of implementation. A second report will document the pilots' longer-term operational experiences, including the extent to which the pilots achieved their performance milestones. • DOL has invested more than $90 million through the ApprenticeshipUSA initiative - a national campaign bringing together a broad range of stakeholders, including employers, labor, and States, education and workforce partners, to expand and diversify Registered Apprenticeship in the United States. This includes more than $60 million for State-led strategies to grow and diversify apprenticeship, and State Accelerator Grants to help integrate apprenticeship into education and workforce systems; engage industry and other partners to expand apprenticeship to new sectors and new populations at scale; conduct outreach and work with employers to start new programs; promote greater inclusion and diversity in apprenticeship; and develop statewide and regional strategies aimed at building state capacity to support new apprenticeship programs. All of these grants include funding for data collection; additionally, ETA and CEO are conducting an evaluation of the American Apprenticeship Initiative. • CEO received grant making authority in 2016. In January of 2017, we awarded 9 research grants aim at supporting university-based research of workforce policies and programs. The goal is to build capacity and drive innovation among academic researchers to answer questions that will provide insight into labor policies and programs.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY17?

ACF:

- In FY17 the 5 largest competitive grant programs are: 1) Head Start ($8.6 billion); 2) Unaccompanied Children Services ($1.4 billion); 3) Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships ($0.6 billion) 4) Transitional and Medical Services ($0.5 billion); and 5) Preschool Development Grants ($0.25 billion).
- ACF's template (see p. 14 in Attachment C) for grant announcements includes two options, requiring grantees to either 1) collect performance management data that contributes to continuous quality improvement and is tied to the project's logic model, or 2) conduct a rigorous evaluation for which applicants must propose an appropriate design specifying research questions, measurement and analysis.
- In FY12, ACF established the Head Start Designation Renewal System requiring Head Start ($8.6 billion in FY17) grantees to compete for grants moving forward if they failed to meet criteria related to service quality, licensing and operations, and fiscal and internal control.
- ACF's Personal Responsibility Education Program ($69.8 million in FY17) includes three individual discretionary grant programs that support evidence-based competitive grants that teach youth about abstinence and contraception to prevent pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections.
- To receive funds through ACF's Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) program, ($39.6 million in FY17) states must "demonstrate an emphasis on promoting the increased use and high quality implementation of evidence-based and evidence-informed programs and practices." CBCAP defines evidence-based and evidence-informed programs and practices along a continuum with four categories: Emerging and Evidence-Informed; Promising; Supported; and Well Supported. Programs determined to fall within specific program parameters will be considered to be "evidence informed" or "evidence-based" practices (EBP), as opposed to programs that have not been evaluated using any set criteria. ACF monitors progress on the percentage of program funds (most recently 61.1% in FY15) directed towards evidence-based and evidence-informed practices.

CNCS:

- CNCS is operating three competitive grant programs in FY17: 1) AmeriCorps State and National program (excluding State formula grant funds) ($232,372,470 million in FY17); 2) Senior Corps RSVP program ($49 million in FY17); and 3) the Social Innovation Fund (SIF) ($50 million in FY16). (SIF funding was zeroed out by Congress in FY17, but CNCS still spent FY16 SIF funds in FY17).
- CNCS's AmeriCorps State and National Grants Program (excluding State formula grant funds), application (see pp. 10-14) allocated up to 31 points out of 100 to organizations that submit applications supported by performance and evaluation data in FY17. Specifically, up to 19 points can be assigned to applications with theories of change supported by relevant research literature, program performance data, or program evaluation data; and up to 12 points can be assigned for an applicant's incoming level of evidence with the highest number of points awarded to strong levels of evidence. These categories of evidence are modeled closely on the levels of evidence defined in the Social Innovation Fund.
- From FY10-FY16, SIF provided competitive grants to non-profit grant-making organizations to help them grow promising, evidence-based solutions that address pressing economic opportunity, healthy futures, and youth development issues in low- income communities. The FY14-16 Omnibus Appropriations Acts allowed CNCS to invest up to 20% of SIF funds each year in Pay for Success initiatives.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY17?

MCC:

- MCC awards all of its agency funds through two competitive grant programs: Compact and Threshold programs (whose budgets for FY17 were $671.2 and $29.9 million respectively). Both types of grants require demonstrable, objective evidence to support the likelihood of project success in order to be awarded funds. For country partner selection, MCC uses twenty different indicators within the categories of economic freedom, investing in people, and ruling justly to determine country eligibility for program assistance. These indicators (see MCC's FY2017 Guide to the Indicators) are collected by independent third parties. When considering granting a second compact, MCC further considers whether countries have (1) exhibited successful performance on their previous compact; (2) exhibited improved 2017 Scorecard policy performance during the partnership; and (3) exhibited a continued commitment to further their sector reform efforts in any subsequent partnership. As a result, the Board has an even higher standard when selecting countries for subsequent compacts.
- Following country selection, MCC conducts a constraints analysis to identify the most binding constraints to private investment and entrepreneurship that hold back economic growth. The results of this analysis enable the country, in partnership with MCC, to select compact or threshold activities most likely to contribute to sustainable, poverty-reducing growth. Due diligence, including feasibility studies where applicable, are conducted for each potential investment. MCC also performs Cost-Benefit Analysis to assess the potential impact of each project, and estimates an Economic Rate of Return (ERR). MCC uses a 10% ERR hurdle to more effectively prioritize and fund projects with the greatest opportunity for maximizing impact. MCC then recalculates ERRs at compact closeout, drawing on information from MCC's monitoring data inter alia, in order to test original assumptions and assess the cost effectiveness of MCC programs. In connection with the ERR, MCC conducts a Beneficiary Analysis, which seeks to describe precisely which segments of society will realize the project benefits. It is most commonly used to assess the impact of projects on the poor, but it has broader applicability that allows for the estimation of impact on populations of particular interest, such as women, the aged, children, and regional or ethnic sub-populations.
- In line with MCC's M&E policy, MCC projects are required to submit quarterly Indicator Tracking Tables showing progress toward projected targets. MCC also requires independent evaluations of every project to assess progress in achieving outputs and outcomes throughout the lifetime of the project and beyond.
- In February 2017, MCC issued new Compact Development Guidance. This guidance codifies the MCC's commitment to using evidence to inform country and project selection by requiring that each project meet certain investment criteria like generating high economic returns, including clear metrics for results, and supporting the long-term sustainability of results.

SAMHSA:

- The following represents SAMHSA's 5 largest competitive grant programs for which funds were appropriated in FY17: 1) Opioid State Targeted Response ($500 million in FY17); 2) Children's Mental Health Initiative ($119 million in FY17); 3) Strategic Prevention Framework ($119.5 million in FY17); 4) Substance Abuse Treatment Criminal Justice ($78 million in FY17); and 5) Targeted Capacity Expansion – General ($67.2 million in FY17).
- The President's Budget request for SAMHSA for FY18 stipulates "that up to 10% of amounts made available to carry out the Children's Mental Health Initiative may be used to carry out demonstration grants or contracts for early interventions with persons not more than 25 years of age at clinical high risk of developing first episode of psychosis." Specifically, funds from this set-aside should address whether community-based interventions during the prodrome phase can prevent further development of serious emotional disturbances and eventual serious mental illness, and the extent to which evidence-based early interventions can be used to delay the progression of mental illness, reduce disability, and/or maximize recovery.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY17?	SAMHSA (cont.): • SAMHSA has universal language about using evidence-based practices (EBPs) that is included in its Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOAs) (entitled Using Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs)). This language includes acknowledgement that, "EBPs have not been developed for all populations and/or service settings" thus encouraging applicants to "provide other forms of evidence" that a proposed practice is appropriate for the intended population. Specifically, the language states that applicants should, 1) document that the EBPs chosen are appropriate for intended outcomes, 2) explain how the practice meets SAMHSA's goals for the grant program, 3) describe any modifications or adaptations needed for the practice to meet the goals of the project, 4) explain why the EBP was selected, 5) justify the use of multiple EBPs, if applicable, and 6) discuss training needs or plans to ensure successful implementation. Lastly, the language includes resources the applicant can use to understand EBPs. SAMHSA shares evidence-based program and practice language with grantees as they compete for SAMHSA grants and describe the types of program/practice implementation they hope to engage in to address the needs of their particular target populations and communities. The review criteria contained in the FOA make clear that applicants proposing to use programs and practices with a more robust evidence base will receive higher scores and thus greater support for their funding application. • The President's Budget for SAMHSA for FY18 plans to implement a tiered evidence approach in the Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) program, which will allow for funding allocations and awards based on the implementation of both innovative practices or programs and more standard programming. Grant funding will be tied to the particular approach taken by the grantee. At the present time, SAMHSA does not use preference points to link funds to evidence of effectiveness; however, the 10% set-aside includes language to suggest that the Coordinated Specialty Care model is a first episode approach of importance to this work. • Among SAMHSA's standard terms and conditions of all grant funding is the requirement that grantees collect and report evaluation data to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of its programs under the Government Performance and Results (GPRA) Modernization Act of 2010 (P.L. 102-62). In addition, grantees must comply with performance goals and expected outcomes described in Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOAs), which may include participation in an evaluation and/or local performance assessment. While exemplar FOAs are not available to be shared publicly at this juncture, SAMHSA is developing the first tiered evidence FOA that will be funded in FY2018, a key step to incentivize innovative practice/program models among grantees. While exemplar FOAs are not available to be shared publicly at this juncture, SAMHSA is developing the first tiered evidence FOA that will be funded in FY2018, a key step to incentivize innovative practice/program models among grantees USAID: • USAID is committed to using evidence of effectiveness in all of its competitive contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants, which comprise the majority of the Agency's work. USAID has rebuilt its planning, monitoring, and evaluation framework to produce and use evidence through the introduction of a new Program Cycle, which systematizes use of evidence across all decision-making regarding grants and all of USAID's work. The Program Cycle is USAID's particular framing and terminology to describe a common set of processes intended to achieve more effective development interventions and maximize impacts. The Program Cycle acknowledges that development is not static and is rarely linear, and therefore stresses the need to assess and reassess through regular monitoring, evaluation, and learning. Thus the different components of the Program Cycle mutually reinforce each other by having learning and adapting integrated throughout. The Program Cycle encourages planning and project management innovations to increase the cost-effectiveness and lasting impact of development cooperation.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY17?	USAID (cont.): • In 2013, USAID reformed its policy for awarding new contracts to elevate past performance to comprise 20 to 30 percent of the non-cost evaluation criteria. For assistance, USAID does a "risk assessment" to review an organization's ability to meet the goals and objectives outlined by the Agency. This can be found in ADS 303, section 303.3.9. Contractor performance is guided by USAID operational policy ADS 302, section 302.3.8.7. As required in FAR Subpart 42.15, USAID must evaluate contractor performance using the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS). Information in CPARS, while not available to the public, is available for Contracting Officers across the Government to use in making determinations of future awards. • USAID has also instituted a policy called the Acquisition and Assistance Review and Approval Document (AARAD) process where all contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements over $100 million are reviewed by the Administrator prior to being awarded and all awards over $50 million are reviewed by the relevant Assistant Administrators. Included in the AARAD review are several key factors that include: Policy Relevant, Commitment to Sustainable Results, Feasibility, and Value for Money. This policy ensures that results, evidence, and long-term strategies are incorporated into all of USAID's major programs. In addition, it ensures senior level accountability on USAID's biggest programs. This policy is outlined in ADS 300. USAID guidance for competitive grants is also available online. USED: • ED's five largest competitive grant programs in FY17 are:1) TRIO ($950 million in FY17); 2) GEAR UP ($340 million in FY17); 3) Charter Schools Grants ($342 million in FY17); 4) Teacher and School Leader Incentive Program (TSL) ($200 million in FY17); and 5) Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants ($190 million in FY17). • ED uses evidence of effectiveness when making awards in all 5 of these largest competitive grant programs. 1) ED awards competitive priorities for grant applicants in Upward Bound (over $300 million in FY17) and Upward Bound Math & Science (approximately $48 million in FY17) who demonstrate they will use strategies with moderate evidence of effectiveness. 2) ED awards competitive priorities for grant applicants in GEAR UP state and partnership grants (approximately $70 million in new awards in FY17) who demonstrate they will use strategies with moderate evidence of effectiveness. 3) Under the Charter Schools Grants, ED makes awards through the Replication and Expansion of High-Quality Charter Schools program ($approximately $57 million in new awards in FY17) to applicants based on their demonstrated success in improving student outcomes. 4) The TSL statute requires applicants to provide a description of the rationale for their project and describe how the proposed activities are evidence-based, and grantees are held to these standards in the implementation of the program. 5) Under the Comprehensive Literacy Development program ED included an absolute priority directing States to ensure that their subgrants to districts support projects that are based on moderate evidence when such evidence is available. • The Evidence Planning Group (EPG) advises program offices on ways to incorporate evidence in grant programs, including use of evidence as an entry requirement or priority to encourage the use of practices where there is evidence of effectiveness, and/or an exit requirement or priority to build new evidence. As noted in response to Question #4, for the past several years, ED has reported publicly on Performance.gov on its Agency Priority Goal (APG) focused on directing an increasing percentage of funds available for new competitive awards towards projects that are supported by evidence. Funding decisions are not yet final for FY17 grant competitions, but ED is on track to meet its target for that APG. • In FY16, ED conducted 12 competitions that included the use of evidence beyond a logic model. In FY17 not all decisions have been finalized yet, but so far ED has announced the following 12 competitions that include the use of evidence beyond a logic model: 1) Strengthening Institutions Program; 2) TRIO-Upward Bound; 3) TRIO-Upward Bound Math & Science; 4) GEAR-UP; 5) National Professional Development; 6) Education Innovation and Research; 7) Supporting Effective Educator Development (2 cohorts); 8) Professional Development for Arts Educators; 9) Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education; 10) Stepping Up Technology Implementation; 11) Model Demonstration Projects to Improve Algebraic Reasoning for Students with Disabilities in Middle and High School; and 12) Magnet Schools Assistance Program.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY17?	**USED (cont.):** • The Education Innovation and Research program ($100 million in FY17) provides competitive grants to create, develop, implement, replicate, or take to scale entrepreneurial, evidence-based, field-initiated innovations to improve student achievement and attainment for high-need students; and rigorously evaluate such innovations. ED's FY18 budget prioritizes funding evidence-based activities. For example, the budget includes $370 for the EIR program, an increase of $270 million over the FY17 enacted level. • Additionally, ESEA requires that ED give priority to applicants demonstrating strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence within the following seven competitive grant programs: Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation; Supporting Effective Educator Development; School Leader Recruitment and Support; Statewide Family Engagement Centers; Promise Neighborhoods; Full-Service Community Schools; and Supporting High-Ability Learners and Learning. **USHUD:** • In FY17 HUD's major competitive grant programs are: 1) Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance ($2.0 billion); 2) Disaster Assistance/National Disaster Resilience Competition ($300 million); 3) Choice Neighborhoods Grants program ($125 million); 4) Service Coordinators program ($75 million); 3) Family Self-Sufficiency Program ($75 million); 4) Indian Community Development Block Grant Program ($60 million); and 5) Housing Counseling Assistance ($50 million). • Decisions regarding the design, funding, and implementation of all HUD competitive grant programs are evidence-based, as specified in funding criteria in HUD's FY17 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). The "Achieving Results and Program Evaluation" factor (see p.13), provides funding priority for applicants that demonstrate effective use of evidence in identifying or selecting the proposed practices, strategies, or programs proposed in the application, and requires all grantees to cooperate in HUD-funded research and evaluation studies (see p. 14). Another factor, "Past Performance," provides: "In evaluating applications for funding HUD will take into account an applicant's past performance in managing funds, including, but not limited to….meeting performance targets as established in the grant agreement…." (see p. 13). The "Achieving Results and Program Evaluation" factor and "Past Performance" factor are two of five factors considered that total 100 points, and 2 additional preference points are available for evidence that activities will support other HUD initiatives. • Competitive grants in the Continuum of Care program account for most HUD grant resources in FY17, and serve homeless populations by providing permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing services. The FY16 NOFA allocated $1.6 billion using a 200-point scale that provides 27 preference points for development and use of a standard Homeless Management Information System and Point-in-Time counts that support performance measurement (see pp. 37–38), 40 preference points for providing a panel of System Performance Measures for local homeless outcomes (see p.40), and a total of 15 points for each of four target populations for the extent to which grantees achieve reductions in homelessness or make progress toward reducing homelessness as demonstrated for the relevant homeless outcome metrics (see pp. 41–42). • The National Disaster Resilience Competition, which was HUD's second-largest competitive grant program in FY16, used evidence about disaster resilience, including benefit/cost analysis, to ensure that disaster funding improves communities' ability to withstand and recover more quickly from future disasters, hazards, and shocks rather than simply recreating the same vulnerabilities. The tiered funding approach awarded implementation grants after evaluating evidence from the FY15 framing grants. • HUD partnered with the U.S. Department of Justice in issuing demonstration grants that use Pay for Success financing to reduce homelessness and prisoner recidivism by providing permanent supportive housing through a demonstration using the "housing first" model.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY17?	USDOL: • In FY17, the five largest competitive grant programs awarded were: 1) Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) National Grants ($140 million), 2) America's Promise Job Driven Grant Program ($111 million), 3) YouthBuild ($80 million), 4) ApprenticeshipUSA State Expansion Grants ($50.5 million), and 5) Reentry Projects ($66 million). • All have been or will be involved in evaluations designed by CEO and the relevant agencies, and require or encourage (through language in the funding announcement and proposal review criteria) grantees to use evidence-based models or strategies in grant interventions and/or test, by participating in an evaluation, new interventions that theory or research suggest are promising. • DOL includes rigorous evaluation requirements in all competitive grant programs, involving either: 1) full participation in a national evaluation as a condition of grant receipt; 2) an independent third-party local or grantee evaluation with priority incentives for rigorous designs (e.g., tiered funding, scoring priorities, bonus scoring for evidence-based interventions or multi-site rigorous tests), or 3) full participation in an evaluation as well as rigorous grantee (or local) evaluations. For example, SCSEP includes language that states, "By accepting grant funds, grantees agree to participate in the evaluation, should they be selected, including making records on participants, employers, and funding available and providing access to program operating personnel and participants, as specified by the evaluator(s) under the direction of ETA, including after the period of operation." • The America's Promise grant program aims to build partnerships focused on key priorities, including using evidence-based design. The grant funding announcement outlined a number of evidence-based strategies and encouraged their use as well as evaluation of promising strategies to build evidence. For instance, the funding announcement stated that, "sector strategies can increase the employability, employment, earnings, and outcomes of job seekers, and at the same time benefit employers through improved worker productivity, job retention, and enhanced profitability. For example, studies randomly assigning people to job training programs with sector partnerships found that participants were employed at a higher rate with higher earnings (an additional $4,500 over 24 months) than those who went through other employment and training programs. For applicants that already have sector strategies in place, we are interested in seeing data and demonstration of strong outcomes for job seekers and employers alike that are outlined later in this document..." • The America's Promise grant program aims to build partnerships focused on key priorities, including using evidence-based design. The grant funding announcement outlined a number of evidence-based strategies and encouraged their use. In reviewing grant proposals, 54 points (out of 100) were given for "project design" (and additional 10 points were given for the expected outcomes and outputs section). The funding announcement, and specifically the project design section outlined evidence based strategies and provided links to resources to make it easier for bidders to identify effective strategies and support improved outcomes. For instance, the funding announcement stated that, "sector strategies can increase the employability, employment, earnings, and outcomes of job seekers, and at the same time benefit employers through improved worker productivity, job retention, and enhanced profitability. For example, studies randomly assigning people to job training programs with sector partnerships found that participants were employed at a higher rate with higher earnings (an additional $4,500 over 24 months) than those who went through other employment and training programs. For applicants that already have sector strategies in place, we are interested in seeing data and demonstration of strong outcomes for job seekers and employers alike that are outlined later in this document…" Additionally, the funding announcement required participation in a national evaluation as a condition of award. • The YouthBuild funding announcement required applicants to demonstrate how their project design is informed by the existing evidence base on disadvantaged youth serving social programs, and in particular disadvantaged youth workforce development programs.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
8. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest competitive grant programs in FY17?	USDOL cont: • The ApprenticeshipUSA grant program strives to meet DOL's goal to double and further diversify Registered Apprenticeships across the country. The grant funding announcement encourages applicants to "use program models with demonstrated evidence of success in serving the targeted population(s), especially models shown by rigorous program evaluations to have positive impacts on participants' employment and earnings outcomes." Further, allowable activities include program administration to improve program efficiency, program quality and outcome measurement such as project management, data collection and grant reporting, and grant monitoring and evaluation. • The Reentry Projects grant program requires applicants to propose evidence-based and informed interventions, or new interventions that theory or research suggests are promising, (or a combination of both) that lead to increased employment outcomes for their target populations and must frame their goals and objectives to address this issue; applicants are able to select and implement different program services and/or features of program models. The grant funding announcement includes examples of previous studies and evaluations that DOL has conducted on reentry programs, as well as other evidence-based and promising practices, and applicants were encouraged to review these resources prior to designing their intervention. • The TechHire Partnership grants rapidly train workers for and connect them to well-paying, middle- and high-skilled, and high-growth jobs across a diversity of H-1B industries. It used a tiered-evidence framework where evidence-based design was a requirement of grant award, and for grantees that requested between $4 and $5 million, applications were assessed by a panel of experts along a continuum of innovation and evidence, ranging from strong to moderate to preliminary. Grantees receiving more than $4 million must also plan to replicate, at multiple sites and/or with the targeted and other populations, strategies that have been shown by prior research to have evidence of positive impacts on education and/or employment outcomes.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
9. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Non-Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs in FY17? *(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)*	ACF: • In FY17, ACF's 5 largest non-competitive grant programs are: 1) Temporary Assistance for Needy Families ($17.3 billion); 2) Child Care and Development Fund (Block Grant and Entitlement to States combined) ($5.8 billion); 3) Foster Care ($5.3 billion); 4) Child Support Enforcement Payments to States ($4.2 billion); and 5) Low Income Home Energy Assistance ($3.4 billion). • ACF's Foster Care program ($5.3 billion in FY16) has approved over 30 jurisdictions to develop and implement child welfare waiver demonstration projects to improve outcomes for children in foster care or at risk for entry or re-entry into foster care. Through these demonstrations, ACF waives provisions of law to allow flexible use of funding normally limited to foster care for other child welfare services. Many participating jurisdictions are implementing evidence-based or evidence-informed interventions and all demonstration projects are required to have a rigorous evaluation conducted by a third-party evaluator. Although ACF does not currently have statutory authority to grant new waivers, current projects are expected to continue through September 30, 2019. General information on this program, including a fact sheet and summary of relevant legislation/policy, is available at the online Children's Bureau portal. CNCS: • CNCS operates one formula grant program, the AmeriCorps State formula grants program ($154 million in FY17). CNCS also operates four direct grant programs in FY17: 1) National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC) ($30 million in FY17), 2) VISTA ($92 million in FY17), 3) Senior Corps Foster Grandparents ($108 million in FY17), and 4) Senior Corps Senior Companion Program ($46 million in FY17). • In FY17, the Senior Corps Foster Grandparents and Senior Companion programs embedded evidence into their grant renewal processes by offering supplemental funding ("augmentation grants") to grantees interested in deploying volunteers to serve in evidence-based programs (see pp. 2-4) and providing evaluation data on implementation fidelity, including outcomes. A total of $500,000.00 (.01% of total program funds) is allocated for the RSVP grantees to augment their baseline award to implement an evidence based program. For the Foster Grandparents program $400,000.00 (.004% of total program funds) has been allocated in FY17. A total of $300,000.00 is allocated for the Senior Companion program in FY17, or .007% of total program funds. • VISTA finalized its theory of change and a learning agenda/evaluation plan to guide them in FY17 that makes explicit the link between the work that the volunteers perform, the design of a sponsor's project to address community needs, and the evidence to support this activity. This effort will impact several management aspects including project approval, volunteer assignment descriptions, member activity, data collection, and the role of evidence in the design and implementation of projects. MCC: • MCC does not administer non-competitive grant programs.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
9. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Non-Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs in FY17? *(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)*	**SAMHSA:** • The following represents SAMHSA's largest non-competitive grant programs for which funds were appropriated in FY17: 1) Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant Program ($1.8 billion); 2) Mental Health Block Grant Program ($562 million); 3) Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH) Program ($64.6 million); and 4) Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness (PAIMI) Program ($36.1 million). • In FY17, SAMHSA's Mental Health Grant Block maintained a 10% set-aside for evidence-based programs (see p. 4) to address early serious mental illness (ESMI) (including psychosis) among individuals. In FY18-19 grant applications, states must describe how they will utilize the 10% set aside to align with coordinated specialty care models such as that which is grounded in the National Institute of Mental Health's RAISE (Recovery after an Initial Schizophrenic Episode) work, or other approved evidence-based approaches. A key assumption of the block grant applications that grantees must meet is that, "state authorities use evidence of improved performance and outcomes to support their funding and purchasing decisions" (p. 8). In addition, a quality improvement plan is requested from all grantees, which is based on the principles of Continuous Quality Improvement/Total Quality Management (CQI/TQM). Grantees are also required to comply with performance requirements, which include assessing how funds are used via data and performance management systems and other tracking approaches. **USAID:** • USAID does not administer non-competitive grant programs. • USAID does contribute funding to multilateral institutions known as Public International Organizations (PIOs), which are listed here, and include the World Bank, UN, and multi-donor funds such as the Global Fund. A Public International Organization (PIO) is an international organization composed principally of countries. In these specific cases, USAID funds are part of overall US Government funding for these partner institutions. These funds become subject to the monitoring and evaluation requirements of the organization that receives them. For example, the Global Fund has a performance-based funding system, which bases funding decisions on a transparent assessment of results against time-bound targets. USAID's ADS Chapter 308 provides more information on how PIOs are defined and includes guidance related to due diligence required prior to awarding grants to PIOs. **USED:** • ED's 5 largest non-competitive grant programs in FY17 included: 1) Title I Grants to LEAs ($15.4 billion); 2) IDEA Grants to States ($12.0 billion); 3) Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants ($2.2 billion); 4) Impact Aid Payments to Federally Connected Children ($1.3 billion); and 5) 21st Century Community Learning Centers ($1.2 billion). • ED worked with Congress in FY16 to ensure that evidence played a major role in ED's large non-competitive grant programs in the reauthorized education law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). As a result, section 1003 of ESEA requires states to set aside at least 7% of their Title I, Part A funds ($14.9 billion in FY16) for a range of activities to help school districts improve low-performing schools. School districts and individual schools are required to create action plans that include "evidence-based" interventions that demonstrate strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence. • Section 4108 of ESEA authorizes school districts to invest "safe and healthy students" funds in Pay for Success initiatives. Section 1424 of ESEA authorizes school districts to invest their Title I, Part D funds (Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk) in Pay For Success initiatives. • ED is working to align its diverse technical assistance to best serve state, school districts, and schools as they use evidence to drive improvements in education outcomes.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
9. Use of Evidence in 5 Largest Non-Competitive Grant Programs: Did the agency use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds from its 5 largest non-competitive grant programs in FY17? *(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)*	**USHUD:** • HUD's budget contains 3 large formula grant programs for public housing authorities (PHAs): 1) the Public Housing Operating Fund ($4.4 billion in FY17), 2) the Public Housing Capital Grants ($1.9 billion in FY17), and 3) Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Administrative Fees ($1.7 billion in FY17). Another 3 formula grant programs serve cities or tribes: 1) Community Development Block Grant Entitlement/Non-Entitlement ($3.0 billion in FY17), 2) HOME Investment Partnerships ($1.0 billion in FY17), and 3) Native American Housing Block Grants ($0.7 billion in FY17). • Although the funding formulas are prescribed in statute, evaluation-based evidence is central to each program. HUD used evidence from a 2015 Administrative Fee study of the costs that high-performing PHAs incur in administering a HCV program to propose a new FY17 approach for funding Administrative Fees while strengthening PHA incentives to improve HCV outcomes by providing tenant mobility counseling. • HUD's funding of public housing is being radically shifted through the evidence-based Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD), which enables accessing private capital to address the $26 billion backlog of capital needs funding. Based on demonstrated success of RAD, for FY18 HUD proposed removing the cap on the number of public housing developments to be converted to Section 8 contracts. HUD is also conducting a Rent Reform demonstration and a Moving To Work (MTW) demonstration to test efficiencies of changing rent rules. • HUD conducted an extensive assessment of Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian housing needs to strengthen the evidence base for the formula programs. **USDOL:** • In FY17/PY17, the 5 largest non-competitive grant programs at DOL are in the Employment and Training Administration: 1) the Unemployment Insurance State grants ($2.5 billion in FY 2017); 2) the Employment Security program state grants ($666 million in PY 2017); and 3) three authorized programs under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). The 3 WIOA-authorized grants are: 1) Youth Workforce Investment program ($867 million in PY 2017), 2) Adult Employment and Training program** ($809 million in PY 2017), and 3) Dislocated Workers Employment and Training program** ($1.2 billion in PY 2017). • All Employment and Training Administration grant programs allocate funding by statute, and all include performance metrics (e.g., unemployment insurance payment integrity, WIOA common measures) tracked quarterly. • A signature feature of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) (Pub. L. 113-128), is its focus on the use of data and evidence to improve services and outcomes, particularly in provisions related to States' role in conducting evaluations and research, as well as in requirements regarding data collection, performance standards, and state planning. Conducting evaluations is a required statewide activity, but there are additional requirements regarding coordination (with other State agencies and Federal evaluations under WIOA), dissemination, and provision of data and other information for Federal evaluations. • WIOA includes evidence and performance provisions which: (1) increased the amount of WIOA funds states can set aside and distribute directly from 5-10% to 15% and authorized them to invest these funds in Pay for Performance initiatives; (2) authorized states to invest their own workforce development funds, as well as non-federal resources, in Pay for Performance initiatives; (3) authorized local workforce investment boards to invest up to 10% of their WIOA funds in Pay for Performance initiatives; and (4) authorized States and local workforce investment boards to award Pay for Performance contracts to intermediaries, community based organizations, and community colleges.

RESULTS FOR AMERICA

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY17, did the agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
 	
(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)
	ACF:
	• The Head Start Designation Renewal System requires Head Start ($8.6 billion in FY17) grantees to compete for grants moving forward if they failed to meet criteria related to service quality, licensing and operations, and fiscal and internal controls. The 2007 Head Start Reauthorization Act made all Head Start grants renewable, five-year grants. At the end of each five-year term, grantees that are running high-quality programs will have their grants renewed. But grantees that fall short of standards are now required to compete to renew grants. Grantees whose ratings on any of the three domains of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System, an assessment of adult:child interactions linked to improved outcomes, fall below a certain threshold, or in the lowest 10 percent of grantees, must also compete.
	• ACF, in collaboration with the HHS Health Resources and Services Administration, has established criteria for evidence of effectiveness of home visiting models, and oversees the Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness Review (HomVEE), which determines whether models have evidence of effectiveness. To date HomVEE has reviewed evidence on 45 home visiting models, determining 20 of these to have evidence of effectiveness. Grantees must use at least 75% of their federal home visiting funds to implement one or more of these models.
	• ACF's FY18 budget request proposes to eliminate the Community Services Block Grant and the Social Services Block Grant (see pp. 144 and 348).
	
	CNCS:
	• Over the past 8 years, AmeriCorps has reduced the amount of a grant award if member enrollment/retention benchmarks are not met. For example, in FY17, a grantee that had not met the performance targets requested 380 part-time members (the equivalent of $1 million) and was given zero.
	• Over the past 3 years, money has been redirected away from grantees with poor past performance metrics and awarded to grantees with positive past performance metrics so that they will have "forward funding." (CNCS programs typically award one-year grants with an option to receive continuation awards). For example, in FY17, AmeriCorps "forward funded" 12 grants, with 9% of its competitive funding based on the reallocation of dollars from poor performing grantees to high performing grantees.
	• According to CNCS policy, Americorps State Commission staff will assess their recompeting subgrantees' past performance and submit those assessments to CNCS. CNCS will assess its recompeting direct grantees related to past performance. This assessment is in addition to the evaluation of the applicant's eligibility for funding or the quality of its application on the basis of the Selection Criteria. Results from this assessment will inform funding decisions. In evaluating programmatic performance, CNCS will consider the following for applicants that are current formula and competitive grantees and are submitting applications for the same program model:
	   • Grant progress reports – attainment of Performance Measures
	   • Enrollment and retention
	   • Compliance with 30-day enrollment and exit requirements in the AmeriCorps portal
	   • Site visit or other monitoring findings (if applicable)
	   • Significant opportunities and/or risks of the grantee related to national service
	   • Commission Rank

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
10. Repurpose for Results: In FY17, did the agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes? *(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)*	**MCC:** • MCC has an established Policy on Suspension and Termination that lays out the reasons for which MCC may suspend or terminate assistance to partner countries. Assistance may be suspended or terminated, in whole or in part, if a country (1) engages in activities contrary to the national security interests of the US, (2) engages in a pattern of actions inconsistent with the MCC's eligibility criteria, or (3) fails to adhere to its responsibilities under a compact or threshold grant, or related agreement. MCC has terminated a compact partnership, in part or in full, seven times out of 33 compacts approved to date, and has suspended partner country eligibility (both compact and threshold) four times, most recently seen with the suspension of Tanzania in March 2016 due to democratic rights concerns. MCC's Policy on Suspension and Termination also allows MCC to reinstate eligibility when countries demonstrate a clear policy reversal, a remediation of MCC's concerns, and an obvious commitment to MCC's eligibility indicators. For example, in early 2012, MCC suspended Malawi's Compact prior to Entry into Force as MCC determined that the Government of Malawi had engaged in a pattern of actions inconsistent with MCC's eligibility criteria, specifically around democratic governance. Thereafter, the new Government of Malawi took a number of decisive steps to improve the democratic rights environment and reverse the negative economic policy trends of concern to MCC, which led to a reinstatement of eligibility for assistance in mid-2012. • MCC also consistently monitors the progress of Compact programs and their evaluations, using the learning from this evidence to make changes to MCC's portfolio. For example, MCC recently undertook a review of its portfolio investments in roads in an attempt to better design, implement, and evaluate road investments. Through evidence collected across 16 compacts with road projects, MCC uncovered seven key lessons including the need to prioritize and select projects based on a road network analysis, to standardize content and quality of road data collection across road projects, and to consider cost and the potential for learning in determining how road projects are evaluated. This body of evidence and analysis will be published in September 2017 as MCC's next Principles into Practice paper. Critically, the lessons from this analysis are already being applied to road projects in compacts in development in Cote d'Ivoire and Nepal. **SAMHSA:** • The SAMHSA budget provides performance information along with budget information which Congress can use to determine funding levels. Each year the program Centers review grantees within each program, project, or activity in terms of performance and financial management, when funding decisions are made for continuation funding. It is up to each Center to determine the factors that go into decisions related to continued funding based on guidance from the Office of Financial Management, Division of Grants Management. To the extent that costs are reduced for continuation funding, those funds can be repurposed to fund new grantees or to provide additional contract support for those grantees. In FY 2017, SAMHSA underwent a stringent review process for all funding requests utilizing both program and fiscal performance. During this process, SAMHSA utilized $51M in unspent funding from existing grantees to fund new programs and activities. • CBHSQ staff conducted a summer evaluation inventory in the summer of 2016, requesting that program staff from the Centers provide information related to how their evaluation findings inform the next iteration of their programs and/or new evaluation activities. For the most part, program staff indicated that evaluation findings were used to improve the next round of funding opportunity announcements and thus grantee implementation of program.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY17, did the agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
 	
(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)
	USAID:
	
	• USAID's updated operational policy for planning and implementing country programs has incorporated a set of tools and practices called Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA), that include designing adaptable activities that build in feedback loops; using flexible implementing mechanisms; and adopting a management approach that includes consulting with partners about how implementation is evolving and what changes need to be made. Through the Program Cycle, USAID encourages managing projects and activities adaptively, responding to rigorous data and evidence and shifting design and/or implementation accordingly.
	
	• USAID uses rigorous evaluations to maximize its investments. A recent independent study found that 71 percent of USAID evaluations have been used to modify and/or design USAID projects. Below are a few recent examples where USAID has shifted funds and/or programming decisions based on performance:
	
	   • **Tunisia**: A USAID enterprise reform project in Tunisia used adaptive management to build feedback loops and flexibility into their project design, learning from monitoring data and adapting programming based on the evidence. The project's components regularly collaborate in order to follow leads and identify opportunities. As a result, the project more than doubled initial targets - and created approximately 10% of the total net new jobs created in the Tunisian economy.
	
	   • **Cambodia**: Findings from a mid-term evaluation of USAID activities under a public health project are informing the design of a new project to more efficiently integrate activities and enable donors and implementing partners to collaborate more easily. Findings are also contributing to the phasing out of some poor performing project components.
	
	   • **Peru**: In response to a 2016 evaluation of a conflict mitigation activity which found that the intervention did not address root causes of conflict, USAID incorporated key changes for the design and award process of future programming, requiring new activities to address root causes of conflict for the particular context.
	
	   • **Vietnam**: Based on the findings of a 2016 mid-term evaluation and subsequent stakeholder consultations, USAID's Vietnam Forest and Delta Program reduced its scope and focused more on local needs, resulting in more efficient use of resources and positive feedback from government officials and implementing partners.
	
	   • **Ethiopia**: A mid-term impact evaluation of the Feed the Future (FtF) portfolio in Ethiopia found that more than half of the communities in the project's zone of influence had not been sufficiently reached by programming. Based on these findings, USAID is already in the process of reducing the number of interventions and their geographic coverage for the final years of the project in Ethiopia. USAID plans to assess and learn from the re-focusing effort to inform programming in other countries.
	
	• USAID's Securing Water for Food: A Grand Challenge for Development (SWFF) selected the highest potential water-for-food innovations and is providing grant funds and ongoing assistance to support business development. SWFF starts as a competition, but the winners must continually show results to receive a new tranche of funding. To move forward, grantees must achieve technical and financial milestones, such as increased crop yields and total product sales. Of the first 15 awardees, nine received Year 2 funding; six did not, because they did not meet the target number of end-users/customers in a cost-effective way and because their model was not deemed sustainable without USAID funding. By using milestone-based funding, SWFF has helped over one million farmers and other customers grow more than 3,000 tons of food and save almost 2 billion liters of water. In addition, SWFF innovators have formed more than 125 partnerships and secured more than $10 million in leveraged funding.
	
	• DIV, another example of USAID directing funds based on evidence of effectiveness, is mentioned earlier in the Innovation section.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	

10. Repurpose for Results: In FY17, did the agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?
 	
(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)
	USED:
	• ED seeks to shift program funds to support more effective practices by prioritizing the use of entry evidence. For ED's grant competitions where there is evaluative data about current or past grantees, or where new evidence has emerged independent of grantee activities, ED typically reviews such data to shape the design of future grant competitions.
	• Additionally, ED uses evidence in competitive programs to encourage the field to shift away from less effective practices and toward more effective practices. For example, ESEA's Education Innovation and Research (EIR) program - the successor to i3 - supports the creation, development, implementation, replication, and scaling up of evidence-based, field-initiated innovations designed to improve student achievement and attainment for high-need students.
	• The President's 2018 Budget request eliminates or reduces funding for more than 30 discretionary programs that do not address national needs, duplicate other programs, are ineffective, or are more appropriately supported with State, local, or private funds. Major eliminations and reductions in the 2018 Budget include:
	  • Supporting Effective Instruction State grants (Title II-A), a savings of $2.3 billion. The program is proposed for elimination because evidence shows that the program is poorly structured to support activities that have a measurable impact on improving student outcomes. It also duplicates other ESEA program funds that may be used for professional development (p. C-16-C20).
	  • 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, a savings of $1.2 billion. The program lacks strong evidence of meeting its objectives, such as improving student achievement. Based on program performance data from the 2014-2015 school year, more than half of program participants had no improvement in their math and English grades and nearly 60 percent of participants attended centers for fewer than 30 days (pp. C-23-C-24).
	• It is also worth noting that one of the themes of the FY18 budget for ED was "building evidence around educational innovation." Consistent with this, the Department sustains funding for all IES-authorized activities and for continued support of State and local-based research, evaluation and statistics that help educators, policymakers and other stakeholders improve outcomes for all students. As another example, the budget requested $42 million for Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) to provide evidence-based professional development activities and prepare teachers and principals from nontraditional preparation and certification routes to serve in high-need LEAs.
	• In the previous administration, ED worked with Congress to eliminate 50 programs, saving more than $1.2 billion, including programs like Even Start (see pp. A-72 to A-73) (-$66.5 million in FY11) and Mentoring Grants (see p. G-31) (-$47.3 million in FY10), which the Department recommended eliminating out of concern based on evidence.

EVIDENCE / EVALUATION CRITERIA	
10. Repurpose for Results: In FY17, did the agency shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes? *(Note: Meeting this criteria requires both Agency and Congressional action.)*	**USHUD:** • HUD's FY17 budget request included a new formula for funding Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Fees that shifts funding away from inappropriately compensated public housing agencies and increases overall funding according to evidence about actual costs of maintaining a high-performing voucher program. (See here for more info.) • HUD's FY17 budget request sought a $11 billion shift (pp.8–9) of resources toward housing vouchers for homeless families based on the rigorous experimental analysis of 4 service options in the Family Options study. • HUD's FY18 budget request sought to eliminate funding for Community Development Block Grants. A 2005 PD&R evaluation had shown that targeting of CDBG resources toward communities with greater needs would be greatly enhanced by any of four alternatives to the 1978 statutory formula, but such improvements have not been authorized. An earlier 1995 evaluation found that although CDBG had made a contribution to community development, the neighborhood interventions generally were ad hoc rather than well-coordinated and strategic. **USDOL:** • DOL's evidence-based strategy is focused on program performance improvement and expansion of strategies and programs on which there is evidence of positive impact from rigorous evaluations. The department takes all action possible to improve performance before considering funding reductions or program termination. However, DOL does use program performance measures and results from evaluations to make decisions about future funding. For example: • In 2016 DOL established a methodology assessing the performance of Job Corps centers and selecting Centers for closure. In 2016 one Job Corps Center was closed because of its chronic low performance. Closure of this center allows DOL to shift limited program dollars to centers that will better serve students by providing the training and credentials they need to achieve positive employment and educational outcomes. In a Federal Register notice published in July 2016, DOL announced the closure and the methodology used for selecting Centers for closure. • All discretionary grant performance is closely monitored and has been used to take corrective action and make decisions about continued funding. For example, Youthbuild grant funding is based heavily on past performance. Organizations that have previously received and completed a YouthBuild grant award receive points based on past performance demonstrated totaling 28 points (almost 30% of their score). This effectively weeds out low performing grantees from winning future awards. (For more information, see the Grant Funding Announcement.) Additionally, DOL uses evidence in competitive programs to encourage the field to shift away from less effective practices and toward more effective practices. For example, recent grant programs such as TechHire and America's Promise supports the creation, development, implementation, replication, and scaling up of evidence-based practices designed to improve outcomes. • DOL's FY18 budget request prioritizes programs with demonstrated evidence (e.g., by allocating $90 million to expand apprenticeships, an evidence-based approach that combines on-the-job training with classroom instruction) and proposes reductions to unproven or duplicative activities (e.g., it proposes a reduction of $238 million by closing additional Job Corps centers that do not meet performance standards, and proposes eliminating the Senior Community Service Employment Program).

About the Results for America Federal Invest in What Works Index

Results for America's Federal Invest in What Works Index (2017) highlights the extent to which the Administration for Children and Families (within HHS); Corporation for National and Community Service; Millennium Challenge Corporation; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (within HHS); U.S. Agency for International Development; U.S. Department of Education; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; and U.S. Department of Labor have built the infrastructure necessary to be able to use data, evidence and evaluation in budget, policy, and management decisions. These agencies are overseeing more than $220 billion in federal investments in FY17.

It is important to note that:

- Results for America developed the criteria and scoring structure in the index in close consultation with more than 75 current and former Federal government officials and key stakeholders from all across the country.

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

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

- Results for America released five previous versions of this Invest in What Works Index in: June 2013, September 2013, May 2014, March 2015, and April 2016.

Scoring

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

About Results for America

Results for America is helping decision-makers at all levels of government harness the power of evidence and data to solve our world's greatest challenges. Our mission is to make investing in what works the "new normal," so that when policymakers make decisions, they start by seeking the best evidence and data available, then use what they find to get better results.

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