Office of Child Welfare Programs
Summary Scorecard
Fundamentals

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
OUTCOMES													
O1: Safety													
a	**Re-abuse Rate**	**# of individuals who have experienced abuse more than once a year divided by the # of all people who have experienced abuse. (summary calculation)**	%						> 5.4 %	5.4% - 4.1%	<4.1%	Lois Day	
1	CW (CFSP Measure)	**ROM Operational Definition:** Percent of children who are victims of founded maltreatment who were not re-victimized (another founded report) within a 6 month observation period following victimization. Observation Period - The observation period is the 6 months after the date the report was received for reports that were founded. Exception - Any subsequent founded report that occurs within 24 hours or less is not considered a recurrence (presumed to be the same incident) **ROM CALCULATION:** Numerator: (Of children counted in the denominator) Number of children with a founded report of maltreatment during the six-month observation period Divided By Denominator: Number of children with a founded report of maltreatment for whom the six-month observation period ended	%	4.4	7.5	4.2	6.3	-	> 5.4 %	5.4% - 4.1%	<4.1%	Stacy Lake	Starting to see an up and down pattern and wondering if this would be something better to look at in a 12 mo. rolling. Reason for the pattern is unknown at this time. Where are the children at time of abuse? Break down to be able to inform field partners. Re-Abuse data break down by district is preferred. Additional work needs to be done to ensure this is accurately representing the actual incidents of re-abuse and where its at & what is driving it. 11/10/15 - Per Judy Helvig- "It was noticed that an incorrect time period was used for the 2015 Q3 QBR data….I've attached an updated version and will enter this correct percent re-abused (6.3%) for the Tier 1 Enterprise QBR on Nov 23rd."
b	**Abuse Rate**	**% abuse in licensed and certified programs.**							>0.49 %	0.49%-0.33%	<0.33 %	Lois Day	
2	CW (CFSP Measure)	**Operational Definition of Measure:** Percent of children in out-of-home care during the 12 months preceding the end of the Report Period who were not abused or neglected by foster care providers while in care during the previous 12 months. The abuse or neglect must be founded, and the report date had to occur within 12 months of the last day in the Report Period, and one of the perpetrators in the report was a foster care caregiver (e.g. group home staff, foster parent, relative provider) **Calculation: Numerator:** (Of children counted in the denominator) Number of children not abused or neglected (founded disposition) by a foster care caregiver anytime during the past 12 months in care Divided By Denominator: Number of children in out-of-home care for any part of the prior 12 months	%	0.98	0.97	0.97	0.85	+	>0.49 %	0.49%-0.33%	<0.33 %	Kevin George & Laurie Price	Completed the safe mitigation training in Sept & Oct. Participating in a Legislative workgroup regarding OAPPI process in relation to HB2233. On going certification case reviews through the sensitive issue review process. Continuing to roll out the confirming a safe environment training. Number of rule sets with Casey's Public Policy Group to review for areas of modification. Working with consortium on a QA process for Safe Home Studies. Clearly a concerning trend. **Scoring scale needs to be adjusted.**
O2: People Living as Independently as Possible													
a	**In Home Service**	**A composite of program reported results as compared to program target.**	%					-	<40 %	41% - 75%	>75 %	Trisha Baxter Jerry Waybrant	

Office of Child Welfare Programs
Summary Scorecard

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
1	CW-Time in Foster Care (CFSP Measure)	Reduction in length of stay in foster care (median length of stay of children exiting care in months). Data Source: DCRU Foster Care Episode. 2014 Q4 and forward Source: ROM OR05 Median Length of Stay at Exit (or those exiting) Operational Definition: Median months in foster care for children exiting care (discharged) during the report period. Length of stay calculation - The number of months (number of days divided by 30.4375) between the date the child was removed and the date they discharged from care (see discharge date) Calculation: A median time in care is computed for the group of children who were discharged during the period of time used by the report. The median is the midpoint in a series of numbers (lengths of stay of those discharged) such that half the children are above and half are below.	Mo.	20.34	20.70	18.50	18.30	+	>15.1	15.1-14.8	<14.8	Kathy Prouty	Still in RED however trending in the right direction. As long stayers leave Foster care this measure will go up. It is not always a negative thing. Kathy believes the focus should be on Reunification, establish a base line first. Break down data available on ROM.
2	CW-Face to Face Contact In Home (CFSP Measure)	Percent of Children Served In Home with at least one contact of all Children Served In Home on the report during the last month of the QBR reporting period. To get last month of Period, run Summary report in the following month (mid-month). Set Parameters as follows: Districts: All, Contact Month: Prior Month, Person Type: Child, Person Location: In Home. Data Source: WB-5001-S Caseworker Family Face to Face All Contacts Summary Report	%	63.1	67.1	71.7	69.5	-	<80 %	80%-90%	>90 %	Darlene Dangelo & Melinda Johnson	Focus has been Foster Care with positive results. Same focus will be given to the In-home. Trending over all in the correct direction.
3	CW (CFSP Measure)	# of children served In Home including Trial Reunification (point in time) / # of children served in Foster Care excluding Trial Reunification (point in time) + In Home including Trial Reunification (point in time).	%	23.7	24.0	23.3	24.3	-	< 20%	20 - 40%	> 40%	Stacey Ayers	Working to change how measured is scored. A strategy to increase this number is to bring in the consultants from Permanency and Safety together around OSM.
4	CW (CFSP Measure)	Children in Oregon who experience a single reentry into care within 12 months subsequent to a prior foster care episode. Children who enter substitute care in Oregon earlier than 12 months of a prior Foster care episode. Source DCRU Foster Care episode. 2014 Q4 and forward Source: ROM CM06 No Reentry in Custody of those discharged 12 months ago. Numerator: Unique count of Children who have entered foster care in the period who had previous episode end within 12 months of the time of entry. Denominator: Unique count of total children who entered Foster care within the reporting period.	%	6.4	6.9	7.6	8.4	+	>9.4%	8.6%-9.4%	<8.6%	Kevin George & Laurie Price	Jason - Why is re-entry a Well-Being measure?
b	**Successful Employment**	**A composite of program reported results as compared to program target.**	%						<35%	35%-65%	>65%	Trisha Baxter Jerry Waybrant	
c	**Progress to less restrictive services**	**% of people who move to less restrictive services**	%						TDB	TBD	TBD	VACANT	

Office of Child Welfare Programs
Summary Scorecard

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
1	CW	Timely Adoption-Median Months to Adoption Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption during the quarter, what was the median length of stay in foster care from the date of the latest removal from home to the date of discharge to adoption. (Source: ROM Report FO.02.2 Median Months to Adoption (of those adopted)	Mo.	33.35	33.68	34.63	34.30	+	>35 mo.	32-35 mo.	<32 mo.	Gail Schelle	Out of line with what they are seeing in other trends. Currently looking as various data to determine the reason for the trend down. Seeking approval to add queries to data pull.
2	CW (CFSP Measure)	Legally free children adopted in less than 12 months Denominator: Children for whom the 12 month observation period (following TPR) ended within the report period (Quarter). Numerator: Children adopted within 12 months of TPR Source: ROM Report FO.02.5 Adopted in less than 12 months of TPR (of those with TPR 12 mos ago)	%	48.3	49.4	48.1	38.8	-	<40%	40%-50%	>50%	Gail Schelle	Currently looking as various data to determine the reason for the trend down. Seeking approval to add queries to data pull.
3	CW	Calculate Percent of all foster care children under age 18 with an appla plan using Permanency Plan data. Source FC 1005 Children In Care report from production reports	%	15.7	15.6	14.7	13.3	+	>15.0 %	15.0%-13.6%	13.6%-12.4%	Kathy Prouty	Let Trend for next 3 quarters for a year of data, then look at meausreing differently.
4	CW-Relative Care	Percent of children in Modified Relative Family Foster care vs. All Children in Modified Family Foster Care. (PIT at the end of the period all children in Family Foster Care including Trial Home Visit and Pre Adoptive services.) Data Source: Children in Care report from Production Reports Denominator: All Children in Family Foster care (Relative/Non-Relative) AND including Pre Adoptive, and Trial Home Visit services	%	54.9	54.5	54.6	55.2	+	<35%	35%-50%	51% or >51%	Kevin George & Laurie Price	
d	**Earning Sufficient Wages**	**A composite of program reported results as compared to program target.**	**%**					-	<80%	80-90%	>90%	Trisha Baxter Jerry Waybrant	
O3: Fiscally Responsible													
a	**On Target Spend**	**% of spending plans within target.**	**%**					-	< 80%	80% - 90%	> 90%	Eric Moore	

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
b	**Balanced Budget**	**Agency spending "is" or "is not" within spending plan.**							No	N/A	Yes	Eric Moore	
O4: Customer Satisfaction													
a	**Customer Satisfaction**	**% of responding customers that rank quality of DHS service as "good" or "excellent."**	%						<75%	75% - 90%	>90%	Gene Evans	
1	CW-Voluntary Services	% of satisfaction of those receiving non-court imposed services (later add in court imposed services)	%									Jason Walling	
2	CW-Foster Parents Relative & Non Relative	% of satisfaction (Statewide Survey) Completed every 6 months. 4/28 combined Relative & Non Relative per Kevin.	%	N/A	83.0	NA	NA	-	<80%	80-90%	90-100%	Kevin George	Survey being sent out this month, Data next quarter
3	CW- Teens	% of satisfaction (Statewide Survey)	%									Kevin George	Asking that this is not be a separate cat. Kevin to talk to Jason.
4	CW-Foster Parents (Relatives)	% of satisfaction	%									Kevin George	Part of #2. Unclear of what to measure with this one.
O5: Service Equity													
a	**Access**	**The number of individual measures which are green or yellow divided by the total number of populated program measures in each section. *Only the population with the greatest disparity is reported.***	%						<60%	60% - 79%	>80%	Carol Lamon	
1	CW (CFSP Measure)	Disproportionate representation of children of color served In Home.	%	4.5			100.0	+	>60%	60 - 80%	>80%	Stacy Lake	Measure has been changed a bit. Updated range measure. Owner changed to Stacy Lake as a DR measure.
2	CW (CFSP Measure)	Disproportionate representation of children of color in foster care.	%	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.2	=	<0.5 OR >1.5	0.5-0.74 OR 1.26-1.5	0.75-1.25	Melissa Sampson-Grier	Needs to go to an Outcome measure rather then Access measure. Added separate Outcome Measure.
b	**Outcomes**	**The number of individual measures which are green or yellow divided by the total number of populated program measures in each section. *Only the population with the greatest disparity is reported for all programs but OVRS.***	%					=	<60%	60% - 79%	>80%	Lydia Muniz	

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
1	CW Outcome: Proportion of foster youth achieving permanency within 24 months by race ethnicity [calculated as a disparity ratio]	The Disparity Ratio = % of Non-White & Hispanic foster youth exiting foster care during the quarter who achieve permanency within 24 months of entering care compared to the % of Non-Hispanic White foster youth exiting foster care during the quarter who achieve permanency within 24 months of entering care	%				75.0		<60%	60%-80%	>80%	Kathy Prouty	
O6: Employee Engagement													
a	**Employee Engagement**	**% of staff reporting medium-high or high level of employee engagement**	%					-	<65%	66% - 85%	>85%	Carolyn Ross	
1	CW-Field	Child welfare staff	%	79.0	79.6	87.9	NA	+	<65%	66% - 85%	>85%	Ryan Vogt	No data received
2	CW-Effectiveness of Training	% increase of pre/post test score from beginning to end of CORE: DATA SOURCE: Pre/Post testing in CORE	%	22.4	21.4	17.4	16.1	-	<65%	65%-80%	>80%	Karyn Schimmels	Change meaure to measure compentancy Relook at meaure and how best displayed, more meaningful measure. As part of the redesign of training that is in the works, include this measure. Measure scoring at a certain level before and after.
O7: Workforce Diversity													
a	**Workforce Diversity**	**% of staff by race, ethnicity, and disability status as compared to Oregon census demographics by race, ethnicity, and disability status.**	%						<75%	75% - 95%	> 95%	Lydia Muniz	
O8: Community Business Partnerships													
a	**External Customer Satisfaction**	**Percent of community partners who state that DHS is meeting their expectations.**	%						<70%	70% - 90%	>90%	Mike McCormick	
b	**External stakeholder Satisfaction**	**Percent of stakeholders who state that DHS is meeting their expectations.**	%						<70%	70% - 90%	>90%	Mike McCormick	
1	CW (APSR Report)	(Enterprise sends out survey) Annual	%		72.9	72.09	NA	+	<70%	70% - 90%	>90%	Jason Walling & AJ Goins	Annual survey

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
c	**Partner outcomes**	**% of contract universes that have implemented performance based contracting.**	%					+	<50%	50% - 75%	>75%	Mike McCormick	
1	CW (Business Continuity Measure)		%					=	<50%	50% - 75%	>75%	Need Owner	
OPERATING PROCESSES													
OP1: Protection and Intervention													
a	**Inconclusive disposition of investigations**	**% of completed investigations coded "unable to determine" or "inconclusive."**	%					+	>19%	15% to 19%	<15%	Chuck Dunn Marie Cervantes	
1	CW (Business continuity Measure)	ROM Operational Definition: The number of CPS reports investigations findings (dispositions) during each report period, by disposition categories Report – This measure is by "report" not individual child. Since there can be multiple allegations and conclusions (findings) for multiple children in a report, all children in the report must have a conclusion (finding) for the report to be reported as concluded. Disposition categories – The dispositions (conclusions of the CPS investigation) provided in this measure uses the highest level per child and then the highest among children named in the report using the following hierarchy (from highest to lowest): Founded (01), Unfounded (02), Unable to determine (03), Other (88), Unknown or missing (99) Calculation: Numerator: (Of the denominator) Number of reports by disposition category Divided By Denominator: Number of reports with a disposition during the Report Period	%	13.0	13.0	12.5	11.6	-	>19%	15% to 19%	<15%	Stacey Ayers	Prev owner - Chuck Dunn
b	**Timeliness of investigation**	**% of calls assigned for field contact that meet policy timelines.**	%					-	<70%	70% - 90%	>90%	Chuck Dunn Marie Cervantes	
1	CW (Business continuity Measure)	Operational Definition of Measure: Percent of reports referred for Investigation that had an initial child contact or attempted contact within the required response time (24 hours or within 5 days) of receiving the report. Counts are based on a family case (not individual child) Cases are counted in the ROM Report Period when the CPS report was received. Required response time- Each report is assigned one of two types of response times ("within 24 hours" or "within 5 days) depending on the urgency of the report as stated in agency policy" Calculation: Numerator: (Of the denominator) Number of cases where the child contact or attempted contact was made within the required response time of report received date Divided by Denominator: Number of CPS reports accepted.	%	57.0	67.0	64.0	56.0	-	<70%	70% to 90%	>90%	Stacey Ayers	Prev owner - Chuck Dunn Behind in entering contacts TR & AR response % are the same 15% of not met are the same day within hrs 15% not entered at all or linked 3 & 6 month lag report out 5 day vs 24 day data Jason wants to see 12 month rolling avg. as well as a 3 & 6 month report. Unaccounted factors - SL, VA, Staff turn over, ML Chuck, Stacey & Jason (PM mgrs) to meet about how and what to meaure.
2	CW (Business continuity Measure)	% of calls assigned for field contact that meet policy timelines.	%						<70%	70% - 90%	>90%	Chuck Dunn	

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
c	**Timeliness of investigation completion**	**% of investigation reports completed within policy timelines.**	%					-	<70%	70% - 90%	>90%	Chuck Dunn Marie Cervantes	
1	CW (Business continuity Measure)	Operational Definition of Measure: Percent of accepted reports for CPS investigations that reached the investigation due date according to agency policy that were completed within 30 days for report date on or before June 1, 2014 and 45 days for report date after June 1, 2014, including any extensions. Report – This measure is by "report" not individual child. Since there can be multiple allegations and conclusions (findings) for multiple children in a report, all children in the report must have a conclusion (finding) for the report to be reported as concluded. Completed Report – a report is only completed when every child named in the report has an investigation completed date. Calculation: Numerator: (Of the denominator) Number of investigations completed within required time period of receiving report, Divided By Denominator: Number of CPS reports that reached the investigation due date according to agency policy. 2014 Q4 and forward Source: ROM CPS02 Assessments Completed within Required Time (of those due)	%	30.4	26.5	21.4	19.9	-	<70%	70% - 90%	>90%	Stacey Ayers	Prev owner - Chuck Dunn Per Jason - Pull group together & report back next quarter.
OP2: Direct Service													
a	**(1) Field workforce strategy**	**% of budgeted positions filled compared to the workforce strategy targets. This measures how the well the field staffing levels are staying on target with their workforce strategy plans. Failure to meet staffing plans affects funding availability either by being over or under budget. The Enterprise measure (target and status) is weighted.**	%					+	> 4% of target (+ or -)	Within 2.1% - 4% of target (+ or -)	Within 2% of target (+ or -)	Sandy Dugan, Angela Munkers	
1	CW		%	101.5	101.0	98.6	NA	-				Ryan Vogt	
b	**(2) Field workforce to forecast workload**	**% of Forecast Earned Positions filled based on quarterly point in time data. This measures the field workforce resource availability to serve the citizens of Oregon and meet performance outcomes. Enterprise measure (target and current status) is weighted.**	%					+	>20% of target (+ or -)	Within 10.1% - 20% of target (+ or -)	Within 10% of target (+ or -)	Sandy Dugan, Angela Munkers	

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
1	CW	Same as above?	%	86.9	86.5	84.4	NA	-				Ryan Vogt	
c	**Eligibility timeline NEW MEASURE - Still being refined**	**% of reporting programs meeting timeliness as defined by each program measures. Determined by a percent of reporting programs identified as green for their composite timeliness measures.**	**%**					**=**	<60%	60% - 79%	>80%	Sandy Dugan, Angela Munkers	
1	CW - Field (Business Continuity Measure)	TANF eligibility timeliness	%	90.84	95.00	92.00	89.33	+	< 80%	80% - 89%	> 90%	Sherril Kuhns	80 cases reviewed, 9 of them were not timely. One FRS had 6 out of 20 cases not timely (which is 75%) and the other FRS's were at 94%. Central office is monitoring the one FRS monthly and working with their manager to ensure timeliness of TANF determinations
d	**Equity awareness**	**Data methodology in development.**										Angela Munkers, Sandy Dugan	
1	CW											Michelle	
e	**Staff to budget Ratio**	**% of budgeted positions field DATA SOURCE: VR/SPD/SSP/CW Workload model and budget authority information system**	**%**						<80%	80%-85%	>85%	Sandy Dugan/Corris Neufeldt	
1	CW (Business continuity Measure)											Michelle	
f	**Staff to workload Ratio**	**% of forecast earned positions filled DATA SOURCE: VR/SPD/SSP/CW Workload model and budget authority information system**	**%**						<80%	80%-85%	>85%	Sandy Dugan/Corris Neufeldt	
g	**Developing and engaging partners**		**%**										
1	CW-Tribal Meetings & Equity	Participant in quarterly meetings with tribal and equity communities at Enterprise level	%						<90%	90%-95%	>95%	Melissa Sampson-Grier	
h	**Quality Service Delivery**												
1	CW-Completed Child and Family Services Reviews (Business continuity measure)	Overall outcome "substantially achieved" DATA SOURE: CFSR Review outcomes/Data Contract Kristofer Rash (OPI)	**%**	90.1	78.0	74.1	81.4	+	<80% @74.4%	81-94%	>95%	Matt Bogart	
2	CW-Quality Assurance Accuracy of Eligibility (Business Continuity Measure)	Accuracy of eligibility determinations. TANF-EA, TITLE XIX, TITLE IVE Data Source: Eligibility Specialist Review	%	97.0	95.0	98.0		-	<80%	80-94%	95%	Sherril Kuhns	
OP3: Provider Regulation													

Office of Child Welfare Programs
Summary Scorecard

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
a	**Provider quality improvement**	**% of licensed or certified providers with medication practice non-compliance rising to the level of corrective action.**	%					+	>25%	15-25%	<15%	Donna Keddy	
1	CW (CFSR Measure)	Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs, % measure substantially achieved. Data Source: Quarterly CFSR Review of Well Being Outcome	%	87.0	73.0	80.7	79.2	-	>80%	81%-94%	<95%	Matt Bogart	
2	CW-Psychotropic Medication (CFSP Measure)	Child welfare foster children who are being administered psychotropic medications. Number of children eligible for an annual review of psychotropic medication who have the review completed. Data Source: Child Well Being Psychotropic Medication tracking data base	%	89.0	83.0	79.8	90.0	-	<79%	80-89%	>90%	Kevin George	Measure rateing adjusted.
3	CW-Referrals (CFSP Measure)	% of children received timely referrals for mental health assessments. Data Source: Manual	%	72.0	71.0	68.0	NA	-	<80%	80-90%	>90%	Ryan Vogt	No data received or update to give. Discussed data source change from manual to something else. What is "received" date, need to define.
4	CW- Assessments (CFSP Measure)	% of children received timely mental health assessments. Data Source: Manual	%	46.0	53.0	51.0	NA	-	<80%	80-90%	>90%	Ryan Vogt	No data received or update to give. Discussed data source change from manual to something else. What is "received" date, need to define.
5	Children Care Licensing Unit (CUT OR KEEP???)		%					-	>25%	15-25%	<15%	Donna Keddy	
b	**Monitoring**	**% of on-site visits completed within program specific timelines.**	%					+	<90%	90%-95%	>95%	Donna Keddy	
1	CW-Face to Face Contact (CFSP Measure)	Children will receive face to face contact when served in foster care. The total number of visits made by caseworkers or SSA's allowed by administrative rule on a monthly basis to any child in the legal or physical custody of the department in substitute care during a fiscal year must not be less than 90% of the total number of such visits if each child were visited once while in care. Data Source: OR-Kids monthly face to face report .	%	78.8	85.8	85.4	86.9	+	<80%	80%-90%	>90%	Melinda Johnson & Darline DeAngelo	Losing 1% federal funding. Trending up and improving.
OP4: Program Design and Implementation													
a	**Sub-process utilization scoring**	**% of utilization of sub process of Program Design and Implementation by Program and DHS**	%					+	<50%	50% - 79%	>80 - 100%	Trina Lee	

Office of Child Welfare Programs
Summary Scorecard

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
1	CW (Business continuity Measure)		%					+	<50%	50% - 79%	>80 - 100%		Rolling up to enterprise measure? If not, remove per Jason.
b	**Scoring of Outcome Measures**	**% of performance to target by program and DHS using Outcome measure data.**	%					+	<50%	50% - 79%	>80 - 100%	Trina Lee	
1	CW (Business continuity Measure)		%					+	<50%	50% - 79%	>80 - 100%	Maurita Johnson	
c	**Budget**	**% of new programs or initiatives brought online at or below budget. Data Source: Survey of program areas, review of charter data**	%						<90%	90%-95%	>95%	Trina Lee	
d	**Sustainable Practices**	**% of new programs or initiatives that are rated as "integrated into ongoing practices" after implementation Data Source: Survey of program areas review of charter data**	%						<85%	85%-95%	>95%	Trina Lee	
e	**Performance Achievement**	**% of new programs or initiatives that met or exceed established performance targets after implantation Data Source: Survey of program areas, review of charter data**	%						<85%	85%-95%	>95%	Trina Lee	
f	**Schedule**	**% of new programs or initiatives that are "on schedule" through implementation phase. Data Source: Survey of program areas review of charter data, grant updates; status reports**	%						<90%	90%-95%	>95%	Trina Lee	
1	CW-Active Efforts	% of active efforts in findings of ICWA cases Data Source: QUICWA	%						<90%	90%-95%	>95%	Jason Walling	
SUPPORTING PROCESSES													
SP1: Program Integrity													
a	**Audits/ reviews related to program integrity**	**Internal Audit and Consulting: Schedule Completion Rate**	%					=	<70%	70% - 80%	>80%	Chuck Hibner	
	Corrective actions implemented	**Corrective Action Plans: Percent Implemented as a percent of the total.**	%					-	<70%	70% - 80%	>80%	Chuck Hibner	
	Audits with no findings	**% of audits within the last 12 months with no findings as a percent of total audits.**	%					+	<30%	30% - 49%	>49%	Chuck Hibner	

Office of Child Welfare Programs
Summary Scorecard

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
	Percent of repeat compliance audit findings	**% of findings that are carried forward in subsequent year as part of the annual statewide compliance audit due to findings not being closed.**	%					=	>67%	34% - 66%	<34%	Chuck Hibner	
b	**Internal business reviews (business & contractor services)**	**% of reviews completed versus reviews expected to be completed for this quarter.**	%					+	<60%	60% - 70%	>70%	Chuck Hibner	
1	CW (Business continuity Measure)	CIRT process initiated in a timely manner		100.0								Stacey Ayers, Chuck Dunn	
2	CW Internal business reviews (business & contractor services) (Business Continuity Measure)	% of reviews completed versus reviews expected to be completed for this quarter.	%						<60%	60% - 70%	>70%	Chuck Hibner	
d(1)	**Employee Fraud**	**Number of substantiated employee fraud cases for the last 12 months**	#					+	> 3	2	1	Chuck Hibner	
d(2)	**Client Fraud and Intentional Program Violations (IPV)**	**% of documented fraud and IPV cases as a percentage of current caseload.**	%					=	> .4%	.4% - .2%	<= .2%	Chuck Hibner	
d(3)	**Client Overpayments**	**% of overpayment referrals received for SNAP, TANF, Medical, ERDC clients as a percentage of current caseload.**	%						> .3%	.3% - .1%	<= .1%	Chuck Hibner	
d(4)	**Medicaid Provider Fraud**	**% of Medicaid provider Fraud investigations open in the current quarter as a percentage of all Medicaid providers.**	%					=	> .3%	.3% - .1%	<= .1%	Chuck Hibner	
SP2: Business Support													
a	**Business operations customer satisfaction**	**% of staff that are satisfied with service delivery of business operations. Excellent= 40.37% Good= 37.52% Fair= 15.25 Poor=6.86**	%					-	<80%	80% - 90%	>90%	Jeremy Emerson	
b	**Business operational performance measures**	**% of business operations performance measures meeting service level agreements**	%					-	<90%	90%-95%	>95%	Jeremy Emerson	
c	**Leadership accountability to performance measures**	**% of Performance Measures by program area reported for QBR**	%						<90%	90%-95%	>95%	Jeremy Emerson	
1	CW (business continuity Measure)								<90%	90%-95%	>95%	Lois Day / Jerry Waybrant	
d	**Timely Payments to Vendors**	**% of timely payments made to DHS vendors Data Source: Financial Report**	%						<80%	80%-90%	>90%	Jeremy Emerson	
SP3: Program Support													
a	**Efficient & Effective services**	**Percentage of projects that meet expected results**	%						<75%	75-89%	≥90%	Angela Long, , Leatha Krehoff,	
b	**Service Excellence – internal**	**% of survey of internal customer respondents rating services as good or excellent**	%					+	<65%	65%-85%	≥85%	Angela Long, Leatha Krehoff, Wes Rios	

No.	Measure Name	Measure Calculation	%	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Progress	Red	Yellow	Green	Measure Owner	Action Items/Comments per 10/28 mtg
c	**Projects follow project management methodology**	**Percentage of projects following project management methodology**	%						<75%	75-89%	≥90%	Angela Long, Leatha Krehoff, Wes Rios	
SP4: Workforce Development													
a	**Cultural Competency**	**% of employees who have attended the cultural competency training within first year of hire date.**	%					-	<85%	85%-95%	> 95%	Jeff Akin	
1	CW (APSR)	% of staff who are meeting their obligated and required trainings. (CW Confidentiality, Sharing of Information b/w CW and SS, ASFA, MEPA) Data Source: Learning Center, Business Objects	%	61.02	82.71	84.87	85.09	+	<85%	86%-92%	93%-96%	Karyn Schimmels	
b	**Performance feedback model: (1) position descriptions**	**% of staff that have current position descriptions.**	%					+	<85%	85%-95%	>95%	Jeff Akin	
1	CW	Data Source: Steve Hastings/HR	%	78.7	78.0	69.0	NA	-	<85%	85%-95%	> 95%	Ryan Vogt	No Update
c	**Performance feedback model: (2) development plans**	**% of staff that have a current Employee Development Plan**	%					+	<85%	85%-95%	>95%	Jeff Akin	
1	CW		%	73.0	75.0	64.0	NA	-	<85%	85%-95%	> 95%	Ryan Vogt to work with Steve Hasting	No Update
d	**Employee Satisfaction**		%									Lisa Hartnisch	