

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES REVIEW

TECHNICAL BULLETIN #11

February 12, 2020

This Technical Bulletin provides information about adjustments the Children's Bureau (CB) is making when setting and evaluating the attainment of case review measurement goals for Program Improvement Plans (PIPs). These changes apply to the third round of the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSRs) and amends information provided in CFSR Technical Bulletin #9, Section IIC.

Section I provides information regarding how case review PIP measurement goal percentages will be set, and how goals will be truncated to a whole number. Section II provides information regarding how case review performance values will be rounded to the nearest whole number to evaluate state attainment of PIP measurement goals. Section III provides information regarding actions CB will take to implement these changes and recommended actions for states.

Section I. Determining Amount of Improvement Required On Items Requiring Measurement in the PIP

CFSR Technical Bulletin #9 provided guidance to states regarding methods used to determine the amount of improvement required for establishing PIP measurement goals. The methods for calculating measurement goals are not changing. We will continue to calculate goals by adding the sampling error (i.e., the 80 percent confidence level for case review item measures and the 95 percent confidence level for state aggregate data measures) to the baseline performance for the item (i.e., the number of strength ratings divided by the number of applicable cases). We will also continue to apply a reduction to the amount of improvement required when setting goals for states using the prospective method to establish baselines. For more information regarding these methods, see CFSR Technical Bulletin #9.

While methods to calculate measurement goals are not changing, we will adjust case review measurement goals by no longer setting goals to the tenths decimal place. Case review measurement goals will be re-calculated and truncated to the whole number.¹

¹ Truncating is a method of approximating a number by dropping all decimal places past a certain point without rounding. Tables 1 and 2 provide examples of case review PIP measurement goals re-calculated and truncated to the whole number.

Table 1. Examples of Truncated Case Review PIP Measurement Goals

CFSR Item	Number of applicable cases	Number of cases rated a Strength	Baseline	Baseline Sampling Error (80% Confidence Level)	Existing PIP Goal =Baseline + Sampling Error	Truncated PIP Goal =TRUNC((Baseline + Sampling Error),2)
1	72	60	83.3%	0.056218270	89.0%	88% ²
1	29	23	79.3%	0.096283643	88.9%	88%
1	55	45	81.8%	0.066569024	88.5%	88%

For states using the prospective measurement method, which provides an adjustment to reduce the amount of improvement required to account for the period of overlap between the baseline period and the PIP implementation period, the adjusted PIP goal will be re-calculated and truncated. Table 2 provides examples of adjusted case review PIP measurement goals re-calculated and truncated to the whole number.

Table 2. Examples of Truncated Adjusted Case Review PIP Measurement Goals

CFSR Item	Number of applicable cases	Number of cases rated a Strength	Baseline	Baseline Sampling Error (80% Confidence Level)	Adjustment Factor*	Existing Adjusted PIP Goal =Baseline + Adjustment Factor*Sampling Error	Truncated Adjusted PIP Goal =TRUNC ((Baseline + Adjustment Factor*Sampling Error),2)
1	72	60	83.3%	0.056218270	0.708333	87.3%	87%
1	55	45	81.8%	0.066569024	0.708333	86.5%	86%
1	40	32	80.8%	0.080954308	0.708333	85.7%	85%

*Example based on 7 months of overlap between baseline and PIP implementation periods

In instances where a state’s baseline performance for an item is at or above the percentage that would result in a strength rating for the CFRS (90% for measurement Items 2-6 and 12-15, and 95% for Item 1), we will consider the required amount of improvement attained for the purposes of PIP measurement, and ongoing measurement for that item will not be required. In addition, we will cap measurement goals using the percentages that would result in strength ratings for the items during the CFRS. For example, a measurement goal calculated to be 93% for Item 3 would be set at 90%.

²In this example, CB’s current procedures to round measurement goals to one decimal place, results in the *Existing PIP Goal* being rounded from 88.9552% to 89.0%. The new procedure to truncate measurement goals to the whole number during the calculation, results in the percentage of 88.9552% being truncated to 88%.

Section II. Evaluating State Attainment of PIP Measurement Goals

This section pertains to the evaluation of state progress toward meeting PIP measurement goals. States are provided the two-year PIP implementation period, followed by a non-overlapping evaluation period, to measure progress and attain the required amount of improvement for item-specific measures. States report achievement of PIP measurement goals in PIP Progress Reports, which we evaluate as part of the goal achievement verification process. When evaluating state performance, we will adjust calculations by rounding performance to the nearest whole number.³ Table 3 provides examples of how we will round case review performance percentages to the nearest whole number to evaluate achievement of truncated PIP measurement goals.

Table 3. Examples of Rounded Case Review PIP Measurement Performance

CFSR Item	Baseline Period		Measurement Period Performance			
	Existing PIP Goal	Truncated PIP Goal	Number of applicable cases	Number of cases rated a Strength	Existing Performance =Strengths / Applicable	Rounded Performance =ROUND ((Strengths / Applicable),2)
1	88.9%	88%	32	29	90.6%	91%
1	88.5%	88%	57	51	89.5%	89%⁴
1	88.1%	88%	43	35	81.4%	81%

As established in CFSTR Technical Bulletin #9, we will continue to apply a high performance plateau adjustment. In instances where state PIP measurement goals are set at 90% or above, we will apply consideration of a plateau effect in determining whether a state has met its goal. In these situations, if the state is able to sustain performance above the baseline for three quarters, we will consider the goal met, even if the state does not meet the actual goal.

Section III. Implementation of These PIP Measurement Adjustments and Guidance for States

In the coming month, we will transmit updated PIP measurement goals, showing each case review goal percentage re-calculated, and truncated to the whole number, for all states with a completed baseline period and calculated PIP measurement goals. We will also adjust each case review performance percentage by rounding to the nearest whole number for all measurement periods in which states reported achievement of a PIP

³ If the number behind the decimal point is less than 5, it is rounded down to the nearest whole number. If the number behind the decimal point is 5 or more, it is rounded up to the next whole number.

⁴ In this example, CB's current procedures to round performance to one decimal place, results in the *Existing Performance* being rounded from 89.474% to 89.5%. The new procedure to round performance to the nearest whole number during the calculation, results in the percentage of 89.474% being rounded to 89%.

measurement goal. We will continue to make these adjustments when we set and evaluate the attainment of case review PIP measurement goals throughout Round 3.

We recommend states review performance for all post-baseline PIP measurement periods to determine whether rounding performance percentages to the nearest whole number results in attainment of previously unmet measurement goals. We request states notify CB of achievement of PIP goals for prior measurement periods at their earliest opportunity and continue to identify future attainment of goals in PIP Progress Reports. When we receive notification from a state that one or more measurement goals is achieved, we will complete the verification process and notify the state in writing whether measurement criteria was met and measurement goal(s) achieved.