



FY 2014 Digital Dashboard Annual Report

Provider, Contract Amount, Program Type, & Benchmarks	Data for services for the time period of July 2013 through June 30, 2014; State performance measures are a requirement. Inputs, Outputs, Quality/Efficiency & Outcome measures																																		
<p>1. Lutheran Services in Iowa New Parent Program \$125,000.00</p> <p>Program type-intensive home visitation</p> <p><u>Goals/Benchmarks</u> 720 home visits 40 families 4 group parent education 2.58 FTE</p> <p>Serving: Adair, Dallas, Madison & Warren County</p> <p>Quality: National HFA Accreditation received</p> <p>Required reporting matrix: Family Support</p>	<p>07/30/2014 report was completed and by Colleen Theis</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$107,533.66 or 86% ECI funds expended \$2,114 other funds expended (not ECI) \$255.00 average cost per visit</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 38 Children ages 0-5 participating (unduplicated) 38 Families participating (unduplicated) ♦ 2 Adair, 17 Dallas, 4Madison, 15 Warren 430 Home visits completed ♦19 Adair, 147 Dallas, 91 Madison, 173 Warren 6 Group meetings</p> <p>Family Demographics (all demographics are required to equal the # of families participating)</p> <p><u>Primary caregiver race</u></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">0 Native American or Alaska Native</td> <td style="width: 50%;">0 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 African America</td> <td>0 Multi -racial</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 Asia</td> <td>27 White</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8 Hispanic or Latino</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Primary caregiver marital status</u></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">11 Married</td> <td style="width: 50%;">18 Partnered</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8 Single</td> <td>1 Divorced</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 Widowed</td> <td>0 Separated</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Primary caregivers education</u></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">0 Elementary, middle school or lower</td> <td style="width: 50%;">12 Some high school</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16 High school diploma</td> <td>2 GED</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 Trade or vocation training</td> <td>5 Some college</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 2 -year degree (Associates)</td> <td>3 4-year degree (Bachelor's)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Master's degree or greater</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Other caregivers education</u></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">0 Elementary, middle school or lower</td> <td style="width: 50%;">12 Some high school</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14 High school diploma</td> <td>1 GED</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 Trade or vocation training</td> <td>3 Some college</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 2 -year degree (Associates)</td> <td>2 4-year degree (Bachelor's)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Master's degree or greater</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	0 Native American or Alaska Native	0 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1 African America	0 Multi -racial	2 Asia	27 White	8 Hispanic or Latino		11 Married	18 Partnered	8 Single	1 Divorced	0 Widowed	0 Separated	0 Elementary, middle school or lower	12 Some high school	16 High school diploma	2 GED	0 Trade or vocation training	5 Some college	0 2 -year degree (Associates)	3 4-year degree (Bachelor's)	Master's degree or greater		0 Elementary, middle school or lower	12 Some high school	14 High school diploma	1 GED	0 Trade or vocation training	3 Some college	0 2 -year degree (Associates)	2 4-year degree (Bachelor's)	Master's degree or greater	
0 Native American or Alaska Native	0 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander																																		
1 African America	0 Multi -racial																																		
2 Asia	27 White																																		
8 Hispanic or Latino																																			
11 Married	18 Partnered																																		
8 Single	1 Divorced																																		
0 Widowed	0 Separated																																		
0 Elementary, middle school or lower	12 Some high school																																		
16 High school diploma	2 GED																																		
0 Trade or vocation training	5 Some college																																		
0 2 -year degree (Associates)	3 4-year degree (Bachelor's)																																		
Master's degree or greater																																			
0 Elementary, middle school or lower	12 Some high school																																		
14 High school diploma	1 GED																																		
0 Trade or vocation training	3 Some college																																		
0 2 -year degree (Associates)	2 4-year degree (Bachelor's)																																		
Master's degree or greater																																			

	<p>Household size</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>0 - 1</td> <td>10 - 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9 - 3</td> <td>7 - 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 - 5</td> <td>4 - 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 >6</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Federal Poverty Level</u></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>23 100% or lower</td> <td>10 101% - 150%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 151% - 200%</td> <td>1 201% - 299%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 300% or higher</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>How well did we do it (quality/efficiency)</p> <p>24 Children prenatal - 5 years that were eligible and screened for developmental delays</p> <p>3 Children that were referred to Early Intervention services</p> <p>9 Families enrolled after July 1, 2013</p> <p>9 Families enrolled after July 1, 2013 that meet one of more the eligibility criteria</p> <p>100% of newly enrolled families that meet the family support eligibility criteria</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures)</p> <p>Outcome data will be provided by REDCap and is not required to be submitted in this report per the 4 R Kids Director</p> <p>% Participating families that improve or maintain healthy functioning, problem solving and communication (# achieved & # possible)</p> <p>% Participating families that increase or maintain social supports (# achieved & # possible)</p> <p>% Participating families that are connected to additional concrete supports (# achieved & # possible)</p> <p>% Participating families that increase knowledge about child development and parenting (# achieved & # possible)</p> <p>% Participating families that improve nurturing and attachment between parents and children (# achieved & # possible)</p> <p>Other information</p> <p>4 Collaborative meetings with MCH, PAT, Group Parent Ed</p> <p>2.48 FTE</p> <p>71% home visit completion rate (scheduled visits completed)</p> <p><i>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks:</i></p> <p>Program has exceeded the number of group meeting completed. this continues to be due to the collaboration between the young parents group of warren county as well as the PAT program from partners in family development. The program was only two away from meeting the goal of of serving 40 during this reporting timeframe.</p> <p><i>Other comments:</i></p> <p>Program has completed the process for re-accreditation as of July 29. reviewers reported that program is very strong in the core of services provided and program overall. program will receive official report in the next 4-6 weeks.</p> <p>Information reported in this report was generated from RedCap system. there is a discrepancy between total number of visits that redcap calculates(430) and the number of visits reported via the monthly tracking tool (513). This difference is significant and skews the data surrounding total number of visits completed as well as the percent of home visitation completion and cost per visit. Staff turnover is a significant contributor to this discrepancy. Program has spent several hours cleaning up the data in redcap system . and is confident that moving forward the information entered will accurate and reliable.</p>	0 - 1	10 - 2	9 - 3	7 - 4	5 - 5	4 - 6	3 >6		23 100% or lower	10 101% - 150%	4 151% - 200%	1 201% - 299%	0 300% or higher	
0 - 1	10 - 2														
9 - 3	7 - 4														
5 - 5	4 - 6														
3 >6															
23 100% or lower	10 101% - 150%														
4 151% - 200%	1 201% - 299%														
0 300% or higher															

<p>2. Partners in Family Development Parents as Teachers \$252,641.58</p> <p>Program type-long term home visitation</p> <p>Goals/Benchmarks 1,050 home visits 125 families 12 group parent education 2.625 FTE (educators) .9 FTE (supervisor)</p> <p>Serving: Dallas, Madison & Warren County</p> <p>Quality Iowa Family Support Credential</p> <p>Required reporting matrix: Family Support</p>	<p>July 25, 2014 report was completed by Jovanka R. Westbrook</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$217,837.95 or 86% total funds expended \$13,970.00 other funds expended (not ECI) \$239.00 average cost per visit</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 168 Children ages 0-5 participating (unduplicated) 124 Families participating (unduplicated) ◆ 56 Dallas, 20 Madison, 48 Warren 969 Home visits completed ◆ 428 Dallas, 147 Madison, 394 Warren 22 Group meetings</p> <p>Family Demographics (all demographics are required to equal the # of families participating)</p> <p>Primary care giver race</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>0 Native American or Alaska Native</td> <td>1 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 African America</td> <td>0 Multi -racial</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 Asia</td> <td>99 White</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22 Hispanic or Latino</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Primary caregiver marital status</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>82 Married</td> <td>21 Partnered</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18 Single</td> <td>1 Divorced</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 Widowed</td> <td>2 Separated</td> </tr> </table> <p>Primary caregivers education</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>5 Elementary, middle school or lower</td> <td>10 Some high school</td> </tr> <tr> <td>39 High school diploma/GED</td> <td>2 Trade or vocation training</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12 Some college</td> <td>9 2 -year degree (Associates)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>38 4-year degree (Bachelor's)</td> <td>9 Master's degree or greater</td> </tr> </table> <p>Other caregivers education</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>10 Elementary, middle school or lower</td> <td>6 Some high school</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25 High school diploma</td> <td>6 GED</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 Trade or vocation training</td> <td>8 Some college</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8 -2 -year degree (Associates)</td> <td>19 - 4-year degree (Bachelor's)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9 Master's degree or greater</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Household size</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>1 - 0</td> <td>2 - 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 -40</td> <td>4-34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 -21</td> <td>6 -11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>6-2</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Federal Poverty Level</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>47 -100% or lower</td> <td>22 - 101% - 150%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16 -151% - 200%</td> <td>16 - 201% - 299%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23 - 300% or higher</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency) 119 - Children prenatal - 5 years that were eligible and screened for developmental delays</p>	0 Native American or Alaska Native	1 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1 African America	0 Multi -racial	1 Asia	99 White	22 Hispanic or Latino		82 Married	21 Partnered	18 Single	1 Divorced	0 Widowed	2 Separated	5 Elementary, middle school or lower	10 Some high school	39 High school diploma/GED	2 Trade or vocation training	12 Some college	9 2 -year degree (Associates)	38 4-year degree (Bachelor's)	9 Master's degree or greater	10 Elementary, middle school or lower	6 Some high school	25 High school diploma	6 GED	2 Trade or vocation training	8 Some college	8 -2 -year degree (Associates)	19 - 4-year degree (Bachelor's)	9 Master's degree or greater		1 - 0	2 - 16	3 -40	4-34	5 -21	6 -11	>6-2		47 -100% or lower	22 - 101% - 150%	16 -151% - 200%	16 - 201% - 299%	23 - 300% or higher	
0 Native American or Alaska Native	1 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander																																														
1 African America	0 Multi -racial																																														
1 Asia	99 White																																														
22 Hispanic or Latino																																															
82 Married	21 Partnered																																														
18 Single	1 Divorced																																														
0 Widowed	2 Separated																																														
5 Elementary, middle school or lower	10 Some high school																																														
39 High school diploma/GED	2 Trade or vocation training																																														
12 Some college	9 2 -year degree (Associates)																																														
38 4-year degree (Bachelor's)	9 Master's degree or greater																																														
10 Elementary, middle school or lower	6 Some high school																																														
25 High school diploma	6 GED																																														
2 Trade or vocation training	8 Some college																																														
8 -2 -year degree (Associates)	19 - 4-year degree (Bachelor's)																																														
9 Master's degree or greater																																															
1 - 0	2 - 16																																														
3 -40	4-34																																														
5 -21	6 -11																																														
>6-2																																															
47 -100% or lower	22 - 101% - 150%																																														
16 -151% - 200%	16 - 201% - 299%																																														
23 - 300% or higher																																															

	<p>7 - Children that were referred to Early Intervention services 27- Families enrolled after July 1, 2013 21- Families enrolled after July 1, 2013 that meet one of more the eligibility criteria 78% of newly enrolled families that meet the family support eligibility criteria</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) Outcome data will be provided by REDCap and is not required to be submitted in this report per the 4 R Kids Director % Participating families that improve or maintain healthy functioning, problem solving and communication (# achieved & # possible) % Participating families that increase or maintain social supports (# achieved & # possible) % Participating families that are connected to additional concrete supports (# achieved & # possible) % Participating families that increase knowledge about child development and parenting (# achieved & # possible) % Participating families that improve nurturing and attachment between parents and children (# achieved & # possible)</p> <p>Other information 0- Collaborative meetings with MCH, PAT, Group Parent Ed 3.525 Direct service FTE 84% home visit completion rate (scheduled visits completed)</p> <p>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks: Met benchmarks for FTE and came within one family of meeting benchmark for number of families served. Home visit benchmark was not met. This benchmark was impacted by weather, illness and an increase in the number of families served with higher risk factors and challenges. The Program exceeded the benchmark for the number of group parent education sessions offered. While we did not formally meet to coordinate group education, the Program did collaborate with the New Parent Program on group parent education. In addition, the Program offered group parent education to the Young Parent Program in Warren County and partnered with HeadStart in Madison County . In addition PFD offers the Stewards of Children Program in Dallas and Madison County.</p> <p>Other comments: The Program is committed to being designated a PAT Model Affiliate and has made or will make the necessary adjustments to the Program as required. A Program Supervisor has been hired for 2015. Four PAT Program Educators (along with 2 others) have been trained and certified as Blockfest educators. Our Program is the first certified program in Iowa in the Blockfest Model. RedCap has been an ongoing challenge for this program year but we are hopeful that our Program's data has been entered appropriately and as required. Constant monitoring seems to indicate that our data is in the RedCap system for 125 families (YTD) . The Program experienced an increase in indirect service hours as a result of the additional commitment of RedCap. All Educators have met or exceeded their professional development requirements. Additional funding through ICAPP and CBCAP grants were received to support the PAT program in Madison County for 2013 through 2015.</p>
--	---

<p>3. Southwestern Community College Parents as Teachers \$72,543.29</p> <p><u>Goals/Benchmarks</u> 360 home visits 30 families 10 group parent education 1 FTE .25 supervisor</p> <p>Serving: Adair County</p> <p>Quality: Enrolled in Iowa Family Support Credential</p> <p>Required reporting matrix: Family Support</p>	<p>July 15, 2014 report was completed by Terry Wangberg</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$64,544.31 or 89 % total funds expended \$9,127.60 other funds expended (ICAP & CBCAP) \$320.31 average cost per visit</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 40 Children ages 0-5 participating (unduplicated) 27 Families participating (unduplicated) 230 Home visits completed</p> <p>Family Demographics (all demographics are required to equal the # of families participating)</p> <p><u>Primary caregiver race</u> 0 - Native American or Alaska Native 0 - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander 0 - African American 0 - Multi-racial 0 - Asia 27 - White 0 - Hispanic or Latino</p> <p><u>Primary caregiver marital status</u> 11 - Married 8 - Partnered 7 - Single 0 - Divorced 0 - Widowed 1 - Separated</p> <p><u>Primary caregivers education</u> 0 -Elementary, middle school or lower 0 5 - Some high school 9 - High school diploma 9 2 - GED 0 - Trade or vocation training 0 2 - Some college 4 - 2 -year degree (Associates) 4 5 - 4-year degree (Bachelor's) 0 - Master's degree or greater 0</p> <p><u>Other caregivers education</u> 0 - Elementary, middle school or lower 3 - Some high school 4 - High school diploma 1 - GED 0 - Trade or vocation training 3 - Some college 2 - 2 -year degree (Associates) 1 - 4-year degree (Bachelor's) 0 - Master's degree or greater</p> <p>Household size 0 - 1 2 - 2 7 - 3 7 - 4 6 - 5 4 - 6 1 >6</p> <p><u>Federal Poverty Level</u> 15 - 100% or lower 6 - 101% - 150% 4 - 151% - 200% 2 - 201% - 299% 0 - 300% or higher</p> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency) 23 Children prenatal - 5 years that were eligible and screened for developmental delays 0 Children that were referred to Early Intervention services 12 Families enrolled after July 1, 2013 11 Families enrolled after July 1, 2013 that meet one of more the eligibility criteria</p>
--	--

92% of newly enrolled families that meet the family support eligibility criteria

What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures)

Outcome data will be provided by REDCap and is not required to be submitted in this report per the 4 R Kids Director

The Program attempted to utilize the data in REDCap to figure the outcomes.

88% Participating families that improve or maintain healthy functioning, problem solving and communication **(14 achieved & 16 possible)**

100% Participating families that increase or maintain social supports **(16 achieved & 16 possible)**

69% Participating families that are connected to additional concrete supports **(11 achieved & 16 possible)**

19% Participating families that increase knowledge about child development and parenting **(3 achieved & 16 possible)**

38% Participating families that improve nurturing and attachment between parents and children **(6 achieved & 16 possible)**

Other information

14 Group meetings

2 Collaborative meetings with MCH, PAT, Group Parent Ed

1.0 Direct service FTE

76% home visit completion rate (scheduled visits completed)

Comments regarding meeting benchmarks:

We were excited that the number of families (27) served was almost to our goal of 30. Lyndsie and the PAT staff worked hard to recruit families and make connections with community partners. As we had many new families come in the last quarter, our number of visits was lower than we hoped. We also exceeded the number of group connections offered, with 4 of those in Adair County. Our Love and Logic parenting class went very well and at least one family was recruited from that! We believe we are making great inroads into this community. The Greenfield Rumble Tumble we organized in April was a great success with many community partners participating. We plan to hold that again next spring.

Our Family Support Credential Visit was held on June 23-25th. We have a couple of things to work on but have just received the report with the details. We have two areas to correct: Review of service plans with goals linked to the assessments and linking families to services demonstrated through the aftercare plans. All our policies were in compliance. We received 9 '1's', 107 '2's' and 9 '3's'. The threes must be brought up to a 1 or 2. We are beginning that process with our mentor now! Areas of Strength notes were our Conflict of Interest policy (exceeds standard!); Grievance policies/procedures; and Governance. We are excited to make these few improvements and then move forward to make our program even better!

We are holding a retreat with PAT staff in August to do some strategic planning. Specifically looking at the areas noted in the report and how we can support families in increasing their supports, child development & parenting and nurturing and attachment.

Other comments:

Note: the 'Other Caregiver Education' will not match the total families as all families do not have two parents involved.

There is not LSP data on all families. Sometimes this is because there is only one assessment done with nothing to compare it. Some families have not been in 90 days yet, some left before the second LSP was due, some have been in more than 90 days but are not due for a second yet. That is why only 16 families were eligible.

No children were referred to early intervention services. Any children who might have been eligible for that were already working with the AEA.

The last three outcomes data % only measures an increase in these areas. The families generally stayed the same. Only 6 improved but if the family was already at a 5, they can't improve any more! We do plan to target any family that scores a 3.5 or less in any of those areas by encouraging their family goals to address at least one of those outcomes.

<p>4. Dallas County ISU Extension Group Parent Education \$15,328.34</p>	<p><i>This data is for Family Nutrition, Together We Can, and Raising a Thinking Child group parent education</i></p>	
<p>Program type-group parent education</p>	<p>July 17, 2014 report was completed by Joy Rouse How much was put in? (Input measures) \$13,272.19 or 87% total ECI funds expended \$29,430 other funds expended for FNP (not ECI funds) \$270.86 average cost per session</p>	
<p>Goals/Benchmarks</p>	<p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 38 Children ages 0-5 participating (unduplicated) 26 Families participating (unduplicated)</p>	
<p><i>Family Nutrition (FNP)</i></p>	<p>24 families 3 groups 24 sessions ♦ 0 Adair, 8 Dallas, 8 Madison, 10 Warren</p>	
<p><i>Together We Can (TWC)</i></p>	<p>Group sessions completed ♦ 0 Adair, 16 Dallas, 16 Madison, 17 Warren (one make up group)</p>	
<p><i>Raising a Thinking Child (RATC)</i></p>	<p>Family Demographics (all demographics are required to equal the # of families participating)</p>	
<p>16 families 2 groups 16 sessions</p>	<p>Primary caregiver race Native American or Alaska Native African America 1 Asia Hispanic or Latino</p>	
<p>8 families 1 group 8 sessions</p>	<p>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander Multi-racial 25 - White</p>	
<p>Serving: Adair, Dallas, Madison & Warren County</p>	<p>Primary caregiver marital status 16 Married 6 Single 0 Widowed</p>	
<p>Quality: FNP received IFS Credential Group parent education is not required by law to enroll in the Iowa Family Support Credential</p>	<p>1 Partnered 2 Divorced 1 Separated</p>	
<p>Required reporting matrix: Family Support</p>	<p>Primary caregivers education 0 Elementary, middle school or lower 5 High school diploma 0 Trade or vocation training 5 2-year degree (Associates) 2 Master's degree or greater</p>	
<p>0 - 1 7 - 3 3 - 5 1 >6</p>	<p>Other caregivers education 0 Elementary, middle school or lower 8 High school diploma 1 Trade or vocation training 2 2-year degree (Associates) 1 Master's degree or greater</p>	
<p>5 - 2 8 - 4 2 - 6</p>	<p>Household size 0 Some high school 1 GED 8 Some college 5 4-year degree (Bachelor's)</p>	
<p>9 - 100% or lower 4 - 151% - 200% 4 - 300% or higher</p>	<p>How well did we do it (Quality/Efficiency measures)</p>	
<p>9 - 100% or lower 4 - 151% - 200% 4 - 300% or higher</p>	<p>0 Some high school 0 GED 3 Some college 7 4-year degree (Bachelor's)</p>	
<p>9 - 100% or lower 4 - 151% - 200% 4 - 300% or higher</p>	<p>Federal Poverty Level 9 - 100% or lower 4 - 151% - 200% 4 - 300% or higher</p>	
<p>9 - 100% or lower 4 - 151% - 200% 4 - 300% or higher</p>	<p>5 - 101% - 150% 4 - 201% - 299%</p>	

	<p>0 Children prenatal - 5 years that were eligible and screened for developmental delays 0 Children that were referred to Early Intervention services 26 Families enrolled after July 1, 2013 18 Families enrolled after July 1, 2013 that meet one of more the eligibility criteria 69% of newly enrolled families that meet the family support eligibility criteria What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) Outcome data will be provided by REDCap and is not required to be submitted in this report per the 4 R Kids Director % Participating families that improve or maintain healthy functioning, problem solving and communication (# achieved & # possible) % Participating families that increase or maintain social supports (# achieved & # possible) % Participating families that are connected to additional concrete supports (# achieved & # possible) % Participating families that increase knowledge about child development and parenting (# achieved & # possible) % Participating families that improve nurturing and attachment between parents and children (# achieved & # possible)</p> <p>Other information Collaborative meetings with MCH, PAT, Group Parent Ed - none 100% group completion rate (scheduled group sessions completed)</p> <p><u>Family Nutrition Program (FNP)</u> 20 children served 14 families served (one family attended FNP and Raising a Thinking Child) ◆ 0 Adair, 4 Dallas, 5 Madison, and 5 Warren</p> <p><u>Together We Can (TWC)</u> 9 children served 8 families served ◆ 0 Adair, 0 Dallas, 3 Madison, and 5 Warren</p> <p><u>Raising A Thinking Child (RATC)</u> 9 children served 5 families served ◆ 0 Adair, 5 Dallas, 0 Madison, and 0 Warren</p> <p>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks: Each of the curriculums offered included 8 sessions. It is hard to get families to commit to that many meetings. IA connection with an established group helped with attendance. We were able to complete all the groups in the three counties. We did send marketing materials to Adair County for the Madison County Together We Can.</p> <p>Other comments:</p>
--	--

<p>5. Dallas County Public Health Maternal Child Health \$78,266</p> <p>Program type-short term home visitation</p> <p><u>Goals/Benchmarks</u> 760 home visits 105 families 1.18 FTE</p> <p>Serving: Dallas County</p> <p>Required reporting matrix: Family Support</p> <p>Quality: Iowa Family Support Credential</p>	<p>07-28-14 Report was completed by Shelley L. Horak</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$78,262.68 or 99.9% total funds expended \$5,656 other funds expended (not ECI) \$98 average cost per visit</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 116 Children ages 0-5 participating (unduplicated) 115 Families participating (unduplicated) 854 Home visits conducted 0 Group meetings</p> <p>Family Demographics (all demographics are required to equal the # of families participating)</p> <p><u>Primary caregiver race</u></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>0 Native American or Alaska Native</td> <td>1 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 African America</td> <td>1 Multi -racial</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 Asia</td> <td>30 White</td> </tr> </table> <p>75 Hispanic or Latino</p> <p><u>Primary caregiver marital status</u></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>43 Married</td> <td>34 Partnered</td> </tr> <tr> <td>37 Single</td> <td>3 Divorced</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 Widowed</td> <td>3 Separated</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Primary caregivers education</u></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>15 Elementary, middle school or lower</td> <td>28 Some high school</td> </tr> <tr> <td>36 High school diploma</td> <td>0 GED</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 Trade or vocation training</td> <td>20 Some college</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 2 -year degree (Associates)</td> <td>8 4-year degree (Bachelor's)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 Master's degree or greater</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Other care givers education</u> We do not collect this information.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Elementary, middle school or lower</td> <td>Some high school</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High school diploma</td> <td>GED</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Trade or vocation training</td> <td>Some college</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 -year degree (Associates)</td> <td>4-year degree (Bachelor's)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Master's degree or greater</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Household size</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>0 - 1</td> <td>16 - 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>32 - 3</td> <td>30 - 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17 - 5</td> <td>15 - 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 >6</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Federal Poverty Level</u></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>68 - 100% or lower</td> <td>20- 101% - 150%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20 - 151% - 200%</td> <td>5 - 201% - 299%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 - 300% or higher</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) 17 Children prenatal - 5 years that were eligible and screened for developmental delays 3 Children that were referred to Early Intervention services</p>	0 Native American or Alaska Native	1 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	4 African America	1 Multi -racial	4 Asia	30 White	43 Married	34 Partnered	37 Single	3 Divorced	0 Widowed	3 Separated	15 Elementary, middle school or lower	28 Some high school	36 High school diploma	0 GED	5 Trade or vocation training	20 Some college	2 2 -year degree (Associates)	8 4-year degree (Bachelor's)	1 Master's degree or greater		Elementary, middle school or lower	Some high school	High school diploma	GED	Trade or vocation training	Some college	2 -year degree (Associates)	4-year degree (Bachelor's)	Master's degree or greater		0 - 1	16 - 2	32 - 3	30 - 4	17 - 5	15 - 6	5 >6		68 - 100% or lower	20- 101% - 150%	20 - 151% - 200%	5 - 201% - 299%	2 - 300% or higher	
0 Native American or Alaska Native	1 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander																																														
4 African America	1 Multi -racial																																														
4 Asia	30 White																																														
43 Married	34 Partnered																																														
37 Single	3 Divorced																																														
0 Widowed	3 Separated																																														
15 Elementary, middle school or lower	28 Some high school																																														
36 High school diploma	0 GED																																														
5 Trade or vocation training	20 Some college																																														
2 2 -year degree (Associates)	8 4-year degree (Bachelor's)																																														
1 Master's degree or greater																																															
Elementary, middle school or lower	Some high school																																														
High school diploma	GED																																														
Trade or vocation training	Some college																																														
2 -year degree (Associates)	4-year degree (Bachelor's)																																														
Master's degree or greater																																															
0 - 1	16 - 2																																														
32 - 3	30 - 4																																														
17 - 5	15 - 6																																														
5 >6																																															
68 - 100% or lower	20- 101% - 150%																																														
20 - 151% - 200%	5 - 201% - 299%																																														
2 - 300% or higher																																															

	<p>90 Families enrolled after July 1, 2013 85 Families enrolled after July 1, 2013 that meet one of more the eligibility criteria 94 % of newly enrolled families that meet the family support eligibility criteria</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures)</p> <p>Outcome data will be provided by REDCap and is not required to be submitted in this report per the 4 R Kids Director</p> <p>% Participating families that improve or maintain healthy functioning, problem solving and communication (achieved & possible) % Participating families that increase or maintain social supports (achieved & possible) % Participating families that are connected to additional concrete supports (achieved & possible) % Participating families that increase knowledge about child development and parenting (achieved & possible) % Participating families that improve nurturing and attachment between parents and children (achieved & possible)</p> <p>Other information</p> <p>0 Collaborative meetings with MCH, PAT, Group Parent Ed 1.02 Direct service FTE 91 % home visit completion rate (scheduled visits completed)</p> <p>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks:</p> <p>Regarding other caregivers' education: With a change in staff at the end of the first quarter, we did not collect the data in the way it is represented on this form. Steps will be taken to collect it in FY 15 and to document this type of conversation with mom, now that we are aware it is required. Please keep in mind that moms sometimes do not want to discuss the circumstances of the other caregiver, especially if they are not involved in the care of the child.</p> <p>Our numbers indicating changes in conditions for our clients are down from last fiscal year. This is an indication of the documentation practices of our staff who were not doing their own documentation in the past. Moving forward, these numbers should be more reliable and accurate. We feel the numbers in this report represent an accurate picture of this indicator for our clients.</p> <p>We show just 1.02 FTE in this report and our benchmark was 1.18. This is due to change in staff and modification of the work within the program. The Director's time spent in the program from October through June is not accurately represented and if it were, the benchmark would have been met.</p> <p>Other comments:</p>
--	---

<p>6. Warren County Public Health Child Care Nurse Consultant \$31,018.04</p> <p>Program type-nursing visits for child care providers</p> <p><u>Goals/Benchmarks</u> 30 child care and preschool providers 3 health and safety trainings 100 visits 100TA contacts .4 FTE</p> <p>Serving: Madison & Warren County</p> <p>Required reporting matrix: Child Care Nurse Consultant - Indirect Services</p> <p>Quality: CCNC certification</p>	<p>7/22/14 report was completed by Shelly Jensen Child Care Nurse Consultant - Indirect Services</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$30,100.06 or 97% total funds expended \$2,272.49 other funds expended in kind (not ECI)</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 156 technical assistance contacts 112 visits to early learning environments by a consultant ◆ 11 Madison and 101 Warren 40 early learning environments involved in quality improvement activities ◆ 5 Madison and 35 Warren</p> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) 60% of programs participating in a quality initiative (24 achieved & 60 possible)</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) 67% of children with special health care needs with a special needs care plan in place at the child care facility (2 achieved & 3 possible) 100% of providers/programs receiving onsite assessment and consultation that improve health and safety conditions in their early learning environments (25 achieved & 25 possible)</p> <p>Other information 7 trainings provided ◆ 2 Madison and 5 Warren 24 providers with a QRS rating ◆ 2 Madison and 22 Warren 5 collaborative meetings with CCNC, QIP, Preschool Enrich, CCR&R, etc 0.4 FTE</p> <p>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks: all benchmarks met and exceeded</p> <p>Other comments:</p>
--	---

<p>7. New Opportunities Child Care Nurse Consultant \$34,983.35</p> <p>Program type-nursing visits for child care providers</p> <p><u>Goals/Benchmarks</u> 40 child care and preschool providers 4 health and safety trainings 115 visits .5 FTE</p> <p>Serving: Dallas County</p> <p>Required reporting matrix: Child Care Nurse Consultant - Indirect Services</p> <p>Quality: CCNC certification</p>	<p>7/15/14 report was completed Paula Klocke Child Care Nurse Consultant - Indirect Services How much was put in? (Input measures) \$33,282.10 or 95% total funds expended \$3,072.00 other funds expended (not ECI) How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 72 technical assistance contacts 88 visits to early learning environments by a consultant 32 early learning environments involved in quality improvement activities How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) 65.6% of programs participating in a quality initiative (21 achieved & 32 possible) What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) 100% of children with special health care needs with a special needs care plan in place at the child care facility (11 achieved & 11 possible) 100% of providers receiving onsite assessment and consultation that improve health and safety conditions in their early learning environments (32 achieved & 32 possible) Other information 5 trainings provided 21 providers with a QRS rating 15 collaborative meetings with CCNC, QIP, Preschool Enrich, CCR&R, etc .50 FTE</p> <p>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks: We did see an increase from our visits last year. We are still short of our benchmark of 115 visits. We provided an additional training.</p> <p>Other comments:</p>
---	---

<p>8. Dallas County ISU Extension Quality Improvement Project \$78,978.00 training and coordination</p> <p>\$16,900.00 mini grants</p> <p>Project type-quality improvement for child care providers</p> <p>Goals/Benchmarks 50 trainings 720 providers 158 provider contacts 420 parent contacts 1.25 FTE</p> <p>Serving: Adair, Dallas, Madison, and Warren County</p> <p>Required reporting matrix: Professional Development - Indirect Services & Improved Early Learning Environments - Indirect Services</p> <p>Quality: None required</p>	<p>July 16, 2014 report was completed by Myra Willms</p> <p>Professional Development - Indirect Services</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$74,741.51 or 95% total funds expended \$2,865.00 other funds expended (not ECI) ISU Extension class fees</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 203 technical assistance contacts 222 visits to early learning environments by a consultant 279 early learning environments involved in quality improvement activities 44 programs that achieved a quality initiative (QRS 3,4,5; IQPPS; NAEYC; NAFCC; Head Start)</p> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) 66% of programs participating in a quality initiative (178 achieved & 269 possible)</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) 99% of ratings/certifications/credentialing/renewals that were a direct result of professional development opportunities (833 achieved & 841 possible)</p> <p>Other information 54 trainings provided ♦ 7 Adair, 16 Dallas, 11 Madison, 20 Warren 841 providers served through training ♦ 82 Adair, 279 Dallas, 85 Madison, 262 Warren, 77 Polk, 56 Other 222 provider face to face contacts ♦ 20 Adair, 83 Dallas, 23 Madison, 96 Warren 943 parent contacts ♦ 96 Adair, 285 Dallas, 106 Madison, 456 Warren</p> <p>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks: We used a new method of using postcards to contact parents about our quality improvement grants, which worked well and the providers seemed eager to help with.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>Improved Early Learning Environments - Indirect Services (Mini Grants)</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$16,900.00 or 100% total funds expended \$92,548.85 other funds expended (not ECI) (note the source) from United Way \$1,244.16 average cost per mini grant</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 792 technical assistance contacts 220 visits to early learning environments by a consultant 199 early learning environments involved in quality improvement activities 59 programs that achieved a quality initiative (QRS 3,4,5; IQPPS; NAEYC; NAFCC; Head Start)</p> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) 22% of programs participating in a quality initiative (59 achieved & 269 possible)</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) 47% of programs that improve, or maintain at the highest level, their rating in a quality initiative (53 achieved & 112 possible)</p> <p>Other information</p>
---	---

	<p>112 mini grants provided by county ◆10 Adair, 42 Dallas, 11 Madison, 49 Warren</p> <p>\$109,448.85 expended on mini grants by county ◆\$8,000 Adair, \$48,548.83 Dallas, \$8,900 Madison, \$44,000.02 Warren</p> <p>13 collaborative meetings with CCNC, QIP, Preschool Enrich, CCR&R, etc 1.25 FTE</p> <p><i>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks:</i></p> <p><i>Other comments:</i> We sent applications to all licensed and registered providers in the four counties. Providers who were eligible for grants under the Preschool Enrichment Project did not receive grants from our program. We worked together to provide grants to all providers who applied. Grant amounts varied by QRS levels, number of children served, years of service, level of care, needs of program, and restriction of funding source.</p>
--	--

<p>9. Orchard Place Provider training and incentives \$4,751.00</p> <p><u>Goals/Benchmarks</u> Up to 25 hours of training and Financial incentives</p> <p>Serving: Adair, Dallas, Madison & Warren County</p> <p>Required reporting matrix: Professional Development - Indirect Services</p> <p>Quality: None required</p>	<p>7/22/14 report was completed by Cathy Wheatcraft</p> <p>Professional Development - Indirect Services</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$4,198.02 or 88 % total funds expended (\$2,798.02 training + \$1,400 cash incentive mini grants) \$0 other funds expended (not ECI) (state the source)</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) NA technical assistance contacts (ChildNet incentives only) NA visits to early learning environments by a consultant (ChildNet incentives only) 4 early learning environments involved in quality improvement activities</p> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) 25% of programs participating in a quality initiative-training (1 achieved & 4 possible-returned evaluations)</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) 100% of ratings/certifications/credentialing/renewals that were a direct result of professional development opportunities (9 achieved & 9 possible)</p> <p>Other information 24 hours of training provided 9 participants served in ChildNet training by county 0 Adair, 9 Dallas, 0 Madison, 0 Warren, 0 Polk , 0 Other 7 participants received cash incentives for attending ChildNet 0 Adair, 2 Dallas, 2 Madison, 3 Warren \$1,400 provided in cash incentives for attending ChildNet 0 Adair, \$400 Dallas, \$400 Madison, \$600 Warren 61 collaborative meetings with CCNC, QIP, Preschool Enrich, CCR&R etc</p> <p><i>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks:</i></p> <p><i>Other comments:</i></p>
--	--

<p>10. Dallas County ISU Extension Preschool Enrichment Project \$274,965.13 total contract</p> <p><i>(\$52,847.00 coordination)</i> <i>(\$149,197.13 tuition)</i> <i>(\$7,600.00 dental screenings)</i> <i>(\$2,100.00 lead screening)</i> <i>(\$26,000.00 transportation)</i> <i>(\$14,700.00 prof. development grants)</i> <i>(\$21,000.00 quality improvement grants)</i> <i>(\$1,521.00 literacy project)</i></p> <p>Program type-coordination of preschool tuition and preschool comprehensive services</p> <p><u>Preschool Coordination</u> <u>Goals/Benchmarks</u> 85 visits to preschools 35 preschools served 3 preschool staff director meetings 1 FTE</p> <p><u>Tuition Goals/Benchmarks</u> 175 families 180 children</p> <p><u>Dental Goals/Benchmarks</u> 350 screenings</p> <p><u>Transportation</u> <u>Goals/ Benchmarks</u> 25 expected the first year (funding capacity to may serve up to 220)</p> <p><u>Quality Improvement</u> <u>Goals/Benchmarks</u> 30 preschools</p> <p><u>Lead Goals/Benchmarks</u> 25 screenings</p>	<p>July 28, 2014 report was completed and by Val Cameron</p> <p>Preschool Scholarship Coordination - Indirect Services</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$52,945.16 or 100 % total funds expended \$0 other funds expended (not ECI)</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 397 technical assistance contacts 34 early learning environments involved in quality improvement activities</p> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) None required</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) 86% of children applying for preschool scholarships who actually receive the scholarship (222 achieved & 257 possible) 11% of children applying for preschool scholarships that did not receive because of, list the reasons (27 achieved & 257 possible) ♦ 15 over-income, 12 eligible for other programs</p> <p>Other information 96 visits conducted 34 preschools served 2 preschool staff director meetings conducted 14 collaborative meetings with CCNC, QIP, Preschool Enrich, CCR&R etc- 1 - FTE</p> <p><i>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks:</i></p> <p><i>Other comments:</i></p> <p>Early Care & Education - Direct Services (Preschool Tuition Scholarships)</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$180,496.94 or 121% total funds expended \$0 other funds expended (not ECI)</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) Age of children served (as of September 15) 0 Prenatal 0 Children 0-1 0 Children 1-2 0 Children 2-3 98 Children 3-4 121 Children 4-5 <u>3 Children 5-6</u> 222 total children served</p> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) 92% Children screened for age appropriate skills (190 achieved & 206 possible) Of those children screened , 7% referred on for additional services or treatment (16 achieved & 222 possible) \$813.05 Average cost per child</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) 92% Children demonstrating age appropriate skills as measured by GOLD (190 achieved & 206 possible)</p>
--	--

<p>Serving: Adair, Dallas, Madison & Warren County</p> <p>Required reporting matrix: ♦Preschool coordination - Indirect Services ♦ Early Care & Education -Direct Services ♦Health - Direct Services ♦Transportation - Direct Services ♦Improved Early Learning environments - Indirect Services</p>	<p>100% Children who were not demonstrating age appropriate skills as reported above that did demonstrate growth toward age appropriate skills as measured by GOLD (16 achieved & 16 possible)</p> <p>Other information \$180,496.94 funds expended on tuition (includes admin) \$73,270.79 - 3 year olds receiving preschool tuition assistance \$103,465.05 - 4 year olds receiving preschool tuition assistance \$3,761.10 - 5 year old receiving preschool tuition assistance</p> <p>Funds expended on tuition by county (includes admin) ♦ \$19,138.35 Adair, \$79,816.28 Dallas, \$32,408.25 Madison, \$49,134.06 Warren</p> <p>222 children served by county ♦ 30 Adair, 92 Dallas, 43 Madison, 57 Warren</p> <p>215 families served by county ♦ 27 Adair, 90 Dallas, 43 Madison, 55 Warren</p> <p>34 preschools assisted</p> <p><i>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks:</i> We had significant growth in Dallas & Madison county this past school year. Attendance was an issue in all counties with the long winter and numerous delays and cancellations.</p> <p><i>Other comments:</i></p> <p>Health - Direct Services (Preschool Dental Screenings)</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$9,004.87 or 118% total funds expended \$1,692.12 other funds expended (not ECI) Medicaid \$10,696.99 total cost of project</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) Age of children served (as of September 15) 0 Prenatal 0 Children 0-1 0 Children 1-2 0 Children 2-3 314 Children 3-4 0 Children 4-5 0 Children 5-6 314 total children served</p> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) 100% Children screened for dental issues (314 achieved & 314 possible) Of those children screened , 38% referred on for additional services or treatment (118 achieved & 314 possible) \$34 Average cost per child</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) 65% screened that needed follow up services/treatment that received the service (77 achieved & 118 possible) 62% of children who are cavity free (196 achieved & 314 possible)</p> <p>Other information \$ 9,004.87 funds expended on dental screenings</p>
--	--

	<p>Children served by county ♦ 113 Adair, 109 Dallas, 45 Madison, 47 Warren</p> <p>Funds expended on tuition by county (includes admin) ♦ \$2,521.36 Adair, \$3,241.18 Dallas, \$1,575.85 Madison, \$1,663.48 Warren</p> <p>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks: 2nd half screenings were not completed in Madison and Warren county due to lack of a dental hygienist.</p> <p>Other comments: 59 students billed to Medicaid</p> <p>Transportation - Direct Services</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$,7694.63 or 30 % total funds expended \$0 other funds expended (not ECI)</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) Age of children served (as of September 15) 0 Prenatal 0 Children 0-1 0 Children 1-2 0 Children 2-3 32 Children 3-4 0 Children 4-5 0 Children 5-6 32 total children served</p> <p>How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) \$248.89 Average cost per child</p> <p>What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) 85% of days that children attended preschool that were provided transportation (128 achieved & 150 possible)</p> <p>Other information Funds expended on transportation scholarships by county ♦ \$1,548.00 Adair, \$1,233.00 Dallas, \$1529.46 Madison , \$975.00 Warren</p> <p>Children served by county ♦ 11 Adair, 2 Dallas, 16 Madison, 3 Warren</p> <p>Comments regarding meeting benchmarks:</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>Improved Early Learning Environments- Indirect Services (Preschool Mini Grants)</p> <p>How much was put in? (Input measures) \$21,000.00 or 100 % total funds expended \$13,800 other funds expended (not ECI) (note the source) UW & QIP</p> <p>How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 15 early learning environments involved in quality improvement activities</p>
--	---

15 programs that achieved a quality initiative (QRS 3,4,5; IQPPS; NAEYC; NAFCC; Head Start)

How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures)

100% of programs participating in a quality initiative (**15 achieved & 15 possible**)

What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures)

100% of programs that improve, or maintain at the highest level, their rating in a quality initiative (**15 achieved & 15 possible**)

Other information

\$21,000.00 expended on grants per county

◆ \$4,730 Adair, \$4,830 Dallas, \$4,090 Madison, \$7,350 Warren

15 mini grants provided

◆ 3 Adair ,4 Dallas, 3 Madison, 5 Warren

15 preschools served

◆ 3 Adair, 4 Dallas, 3 Madison, 5 Warren

14 collaborative meetings with CCNC, QIP, Preschool Enrich, CCR&R, etc

1 FTE

Comments regarding meeting benchmarks:

Other comments:

Health - Direct Services (Lead Screenings)

How much was put in? (Input measures)

\$415.40 or 20% total funds expended

\$0 other funds expended (not ECI)

How much was done or produced? (Output measures)

Age of children served (as of September 15)

0 Prenatal

0 Children 0-1

0 Children 1-2

0 Children 2-3

0 Children 3-4

11 Children 4-5

0 Children 5-6

11 total children served

How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures)

100% Children screened for lead poisoning (**11 achieved & 11 possible**)

Of those children screened , 0% referred on for additional services or treatment (**0 achieved & 11 possible**)

Average cost per child \$37.76

What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures)

0% screened that needed follow up services/treatment that received the service (**0 achieved & 11 possible**)

Other information

\$415.40 funds expended on lead screenings

◆ \$288.75 Adair, \$0 Dallas, \$0 Madison , \$126.65 Warren

Comments regarding meeting benchmarks:

<p>11. Central Iowa Juvenile Detention Center ECI Executive Director \$83,713.00 <i>\$73,612 salary/benefits</i> <i>\$12,600.00 expenses</i></p> <p>Project type-administrative, board & community coordination services (includes salary, benefits, and expenses)</p> <p>Serving Adair, Dallas, Madison, & Warren County</p>	<p>Other comments: 7-15-14 report was completed by Debra Schrader ECI Director How much was put in? (Input measures) \$73,896.72 or 100% total funds expended - salary/benefits \$10,873.19 or 86% total funds expended - expenses How much was done or produced? (Output measures) 87 community collaboration meetings convened 93 community collaboration meetings attended (not hosted by ECI board) 2 of 2 ECI statewide ECI Area Director meetings attended 38 hours of professional development activities participated in pertaining to job duties How well did we do it? (Quality/Efficiency measures) 100% of ECI area compliance with ECI office defined information submissions (8 achieved & 8 possible) 100% of contracts monitored fiscally (13 achieved & 13 possible) 100% of contracts monitored programmatically (13 achieved & 13 possible) What was the change in conditions for those we served? (Outcome measures) 100% of contracts that meet all areas of service contract compliance; spending on target, reports timely and complete, outcome benchmarks achieved (13 achieved & 13 possible) 100% ECI Board meetings that meet quorum and adhered to Chapters 21 and 22 of the Iowa Code (7 achieved & 7 possible) 100% of contractors monitored that did not required corrective action (13 achieved & 13 possible) Other information 292 community partners that received regular communication 4 newsletter(s) completed 13,742 miles driven 159.78 vacation hours & 274 hours sick leave accumulated Other comments: The 4 R Kids ECI Area board went through the Levels of Excellence process and of the four levels possible was awarded the highest level which is Model status.</p>
<p>12. 4 R Kids ECI Area Board Board expenses \$25,000.00 <i>(\$10,000.00 fiscal agent,</i> <i>\$15,000.00 other admin costs)</i></p>	<p>\$17,503.87 or 70% total funds expended 4,566 website hits to date 112 hours of volunteer time from board members 10 presentations provided by programs for board professional development 11 advocacy, marketing, public awareness, events & presentations conducted year to date <i>(Rumble Tumble, Warren County Toddlerfest, Madison County Toddlerfest, Dallas County Toddlerfest, 4th of July Parade, Mental Health Community Conversation, Presentation to Matura Head Start, 3rd Annual Appreciation Reception, Presentation to Greenfield Optimist Club, Presentation to Dallas County Human Services Coalition, Dexter Childrens Day)</i></p>

Notes and items of interest

- 100% or 10 of 10 of the google document year end report submitted timely
- 80% or 8 of 10 of the contractor annual reports were submitted timely (i.e. emailed copy)
- 92.3% overall has been expended for expenses, on target is 100%
 - 91.5% school ready expended with \$83,554.94 carryover (\$5,972.32 SR administration, \$63,230.53 SR family support, \$1,484.35 SR quality, \$12,867.74)
 - 98.8% early childhood expended with \$1,573.92 carryover (\$92.37 EC programming, \$1,481.55 EC administration)

Interest Earned

- \$769.71 interest earned; interest earned must go back into programming and is included in the carryover above
 - \$92.37 earned on early childhood funds
 - \$677.34 earned on school ready funds

Fiscal Accountability

- 81% of the payment vouchers processed **was complete; no contact was needed** and was processed for payment
- 11% of the payment processed required a **call/email/contact for clarification** and then was processed for payment
- 18% of the payment vouchers processed **had issues and required correction** and then was processed or payment
- 0% of the payment vouchers processed were **rejected**, were incomplete and was not processed for payment