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**Additional Results for America Standards of Excellence**

Results for America also publishes annual standards of excellence for the following levels of government:

**Federal Government**

Results for America's 2019 Invest in What Works Federal Standard of Excellence highlights the extent to which nine federal agencies have built the infrastructure necessary to use data and evidence when making budget, policy, and management decisions, collectively overseeing more than $220 billion in federal investments in FY 2019.

**Local Government**

Results for America leads What Works Cities Certification, which evaluates how well cities are managed by measuring the extent to which city leaders incorporate data and evidence in their decision-making. Launched by Bloomberg Philanthropies in 2015, What Works Cities has worked with more than 100 mayors and chief executives — Democrats and Republicans — and as of 2020, 24 cities have been recognized for achieving Certification, with many more working towards building a stronger data foundation to effectively make decisions and provide better services for their residents.
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The Invest in What Works State Standard of Excellence (State Standard of Excellence) sets a national benchmark — a “north star” — for how state governments can consistently and effectively use evidence and data in budget, policy, and management decisions to achieve better outcomes for their residents. In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that, now more than ever, states need robust evidence and data capacities to make equitable decisions that affect their residents’ health, economic mobility, and overall well-being. Results for America's 2020 Invest in What Works State Standard of Excellence tracks the important progress that state governments are making to use evidence-based policy to get results at the pace and scale our country needs.

In the 2020 State Standard of Excellence, Results for America identified 169 examples of data-driven and evidence-based practices, policies, programs, and systems in effect as of June 2020 in 35 states across the country (including two new states not represented in 2019: Alabama and North Dakota). This represents a 36% increase from the 125 examples in the 2019 Invest in What Works State Standard of Excellence.

Overall, seven states are leading the way with their use of data-driven and evidence-based practices, policies, programs, and systems. These Leading States are Colorado, Connecticut, Minnesota, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah, and Washington. Four Honor Roll States have also demonstrated a commitment to improving their evidence and data efforts: Massachusetts, North Carolina, Ohio, and Rhode Island.
Across the country, state governments have recognized that they can respond more effectively to crises when they incorporate data and evidence into their decision-making. In 2020, all 50 states have elevated the importance of data in response to the COVID-19 pandemic by creating public-facing dashboards to track key health and economic indicators. These dashboards inform internal decision-making and public communication, with a majority of governors regularly conducting briefings on pandemic-related data in their state.

In 46 states, these dashboards disaggregate data by race and ethnicity, revealing the degree to which the COVID-19 pandemic has amplified long-standing racial inequality for communities of color. The State Standard of Excellence highlights specific examples of how states have used evidence and data to achieve more equitable results and responded to community needs. In particular, a growing number of states are making evidence-based budget decisions to ensure their investments deliver quality services and equitable benefits to their most highly impacted residents, even in the face of pandemic-induced budget reductions.

The 2020 State Standard of Excellence also identified 76 leading and promising examples related to economic mobility, as well as 96 education and 84 workforce examples.

The leading and promising examples highlighted in the 2020 State Standard of Excellence are informing other state governments, policymakers, and the public about the effectiveness of using evidence and data to invest taxpayer dollars in what works. To further help states meet the State Standard of Excellence’s criteria, the recently released Blueprint for Delivering Results in State Government provides state leaders with implementation strategies and actions for consistently and effectively using evidence and data to improve residents’ lives.

**Purpose of the 2020 State Standard of Excellence**

- **Create a National Standard**
  which defines the data and evidence infrastructure state governments need to have in place in order to invest in what works.

- **Showcase Examples**
  of results-driven and evidence-based practices, policies, programs, and systems within state governments.

- **Provide a Road Map**
  for state government leaders committed to investing in what works.
2020 State Standard of Excellence Key Findings

States Use Data to Respond to COVID-19

With the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, governors and state leaders have increasingly turned to data to guide their decision-making. All state governments publicly shared data on their COVID-19 emergency response dashboards, but states with a comprehensive data infrastructure (Criteria 3, Data Leadership; Criteria 4, Data Policies/Agreements; and Criteria 5, Data Use) had an enhanced ability to leverage a data-driven response.

COVID-19 Data Dashboards

The 2019 State Standard of Excellence identified 12 states with significant public-facing performance management systems. However, in 2020, all 50 states launched COVID-19 dashboards to monitor public health data and emergency response services. This alone constitutes a significant step forward for state government use of data-driven policymaking.

1 In July 2020, Results for America conducted a scan of all states to assess their COVID-19 response efforts, see Appendix B for details of this analysis.
Moreover, as of July 2020, 18 governors (nearly all of them from states highlighted in the 2020 State Standard of Excellence) had publicly committed to taking a data-driven and/or evidence-based approach in their COVID-19 response. Through daily press briefings, governors reaffirmed their state’s commitment to a response grounded in facts, science, and data. In regional plans, governors agreed to coordinate re-opening efforts and frequently share data as hotspots emerged. These actions respond to the public demand for data transparency, as well as the public’s desire that their governors and state leaders rely on data to make decisions. A recent national poll commissioned by Results for America and conducted by NORC at the University of Chicago found that 92% of Americans believe policymakers should seek the best evidence and data available when making decisions.¹

Beyond these efforts, several states took a comprehensive approach by outfitting their data dashboards with highly detailed information on economic, health, and demographic indicators. For example, Colorado’s COVID-19 dashboard features extensive data on hospitals, outbreaks, surveillance efforts, and the incidence and epidemic curve (see Colorado example in Criteria 5). Minnesota’s COVID-19 Response Capacity Tracker monitors hospital surge capacity, child care capacity, and COVID-19 response funding in addition to economic and food security metrics, critical care supplies, dial back indicators, and demographic details (see Minnesota example in Criteria 2). In both states, these data informed governors’ actions and were leveraged to drive everyday decisions during the pandemic.

Minnesota’s race/ethnicity data dashboard publishes demographic COVID-19 data by age, gender, and race/ethnicity; this approach was mirrored in 45 other states that also released demographic data about COVID-19 cases. The use of these disaggregated data allows states to identify disproportionately impacted communities, in particular, communities of color. For example, Virginia’s COVID-19’s Health Equity Work Group (see Virginia example in Criteria 13) leveraged geospatial data to provide testing and personal protective equipment in communities typically underserved by government programs. These data enable states to tailor their response activities in equity-informed ways. States are also encouraging community engagement and civic innovation by publicly posting open data daily on state websites in Massachusetts, Washington, Connecticut, and more.

**States Leverage Data to Support Pandemic Response Efforts**

All 50 states publicly posted coronavirus data, but states with the ability to link, share, and integrate data were well-positioned to incorporate data insights into their response efforts. For example, InnovateOhio’s statewide data-sharing and integration platform (see Ohio example in Criteria 4), gave Ohio a head start by providing rapid, actionable COVID-19 data to decision-makers. By using an existing infrastructure, the state obtained vital information, such as hospital capacity, more quickly by turning quarterly data deadlines into daily data reports.

Connecticut’s statewide data infrastructure helped the state leverage existing data-sharing agreements to match student and SNAP data, enabling students to directly receive SNAP Pandemic EBT food benefits with no application necessary (see Connecticut example in Criteria 5). Similarly, in administering the federal COVID-19 Pandemic Unemployment Assistance program, Rhode Island’s Department of Labor and Training launched an improved cloud-based system to manage the surge in unemployment claims. This system enabled Rhode Island, a model for other states, to be among the first states in the country to allocate Pandemic Unemployment Assistance benefits in the face of record-high unemployment claims.

¹ A 2020 poll conducted by NORC at the University of Chicago, commissioned by Results for America, focused on the public’s perception of how their government leaders were using data and evidence to inform their response to the COVID-19 crisis.
Prior to the pandemic, Virginia’s Chief Data Officer spearheaded the creation of a roadmap for enhanced data integration and use that allowed an existing cross-agency data platform, initially launched to coordinate the opioid crisis, to be enhanced for the COVID-19 response (see Virginia examples in Criteria 3, 4, and 5). These efforts demonstrate how states were able to use existing data infrastructure to rapidly provide or expand services and benefits during the COVID-19 crisis.

Evidence in State Budgets

States have also positioned themselves to leverage evidence and data infrastructure as part of the budget process. This approach to using evidence in fiscal decisions can foster innovation, build evidence of program effectiveness, and fund evidence-based programs that improve services for residents. With many states facing unprecedented budgetary decisions as a result of the COVID-19–induced recession, some states featured in the State Standard of Excellence have developed the capacity to invest in evidence-based programs to deliver better outcomes for residents.

For example, Colorado’s FY 2020–2021 budget development instructions (pp. 10–12) required agencies to describe the evidence and body of research supporting any new program (see Colorado example in Criteria 9). Minnesota also issued guidance on identifying evidence in budget proposals, which led to $87 million invested in new or expanded evidence-based programs in the FY 2020–2021 budget (see Minnesota example in Criteria 9). In 2019, the New Mexico legislature defined four tiers of evidence and required select agencies to identify their investments in evidence-based programs. As a result, the state legislature recommended more than $13.6 million in additional spending for evidence-based human services programs (see New Mexico example in Criteria 9).

Tennessee, North Carolina, and Rhode Island demonstrated progress in leveraging evidence in their budget processes. North Carolina’s budget process encouraged departments to identify and develop evidence-focused budget proposals (see North Carolina example in Criteria 9). Tennessee’s Office of Evidence and Impact, founded in 2019, spearheaded an increased use of evidence and research in the state budget process (see Tennessee examples in Criteria 6 and Criteria 9). In Rhode Island, the FY 2021 budget instructions required agencies to describe program effectiveness and improvement of outcomes, rather than simply reporting activities and outputs (see Rhode Island example in Criteria 9). Collectively, these examples signaled a growing commitment across the country to leverage evidence in budget decisions in order to achieve improved results.
2020 State Standard of Excellence Sector Analysis and Blueprint Overlay

Sector Analysis

Blueprint Overlay

In 2020, Results for America released the *Blueprint for Delivering Results in State Government* (Blueprint), which serves as an implementation guide for the State Standard of Excellence. The Blueprint provides state governments with clear implementation strategies and actions for consistently and effectively using evidence and data in budget, policy, and management decisions. Together, the State Standard of Excellence and Blueprint provide policymakers with comprehensive resources to:

| **Create a high-level roadmap** for how they can increase their capacity to use evidence and data in their decision-making |
| **Build capacity** to foster and sustain an organizational culture focused on learning and results |
| **Improve investments** by using their evidence and data capacity to spend taxpayer dollars on evidence-based solutions that achieve better results for their residents |

View the Blueprint for Delivering Results in State Government [here](#).

The Blueprint identifies the action-oriented steps that state governments should take to build their capacity to use evidence and data to get better results through four themes: Managing for Results; Leveraging Data; Building and Using Evidence; and Investing for Results. Each theme encompasses corresponding State Standard of Excellence criteria, providing state leaders a way to map their progress over time. In recent years, state governments have significantly increased the number of examples in the State Standard of Excellence criteria that correspond to these four Blueprint Themes, demonstrating that state leaders are building their capacity to use evidence and data. In future years, state leaders can continue to make progress in the State Standard of Excellence by implementing the Blueprint's Strategies and Actions.

---

3 See Appendix C for comparison of the Blueprint and State Standard of Excellence.
State Standard of Excellence Example Growth by Blueprint Theme

The Blueprint for Delivering Results in State Government serves as an implementation guide for the State Standard of Excellence. For strategies and actions to achieve excellence in these themes and criteria, visit the Blueprint online. The chart below shows the growth of State Standard of Excellence examples by Blueprint theme from 2018-2020.

**MANAGING FOR RESULTS**
Managing performance starts with understanding how the governor’s administration defines success and builds the overarching system and culture to deliver that success.


**BUILDING & USING EVIDENCE**
Data is a key tool for performance management, but it can also play a valuable role in building longer term evidence about interventions that achieve the best outcomes.


---

The Blueprint for Delivering Results in State Government serves as an implementation guide for the State Standard of Excellence. For strategies and actions to achieve excellence in these themes and criteria, visit the Blueprint online. The chart below shows the growth of State Standard of Excellence examples by Blueprint theme from 2018-2020.
## 2020 State Standard of Excellence Leading and Promising Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Standard of Excellence Criteria</th>
<th>Leading Example</th>
<th>Promising Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strategic Goals</td>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>ARIZONA, KENTUCKY, OREGON, PENNSYLVANIA, TENNESSEE, UTAH, VERMONT, WASHINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the governor have public statewide strategic goals?</td>
<td><strong>COLORADO</strong></td>
<td>In 2019, Colorado launched the Governor’s Dashboard, which outlines four high-priority strategic goals: tax reform and economic development, energy and renewables, health, and education and workforce. Each high-priority strategic area is supported by a cabinet working group as well as aligned goals, metrics, and strategies contained within agency performance plans. The governor’s annual budget request also links these goals to specific agency activities and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Performance Management / Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA, COLORADO, CONNECTICUT, FLORIDA, ILLINOIS, MARYLAND, MASSACHUSETTS, MISSOURI, NEW JERSEY, NEW MEXICO, OREGON, RHODE ISLAND, TENNESSEE, UTAH, VERMONT, WASHINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies implement a performance management system aligned with its statewide strategic goals, with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals, program objectives, and measures; and did it consistently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other indicators of performance?</td>
<td><strong>MINNESOTA</strong></td>
<td>In response to COVID–19, the state built a comprehensive public data dashboard that tracks health and economic data, including response data on hospital capacity, critical care supplies, child care, and funding. The dashboard also tracks the disparate impacts of the virus on communities of color to enhance collaboration with stakeholders and “eliminate systemic barriers so communities of color and indigenous communities can recover with dignity and resiliency.” Such a collaboration includes an ongoing partnership with J-PAL North America that is leveraging the data to identify how to increase take up of COVID–19 testing in Black and Latinx communities based on local needs and preferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME: Managing for Results

See the Managing for Results theme in the Blueprint to learn how your state can make progress in meeting this criteria.
### 3. Data Leadership

Did the governor’s office or any state agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data — consistent with strong privacy protections — to improve (or help other entities including, but not limited to, local governments and nonprofit organizations improve) federal, state, and local programs? (Example: Chief Data Officer)

**CONNECTICUT**

A 2018 Connecticut law formalized the position of Chief Data Officer within the Office of Policy and Management and created the Connecticut Data Analysis Technology Advisory Board, and required each state agency to designate an agency data officer to manage high value data sets and coordinate data-related activities with the state Chief Data Officer. The Chief Data Officer, along with individual agency data officers, are required to biannually update the state data plan, which covers open data and creates data standards for agencies. The plan also contains 11 principles and accompanying practices that all agencies should adopt in order to improve their management, use, sharing, and analysis of data. In 2019, the Office of Policy and Management created a new Data and Analytics Policy unit to further support the management, use, sharing, and analysis of data across state agencies.

**OHIO**

In April 2019, Ohio’s Governor signed an executive order consolidating state data systems into the InnovateOhio Platform, which uses data as “a shared strategic asset” whose “value is multiplied when data sets are linked across programs and organizations” through data integration and management tools. The executive order created a presumption of data sharing between state agencies, except where a specific legal prohibition is identified in writing. Since its launch, InnovateOhio and the Ohio Department of Administrative Services have collaborated with state agencies to incorporate 1,600 information systems into the State’s cloud environment. As of June 2020, the InnovateOhio Platform recovered over $1 million in duplicate payments by applying a data analytics tool to state agency spending ledgers.

### 4. Data Policies / Agreements

Did the state or any of its agencies have data sharing policies and data sharing agreements — consistent with strong privacy protections — with any nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, local government agencies, and/or federal government agencies which were designed to improve outcomes for publicly funded programs, and did it make those policies and agreements publicly available? (Example: data sharing policy, open data policy)

**CONNECUTICUT**

A 2018 Connecticut law formalized the position of Chief Data Officer within the Office of Policy and Management and created the Connecticut Data Analysis Technology Advisory Board, and required each state agency to designate an agency data officer to manage high value data sets and coordinate data-related activities with the state Chief Data Officer. The Chief Data Officer, along with individual agency data officers, are required to biannually update the state data plan, which covers open data and creates data standards for agencies. The plan also contains 11 principles and accompanying practices that all agencies should adopt in order to improve their management, use, sharing, and analysis of data. In 2019, the Office of Policy and Management created a new Data and Analytics Policy unit to further support the management, use, sharing, and analysis of data across state agencies.

**OHIO**

In April 2019, Ohio’s Governor signed an executive order consolidating state data systems into the InnovateOhio Platform, which uses data as “a shared strategic asset” whose “value is multiplied when data sets are linked across programs and organizations” through data integration and management tools. The executive order created a presumption of data sharing between state agencies, except where a specific legal prohibition is identified in writing. Since its launch, InnovateOhio and the Ohio Department of Administrative Services have collaborated with state agencies to incorporate 1,600 information systems into the State’s cloud environment. As of June 2020, the InnovateOhio Platform recovered over $1 million in duplicate payments by applying a data analytics tool to state agency spending ledgers.
5. Data Use

Did the state or any of its agencies have data systems consistent with strong privacy protections that linked multiple administrative data sets across state agencies, and did it use those systems to improve federal, state, or local programs?

**INDIANA**

The Indiana Management Performance Hub (MPH), overseen by the state’s Chief Data Officer, houses the integrated Education and Workforce Development database, which brings together data from 12 state agencies, including: the Commission for Higher Education, Department of Education, Department of Health, Department of Corrections, Department of Workforce Development, and Family and Social Services Administration. In addition, MPH has created integrated databases to address pressing program and policy issues related to COVID-19, opioids, Medicaid, fiscal transparency, and other areas. MPH has been at the forefront of using data to drive decision-making for Indiana’s COVID-19 response, including a study to better understand the prevalence of the coronavirus and/or its antibodies.

6. Evaluation Leadership

Did the governor’s office or any state agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them? (Example: chief evaluation officer)

**TENNESSEE**

Founded in 2019, Tennessee’s Office of Evidence and Impact is led by the state’s Director of Evidence and Impact. To propagate Tennessee’s evidence-based budgeting efforts, the Office defined four tiers of evidence, conducted program inventories, developed evidence reviews, and provided evidence-building technical assistance.

### Relevant Blueprint Themes

**Leveraging Data**

See the Leveraging Data theme in the Blueprint to learn how your state can make progress in meeting this criteria.

**Building & Using Evidence**

See the Building & Using Evidence theme in the Blueprint to learn how your state can make progress in meeting this criteria.

### Promising Examples

- ARKANSAS
- COLORADO
- CONNECTICUT
- FLORIDA
- GEORGIA
- ILLINOIS
- KENTUCKY
- MARYLAND
- MINNESOTA
- MISSISSIPPI
- NEVADA
- NEW JERSEY
- NORTH CAROLINA
- OHIO
- OREGON
- RHODE ISLAND
- SOUTH CAROLINA
- UTAH
- VIRGINIA
- WASHINGTON
- WISCONSIN

---
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### 7. Evaluation Policies

Did the state or any of its agencies have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations?

**KENTUCKY**

The Kentucky Center for Statistics (KYSTATS) has a 2020-22 Research Agenda, which details four primary research areas to identify barriers to education and workforce opportunities: (1) expand data access and data use to inform equity issues; (2) evaluate outcomes and barriers for education and workforce programs over time; (3) connect supply and demand of the state’s future workforce; and (4) measure the impact of out-of-state education and workforce migration. All research results are made publicly available.

### 8. Evaluation Resources

Did the state or any of its agencies invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations?

**MINNESOTA**

A 2017 law created Minnesota’s Opiate Epidemic Response grant program. The FY 2021 budget includes $300,000 for Minnesota Management and Budget to conduct experimental and quasi-experimental design impact evaluations for opiate epidemic response grant activities, which is slightly more than 1.1% of the agency’s $27 million general fund budget.

### 9. Outcome Data

Did the state or any of its agencies report or require outcome data for its state-funded programs during their budget process?

**COLORADO**

The 2013 Colorado State Measurement for Accountable, Responsive and Transparent Government (SMART) Act required all Colorado state agencies to submit annual performance reports to the state legislature as part of the state’s budget process. These reports include: (1) performance measures for the major functions of the department; (2) performance goals for at least the following three years; (3) a description of the strategies necessary to achieve those goals; and (4) a summary of the department’s most recent performance evaluation. In addition, the state’s FY 2020–2021 budget development instructions (pp. 10–12) prioritize new program requests “based on the evidence and body of research supporting the program’s effect on desired outcomes and proposed implementation plan.” In the FY 2020–2021 budget cycle, the state applied an evidence continuum to budget requests and used that criteria to inform resource allocation decisions.
10. Evidence Definitions and Program Inventories

Did the state or any of its agencies release a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and make publicly available an inventory of state-funded programs categorized based on at least two tiers of evidence?

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME:

Building & Using Evidence

See the Building & Using Evidence theme in the Blueprint to learn how your state can make progress in meeting this criteria.

NEW MEXICO

A 1999 New Mexico law required all state agencies to submit annual performance-based budget requests that include outputs, outcomes, performance, and evaluation data. The 2019 Evidence and Research Based Funding Requests Act amended the 1999 law by defining four tiers of evidence and further requiring certain state agencies (selected annually by the state legislature), to “identify each sub-program as evidence-based, research-based, promising, or lacking evidence of effectiveness” and report on the amount allocated for each of these evidence tiers. The law builds on New Mexico’s long-standing series of inventory and cost-benefit reports in the areas of children’s behavioral health; adult behavioral health; early education; child welfare; criminal justice; healthcare, infant, and maternal health; and education.

WASHINGTON

A 2013 Washington State law (pp. 105–106) directed the Department of Corrections, in consultation with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP), to: (1) compile an inventory of existing programs; (2) determine whether its programs were evidence-based; (3) assess the effectiveness of its programs, including conducting a cost-benefit analysis; and (4) phase out ineffective programs and implement evidence-based programs. As a result of this and similar laws, WSIPP has published cost-benefit analyses in a wide variety of issue areas over the past 10 years, including a 2020 report on the state’s extended foster care program. The WSIPP cost-benefit framework has been widely adopted by governments across the country.
### 12. Use of Evidence in Grant Funding

Did the state or any of its agencies (1) invest at least 50% of program funds in evidence-based solutions or (2) use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds to eligible grantees (including local governments) from its five largest competitive and noncompetitive grant programs?

**NEVADA**

Since 2017, the Nevada Department of Education has allocated 100% of the state’s $9.5 million in federal Title I school improvement funds to districts and schools for interventions backed by strong, moderate, or promising evidence (using the top three tiers of evidence as defined by the federal Every Student Succeeds Act [ESSA]). This represented an increase over the approximately 15% of funds that had been allocated based on level of evidence in the 2016–2017 school year. Grant recipients may set aside funds to monitor and evaluate the identified evidence-based approaches to ensure the investments yield a positive impact on student outcomes.

### 13. Innovation

Did the state or any of its agencies have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve outcomes?

**CALIFORNIA**

In 2020, California launched the California COVID Assessment Tool to identify potential COVID–19 hotspots, predict which hospitals might reach capacity, and proactively allocate resources to such hotspots. This innovative assessment tool is a “model of models,” which incorporates the statistical projections of several leading research institutions. Notably, the assessment tool allows residents to create their own scenarios for transmission potential in the coming months depending on specific public health guidelines. Further, California released the source data sets on California’s Open Data Portal, allowing the public to examine the data underlying the Assessment Tool.
### 14. Contracting for Outcomes

Did the state or any of its agencies enter into performance-based contracts and/or use active contract management (frequent use of data and regular communication with providers to monitor implementation and progress) to improve outcomes for publicly funded programs?

**RHODE ISLAND**

Since 2015, Rhode Island’s Department of Children, Youth, and Families has worked to reform and restructure the department’s procurement. As part of this initiative, the department executed $90 million in 116 results-driven contracts that require providers to meet outcome goals rather than output metrics. As a result, the Department has reduced the number of children in group care by over 20% since 2015, experienced a 50% expansion of foster care resources for the most challenging adolescents, doubled the capacity of high-quality family visitation and reunification services, and made start-up investments of $1.2 million in nonprofit community organizations to support new and expanded programming.

**PENNSYLVANIA**

Since 2013, the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections has set performance targets for its community corrections program through performance-based contracts. Providers who meet recidivism prevention goals receive a 1% increase in their rate, while providers who fail to meet targets for two consecutive years can have their contracts terminated. Following the introduction of these performance goals, the program’s recidivism rate dropped by 11.3% in 2014, another 16% in 2015, and an additional 11% in 2016. In 2018, the Commonwealth Foundation’s report on criminal justice reform in Pennsylvania recommended expanding the program to other areas based on these results.

### 15. Repurpose for Results

Did the state or any of its agencies shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program which consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?

**RHODE ISLAND**

**PENNSYLVANIA**

---

**RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME:**

$ Investing for Results

See the Investing for Results theme in the Blueprint to learn how your state can make progress in meeting this criteria.
Methodology

Results for America classified state governments’ data-driven and evidence-based practices, policies, programs, and systems as “leading” or “promising” examples based on (1) whether the effort met the minimum threshold described below, and (2) the extent to which it demonstrated five characteristics: results, breadth, depth, legal framework, and interconnectedness.

In each criteria, the most outstanding effort by an individual state in a given year is designated as the “leading” example. Other examples from states that meet the minimum threshold for the criteria are denoted as “promising.”

In order to meet the minimum threshold for inclusion as leading or promising, the example must:

- Meet the requirements of the criteria question
- Be in effect in June 2020
- Be verifiable with publicly available information

**Results** refers to the demonstrated impact of the practice, policy, program, or system in terms of results achieved, dollars saved, and/or lives improved.

**Breadth** refers to whether the example is in effect:

- Across the state government
- Across multiple state agencies
- Across an entire state agency
- Across multiple programs within a state agency, and
- Within one program within a state agency.

**Depth** refers to the extent to which the practice, policy, program, or system is exemplary in all aspects of the criteria.

**Legal Framework** refers to whether the practice, policy, program, or system is mandated by law, an executive order, or another formal rule-making mechanism.

**Interconnectedness** refers to the extent to which the practice, policy, program, or system directly informs budget, policy, and/or management decisions.
Background

The 2020 State Standard of Excellence encompasses state efforts in effect between July 2019 and June 2020. Results for America gave the state governments featured in this 2020 State Standard of Excellence multiple opportunities to review and comment on the content and presentation of the information related to their work. Results for America recognizes that it is difficult to distill complex practices, policies, programs, and systems into a single standard of excellence and accordingly relied on the knowledge of experts and leaders both within and outside state governments during the development of the 2020 State Standard of Excellence.

Results for America also acknowledges that there are likely additional state government practices, policies, programs, and systems that have been omitted from this 2020 State Standard of Excellence. Of the 169 examples included in the 2020 State Standard of Excellence, 14% are examples that were included for the first time in 2020 but were, in fact, in place in 2019, although they were not included in the 2019 State Standard of Excellence. In future years, Results for America plans to continue to publish updated versions of the Invest in What Works State Standard of Excellence to illustrate how states are progressing in their use of evidence and data to improve outcomes for residents.

Research Sources

Results for America's analysis is based on data provided under license by The Pew Charitable Trusts' Results First initiative (which was used to inform its 2017 report on states' engagement in evidence-based policymaking) and input from more than 200 current and former state government officials and other experts. The views expressed herein are those of Results for America and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Pew Charitable Trusts. All internet hyperlinks in this report were operational at the time of publication; however, URLs may change over time. Results for America regrets any inconvenience to readers; links will be updated in future editions of the Invest in What Works State Standard of Excellence.
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2020 State Standard of Excellence
Leading and Promising Examples
1. Strategic Goals

Did the governor have public statewide strategic goals?

Why is this important?
The creation of statewide strategic goals is an important first step in aligning state government budgets, policies, and programs to improve outcomes on a state government's highest priorities.

Launched in 2019, Colorado's Governor's Dashboard outlines four high-priority strategic goals: tax reform and economic development, energy and renewables, health, and education and workforce. Each high-priority strategic area is supported by a cabinet working group as well as aligned goals, metrics, and actions contained within agency performance plans. The governor's annual budget request also links these goals to specific agency activities and outcomes.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME
Managing for Results

For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.

Leading Example

COLORADO
STATEWIDE

Economic Mobility  Education  Health  Workforce

Launched in 2019, Colorado's Governor's Dashboard outlines four high-priority strategic goals: tax reform and economic development, energy and renewables, health, and education and workforce. Each high-priority strategic area is supported by a cabinet working group as well as aligned goals, metrics, and actions contained within agency performance plans. The governor's annual budget request also links these goals to specific agency activities and outcomes.
Promising Examples

ARIZONA
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

Since 2017, the Arizona Governor's Office has developed and updated the Governor’s Fundamentals Map, which lists goals under six statewide priority areas. All cabinet agencies are required to complete an annual strategic plan that includes annual objectives, metrics, and initiatives, which are captured in My Agency Scorecards. In 2020, the Governor’s Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting hired a statewide Strategic Planner to further support the multi-year strategic planning processes.

KENTUCKY
COVID-19, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

The Kentucky Governor has statewide priorities focused on wages, health care, education, retirement, and transparency. State agencies are required to align their activities to the Governor’s priorities and establish, maintain, and publish strategic plans. In March 2020, the Governor took actions to elevate Kentucky’s COVID-19 crisis response as the state's highest priority and publicly committed to a statewide, data-driven response.

OREGON
Child Welfare, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

In 2018, the Oregon Governor’s Office released the Action Plan for Oregon, which identified key priorities for the state in the areas of: environment, healthcare, education, transportation, good government, earthquake preparedness, housing and homelessness, child welfare, and job training. Progress made on meeting each priority is publicly available online, along with strategic plans for these policy areas.

PENNSYLVANIA
Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

The Pennsylvania Governor has three statewide goals: Jobs that Pay, Schools that Teach, and Government that Works. For each goal, the governor’s office developed subgoals with key performance measures sourced from the state's open data platform to track the progress in all three strategic areas.
Promising Examples

**TENNESSEE**

**Economic Mobility, Education, Workforce**

The Tennessee Governor has five priorities: Education and Workforce Development, Jobs and Rural Economic Development, Transparent and Efficient Government, Healthier Tennessee, and Public Safety and Criminal Justice Reform. Specific metrics tied to the success of each priority area are publicly displayed on the state’s Transparent TN website.

**UTAH**

**COVID-19, Economic Mobility, Health, Workforce**

In 2018, the Utah Governor’s Office released the Utah Life Elevated 2020 Initiative, which includes four statewide goals: effective and efficient government, thriving communities, qualified workforce, and equitable and competitive revenue. Statewide goals were joined by high priority COVID-19 response goals and strategies that were elevated in March 2020 to help Utah recover from the pandemic.

**VERMONT**

**Child Welfare, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce**

Vermont’s 2018–2023 Strategic Plan included four statewide goals: the economy, affordability, vulnerability, and modernization. These priority areas were established by a 2017 Vermont executive order, which required all agencies “to establish the following cornerstones as their strategic and operational goals: growing the Vermont economy; making Vermont an affordable place to live, work, and do business; and protecting vulnerable Vermonters.” As required by a 2014 law and a related executive order, the state’s Chief Performance Officer annually reports data related to the state’s goals and fiscal transparency.

**WASHINGTON**

**Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce**

In 2017, the Washington Governor’s Office issued five overarching goals with aligned outcome measures: world-class education; prosperous economy; sustainable energy and clean environment; healthy and safe communities; and effective, efficient, and accountable government.
2. Performance Management / Continuous Improvement

Did the state or any of its agencies implement a performance management system aligned with its statewide strategic goals, with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals, program objectives, and measures; and did it consistently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other indicators of performance?

Why is this important?
Performance management helps state governments monitor and improve customer service, program performance, and outcomes for their residents.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME
Managing for Results
For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.

Leading Example

MINNESOTA STATEWIDE

In response to COVID-19, the state built a comprehensive public data dashboard that tracks health and economic data, including response data on hospital capacity, critical care supplies, child care, and funding. The dashboard also tracks the disparate impacts of the virus on communities of color to enhance collaboration with stakeholders and “eliminate systemic barriers so communities of color and indigenous communities can recover with dignity and resiliency.” Such a collaboration includes an ongoing partnership with J-PAL North America that is leveraging the data to identify how to increase take up of COVID-19 testing in Black and Latinx communities based on local needs and preferences.
Promising Examples

CALIFORNIA
COVID–19, Health, Economic Mobility, Education

California’s Department of Health Care Services has a performance dashboard initiative that aggregates enrollment, client demographic, access, and coverage data. The information is also available on the California Health and Human Services Open Data Portal. The state’s Department of Social Services uses the Cal-OAR system to continuously improve county-based CalWORKs programs by collecting, analyzing, and disseminating outcomes and best practices. The California Department of Education’s California School Dashboard documents state and local education performance. The state indicators include: academic information, English learner progress, chronic absenteeism, graduation rate, suspension rate, and college/career readiness.

COLORADO
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

A 2013 Colorado law required all state agencies to submit annual performance reports to the Colorado state legislature, which must include: (1) performance measures for the major functions of the department; (2) performance goals for at least the subsequent three years; (3) a description of the strategies necessary to achieve those goals; and (4) a summary of the department’s most recent performance evaluation. In 2019, the Governor asked agencies to identify Wildly Important Goals that roll–up to the statewide Bold Four goals and to align their operations to achieve those goals. Reported monthly on the Governor’s dashboard, these goals are aligned to the state’s budget and are coordinated by inter–agency working groups.

CONNECTICUT
Child Welfare, COVID–19, Economic Mobility, Health

In 2019, the Governor of Connecticut announced a Performance and Results Agenda, which included linking data to generate cost–savings, cross–agency collaboration, and streamlining digital services. In addition, the Department of Public Health has a performance management system, which tracks the state’s COVID–19 indicators and measures for the Healthy Connecticut 2020 State Health Improvement Plan.
Promising Examples

**FLORIDA**
Child Welfare, Health

A 2014 Florida law created the Florida Department of Children and Families’ results-oriented accountability program. This program monitors data from service providers and other entities to report progress via a public child welfare performance dashboard. In addition, the Department publishes interactive scorecards with detailed information on program performance for: community-based care, federal child welfare indicators, child protective investigations, and adult protective services. Pursuant to the law, the Office of Child Welfare publishes an annual performance report.

**ILLINOIS**
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

The Illinois Budgeting for Results Commission is the state’s performance-based budgeting initiative. The Commission’s annual report summarizes the state’s performance improvement efforts across seven statewide results areas: education, economic development, public safety, human services, healthcare, environment and culture, and government services.

**MARYLAND**
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

As required by a 2013 Maryland law, the Maryland Department of Budget and Management’s Managing for Results initiative publishes annual performance reports as part of the state’s budget process. These reports track agencies’ key goals, objectives, and performance measures. The Maryland Governor’s Office of Performance Improvement, established by a 2015 executive order, assists “agencies with measuring and managing performance information” to support the state’s efforts. Further, the Maryland Children’s Cabinet maintains a Child Welfare Scorecard, which tracks indicators for eight statewide child welfare goals.

**MASSACHUSETTS**
Child Welfare, COVID-19, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Health, Workforce

Massachusetts’ data-driven performance initiative is designed to improve constituent-facing services by publicly posting annual performance reports with specific targets and progress metrics. Additionally, the state’s COVID-19 Response Reporting platform provides daily and cumulative updates on cases, testing, hospitalizations, weekly reports on care capacity, and cases by city and town. The dashboard’s raw data is downloadable and has been used to inform state decision-making.
Promising Examples

MISSOURI

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

The Missouri Chief Operating Officer, a position established in 2017, works with all state departments to define strategic priorities and achieve results. Departments represent their priorities and main strategic initiatives on “placemats” that are shared throughout the organization and with the public. All Missouri departments publish annual performance data on core programs as part of the annual budget process. Missouri also established in 2019 a cross-department Operational Excellence community to build a network of Lean Six Sigma practitioners to drive improvements across 16 executive departments.

NEW JERSEY

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

The New Jersey Governor’s Performance Center publicly posts key performance indicators for each department and tracks department operations.

NEW MEXICO

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

Since 1999, a New Mexico law required all state agencies to submit annual performance-based budget requests, which include: (1) the outputs and outcomes for each program; (2) performance measures and targets for each program; and (3) an evaluation of each program's performance. This information is released annually in the state's policy and fiscal analysis, which shares individual agency performance reports and information on the cost effectiveness of different programs.
Promising Examples

**OREGON**

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

A [2016 Oregon law](#) required all state agencies to develop and use performance measures. Each state agency submits an [Annual Performance Progress Report](#) to the [Oregon Legislative Fiscal Office](#) detailing agencies programmatic outcomes and performance measures, which are reviewed during the state’s budget process.

The Oregon Department of Education has established a [continuous improvement program](#) for school districts to monitor program success and evaluate current services to ensure students are receiving the best possible education. The [framework](#) ties together strategic planning, needs assessments, and monitoring and feedback loops to “support ambitious, priority-driven action plans where routine collaboration and decision-making among district leaders is reflected throughout implementation.” The continuous improvement processes relate the Department’s broader [Oregon Integrated Systems Framework](#) to support inclusive policy and practice, including the use of evidence-based education programs.

**RHODE ISLAND**

Health

In 2016, Rhode Island’s Governor launched the state’s [Overdose Prevention and Intervention Task Force Action Plan](#), which was [updated](#) in 2019, and set statewide goals to save lives by preventing drug abuse and overdose. The [Task Force](#) publishes [dashboards](#) tracking progress on the state’s overdose prevention goals.

**TENNESSEE**

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

Tennessee’s [Governmental Accountability Act of 2013](#) established a statewide performance management system, [Transparent Tennessee](#) and the state’s Chief Operating Officer continuously track and monitor performance data and report publicly available operational performance on [Transparent Tennessee’s dashboards](#), which include specific [goals, targets, and performance data](#) for each of the state’s strategic priorities. The site also includes state [fiscal data](#) as well as [OpenMaps](#), which showcases key metrics and an interactive budget tool.
Promising Examples

UTAH

COVID-19, Economic Mobility, Health, Workforce

In March 2020, Utah's Governor released Utah Leads Together, a dynamic, data-informed, and unified plan for Utah's health and economic response to COVID-19. The plan conveys three phases of response accompanied by specific, measurable goals, with strategies and tactics to achieve them. The Utah Governor's Office of Management and Budget oversees the project management structure, creation of a dashboard, and dynamic modeling to monitor daily progress towards the transmission rate goal and other key indicators.

The Utah Governor's Office of Management and Budget uses a standard performance management framework across all cabinet agencies, which is also used to inform the state's performance-budgeting. Agencies have embedded operational excellence specialists who report directly to agency leadership, assist in the routine reporting of performance data, and pursue operational projects to improve outcomes. Training on continuous improvement is offered in workshops and at the annual Utah Ops Conference to state personnel.

VERMONT

Child Welfare, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

Vermont measures progress towards the goals of its five-year strategic plan, established by a 2017 Vermont executive order, through dashboards that track progress on the economy, affordability, vulnerability, and modernization. As required by a 2014 law and a related executive order, the Office of the Chief Performance Officer also publishes annual Programmatic Performance Measure Budget Reports and annual Outcomes & Indicators Reports aimed at integrating strategic planning, performance management, and budgeting.

WASHINGTON

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

A 2013 Washington State Executive Order established Results Washington to strengthen performance management and continuous improvement throughout Washington state government. From 2014 to early 2020, Results Washington conducted Results Review meetings with the Governor 10 times per year. The meetings, recorded and publicly posted, allowed the Governor and state agency directors to discuss objectives, improvement strategies, and metrics. Results Washington is currently refocusing its efforts toward a new Public Performance Review process. This new process creates the opportunity to better partner with state agencies on complex, cross-enterprise projects. The state's goal is to develop an approach that fosters partnership and focuses on the outcomes that matter to state agencies, the Governor, and ultimately the state of Washington.
3. Data Leadership

Did the governor’s office or any state agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data—consistent with strong privacy protections—to improve (or help other entities including, but not limited to, local governments and nonprofit organizations improve) federal, state, and local programs? (Example: Chief Data Officer)

Why is this important?
A designated chief data officer can create a coherent set of policies, structures, and guidance for how state agencies should routinely use data to improve programs.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME

Leveraging Data

For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.

Leading Example

CONNECTICUT STATEWIDE

A 2018 Connecticut law formalized the position of Chief Data Officer within the Office of Policy and Management and created the Connecticut Data Analysis Technology Advisory Board. The law required each state agency to designate an agency data officer to manage high-value data sets and coordinate data-related activities with the state Chief Data Officer. The Chief Data Officer, along with individual agency data officers, are required to biannually update the state data plan, which covers open data and creates data standards for agencies. The plan also contains 11 principles and accompanying practices that all agencies should adopt in order to improve their management, use, sharing, and analysis of data. In 2019, the Office of Policy and Management created a new Data and Analytics Policy unit to further support the management, use, sharing, and analysis of data across state agencies.
Promising Examples

**ARKANSAS**

In 2020, Arkansas named the state’s new Chief Data Officer. The Chief Data Officer position, created by a 2017 law, leads the state’s efforts to improve data use, infrastructure, and security.

**CALIFORNIA**

In 2020, California appointed a new Chief Data Officer. This position is responsible for creating data strategies that improve programs statewide and lead to better outcomes, with a particular focus on connecting traditionally siloed data.

**COLORADO**

Colorado’s Chief Data Officer position determines the state’s data strategy, policies, standards, and management with the support of the state’s Government Data Advisory Board, which was created by a 2009 state statute. The Board utilizes subcommittees that focus on policy areas, such as: education, early childhood development, and privacy. Within state agencies, data officers, analysts, and researchers also support data collection, analysis and use, with a total of 70% of state agencies in Colorado reporting dedicated data leadership entities.

**INDIANA**

A 2017 Indiana law (p. 8) established the position of Chief Data Officer with the budget, staff, and authority to: (1) coordinate data analytics and data transparency for state agencies; (2) advise state agencies regarding best practices for data maintenance, security, and privacy; and (3) oversee the Indiana Management Performance Hub (MPH). MPH uses state data, such as the Education and Workforce Development database, to provide “[analytical] solutions tailored to address complex management and policy questions enabling improved outcomes.”
Promising Examples

KENTUCKY
In 2018, Kentucky established a Chief Data Officer position to “coordinate and oversee the sharing of data” and “implement effective data governance strategies designed to maintain data integrity, confidentiality, availability, security, and to promote access to data.” Kentucky's statewide Chief Data Officer is the senior executive responsible for leading data management with the support of Agency Data Officers who coordinate data management practices within their respective agencies. Agency Data Officers meet monthly to share best practices and support the state’s data initiatives.

MINNESOTA
In 2019, Minnesota established a statewide Chief Data and Evaluation Officer with the authority, staff, and budget to collect, analyze, share, and use data to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of public programs. This Chief Data and Evaluation Officer leads a team of analysts and research scientists who partner with state agencies to integrate useful information into strategic planning, budget formulation, and ongoing management. In the context of the COVID-19 response, this team provides daily data updates to the Governor and other state leaders on hospital surge capacity, economic and food security, and the availability of child care for workers in critical sectors. The Chief Data and Evaluation Officer also assists state agencies in leveraging the expertise and resources of national experts and peer states.

NEW JERSEY
New Jersey’s Chief Data Officer leads statewide data transparency initiatives and open data projects, such as the Open Data Center, Governor’s Transparency Center, and Superstorm Sandy Transparency website.

NORTH CAROLINA
North Carolina’s Chief Data Officer maintains the North Carolina Government Data Analytics Center, which manages data sharing, integration, and data analytics to improve service delivery and the efficiency of services. In this role, the Chief Data Officer has the authority, staff, and budget “to transform existing data assets into an information utility for the state's policy and operational leaders for their use in making program investment decisions; managing resources; and improving financial programs, budgets, and results.”
Promising Examples

**OHIO**

**Child Welfare, COVID-19, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce**

In 2019, the Ohio Governor’s Office established the Chief Data Advocate role as a senior staff member with the authority to collect, analyze, share, and use data to improve state government programs. The Chief Data Advocate works under InnovateOhio, which was created in 2019 and is led by the Lieutenant Governor. The executive order that created InnovateOhio states a presumption of data-sharing between state agencies, except where a specific legal prohibition is identified in writing.

**OREGON**

A 2018 Oregon law instituted a Chief Data Officer responsible for the state’s centralized data strategy, including an enterprise open data platform. The Chief Data Officer is charged with creating open data standards, providing privacy guidance for state agencies, identifying opportunities for data sharing, and designing stakeholder engagement strategies, including an advisory committee.

**RHODE ISLAND**

**COVID-19, Health, Child Welfare**

Rhode Island’s Data Ecosystem, managed by the Executive Office of Health and Human Services, uses state data from more than 15 sources, including health, child welfare, and human services. The Ecosystem is led by a Director of Data and Analytics and a team of analysts who use integrated data to improve state programs. The Ecosystem produces regular dashboards that are used for internal performance management meetings.

**UTAH**

In 2019, Utah appointed a Chief Data Officer to increase interagency data integration. The Chief Data Officer administers an integrated client database to facilitate secure sharing of administrative data and improve service delivery outcomes. A 2014 law created a State Open Data Coordinator to oversee the state’s open data catalog, interoperability projects, and support the Office of the State Auditor.
Promising Examples

**VIRGINIA**  
*Child Welfare, COVID–19, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce*

A [2018 Virginia law](#) established a [Chief Data Officer](#) role to coordinate data sharing among state, regional, and local entities. The Chief Data Officer coordinates the state’s [Data–Sharing and Analytics Advisory Committee](#) and is responsible for data governance, including policies related to open data, data sharing, and data privacy.

**WASHINGTON**  
*Economic Mobility, Health*

The Washington State Department of Social and Health Services [Research and Data Analysis Division](#) is led by a Director who is responsible for providing policymakers with data and analyses to improve the effectiveness of services for clients. The Director oversees the Department’s [Integrated Client Database](#), which brings together data from 10 state agencies, 40 separate data systems, and millions of individuals receiving services through publicly–funded health and human services programs in Washington State.
4. Data Policies / Agreements

Did the state or any of its agencies have data-sharing policies and data-sharing agreements — consistent with strong privacy protections — with any nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, local government agencies, and/or federal government agencies that were designed to improve outcomes for publicly funded programs, and did it make those policies and agreements publicly available? (Example: data-sharing policy, open data policy)

Why is this important?
Data-sharing policies and agreements allow state governments to take a coordinated approach to identifying and using relevant data to improve programs while implementing strong privacy protections.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME
Leveraging Data

For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.
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In April 2019, Ohio’s Governor signed an executive order consolidating state data systems into the InnovateOhio Platform, which uses data as "a shared strategic asset" whose “value is multiplied when data sets are linked across programs and organizations" through data integration and management tools. The executive order created a presumption of data sharing between state agencies, except where a specific legal prohibition is identified in writing. Since its launch, InnovateOhio and the Ohio Department of Administrative Services have collaborated with state agencies to incorporate 1,600 information systems into the State's cloud environment. As of June 2020, the InnovateOhio Platform recovered over $1 million in duplicate payments by applying a data analytics tool to state agency spending ledgers.
Promising Examples

ARIZONA
In 2019, Arizona's Department of Administration implemented an enterprise memorandum of understanding (eMOU) for data sharing, which has been signed by 28 state agencies. The eMOU sets forth governance standards for data sharing according to the statewide data policy and has a presumption of data sharing between agencies, unless specifically prohibited by law.

CALIFORNIA
California's statewide Open Data Policy encourages departments to share data in standard and accessible formats through the California Open Data Portal. As outlined in the California Open Data Handbook, the state’s open data efforts are designed to improve collaboration, expand transparency, encourage innovation, and increase effectiveness. In addition, the state hosts CalData, a professional network for government officials and partners to promote the best uses of open data.

COLORADO
Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce
In 2019, the Colorado Governor's Office and the Colorado Evaluation and Action Lab co-designed the Linked Information Network of Colorado (LINC) to facilitate data sharing for research and analytics. The Network is designed to share data across state agencies and provide de-identified data to perform robust, academically rigorous research to inform policy. LINC has a three-tier legal structure, which includes: (1) an enterprise memorandum of understanding (eMOU) signed by all data providers; (2) data-sharing agreements to secure, handle, and anonymize data for all LINC projects; and (3) data licenses with roles and responsibilities for users of LINC project data. In addition, the Colorado Department of Higher Education was the first state agency in the nation to partner on a pilot project with the U.S. Census Bureau to match federal unemployment insurance data with postsecondary degree completion data. At the state and county level, the Colorado Department of Human Services' C–Stat performance management system facilitates data sharing among its 64 counties by providing dashboards to track key metrics and Performance and Partnerships Exchanges to facilitate sharing of best practices.
Promising Examples

CONNECTICUT

A 2018 Connecticut law required each state agency to designate an agency data officer to manage high-value data sets and coordinate data-related activities with the state Chief Data Officer. The Chief Data Officer, along with individual agency data officers, is required to biannually update the state data plan, which covers open data and creates data standards for agencies. The plan also contains 11 principles and accompanying practices that all agencies should adopt to improve their management, use, sharing, and analysis of data. In addition, a 2019 law required a report on the legal issues surrounding interagency data sharing. Based on analysis of 17 state agencies and 224 data sharing agreements, the report recommends: 1) establishing a coordinated governance structure for cross-agency data sharing, and 2) implementing cross-agency data-sharing agreements that are more flexible and durable. Building on this report, Connecticut released a Data-Sharing Playbook in 2020 to help agencies share data safely, securely, and ethically.

INDIANA

Health, Education, Workforce

The Indiana Data Partnership, launched in 2019, brings together government, nonprofit, and private sector entities to share data, talent, and technology to solve key challenges impacting Indiana residents. The Partnership was formed as an extension of the Indiana Management Performance Hub to create a secure, replicable, and sustainable framework to help partner organizations use shared data in coordinating efforts and maximizing holistic solutions. Initial projects included combating the opioid epidemic, improving education and workforce development, mapping local health delivery, and a networking analysis.

KENTUCKY

Economic Mobility, Education, Workforce

The Kentucky Center for Statistics (KYSTATS) collects and links high-quality, actionable data from 15 state agencies to improve education and workforce programs in the state. KYSTATS has a data request hub, which includes a data access and use policy, data-sharing agreement, and a data dictionary to facilitate the exchange of data with requestors. In 2019, Kentucky released a Master Data Agreement for use by all executive agencies, which are also subject to the state's Enterprise Privacy Policy. KYSTATS also has a Security Policy that contains procedures for securing the confidentiality of the data maintained by KYSTATS.
Promising Examples

**MARYLAND**

*Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce*

In 2019, Maryland unveiled an [updated open data portal](#) with an expanded catalog of data covering education, health, criminal justice, child welfare, workforce, and economic mobility. The state's Council on Open Data governs the portal and meets on a quarterly basis to coordinate, plan, and promote Maryland's open data, regularly publishing its [agenda and minutes](#). In addition, the [Maryland Transparency Portal](#) provides information about the state's operating budget, state grants, and payments to vendors.

**MASSACHUSETTS**

*Education, COVID-19, Health, Economic Mobility*

The Massachusetts Department of Public Health maintains a [Public Health Data Warehouse](#) that leverages public and private partnerships to provide timely, linked, multi-year data to analyze health priorities through [data briefs](#) and [data digests](#). The Department also created a [COVID-19 Response Reporting](#) hub that publishes [data](#) and [cumulative reports](#) on Massachusetts COVID-19 cases, testing, and hospitalizations.

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education [Researcher's Guide to Massachusetts State Education Data](#) contains data-sharing information about “what data is available, how to obtain and interpret it, and, ultimately, [how] to generate better research projects and more accurate and useful results” for improving student outcomes in the state. The guide has links to data sets such as aggregate data at the [school](#) and [district](#) levels, as well as information on confidential student-level [data](#), nonconfidential student-level [data](#), and educator [data](#). The Department's data-sharing [memorandum of understanding template](#) and corresponding approval process reiterates the confidentiality of student-level data.

**MICHIGAN**

Michigan's [Enterprise Information Management Program](#) established policies and [protocols](#) for data sharing, management, and governance. As part of these efforts, Michigan developed a [statewide data-sharing agreement template](#) to facilitate improved data sharing among agencies and departments. The [Open Michigan Portal](#) houses the state's [open data portal](#), which includes [information](#) about the impact of COVID-19 in the state.
## Promising Examples

### NEW JERSEY

**Education, Workforce**

New Jersey partners with Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, to operate the New Jersey Education to Earnings Data System (NJEEDS), which uses a data-sharing agreement to link data from the Departments of Education and Labor, the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education, and the Higher Education Student Assistance Authority.

### NORTH CAROLINA

**Criminal Justice, Education, Health, Workforce**

The North Carolina Data Analytics Center serves as the centralized data office for the state. As authorized by law, the Center has developed a data governance program for utilizing standardized memorandums of agreement consistent with strong privacy protections to share data with local, state, and federal agencies. It also coordinates the state’s education longitudinal system, which includes data sharing among the Departments of Education, Labor, Revenue, Health and Human Services, and the state’s university system.

### OREGON

**Child Welfare, Education, Health, Workforce**

A 2017 Oregon law requires the Chief Data Officer to create an enterprise Memorandum of Understanding to facilitate data sharing across state agencies. This approach has been used for the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, launched in 2018, to bring together education and workforce data, the Sustainable Solutions for Accelerated Learning (SSAL) Work Group, and Trauma-Informed Pilot Project to identify areas of inequities for increased funding. In 2019, the state also partnered with the Oregon Health and Sciences’ University Center for Evidence Based Policy, state agencies, nonprofit leaders, and the state legislature to create the Child Well-Being Dashboard, which uses data from the Oregon Departments of Education, Early Learning, Health and Human Services, and Youth to measure the outcomes of early childhood intervention programs.
Promising Examples

RHODE ISLAND
COVID-19, Economic Mobility, Workforce

In response to the federal COVID-19 Pandemic Unemployment Assistance program, Rhode Island’s Department of Labor and Training partnered with the nonprofit Research Improving People’s Lives and Amazon Web Services to develop a cloud-based system to share data and improve management of unemployment claims. This enabled Rhode Island to be among the first states in the nation to provide Pandemic Unemployment Assistance benefits in the face of record-high employment claims during the COVID-19 crisis.

TEXAS
Education, Workforce

The Texas Education Agency administers the Texas Student Data System, a statewide platform for collecting, managing, sharing, and reporting state education data. The system has a data standards and data governance process. Additionally, the Workforce Information System of Texas (TWIST) links data across workforce funding streams for intake, eligibility determination, and reporting on programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Employment and Training, and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

UTAH
Child Welfare, Economic Mobility, Health

Utah’s Chief Data Officer is using data sharing and a Memorandum of Understanding to support the Blueprint Solution, which is designed to improve service delivery through enhanced case management coordination among state social services agencies. Utah also has an open data catalog supported by the State Open Data Coordinator, a position created by a 2014 law.

VIRGINIA

In 2020, a Virginia executive order established data governance bodies to improve data sharing between state agencies and localities. The Executive Order implements the recommendations from the 2019 publication Data Sharing and Analytics Governance Structure for the Commonwealth of Virginia Report. The Virginia open data portal also features resources on data use, a data dictionary, and an open data catalog.
Promising Examples

WASHINGTON
Child Welfare, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

The Washington Education Research and Data Center’s memorandum of understanding describes how data will be collected and shared among partners. It has a strong focus on protecting individual privacy. The Center gathers 11 partners, including state workforce, education, and child welfare agencies, to compile education and workforce data to improve student achievement and workforce outcomes.

The Washington State Department of Social and Health Services maintains an integrated client database with data from 10 state agencies, 40 separate data systems, and millions of individuals receiving services through publicly funded health and human services programs in Washington State. This data is used for rapid-cycle policy analysis, program evaluation, predictive modeling, and performance measurement to help agencies understand how health services and other factors are related to outcomes for persons served by public assistance programs. Predictive modeling and clinical decision support tools developed and maintained in the Research and Data Analysis’s integrated data environment have been used by the state’s Health Home Program, which provides intensive care management services to high-risk Medicaid beneficiaries, to improve beneficiary health outcomes and lower costs. These lower costs have resulted in tens of millions in dollars in shared savings payments from the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.
5. Data Use

Did the state or any of its agencies have data systems consistent with strong privacy protections that linked multiple administrative data sets across state agencies, and did it use those systems to improve federal, state, or local programs?

Why is this important?
The linking of agency data allows state governments to increase the effectiveness of state services and get better results for their residents.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME
Leveraging Data

For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.

Leading Example

INDIANA STATEWIDE

The Indiana Management Performance Hub (MPH), overseen by the state’s Chief Data Officer, houses the integrated Education and Workforce Development database, which brings together data from 12 state agencies, including: the Commission for Higher Education, Department of Education, Department of Health, Department of Corrections, Department of Workforce Development, and Family and Social Services Administration. In addition, MPH has created integrated databases to address pressing program and policy issues related to COVID–19, opioids, Medicaid, fiscal transparency, and other areas. MPH has been at the forefront of using data to drive decision-making for Indiana's COVID–19 response, including a study to better understand the prevalence of the coronavirus and/or its antibodies.
Promising Examples

**ARKANSAS**

A 2019 Arkansas law created the Data-Sharing and Data-Driven Decision-Making Task Force “to implement a shared services model for statewide data sharing in order to drive innovation and facilitate efficiency across state agencies, improve the delivery of services, and to better serve the citizens of this state.” In December 2019, the Task Force reported recommendations to create a statewide centralized data hub and analytics center, establish a data-sharing and data-driven decision-making subcommittee in the state legislature, and require agencies to enter into data-sharing agreements to augment data-sharing and integration efforts. A new committee was established to continue the work of the task force through December 2020.

**COLORADO**


Colorado’s Department of Public Health and Environment extended their geospatial data and resource library to encompass a wide range of COVID-19-related data, including: hospital data, incidence and epidemic curve data, outbreak data, and surveillance data. Daily state-level data keeps policymakers informed with up-to-date information on COVID-related indicators. The Department's open data portal also maps operational community testing sites that receive COVID-19 testing resources from the state.

In 2019, the Colorado Governor’s Office and the Colorado Evaluation and Action Lab at the University of Denver co-designed the Linked Information Network of Colorado (LINC) to facilitate data sharing for research and analytics purposes as a way to improve state policies and programs. Using this data, the Lab and state agencies have collaborated on projects to improve outcomes in areas such as education, renewable energy, reentry and racial disparities in criminal justice, prenatal health, and the early childhood education workforce.
Promising Examples

CONNECTICUT
Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

The Connecticut Departments of Education and Social Services leveraged data-sharing agreements by matching student and SNAP benefit data to automatically certify SNAP Pandemic EBT for more than 287,000 Connecticut students who receive free or reduced-price meals. This allowed the state to provide meals to 82,000 students participating in only the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program, but who do not receive food assistance through SNAP, Medicaid, or other food assistance programs. The state also partnered with food retailers to allow SNAP enrollees to use their benefits to purchase eligible food items online.

Connecticut’s statewide longitudinal data system, P20 WIN, brings together workforce, education and supportive services data to inform educational policy and practice. Created by participating agencies, it houses extensive documentation, including data-sharing agreements, a robust data management process, and a data dictionary. In 2020, P20 WIN received an expansion grant through the National Center for Education Statistics to build agency analytical capacity and to expand P20 WIN to include information from state human service agencies.

FLORIDA
Education, Workforce

Florida’s PK–20 Education Data Warehouse provides public access to data linked across elementary and secondary education, university, and workforce outcomes. This comprehensive longitudinal data system supports the State’s Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) plan’s commitments to evidence-based practices and continuous improvement.

GEORGIA
Child Welfare, Health, Economic Mobility

The Georgia Cross Agency Child Data System is an early childhood integrated data system that links data from multiple child-serving agencies. By matching longitudinal data across multiple programs and data systems, decision-makers can leverage the platform to identify service gaps, create opportunities for analysis and research, and provide an integrated and aligned approach to meet the needs of children. The system, which is guided by a policy manual, has publicly available data tools and reports.
Promising Examples

**ILLINOIS**  
**Education, Workforce**

The Illinois Department of Employment Security, Illinois Student Assistance Commission, Illinois Board of Higher Education, Illinois Community College Board, and Illinois State University have partnered to share workforce, financial aid, and university data for the Illinois's "College2Career" resource. The integrated data platform highlights outcome metrics such as average earnings, earnings growth, and job stability for graduates of Illinois institutions of higher education. The program seeks to use these data to help Illinois students make informed education and workforce decisions.

**KENTUCKY**  
**Education, Economic Mobility, Workforce**

A 2013 Kentucky law established the Kentucky Center for Statistics (KYSTATS), which collects and links high-quality, actionable data from 15 state agencies to improve education and workforce programs in the state. By providing data sets, publishing reports, and fulfilling research requests, the Center provides state-specific insights with appropriate data privacy and data access controls. It has more than 40 staff members who are dedicated to “developing reports, responding to research requests, and providing statistical data about these efforts so policymakers, agencies, and the general public can make better-informed decisions.” The Center is run by an executive director with oversight from a board composed of participating state agencies, and Center has developed a research agenda for 2020–2022 focused on issues of equity.

**MARYLAND**  
**Education, Workforce**

A 2010 Maryland law established the Maryland Longitudinal Data System Center as an independent agency to bring together education and workforce data from the Maryland Higher Education Commission, the Maryland State Department of Education, and the Maryland Department of Labor. In partnership with the University of Maryland System and under the guidance of a governing board, the Center’s 12 staff members produce a variety of publications about student performance at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary level to improve the state's education system and guide decision-makers at all levels.
Promising Examples

**MINNESOTA**  
*Education, Workforce*

Minnesota’s Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System and Early Childhood Education Data System match administrative education and employment data from five state agencies. Together, these two systems form a P–20 education data system, which captures, analyzes, and uses student data from preschool to high school, college, and the workforce.

**MISSISSIPPI**  
*Education, Workforce*

Mississippi LifeTracks is an interoperable data system, governed by an interagency board, that supports research and analysis by providing linkages among early childhood, K–12 education, postsecondary education, and workforce data to improve career-readiness outcomes for students.

**NEVADA**  
*Education, Workforce*

The Nevada P–20 to Workforce Research Data System integrates data from the state’s PK–12, higher education, and workforce agencies. The system leaves all private data behind agency firewalls and uses an algorithm to de-identify data during the matching process. A wide variety of reports provide agency leaders greater insights into Nevada’s education and workforce programs, initiatives, and outcomes.

**NEW JERSEY**  
*Education, Health, Workforce*

New Jersey’s Prescription Monitoring Program integrates data from multiple state agencies, including the Department of Health, the Division of Consumer Affairs, the Office of the Attorney General, and other law enforcement bodies, to power the Overdose Data Dashboard. The Department of Health uses the dashboard to make decisions about access to medications, such as naloxone, designed to rapidly reverse opioid overdose and harm reduction services.

New Jersey partners with Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, to operate the New Jersey Education to Earnings Data System (NJEEDS), a statewide longitudinal data system designed to improve the performance of state education and workforce initiatives. NJEEDS is overseen by an executive leadership council and convenes a data stewards work group from relevant state agencies. Four state agencies also partner with Rutgers to operate the Integrated Population Health Data project to promote population health research.
Promising Examples

NORTH CAROLINA
Education, Workforce
A 1995 North Carolina law created the North Carolina Common Follow-up System, a longitudinal repository of workforce and education data. The system includes employment and wage data for all North Carolina workers (in areas covered by unemployment insurance) from the past 25 years, making it one of the largest sources of historical wage data in the nation. Regularly publishing operational reports and evaluation reports, the Common Follow-Up System also shares data with North Carolina Tower, which houses aggregate information on public university students, including programs of study, degrees attained, further enrollment, and wage and employment information. Together, these systems, which adhere to strict privacy protections, provide insights on the state’s education and employment outcomes.

OHIO
In April 2019, Ohio’s Governor signed an executive order consolidating state data systems into the InnovateOhio Platform, which uses data as “a shared strategic asset” whose “value is multiplied when data sets are linked across programs and organizations” through data integration and management tools. The executive order created a presumption of data sharing between state agencies, except where a specific legal prohibition is identified in writing. Since its launch, InnovateOhio and the Ohio Department of Administrative Services have collaborated with state agencies to incorporate 1,600 information systems into the State’s cloud environment.

OREGON
COVID-19, Workforce
Created by a 2017 Oregon statute, the Performance Reporting Information System serves as the state’s workforce data dashboard. The system was leveraged for Oregon’s COVID-19 economic recovery response by matching customer workforce program participation against quarterly Unemployment Insurance (UI) wage records to develop monthly UI claims data. Oregon also created a dashboard, FAQ, and resource page to help residents respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. The dashboard and public health information page allows residents and state leaders to make decisions by coordinating data from hospitals, state agencies, public health providers, and the emergency management community.

In 2020, Oregon launched a Data Strategy designed to empower state agencies within the executive branch to better utilize, maintain, and share data. Outlined in three key components, the Data Strategy involves the use of data principles, data practices, and a forthcoming one to three year Action Plan for implementing the practices. The Office of the State Chief Information Officer, spearheaded by the State’s Chief Data Officer, is currently soliciting public comment on the development of the Action Plan.
Promising Examples

**RHODE ISLAND**
*Child Welfare, COVID-19, Health*

Rhode Island’s Data Ecosystem supported the development and implementation of daily COVID-19 dashboards, which provide information for the governor and other state leaders to make informed decisions about the state’s response and recovery activities. The Ecosystem, managed by the Executive Office of Health and Human Services, integrates data from 15 sources through an Executive Data-Sharing Agreement among the state’s health, child welfare, and human services agencies.

**SOUTH CAROLINA**
*Child Welfare, Health*

The South Carolina Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office maintains an integrated data system, which links individuals being served by more than 20 state agencies and other organizations. This system has facilitated program improvement efforts and numerous research studies, including a randomized controlled trial (RCT) as a part of the state’s Pay for Success initiative to improve outcomes for low-income mothers and their babies. South Carolina has continued to expand its evaluations, including an RCT on the impact of Managed Care Organizations.

**UTAH**
*COVID-19, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce*

In 2019, The Utah Department of Human Services instituted the Management Information Center, a team of analysts, researchers, and statisticians to integrate data from child welfare, juvenile justice, services for individuals with disabilities, behavioral health, public assistance, and public education agencies to improve the quality and outcomes of services to children, families, and individuals. The Center oversees systematic reviews of research to ensure programs are effective and evidence-driven in support of DHS’ Family First Prevention Services Act plan.

The Utah Data Research Center was created by a 2017 law to integrate data from the Utah System of Higher Education, Utah System of Technical Colleges, Utah State Board of Education, Utah Department of Health, and the Utah Department of Workforce Services. The Center has a research agenda and provides both “data products” and “data-as-a-product.” The Center has a governance structure, staff, a data dictionary, an advisory board of agency designees, an institutional review board, and a peer review process.
Promising Examples

**WASHINGTON**

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

The Washington State Department of Social and Health Services maintains an integrated client database with data from 10 state agencies, 40 separate data systems, and millions of individuals receiving services through publicly funded health and human services programs in Washington State. This data is used for rapid-cycle policy analysis, program evaluation, predictive modeling, and performance measurement to help agencies understand how health services and other factors are related to outcomes for persons served by public assistance programs. Predictive modeling and clinical decision support tools developed and maintained in the Research and Data Analysis's integrated data environment have been used by the state's Health Home Program, which provides intensive care management services to high-risk Medicaid beneficiaries, to improve beneficiary health outcomes and lower costs. These lower costs have resulted in tens of millions in dollars in shared savings payments from the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

**VIRGINIA**

COVID-19, Economic Mobility, Health, Workforce

In 2020, Virginia utilized its existing Framework for Addiction Analysis and Community Transformation (FAACT) to share new data and provide actionable information as part of the state’s COVID-19 response. FAACT, a cross-agency, cloud-based data-sharing and analytics platform, was previously used as part of the state’s work on the opioid crisis to generate actionable insights about the contributing factors to opioid abuse, as well as to collate the most effective community responses.

Amid the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, Virginia’s workforce system launched an improved integrated data system, governed by a data trust, that improves user experience through the new Virginia Career Works Referral Portal. The related Virginia Career Works Dashboard is a data visualization tool that conveys information about labor conditions and allows agencies to make real-time, data-driven decisions. These innovative systems demonstrated a potential cost savings of more than 94% over traditional approaches.
Promising Examples

**WISCONSIN**

Child Welfare, Education, Health

The Wisconsin [Early Childhood Integrated Data System](#) integrates data from the state Departments of Children and Families, Health Services, and Public Instruction. The system links, collects, and monitors early childhood data from 11 state programs. The state engaged in an inclusive planning process to design the system, which, although not an integrated data warehouse, provides for data sharing among relevant state agencies. The system also has strong privacy protections, including an overarching [memorandum of understanding](#) and individual data-sharing agreements from the Departments of Children and Families, Health Services, and Public Instruction, which are used with each interagency data-sharing project.
6. Evaluation Leadership

Did the governor's office or any state agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them? (Example: Chief Evaluation Officer)

Why is this important?
Evaluation leadership positions are an important tool for state governments to ensure that evidence of what works is a primary consideration when making programmatic and budget decisions.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME

Building & Using Evidence

For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.

Leading Example

TENNESSEE
STATEWIDE

Founded in 2019, Tennessee's Office of Evidence and Impact, is led by the state's Director of Evidence and Impact. To propagate Tennessee's evidence-based budgeting efforts, the Office defined four tiers of evidence, conducted program inventories, developed evidence reviews, and provided evidence-building technical assistance.
Promising Examples

ALABAMA
A 2019 Alabama law created the Alabama Commission on the Evaluation of Services, which catalogues and evaluates public services statewide. The Commission, comprised of state legislators and governor's office staff, determines the effectiveness of public services in order to make informed funding recommendations for state leaders.

COLORADO
The Colorado Governor’s Office of State Planning and Budgeting reviews and scores agency budget requests based upon their level of evidence and evaluation to inform priority policy and budget decisions. The office also maintains a $500,000 annual fund for program evaluation and implementation grants.

CONNECTICUT
Education
The Connecticut State Department of Education’s Office of Performance is led by a Chief Performance Officer, who is responsible for using data, evaluation, research, and technology to improve student outcomes. The Chief Performance Officer maintains the department’s data collection, assessment, information technology, reporting, research, and accountability activities, including the management of its performance dashboard, EdSight. The Office also hosts an annual Performance Matters Forum, which focuses on performance, continuous improvement, research, and evaluation topics.

MASSACHUSETTS
Education
The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Office of Planning and Research is led by a Chief Strategy and Research Officer who is responsible for improving the use of data and research findings to influence policy and program decision-making. The Chief Strategy and Research Officer monitors progress towards the Department’s goal of preparing all students for success after high school, along with the other five priorities detailed in the department’s strategic plan. The position oversees all activities related to research, performance management, research partnerships, and strategic planning.
Promising Examples

**MINNESOTA**


In 2019, Minnesota established a statewide Chief Data and Evaluation Officer position with the authority to conduct experimental and quasi-experimental impact evaluations, as well as advise the Governor and legislature on the evidence of effectiveness of publicly funded services.

**MISSISSIPPI**

Education

The Mississippi Department of Education's Office of Research and Development is led by a Director charged with using data and research to improve student outcomes across the state. Guided by a Dynamic Research Framework, the Office of Research and Development, the Office uses a longitudinal data system to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in areas such as Early Learning.

**OHIO**

Education, Workforce, Health

The Director of the Ohio Department of Education's Office of Research, Evaluation and Advanced Analytics enables educational leaders across the state to recognize, gather, analyze, evaluate, and leverage data in problem solving to improve student outcomes. Initiatives such as Empowered by Evidence and Ohio's Evidence-Based Clearinghouse are designed to foster "a culture of continuous learning...[and to] create the framework and processes needed for actionable research." The Department has partnered with the Ohio Education Research Center to share education data across the state.
7. Evaluation Policies

Did the state or any of its agencies have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations?

**Why is this important?**

Evaluation policies allow state governments to align their evaluation and research priorities, learn about what works, and share information with outside researchers about additional areas where they want to increase their knowledge base.

---

**RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME**

Building & Using Evidence

*For more information, visit the [Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government](#).*

---

**Leading Example**

**KENTUCKY**

**MULTIPLE AGENCIES**

The Kentucky Center for Statistics (KYSTATS) has a [2020–22 Research Agenda](#), which details four primary research areas to identify barriers to education and workforce opportunities: (1) expand data access and data use to inform equity issues; (2) evaluate outcomes and barriers for education and workforce programs over time; (3) connect supply and demand of the state’s future workforce; and (4) measure the impact of out-of-state education and workforce migration. All research results are made [publicly available](#).
Promising Examples

**COLORADO**

**Economic Mobility, Education, Workforce**

The Colorado Department of Higher Education developed a research agenda to inform education and training policies and programs. Data sharing required by Colorado law between the Departments of Education, Higher Education, Labor, and Economic Development generates research covering the education-to-workforce continuum. In addition, 25% of Colorado State agencies report having created research agendas with publicly available findings.

**MARYLAND**

**Education**

The Maryland Longitudinal Data Systems Center brings together education and workforce data from the Maryland Higher Education Commission, the Maryland State Department of Education, and the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation. The Center's research agenda is established by its governing board.

**MASSACHUSETTS**

**Education**

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has published a research agenda and posts publicly available results of all completed evaluations, as well as other research reports, online.

**MINNESOTA**

**Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health**

In 2018, Minnesota Management and Budget adopted an evaluation policy, which governs its use of evaluations and requires the release of all completed evaluations, regardless of findings. The policy outlines key principles for evaluation, including: rigor, relevance, independence, transparency, and ethics. Minnesota Management produced an evaluation guide and also defines evidence for statewide research, evaluation, and funding purposes.
Promising Examples

MISSISSIPPI

Education

The Mississippi Department of Education has a research agenda informed by the State Board of Education’s strategic plan and a focus group of department staff members. The agenda’s associated questions and a dynamic framework shape the activities of the Office of Research and Development, which uses data to drive the Department’s evidence-based decision-making.

TENNESSEE

Education

The Tennessee Education Research Alliance is a formal research partnership between the Tennessee Department of Education and Vanderbilt University’s Peabody College of Education. Led by seven full-time staff and guided by a steering committee and advisory council, the Department and the University have co-created a research agenda that builds a body of knowledge to better position the state to make data-driven and evidence-based decisions. The Alliance conducts independent studies and directs external research to provide relevant and timely information to state policymakers across a variety of topic areas, including early reading, professional learning, and school improvement.

UTAH

Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

The Utah Data Research Center’s research agenda investigates themes related to the state’s education and workforce policies and programs. The Center’s work is guided by a governance structure that calls for staff engagement, an advisory board, an institutional review board, and a peer review process.
8. Evaluation Resources

Did the state or any of its agencies invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations?

Why is this important?

Making specific funding commitments to evaluation is critical and ensures that state governments have the necessary funds to evaluate whether state programs are achieving their desired outcomes. At the federal level, several agencies have made commitments to spend 1% of program funds on evaluation, which has allowed them to improve programmatic outcomes and build their knowledge base about what works.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME

Building & Using Evidence

For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.

Leading Example

MINNESOTA
SINGLE AGENCY

Health

A 2017 law created Minnesota's Opiate Epidemic Response grant program. The FY 2021 budget includes $300,000 for Minnesota Management and Budget to conduct experimental and quasi-experimental design impact evaluations for opiate epidemic response grant activities, which is slightly more than 1.1% of the agency's $27 million general fund budget.
9. Outcome Data

Did the state or any of its agencies report or require outcome data for its state-funded programs during their budget process?

Why is this important?

Using data and evidence as part of the budget process helps state policymakers allocate funds based on information about what works. In particular, collecting information (evidence, outcomes, performance) on the evidence base for state programs allows state budget offices, governors, and legislatures to prioritize funding for those interventions that are most likely to achieve results.

The 2013 Colorado State Measurement for Accountable, Responsive and Transparent Government (SMART) Act required all Colorado state agencies to submit annual performance reports to the state legislature as part of the state's budget process. These reports include: (1) performance measures for the major functions of the department; (2) performance goals for at least the following three years; (3) a description of the strategies necessary to achieve those goals; and (4) a summary of the department's most recent performance evaluation. In addition, the state's FY 2020–2021 budget development instructions (pp. 10–12) prioritize new program requests “based on the evidence and body of research supporting the program's effect on desired outcomes and proposed implementation plan.” In the FY 2020–2021 budget cycle, the state applied an evidence continuum to budget requests and used that criteria to inform resource allocation decisions.

Leading Example

COLORADO STATEWIDE

The 2013 Colorado State Measurement for Accountable, Responsive and Transparent Government (SMART) Act required all Colorado state agencies to submit annual performance reports to the state legislature as part of the state's budget process. These reports include: (1) performance measures for the major functions of the department; (2) performance goals for at least the following three years; (3) a description of the strategies necessary to achieve those goals; and (4) a summary of the department's most recent performance evaluation. In addition, the state's FY 2020–2021 budget development instructions (pp. 10–12) prioritize new program requests “based on the evidence and body of research supporting the program's effect on desired outcomes and proposed implementation plan.” In the FY 2020–2021 budget cycle, the state applied an evidence continuum to budget requests and used that criteria to inform resource allocation decisions.
Promising Examples

MARYLAND
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

A 2013 Maryland law requires the Maryland Department of Budget and Management to submit an annual Managing for Results performance report to the state legislature as part of the budget process. This report contains the following information for each state agency: (1) the outcomes or results that have been achieved towards annual performance measures; (2) a three-year review of performance for each of the indicators; and (3) an estimate of expected program outcomes over the subsequent two years.

MINNESOTA
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

A 2017 Minnesota law required state agencies to include performance data in their biennial budget documents. Minnesota Management and Budget issued guidance on how to report outcome data to help agencies and departments meet this statutory requirement. In the budgeting process, agencies must identify the evidence base for changes to existing activities. In addition, the state used evidence to inform funding decisions that resulted in $87 million in new or expanded evidence-based programming in the FY 2020–2021 budget.

MISSISSIPPI
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

A 2019 amendment to Mississippi’s 2014 performance-based budgeting law provided strong, more rigorous evidence definitions for evidence-based programs, intervention programs, research-based programs, promising programs. While the law continued to require the Mississippi Departments of Corrections, Health, Education, and Transportation to report during the annual budget process on their programs’ performance and cost–benefit ratio, the amendment authorized the Joint Legislative Committee on Performance Evaluation and Expenditure Review to designate additional agencies to comply with the law. Additional agency inventories include: Departments of Revenue and Medicaid. Mississippi’s FY 2022 budget formulation process required all state agencies to include the level of evidence, performance measures, and a fidelity plan for any newly proposed programs.
Promising Examples

MISSOURI
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

The Missouri Budget Explorer, launched in 2018, is a public-facing tool that provides transparency on state budget expenditures, hosts department-level budget summaries, and includes information on performance at the programmatic level. The state’s FY 2022 budget instructions for program descriptions required each department to provide a standard set of performance measures for more than 600 major state programs, including quality, impact, and efficiency.

NEW MEXICO
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

A 1999 New Mexico law required all state agencies to submit annual performance-based budget requests that include output, outcome, performance, and evaluation data. The 2019 Evidence and Research Based Funding Requests Act amended the 1999 law by defining four tiers of evidence and further requiring certain state agencies (selected annually by the state legislature) to “identify each sub-program as evidence-based, research-based, promising, or lacking evidence of effectiveness” and report on the funding amount allocated for each of these evidence tiers. In FY 2021, the Departments of Corrections, Children, Youth, and Families, and Human Services were designated to submit these program inventories, which resulted in 6%, 8%, and nearly 5% increases in appropriations, respectively. The Legislative Finance Committee recommended expanding more than $13.6 million for evidence-based human services and child and family programs, along with continued funding for other evidence-based programs and services.

NORTH CAROLINA
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

North Carolina requires budget requests for new and expanded programs and services to include evidence and research supporting the program’s goals, as well as the governor’s strategic priorities. For the FY 2020–2021 budget development process, the North Carolina Office of State Budget and Management further encouraged the use of evidence through an optional change request process where agencies and budget office staff worked collaboratively to develop data-driven and evidence-based pilots. Agencies who opted-in were given additional time to work with a diverse set of state stakeholders to develop evidence-based approaches before submitting their final budget requests.
Promising Examples

OREGON
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

A 2016 Oregon law requires all state agencies to develop and implement performance measures. The agencies must also submit to the Oregon Legislative Fiscal Office an Annual Performance Progress Report detailing the agency’s programmatic outcomes, which are reviewed during the state’s budget process.

RHODE ISLAND

A 1996 Rhode Island law requires state agencies to submit performance information as part of the state’s budget process. The state’s Office of Performance Management collects this performance data and works with agencies to achieve performance goals. The state’s FY 2021 budget instructions required agencies to demonstrate program efficiency, effectiveness, and/or improvement of outcomes -- not simply count activities and outputs.

TENNESSEE
Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

Tennessee’s FY 2020–2021 budget instructions aligned the governor’s priorities with agency strategic plans. The instructions also encouraged agencies to invest in programs that were supported by research and evidence and, if not, consider conducting evaluations. The Cost Increase Request Form invited agencies to highlight their programs’ level of evidence based on the four tiers of evidence defined by the state’s Office of Evidence and Impact.

UTAH

The Utah state legislature emphasizes outcomes in its budget process by collecting high-level performance metrics and targets with each appropriations line item. Along with this, each new or expanded state program in the proposed budget requires a performance note, which are documented in Utah’s Compendium of Budget Information. Utah’s business case form for new budget requests also asks for evidence from the existing quality throughput over operational expenses (QT/OE) measure; if not available, then agencies are asked to propose one. If requests are ultimately funded, they are formalized by the Governor’s Office of Management and Budget for ongoing monitoring. To further support operational management best practices, the Utah Legislative Auditor General provides the new program (or agency) with information on management best practices.
10. Evidence Definition and Program Inventory

Did the state or any of its agencies release a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and make publicly available an inventory of state-funded programs categorized based on at least two tiers of evidence?

Why is this important?
Defining evidence and conducting program inventories can help state governments ensure that their programs are using proven practices and that their interventions are effective in meeting the state's desired goals as well as improving outcomes for residents.

A 1999 New Mexico law required all state agencies to submit annual performance-based budget requests that include outputs, outcomes, performance, and evaluation data. The 2019 Evidence and Research Based Funding Requests Act amended the 1999 law by defining four tiers of evidence and further requiring certain state agencies (selected annually by the state legislature), to “identify each sub-program as evidence-based, research-based, promising, or lacking evidence of effectiveness” and report on the amount allocated for each of these evidence tiers. The law builds on New Mexico’s long-standing series of inventory and cost-benefit reports in the areas of children’s behavioral health; adult behavioral health; early education; child welfare; criminal justice; healthcare, infant, and maternal health; and education.
Promising Examples

**CALIFORNIA**
**Child Welfare**
The California Department of Social Services created the California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare, which allows child welfare providers and professionals to "identify, select, and implement evidence-based child welfare practices that will improve child safety, increase permanency, increase family and community stability, and promote child and family well-being." This tool helps identify best practices and provides guidance and support for program implementation. The Clearinghouse's numerical rating scale categorizes programs into six tiers of evidence and uses a relevance scale as a complement to the scientific rating scale and to demonstrate applicability for client populations.

**COLORADO**
**Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Education, Health**
The Colorado Governor’s Office of State Planning and Budgeting, along with the Legislature’s Joint Budget Committee, established a common set of evidence definitions and a five-step evidence continuum that includes actions to increase a program's level of evidence. The Office also publishes periodic Results First reports that categorize all state-funded prevention programs in the areas of child welfare, criminal justice, and juvenile justice according to three tiers of evidence: evidence-based, promising, and needs additional research.

**CONNECTICUT**
**Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Health**
A 2015 Connecticut law defines three tiers of evidence for programs operated by the Connecticut Departments of Correction, Children and Families, and Mental Health and Addiction Services, and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch: evidence-based, research-based, and promising. The law requires these agencies to categorize their programs by the evidence tiers in even-numbered fiscal years. Additionally, the law charges the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University with submitting an annual report containing a cost-benefit analysis of the programs, which, in 2019, was entitled Benefit–Cost Analyses of Evidence-Based Programs. The findings showed that the Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division spent 79% of their adult program funding and 86% of juvenile funding on evidence-based programs; the Department of Children and Families spent 20%; and the Department of Corrections spent 98% on such programs.
Promising Examples

**FLORIDA**

*Criminal Justice*

Florida’s Department of Juvenile Justice requires all residential commitment prevention contractors to implement at least one evidence-based model from the agency’s *Sourcebook of Delinquency Interventions*. The sourcebook lists all juvenile justice programs according to three levels of evidence: evidence-based practices, promising practices, and practices with demonstrated effectiveness, as defined in the book. The Department also introduced a *Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol*, a monitoring tool to ensure providers implement programs with fidelity.

**MINNESOTA**

*Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce*

As a result of a 2015 Minnesota law, Minnesota Management and Budget has developed numerous inventories of evidence-based programs, including *criminal justice, mental health, child welfare*, and *higher education programs*. Minnesota Management and Budget also maintains the *Minnesota Inventory*, a searchable clearinghouse of more than 500 state programs. As part of the inventory, the state developed a *guide* for using evidence in policymaking and *evidence definitions* to categorize interventions as proven effective, promising, theory-based, or having no effect. These resources informed *funding decisions* in the state, including $87 million in new or expanded evidence-based programming in the FY 2020–2021 budget.

**MISSISSIPPI**

*Criminal Justice, Education, Health*

A 2019 amendment to Mississippi’s 2014 performance-based budgeting law provided strong, more rigorous evidence definitions for evidence-based programs, intervention programs, research-based programs, promising programs. While the law continued to require the Mississippi Departments of Corrections, Health, Education, and Transportation to report during the annual budget process on their programs’ performance and cost–benefit ratio, the amendment authorized the Joint Legislative Committee on Performance Evaluation and Expenditure Review to designate additional agencies to comply with the law. Additional *agency inventories* include: Departments of Revenue and Medicaid. The Mississippi Joint Legislative Committee on Performance Evaluation and Expenditure Review’s 2018 Results First Mississippi analysis on juvenile justice programs at a residential facility should invest more resources in high-quality interventions and ensure implementation fidelity. The analysis identified the state’s need to define high-quality research.
Promising Examples

**NORTH CAROLINA**

**Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Health**

The North Carolina Office of State Budget and Management released program inventories in the areas of child and family health and juvenile justice. The state also publishes periodic Results First progress reports and has created evidence definitions to categorize programs based on their levels of evidence.

**OHIO**

**Education**

The Ohio Department of Education’s evidence-based clearinghouse provides a common evidence framework by aligning evidence standards from various clearinghouses to assist educators in identifying evidence-based interventions according to content focus area, subject, grade bands, urban/rural settings, student demographics, and the four levels of evidence in federal Every Student Succeeds Act.

**OREGON**

**Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Education, Health**

A 2003 Oregon law created evidence definitions for agencies that provide direct client engagement, including the Oregon Youth Authority, Department of Corrections, and the Oregon Health Authority. These evidence definitions require programs to incorporate “significant and relevant practices based on scientifically based research” by “[u]tilizing randomized controlled trials when possible and appropriate.” The law requires these agencies to perform cost-benefit analyses and compile a biennial program inventory with results from funded programs, such as the inventory of evidence-based practices produced by the Oregon Health Authority’s Health Evidence Review Commission.

**PENNSYLVANIA**

**Economic Mobility, Education, Workforce**

In 2020, the Pennsylvania Workforce Development Board unanimously voted to adopt a four-tiered evidence framework for the state’s workforce system. The definitions for evidence of effectiveness include: strong evidence, moderate evidence, preliminary evidence, and pre-preliminary evidence.

In 2020, the Pennsylvania Department of Education launched the PDE Evidence Resource Center to help Pennsylvania schools thoughtfully apply high-quality, relevant research to their local settings. By listing evidence-based interventions in the areas of instruction and curriculum, student support and professional development, and student wellness, this tool helps school districts identify and select strategies to address every aspect of school improvement. This tool is also being used for the PDE’s research agenda that allows the department to identify and measure its progress in meeting its research and learning priorities.
Promising Examples

TENNESSEE
Criminal Justice, Health

Tennessee’s Office of Evidence and Impact defined four tiers of evidence. The Office also completed inventories of state-funded programs in the areas of corrections, mental health, and substance abuse services as a part of the state’s evidence-based budgeting initiative.

TEXAS
Workforce

In 2020, the Texas Workforce Commission, in partnership with the Office of the Governor, Texas Workforce Investment Council, and Rural Capital Area Workforce Board, collaborated to develop a new Evidence Framework to better measure the impact of publicly funded workforce development programs. In July 2020, the Commission approved $1.8 million in Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) statewide funding for the Building Construction Trades project, which will utilize the evidence framework to better measure the success of the grant program.

VERMONT
Education

In 2018, the Vermont Agency of Education adopted four tiers of evidence, based on the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) for use in distributing education funds, including the bulk of federal education and state-funded grants (such as BEST/Act 230 and Flexible Pathways; see sample statement of evidence). The guidance states: “applying the same requirement to both federal and state grants will allow for greater consistency in the review and approval of grant applications.”

WASHINGTON
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

A 2012 Washington law stated that “prevention and intervention services delivered to children and juveniles in the areas of mental health, child welfare, and juvenile justice [must] be primarily evidence-based and research-based” (p. 2); directed the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to develop definitions for three levels of evidence: evidence-based, research-based, and promising practices (p. 4); and tasked WSIPP with creating an inventory of evidence-based programs. The most recent inventories include evidence reviews in children’s mental health, child welfare, and juvenile justice (2019), cannabis prevention and treatment (2019), adult corrections (2018), and K–12 educational programs for struggling students (2020) (which is also featured on the state superintendent’s website as Menus of Best Practices and Strategies).
11. Cost-Benefit Analysis

Did the state or any of its agencies assess and make publicly available the costs and benefits of public programs?

Why is this important?
Cost-benefit analysis helps state governments quantify outcomes and program costs to ensure that public dollars are being efficiently spent to get the most value for taxpayers and the best outcomes for residents.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME

$ Investing for Results

For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.

Leading Example

WASHINGTON
MULTIPLE AGENCIES

Child Welfare    Criminal Justice    Education    Health    Workforce

A 2013 Washington State law (pp. 105–106) directed the Department of Corrections, in consultation with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP), to: (1) compile an inventory of existing programs; (2) determine whether its programs were evidence-based; (3) assess the effectiveness of its programs, including conducting a cost-benefit analysis; and (4) phase out ineffective programs and implement evidence-based programs. As a result of this and similar laws, WSIPP has published cost-benefit analyses in a wide variety of issue areas over the past 10 years, including a 2020 report on the state's extended foster care program. The WSIPP cost-benefit framework has been widely adopted by governments across the country.
Promising Examples

**COLORADO**

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Health

The Colorado Governor’s Office of State Planning and Budgeting proactively publishes periodic Results First cost-benefit reports. The 2018 health findings report built on earlier cost-benefit analyses in the areas of child welfare, criminal justice, juvenile justice, and health.

**CONNECTICUT**

Criminal Justice, Child Welfare, Health

A 2015 Connecticut law (pp. 649–651) requires the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University to perform cost-benefit analyses of programs operated by the Connecticut Departments of Correction, Children and Families, and Mental Health and Addiction Services, and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch. The initiative issues regular reports, including the November 2019 report that found 92 evidence-based programs and services implemented in the state, 38 of which were subject to a Connecticut-specific cost-benefit analysis. The report also found that the Judicial Branch’s Court Support Services Division spent 79% of their adult program funding and 86% of juvenile funding on evidence-based programs; the Department of Children and Families spent 20%; and the Department of Corrections spent 98% on such evidence-based programs.

**MINNESOTA**

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce

A 2015 Minnesota law directed Minnesota Management and Budget to develop a cost-benefit inventory of evidence-based interventions. As a result, the state developed cost-benefit analyses in the areas of criminal justice, adult mental health, children’s mental health, child welfare, probation, and substance use, based on the following four levels of evidence: proven effective, promising, theory-based, or no effect. Minnesota Management and Budget maintains the Minnesota Inventory, which includes a searchable clearinghouse of more than 500 programs.
Promising Examples

NEW MEXICO
Criminal Justice, Child Welfare, Economic Mobility, Education, Health

New Mexico has published a series of inventory and cost-benefit reports in the areas of children's behavioral health; adult behavioral health; early education; child welfare; criminal justice; healthcare, infant, and maternal health; and education.

In 2019, the Legislative Finance Committee’s Evaluation Unit also published analyses on substance abuse treatment outcomes and Medicaid spending and managed care administration. The state has also published guidance on Legislating for Results.

NEW YORK
Criminal Justice

Beginning in 2013, the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services developed a cost-benefit analysis, based on an initial technical report, to outline the impact, costs, and benefits of specific criminal justice interventions. As a result of these efforts, New York has continued to operate Alternatives to Incarceration programs, a $12.8 million initiative in 2019–2020, to support evidence-based interventions.

NORTH CAROLINA
Child Welfare, Health

The North Carolina Office of State Budget and Management has developed a child and family health program inventory and cost-benefit analysis. The state also publishes annual and periodic Results First progress reports.

OREGON
Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Health

As a result of a 2003 Oregon law, the Oregon Department of Corrections, Oregon Youth Authority, Oregon Youth Development Division, and the Oregon Health Authority divisions focused on mental health and addiction issues are required to perform a cost–benefit analyses and compile a biennial program inventory that details results from funded programs. In 2019, the Youth Authority and the Department of Corrections both published reports on costs and benefits of their programs, with the Youth Authority’s data found that four of six programs examined had a high likelihood of providing a positive return on investment.
Promising Examples

UTAH

All areas

Since 2013, Utah state agencies have used the SUCCESS Framework to perform cost-benefit analyses of government services. As detailed in the state's Measurement Guide, this framework integrates the performance elements of quality, throughput, and cost to “help agencies improve quality, reduce costs, and create the capacity to do more with the same or fewer resources (improved throughput).” These program performance elements are reported as part of the state's annual budget process.
12. Use of Evidence in Grant Programs

Did the state or any of its agencies (1) invest at least 50% of program funds in evidence-based solutions or (2) use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds to eligible grantees (including local governments) from its five largest competitive and noncompetitive grant programs?

Why is this important?

Requiring a portion of grant funds to be spent on evidence-based programs allows state governments to use and scale proven program models to achieve better results.

---

**RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME**

$ Investing for Results

For more information, visit the [Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government](#).

---

**Leading Example**

**NEVADA SINGLE AGENCY**

Since 2017, the Nevada Department of Education has allocated 100% of the state's $9.5 million in federal Title I school improvement funds to districts and schools for interventions backed by strong, moderate, or promising evidence (using the top three tiers of evidence as defined by the federal Every Student Succeeds Act [ESSA]). This represented an increase over the approximately 15% of funds that had been allocated based on level of evidence in the 2016-2017 school year. Grant recipients may set aside funds to monitor and evaluate the identified evidence-based approaches to ensure the investments yield a positive impact on student outcomes.
Beginning in 2017, the Nevada Department of Education also began requiring school districts to invest awarded funds from two additional federal grant programs in interventions that meet one of the four tiers of evidence (strong, moderate, promising, and under evaluation) defined in ESSA: (1) ESSA Title IV-B ($9 million in 2017–2018), for the competitive 21st Century Community Learning Centers grants; and (2) ESSA Title IV-A grants ($9.4 million in federal funds to Nevada in 2017–2018 to increase students’ access to a well-rounded education), where applications with stronger evidence are considered for funding before other applications.

Starting in 2013, the Nevada State Legislature passed a series of laws with strong evidence requirements that aligned state education funding with ESSA's tiered evidence definition. The following six programs require grantees to use interventions that meet one of the four ESSA evidence tiers (though supplemental curriculum and professional development must meet the top three tiers: strong, moderate, or promising):

1. **Zoom School program**, first enacted in 2013, supports competitive grants ($50 million per year in state education funds) to help school districts provide English language instruction to non-native speakers;

2. **Nevada Turnaround** grant program, authorized in 2017, is a competitive grant program ($2 million in state education funds per year) that helps underperforming schools implement their school improvement plans;

3. **SB 178**, authorized in 2017, gives weighted formula grants to support extended learning opportunities in schools (approximately $1,200 for every eligible student; 2019 total funding of $70 million in state funds per year);

4. **College and Career Readiness**, a competitive grant program ($4.9 million in state education funds per year), created in 2017, helps school districts establish advanced academic programs for middle school and high school students;

5. **Victory Schools** initiative ($25 million in state education funds per year), created in 2015 (and reauthorized in 2019), aims to improve results in the state’s lowest-performing schools in the poorest zip codes; and

6. **Read by Grade Three Act** ($31 million in state funds in 2019–2020), amended in 2019, allocates funds to school districts through a formula grant process to support student literacy.
Promising Examples

COLORADO

Education

In 2018, the Colorado Department of Education grant program for school improvement, Empowering Action for School Improvement, required schools to use evidence-based practices as defined by the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The application gives points for the use of evidence-based strategies, as well as past performance to applicants who are seeking to expand existing initiatives. Further, the Colorado Reading to Ensure Academic Development (READ) Act, amended in 2019, emphasizes the use of evidence-based instructional practices to support early literacy. It required use of program funds for external program evaluation; created a science-based early literacy block grant program of $2.5 million annually; and required districts receiving funds in the school year 2021–2022 to have K–3 teachers complete evidence-based training in teaching reading.

GEORGIA

Child Welfare, Health, Economic Mobility

Georgia's Division of Family and Children Services' Promoting Safe and Stable Families program requires that all "service plans must include evidence-based programs, practices, and/or strategies proven effective in meeting the needs of children and their families." The evidence-based requirement in the requests for proposal (Form 3) includes the following components: a description of the evidence-based model, practice, or strategy for service delivery; the evidence-based rating from the California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare (CEBC) or comparable rating from a relevant clearinghouse; a description of how the evidence-based model, practice, or strategy will be effective in meeting the grant's objectives; and a description of how the model will be implemented.

MASSACHUSETTS

Education

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education distributes competitive federal funds through the School Redesign Grant to help districts improve their lowest-performing schools. The school and districts, in partnership with the state, develop a sustainable improvement plan, which guides the approach to rapid school improvement. The state requires that the plan, in order to meet both state and federal requirements, must incorporate at least one strategy backed by evidence that meets the criteria from one of the top three evidence tiers as defined by ESSA. The Department provides support to potential applicants on using evidence-based practices through its How Do We Know Initiative.
Promising Examples

**MINNESOTA**

Health

A [2019 Minnesota law](#) created new grants to address the state's opioid addiction and overdose epidemic. In 2020, 77% percent of the [grant funding](#) was invested in evidence-based services ([promising or proven-effective](#)), including medication-assisted treatment, naloxone, and peer support for substance abuse.

**NEW MEXICO**

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice

New Mexico's 2019 [Evidence and Research Based Funding Requests Act](#) requires certain state agencies (selected annually by the state legislature) to "identify each sub-program as evidence-based, research-based, promising, or lacking evidence of effectiveness" and report on the amount allocated for each of these evidence tiers. As a result, in FY 2020, the Juvenile Justice Services program within the Department of Children, Youth and Families [reported](#) that 57% of its spending went to sub-programs that were evidence-based.

**NEW YORK**

Criminal Justice, Workforce

The New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services increased its funding of evidence-based interventions by targeting [75% of its alternative to incarceration funds](#) towards evidence-based interventions beginning in FY 2015-2016. This funding target was based on the department's [technical report](#) and [cost-benefit analysis](#) to outline the impact, costs, and benefits of specific criminal justice interventions. The state's 2019–2020 Alternative to Incarceration Probation Violation Residential Centers [competitive grant](#) ($7 million) funds "evidence-based services to adults involved in the criminal justice system." The Alternatives to Incarceration Employment Focused Services [competitive grant](#) ($5.3 million) funds "evidence-based practices in programs and services that reduce recidivism, promote public safety, ensure offender accountability, and provide restitution to victims."

**OHIO**

Education, Workforce

The Ohio Department of Higher Education's [Aspire program](#) uses a performance-based funding contract for workforce readiness education providers. Grants, awarded in a three-year cycle (FY 2018–2021), [require applicants](#) to describe how the program uses rigorous research and evidence-based instruction (p. 24) and to demonstrate effectiveness through performance data (p. 8). Performance is measured annually, and funding is adjusted based on performance against [established benchmarks](#).
Promising Examples

OREGON

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Health

A 2003 Oregon law provides a definition of evidence and states that the Oregon Department of Corrections, Oregon Youth Authority, Oregon Youth Development Division, and Oregon Health Authority divisions focused on mental health and addiction issues shall: (1) “spend at least 75% of state moneys that the agency receives for programs on evidence-based programs;” (2) perform cost-benefit analyses; and (3) compile a biennial program inventory with results from funded programs. As of 2018, the Youth Authority spent “90% of General Funds and almost 92% of total funds subject to Oregon’s Senate Bill 267 (SB267) on evidence-based programming” for FY 2017–2019.

TENNESSEE

Child Welfare, Criminal Justice

A 2007 Tennessee law defined evidence and required that 100% of the state’s juvenile justice funding be evidence-based beginning in 2012, with the exception of pilot programs that are building the evidence basis for research or theory-based interventions. As a result, the Tennessee Department of Children’s Services’ 2017 Request for Proposal for juvenile justice services, which provides funding through 2020, noted that “the Department of Children’s Services is prohibited from expending state funds on any juvenile justice program...unless the program is evidence-based.”

MULTIPLE STATES

Evidence in AmeriCorps State Grants

Forty-five states allocate points for evidence in their AmeriCorps State grants. These state applications for AmeriCorps national service funds are modeled after the FY 2020 Notice of Funding Opportunity for AmeriCorps State and National grants operated by the Corporation for National and Community Service, the federal agency for service and volunteering. These states allocate up to 20 points (out of 100) for the level and quality of evidence proposed by the applicant to assess “the likelihood that the proposed intervention will lead to [the desired] outcomes.” In 2020, these state grants ranged from $338,964 in North Dakota to $45 million in California.

---

4 See Appendix D for a complete list of states.
13. Innovation

Did the state or any of its agencies have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve outcomes?

Why is this important?
Encouraging innovation allows state governments to implement new models that can improve programs and build new evidence about what works.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME

Investing for Results

For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.

Leading Example

In 2020, California launched the California COVID Assessment Tool to identify potential COVID-19 hotspots, predict which hospitals might reach capacity, and proactively allocate resources to such hotspots. This innovative assessment tool is a "model of models," which incorporates the statistical projections of several leading research institutions. Notably, the assessment tool allows residents to create their own scenarios for transmission potential in the coming months depending on specific public health guidelines. Further, California released the source data sets on California's Open Data Portal, allowing the public to examine the data underlying the Assessment Tool.

The California Government Operations Agency (GovOps), which serves as an umbrella organization for the state's innovation work, is designed to institutionalize policies, tools, and training that can drive its mission to modernize the processes of government through lean process improvement, data, leadership, and performance improvement. GovOps brings together statewide initiatives such as the Lean Academy, California Leadership Academy, the Office of Digital Innovation, and California's Open Data Portal resources. As well, the California Health and Human Services Agency has an Office of Innovation that focuses on improving programs and services through the use of tools such as human-centered design and data analytics.
Promising Examples

**ARIZONA**

The Arizona Government Transformation Office's Lean Foundations workshops provide training to state staff as part of the state's Arizona Management System, which is designed to implement innovative solutions to improve service delivery.

**COLORADO**

**Economic Mobility, Health**

Since 2009, the Colorado Department of Public Safety has housed the Evidence-Based Practices Implementation for Capacity (EPIC) Resource Center, which partners with agencies to implement evidence-based and researched-informed programs to enhance program fidelity and improve justice outcomes in Colorado communities. For example, EPIC, the Department of Corrections, the Department of Local Affairs, and the Colorado Evaluation and Action Lab are partnering with Volunteers of America to implement the Rapid Rehousing program, which provides homes for people leaving jails and prisons. The Department of Human Services' Performance Management Academy, a similar approach to EPIC, supports strategic goal setting, performance management, continuous improvement, and program evaluation. The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment's Quality Improvement Plan and Quality Improvement Council are designed to support a culture focused on improvement through a variety of quality improvement and performance trainings, accreditations, and resources and tools. In addition, the department has operated a competitive Innovation Mini-Grant program, which began in 2017 and has awarded grants of $50,000–$100,000 to fund innovative, staff-generated ideas. One innovation funded by the grant program is an industry-supported carbon-capture and reuse pilot.
Promising Examples

CONNECTICUT
Child Welfare, Economic Mobility

Connecticut’s Department of Children and Families, in partnership with the Harvard Kennedy School’s Government Performance Lab, implemented an Enhanced Service Coordination project in 2019. One part of the state’s 2020–2024 Child and Family Services Plan, it seeks to improve the process of matching clients to services across the state. The innovations included real-time use of data to inform organizational processes and procurement as well as active contract management strategies to further improve service delivery.

A 2019 Connecticut law required that the Office of Policy and Management develop a Two-Generational Interagency Plan to address intergenerational poverty and support families in overcoming barriers to economic success. The plan is designed to improve interagency data sharing and community engagement with cross-agency indicators focused on collaboration, economic self-sufficiency, and racial and socioeconomic equity. The initiative began with proof of concept pilots, designed to use or build evidence.

KENTUCKY
Child Welfare, Education, Economic Mobility, Workforce

In 2019, the Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services hosted the Transformers of Child Welfare Summit that focused on evidence-based interventions for the implementation of the Family First Prevention Services program. Through the Summit and nine regional convenings, the Department for Community Based Services convened state and local advocates, policymakers, public child welfare agencies, private providers, the legal community, and other stakeholders to collaborate on the effective and efficient implementation of these evidence-based practices. The Kentucky Center for Statistics, KYSTATS, also hosted a two-day Data Use Conference to advance the use of data to drive policy decisions in education and workforce sectors as well as foster data collaborations among local governments, school districts, academics and researchers, and residents.
Promising Examples

**MASSACHUSETTS**

**Economic Mobility**

The Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development dedicated up to $2 million in its family shelter procurement for provider-defined innovative proposals. The grant allocated 60 points to applicants who proposed interventions that would produce evidence of success based on existing research or providers’ past performance. Interventions were focused on **three outcomes**: promoting shorter shelter stays to transition families into stable housing; improving housing stability to reduce repeated homelessness; and improving family well-being.

**MISSOURI**

**COVID-19, Health**

In 2019, Missouri launched The Show Me Challenge, which encourages state employees to **pitch** innovative ways to better serve state’s citizens and improve the effectiveness of government. In December 2019, the state announced the winners of the first three cycles of this innovation challenge and the fourth cycle is underway. Their pitches and plans are **publicly available**, including the research that supports their innovative ideas.

In 2020, Missouri’s Department of Economic Development created a **PPE Marketplace** to connect public and private buyers and vendors of personal protective equipment (PPE). The marketplace data has been leveraged by policymakers to calculate the state’s overall PPE burn rate, which has allowed the state to invest over $100 million in a PPE reserve for managing COVID-19 during the winter cold and flu season and protecting the state from supply chain shortages.

In 2020, the State established the COVID-19 Fusion Cell (CFC), a statewide daily, cross-agency virtual forum of nearly 250 attendees, with representation from every state agency and the Governor’s Office, and multiple external stakeholders. CFC drove an interdepartmental collaboration against 13 whole-of-government priorities. Further as a real-time platform for cross-functional problem-solving and decision-making, the CFC supports a forum of 16 Cabinet members and the Governor’s senior staff three times weekly to support regular problem-solving among state leaders on the state’s COVID-19 response. The foundation for the CFC’s work is a series of dashboards, which pull data from across state and federal sources in the public health **COVID-19 GIS Dashboard** and **COVID-19 models**, as well dashboards related to the state’s recovery in **employment, business, consumer, social impact, consumer finance, and industry**.
Promising Examples

NEW JERSEY

In 2018, New Jersey’s governor appointed the state’s first Chief Innovation Officer who launched Innovation ENJINE, an open innovation challenge for state employees to submit, vote on, and implement innovative proposals focused on effectiveness and efficiency. The criteria included direct cost-savings, staff time efficiency, and improved impact of an existing service or program. Five ideas were selected for implementation in November 2019. In addition, New Jersey launched the Innovation Skills Accelerator, a free, online program to train state staff to use innovative methods -- including design thinking, evidence-based decision-making, and collective intelligence -- to solve public problems.

NEW YORK

Criminal Justice

In 2019, the New York Division of Criminal Justice Services partnered with the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy to host a 10-week course called “Evidence-Based Policing: Translating Research into Practice.” New York was the first state to offer the course, which was completed by 26 law enforcement professionals, during which students developed and presented ideas for furthering the use of evidence-based policing strategies in their respective agencies.

NORTH CAROLINA

COVID-19, Health

In 2018, North Carolina appointed the state’s first ever Director of Strategic Partnerships to identify philanthropic, nonprofit, and higher education partners to support the state’s priorities, including research partnerships to support evaluations. As part of a Strategic Partnerships initiative, the North Carolina Department of Revenue developed a research agenda in October of 2019, listing its most important research questions and possible research partners. The state also established a pandemic recovery office to coordinate its COVID-19 recovery efforts and provide technical assistance to state agencies and local governments for properly spending $6 billion in federal coronavirus relief funds.
Promising Examples

**NORTH DAKOTA**

In 2019, North Dakota appointed a Chief Reinvention Officer to lead statewide efforts to improve the customer experience associated with the state’s technology offerings. The Office of Reinvention has offered process improvement training to state employees and also standardized the state’s website platform to create a consistent user experience, saving $1 million through strategic consolidation.

**OHIO**

*Education, Health*

LeanOhio, an initiative of the Ohio Department of Administrative Services, uses the Lean process improvement methodology to assist state agencies in streamlining their service delivery through consultations and training. Between 2011 and 2019, LeanOhio ran more than 360 projects in 44 agencies, boards, and commissions.

In 2019, the Ohio Department of Education launched a new program, Student Wellness and Success: Ideas for Innovation, to help school districts use novel strategies to increase mental health counseling, wraparound services, and mentoring programs. The evidence built from these innovation grants will be included in the Ohio Evidence-Based Clearinghouse.

In 2019, the governor signed an executive order creating the InnovateOhio Advisory Board, whose mission is to make the state the most innovative, creative, and entrepreneurial state in the region. This Office advises the Office of InnovateOhio on new technologies and innovations to improve customer service across state agencies, departments, boards, and commissions. The Board’s key focus areas include: reduce costs, improve services, and spur a culture of innovation through public-, private-, and academic partnerships.

**OREGON**

*Criminal Justice*

The Oregon Youth Authority has used predictive modeling to determine risk factors associated with youth entering the juvenile justice system through their Feeder Systems Project. These risk assessment tools are based on data and outcomes captured in the state’s Juvenile Justice Information System, which uses a risk/needs profile to provide adaptive interventions and support program evaluation, such as a 2019 report on recidivism outcomes. Further, the initiative seeks to identify earlier-intervention strategies to help youth avoid future engagement within the juvenile justice system.
Promising Examples

**RHODE ISLAND**

In 2020, the Rhode Island Governor’s Office partnered with the Policy Lab at Brown University to launch the Government Innovation League, a nine-month fellowship for state staff to implement performance-improvement projects aligned with the governor’s strategic priorities.

**UTAH**

**COVID-19, Health**

In April 2020, Utah began beta-testing its COVID-19 contact tracing mobile application, Healthy Together. The mobile application tracks users’ location data for enhanced contact tracing and includes privacy protections compliant with the state’s data security and encryption law. The state also leveraged a public-private partnership with the local technology industry to conduct testing and messaging for residents alongside a public-private partnership to provide free masks to residents through the #MaskForEveryUtahn initiative.

Additionally, as of December 2019, the Utah Department of Health demonstrated a more than 60% performance improvement across 11 of its largest systems of operation. The Department implemented performance measures, dashboards, and monthly accountability sessions to spotlight innovative projects aligned with the department’s strategic plan. These resulted in service improvements in autopsy reports, a 21% increase in cancer screenings for women at or below the 250% federal poverty level, and a 42% increase in the number of matches between adoptees and their biological parents.

**VERMONT**

**Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Health, Workforce**

In 2017, Vermont’s governor launched the Program to Improve Outcomes Together (Pivot) in conjunction with a Governor’s Government Modernization and Efficiency team. PIVOT combines outcomes-based improvement and lean process improvement into a unified effort. Vermont’s Chief Performance Officer (CPO) oversees the implementation of the continuous improvement effort, which is aligned with strategic outcomes and indicators enacted by the state legislature. PIVOT aims to “move the needle” on indicators aligned with the state’s strategic plan.
Promising Examples

VIRGINIA
COVID-19, Economic Mobility, Health

The Virginia COVID–19 response command includes a Health Equity Work Group charged with “prioritizing resources and decision points impacting marginalized and at-risk individuals and communities.” The Work Group overlayed geospatial and race and ethnicity data to establish testing areas in communities, which later allowed the public health department to target the distribution of masks and hand sanitizer in communities that are typically underserved by government programs.
14. Contracting for Outcomes

Did the state or any of its agencies enter into performance-based contracts and/or use active contract management (frequent use of data and regular communication with providers to monitor implementation and progress) to improve outcomes for publicly funded programs?

Why is this important?
Performance contracting techniques allow state governments to get better results and value for each taxpayer dollar.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME

$ Investing for Results

For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.

Leading Example

RHODE ISLAND
MULTIPLE AGENCIES

Since 2015, Rhode Island’s Department of Children, Youth, and Families has worked to reform and restructure the department’s procurement. As part of this initiative, the department executed $90 million in 116 results-driven contracts that require providers to meet outcome goals rather than output metrics. As a result, the Department has reduced the number of children in group care by over 20% since 2015, experienced a 50% expansion of foster care resources for the most challenging adolescents, doubled the capacity of high-quality family visitation and reunification services, and made start-up investments of $1.2 million in nonprofit community organizations to support new and expanded programming.

Also in 2015, the Department of Labor and Training launched Real Jobs Rhode Island, an innovative, $14 million workforce program that used performance-based metrics and active contract management. As a result, the state reconfigured the way it manages and evaluates its job training programs to capture meaningful, long-term employment outcomes and created a Strategic Coaching Procurement Playbook, which includes specific strategies and sample language for using active contract management to achieve better results.
Rhode Island Works, administered by the Department of Human Services, also used performance payments and active contract management to improve its job search services, which, in 2015, ranked at the bottom nationally on the federal measure of work participation rate (which counts the number of recipients engaged in work-related activities as a share of all work-eligible clients receiving benefits). To improve the program, the Department partnered with the Harvard Kennedy School Government Performance Lab to incorporate performance-based payments for self-sufficiency outcomes and deploy active contract management. As a result, the federal participation rate improved by one-third within the first six months after these reforms were launched.

Promising Examples

**ARIZONA**

**Child Welfare**

In 2019, the Arizona Department of Child Safety partnered with the Harvard Kennedy School Government Performance Lab to improve upon the existing rate of nearly one in five families receiving supportive in-home preservation services that were re-reported for maltreatment, which resulted in the removal of a child from that home. Through active contract management, implementing uniform performance measures for providers, and establishing a unit to oversee child and family service contracts, the Department was able to reduce the number of families re-reported by 40% and the number child removals by 50%.

**FLORIDA**

**Child Welfare, Health**

The Florida Department of Children and Families partnered with the Harvard Kennedy School Government Performance Lab to improve child welfare and behavioral health service delivery in Florida’s SunCoast region, which has four million children receiving child protection services. The Department, which adopted active contract management practices to enhance coordination among providers, allowed contracted providers to track client-level data for a prioritized set of six performance metrics. These innovations led to better service delivery, including increasing the share of clients completing a timely needs assessment by 28% and doubling the share of caretakers beginning substance use treatment within 30 days of referral.
Promising Examples

**ILLINOIS**

**Criminal Justice**

The Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice and Department of Children and Family Services streamlined the process for supporting youth who are dually involved in the child welfare and criminal justice systems. The project used a performance-based contract, active contract management, and other tools to focus on streamlining case management, improving coordination between the foster care and juvenile justice systems, and augmenting services by using evidence-based interventions. Early results include reducing the reporting time for the state to share juvenile justice occurrences with child welfare agencies from 90 days to fewer than three days.

**MASSACHUSETTS**

**Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility, Education, Workforce**

A 2012 Massachusetts law authorized established a Social Innovation Financing Trust Fund for the purpose of funding contracts to improve outcomes and lower costs for contracted government services, referred to as “pay for success contracts.” The first contract entered in January 2014 supports an on-going project to help young men leaving the juvenile justice system or on probation avoid re-offending ($28 million in success payments). In 2016, the state launched a Pay for Success contract, Pathways to Economic Advancement ($15 million in success payments), to improve employment outcomes for immigrants. A July 2018 contract, the most recent project, supports unemployed or underemployed veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder in attaining competitive and compatible employment ($1.5 million in success payments). In addition, the state has taken a similar approach to use pay for success and performance for performance contracts in Adult Basic Education.

In 2014, Massachusetts launched the Massachusetts Chronic Homelessness Pay for Success Initiative ($6 million in success payments) to provide permanent supportive housing to 500 to 800 individuals experiencing chronic homelessness with payments based on stable housing for at least one year for program clients. As of July 2020, the Pay for Success program has housed 998 tenants, 857 of whom have been enrolled in the Community Support Program for People Experiencing Chronic Homelessness, the innovative Medicaid reimbursement program that provides health services for chronically homeless individuals. The Department also incorporated “success payments” into its procurement for the family homeless shelter system.
Promising Examples

NEW YORK  
**Education, Workforce**

New York State’s Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance issues outcomes-based contracts for workforce training providers in its Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Employment and Training Venture Program. The most recent grants, which fund providers through 2021, link payments to such milestones as educational gains, program completion, job entry, and job retention.

TENNESSEE  
**Child Welfare**

In 2016, the Tennessee Department of Children’s Services introduced a performance-based contracting model that includes performance bands. Agencies are placed into one of three bands: high performance, mid-range (or average) performance, or lower performance. Providers are then paid based on their performance on specific metrics resulting in a performance pay system with standardized outcomes, daily rates for contracts, metric definitions, and measurement methodology. As part of this initiative, the agency distributes monthly performance reports to providers.

WASHINGTON  
**Child Welfare, Economic Mobility**

A 2017 Washington law consolidated several agencies into a new Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF), requiring a shift of all contracts for client services to performance-based contracts. With the support of partner organization Third Sector, the agency is converting over 1,000 contracts that invest approximately $1 billion each biennium to support nine (9) priority outcome goals for children, youth, and families. Building on traditional performance-based contracting (PBC) mechanisms, the project intentionally focuses on deepening stakeholder engagement, using PBC as a tool to advance racial equity, and facilitating continuous improvement through data and research. Once fully implemented, DCYF will become the first state agency to successfully implement outcomes-oriented contracts across its entire portfolio of programs.
15. Repurpose for Results

Did the state or any of its agencies shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?

Why is this important?
Repurposing funds from programs that fail to consistently achieve results to programs that consistently achieve results is a key strategy for state governments to improve their performance while building knowledge about what works.

RELEVANT BLUEPRINT THEME

$ Investing for Results

For more information, visit the Blueprint for Delivering for Results in State Government.

Leading Example

PENNSYLVANIA
SINGLE AGENCY

Since 2013, the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections has set performance targets for its community corrections program through performance-based contracts. Providers who meet recidivism prevention goals receive a 1% increase in their rate, while providers who fail to meet targets for two consecutive years can have their contracts terminated. Following the introduction of these performance goals, the program's recidivism rate dropped by 11.3% in 2014, another 16% in 2015, and an additional 11% in 2016. In 2018, the Commonwealth Foundation's report on criminal justice reform in Pennsylvania recommended expanding the program to other areas based on these results.
Promising Examples

MINNESOTA
Criminal Justice, Economic Mobility

A 2014 Minnesota law (subdivision 7) requires the Minnesota Department of Human Services to use the Self-Support Index to monitor each county's performance in assisting clients to become self-sufficient. Counties that meet performance targets receive a 2.5% bonus payment from the state, and counties that perform below the expected target must submit a performance improvement plan. In counties where "no improvement is shown by the end of the multi-year plan, the county's or tribe's allocation must be decreased by 2.5 percent" (Section 256J.626(7)(a)(2)).

A 2016 Minnesota law (section 14, line 15.21) allows the state to use the savings achieved from reducing the sentences of minor drug offenders for evidence-based drug and mental health treatments for offenders still in prison or under supervised release. The evidence to support this law comes from the Department of Corrections' own research, which found that providing offenders drug treatment reduces recidivism rates.
## Appendix A: State Standard of Excellence

### Criteria for Investing in What Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Strategic Goals</th>
<th>Did the governor have public statewide strategic goals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Performance Management / Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies implement a performance management system aligned with its statewide strategic goals, with clear and prioritized outcome-focused goals, program objectives, and measures; and did it consistently collect, analyze, and use data and evidence to improve outcomes, return on investment, and other indicators of performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Data Leadership</td>
<td>Did the governor’s office or any state agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to collect, analyze, share, and use high-quality administrative and survey data — consistent with strong privacy protections — to improve (or help other entities including, but not limited to, local governments and nonprofit organizations improve) federal, state, and local programs? (Example: Chief Data Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data Policies / Agreements</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies have data-sharing policies and data-sharing agreements — consistent with strong privacy protections — with any nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, local government agencies, and/or federal government agencies that were designed to improve outcomes for publicly funded programs, and did it make those policies and agreements publicly available? (Example: data-sharing policy, open data policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Data Use</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies have data systems consistent with strong privacy protections that linked multiple administrative data sets across state agencies, and did it use those systems to improve federal, state, or local programs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluation Leadership</td>
<td>Did the governor’s office or any state agency have a senior staff member(s) with the authority, staff, and budget to evaluate its major programs and inform policy decisions affecting them? (Example: Chief Evaluation Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluation Policies</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies have an evaluation policy, evaluation plan, and research/learning agenda(s), and did it publicly release the findings of all completed evaluations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluation Resources</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies invest at least 1% of program funds in evaluations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Outcome Data</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies report or require outcome data for its state-funded programs during their budget process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Evidence Definition and Program Inventory</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies release a common evidence framework, guidelines, or standards to inform its research and funding decisions and make publicly available an inventory of state-funded programs categorized based on at least two tiers of evidence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cost-Benefit Analysis</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies assess and make publicly available the costs and benefits of public programs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Use of Evidence in Grant Programs</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies (1) invest at least 50% of program funds in evidence-based solutions or (2) use evidence of effectiveness when allocating funds to eligible grantees (including local governments) from its five largest competitive and noncompetitive grant programs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Innovation</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies have staff, policies, and processes in place that encouraged innovation to improve outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Contracting for Outcomes</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies enter into performance-based contracts and/or use active contract management (frequent use of data and regular communication with providers to monitor implementation and progress) to improve outcomes for publicly funded programs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Repurpose for Results</td>
<td>Did the state or any of its agencies shift funds away from any practice, policy, or program that consistently failed to achieve desired outcomes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: 50 State COVID-19 Survey

To provide an overview of state responses to the pandemic, Results for America used the following criteria to conduct a national review of the state COVID-19 actions. The review was conducted in March 2020 and July 2020.

1. Did the governor or state issue a strategic plan for its COVID-19 response?
2. Did the state participate in a regional opening plan?
3. Did the governor publicly commit to taking a data-driven, science-based, or evidence-based COVID-19 response?
4. Did the governor or relevant state agency(ies) launch a COVID-19 data dashboard to publicly monitor the state’s public health and emergency response services?
5. Did the state have a dashboard that publicly tracks the spending and use of COVID-19 funding?
6. Did the state publish demographic information on its COVID-19 dashboard?
7. Did the state publish data in an open, machine readable format to support civic engagement and innovation?

Results for America also relied on data from The COVID Tracking Project, launched from The Atlantic, which collects, cross-checks, and publishes COVID-19 data from 56 US states and territories' public health authorities, press conferences, and other official materials.
Appendix C: A Comparison of the State Standard of Excellence and the Blueprint for Delivering Results in State Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State Standard of Excellence</th>
<th>Blueprint for Delivering Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td>High-level roadmap and self-assessment tool</td>
<td>Detailed implementation guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Provide a “north star” for best-in-class data-driven, and evidence-based practices with demonstrated results</td>
<td>Provide specific Strategies and Actions for building data and evidence capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Summaries of leading and promising data-driven and evidence-based practices from state governments</td>
<td>Detailed steps to help state governments improve data and evidence use over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>Governors, governors’ senior staff, and state agency heads</td>
<td>Governors’ senior staff, state budget directors, state performance management directors, state evaluation staff, and state agency senior staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>Engages all state governments in sharing their data and evidence work</td>
<td>Developed by leading state government staff as part of What Works Bootcamp training series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learn more about the Blueprint online [here](#).
## Appendix D: AmeriCorps State Grant Applications and FY 2019-2020 State Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Requirements in State Grant Applications</th>
<th>State AmeriCorps Allocations (2019-2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$1,116,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$1,811,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$1,988,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$45,095,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$6,052,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$1,904,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$14,104,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$3,255,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$3,014,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$7,637,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$1,040,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$12,196,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$3,354,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$1,392,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Requirements in State Grant Applications</td>
<td>State AmeriCorps Allocations (2019-2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$7,282,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$5,260,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$13,733,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$5,065,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$2,033,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$10,246,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$25,588,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$5,433,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$3,223,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$3,742,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$6,280,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$338,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$1,184,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$3,038,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$4,122,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$2,260,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$2,864,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Requirements in State Grant Applications</td>
<td>State AmeriCorps Allocations (2019-2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$14,692,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$8,356,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$3,714,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$11,337,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>$1,297,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$3,485,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$5,385,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$16,663,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$3,439,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>$2,226,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$17,827,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$6,816,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$2,951,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$730,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State AmeriCorps grants not available for the following states: Arizona, Delaware, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Utah.