

**Department of Health and Human Services**

**Office of Inspector General  
Projects**



**ADMINISTRATIONS FOR CHILDREN,  
FAMILIES, AND AGING  
Table of Contents**

**TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES**

Collecting AFDC Overpayments ..... 1  
Collection and Distribution of Child Support Arrearages ..... 1  
Technical Assistance to States ..... 1  
Work Participation Data ..... 1  
Child Support Enforcement for Former TANF Recipients ..... 2  
Temporary Assistance for Children Only ..... 2  
State Diversion Program ..... 2  
Use of TANF Funds ..... 3

**CHILD CARE AND PROTECTION**

Child Protective Service Effectiveness ..... 3  
State Administrator Perspectives on Technical Assistance: An Update ..... 3

**CHILD SUPPORT**

Implementing State Child Support Disbursement Units ..... 4  
Child Support Payment Distribution ..... 4  
Interstate Case Collections ..... 4  
State Use of Wage Withholding ..... 5  
Insurance Intercept Program ..... 5  
Collecting Child Support From Federal Employees ..... 5  
State Use of State and National Directories of New Hires ..... 5  
Penalties for Failure to Report New Hires ..... 6  
Customer Access to Child Support Enforcement Agencies ..... 6  
Support Programs for Noncustodial Parents ..... 6  
State Child Support Fees ..... 7

Privatization of State IV-D Agency Services .....	7
State Controls to Ensure Integrity of IV-D Personnel .....	7
State Child Support Case Closure Activities .....	7

## **INVESTIGATIONS**

Child Support Enforcement Task Force Model .....	8
--	---

## **FOSTER CARE**

Foster Care Eligibility Determinations .....	8
Child Abuse and Neglect in Foster Care .....	9
Foster Care Children's Access to Medicaid .....	9
Recruitment of Family Foster Care Providers .....	9
Use of Federal Parent Locator System .....	10
Licensing and Oversight of Group Homes .....	10
Therapeutic Foster Care Per Diem Rates .....	10
State Foster Care Contracts With Local Agencies .....	10
Administrative Costs Billed by Child Placement Agencies .....	11

## **HEAD START**

Enrollment Claimed by Head Start Grantees .....	11
Blended Funding .....	11
Matching Contributions .....	12
Construction and Renovation of Head Start Facilities .....	12

## **OTHER ISSUES**

Critical Infrastructure Protection .....	12
Safeguarding Persons With Disabilities .....	13
Social Services and Targeted Refugee Assistance Programs .....	13
Verification of Immigrant Status and Citizenship .....	13
Office of Refugee Resettlement Grant Administration .....	13
Data Used to Support Performance Measures .....	14
State Agency Child Welfare Information System .....	14
Contract Administration .....	14
Audit Resolution Process .....	15

## **ADMINISTRATION ON AGING**

Critical Infrastructure Protection .....	15
Funding the Aging Network .....	15
Supportive Services .....	15

Followup on Long-Term-Care Ombudsman Program .....	16
Data Used to Support Performance Measures .....	16

---

## TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES

---

### **Collecting AFDC Overpayments**

This nationwide review will examine State practices for reporting and collecting Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) assistance overpayments since welfare reform. Although the AFDC program has been repealed and replaced with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), States must return the Federal share of AFDC overpayment recoveries to the Government. A nonfederal audit in one State disclosed that the Federal Government had not been reimbursed for its share of recoveries.

*OAS; W-00-00-20016; A-02-00-02004, -12-01-00000*

### **Collection and Distribution of Child Support Arrearages**

This review will determine whether, subsequent to welfare reform, States have appropriately distributed the collection of child support arrearages accrued while families were on AFDC. As in the case of AFDC overpayments, States must return the Federal share of overdue AFDC-related child support collected based on distribution requirements for families that formerly received or currently receive assistance.

*OAS; W-00-01-20016; A-12-01-00000*

### **Technical Assistance to States**

We will examine States' experiences with and perceptions of technical assistance provided by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) to State TANF agencies and determine opportunities for improvement. Under welfare reform, one of ACF's major responsibilities is to provide technical assistance to State and local entities.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

### **Work Participation Data**

We will examine the quality and uniformity of State data reported to ACF on TANF recipients' work participation rates. The ACF uses these data to monitor program performance and, specifically, to determine if States have met their federally defined work participation

target rates. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act imposes financial penalties if States do not meet target rates.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

### **Child Support Enforcement for Former TANF Recipients**

We will evaluate State child support enforcement efforts on behalf of those who are no longer eligible to receive cash assistance. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 requires that States impose specific limits on the time that families may receive cash assistance under the TANF program. Child support enforcement is critical to the self-sufficiency of families who have recently left TANF or who are nearing their time limit for receiving benefits. Study of this topic was a high priority for the child support enforcement workgroup, the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement, and analysts in the office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

*OEI; 07-00-00400*

### **Temporary Assistance for Children Only**

We will examine temporary assistance for children only and report on trends in States' use of this category. Children-only cases include households in which the parent is not eligible for benefits or a child is living with another adult (most commonly a grandparent or another relative). Currently, there is limited understanding of these types of cases, and the Department is concerned that States may create children-only cases as a way of avoiding penalties for failure to meet time limit or work participation requirements. This study will complement the recent study by the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation entitled "Understanding the AFDC/TANF Child-Only Caseload: Policies, Composition, and Characteristics in Three States."

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

### **State Diversion Program**

This review will examine how State welfare agencies divert potential welfare applicants from applying for TANF and whether diverted applicants receive necessary services. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 requires States to reduce their welfare case loads over several years. To keep families off the rolls, States have employed diversion strategies designed to provide short-term assistance and services to families in crisis who would otherwise enter the welfare rolls. We will determine whether

families who are dissuaded from applying for TANF are given information about other supplemental benefits for which they qualify.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

### **Use of TANF Funds**

This review will examine how States have used TANF funds and their strategies for using unobligated balances. Many States have considerable balances resulting from significant caseload decreases. We will determine if there are other major factors influencing unobligated balances. This review will assist ACF in responding to a recent Office of Management and Budget (OMB) request for information on the States' use of TANF funds.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

---

## **CHILD CARE AND PROTECTION**

---

### **Child Protective Service Effectiveness**

We will determine whether State Child Protective Service referrals were properly prioritized and resolved and whether any service delays could result in further occurrences of child abuse and/or neglect. We will also examine recidivism rates and the extent of State outreach efforts to alert the community to the problem of child abuse. Recent studies requested by the Congress found that approximately 1 million American children are victims of abuse and neglect annually and that many of these children and their families fail to receive adequate protection and treatment.

*OAS; W-00-99-20018; A-04-99-00130, -12-00-00004*

### **State Administrator Perspectives on Technical Assistance: An Update**

At ACF's request, we will determine the perceptions of State child care administrators on the impact and success of technical assistance provided through the Child Care Technical Assistance Network. Our prior study indicated that while State child care administrators were generally satisfied with most aspects of the assistance provided, the assistance focused on services furnished through a sole contract provided with Child Care and Development funds. In February 1998, ACF created the Child Care Technical Assistance Network, expanding

efforts through seven independent contracts. Our study will be used to improve technical assistance provided to States through the network.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

---

## **CHILD SUPPORT**

---

### **Implementing State Child Support Disbursement Units**

Using self-reported data from the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, this congressionally requested study will describe the status of States' implementation of child support disbursement units. We will also make an in-depth evaluation of six States' implementation efforts. Under Title IV of the Social Security Act, each State is required to establish a State disbursement unit, a single system for receiving, distributing, and disbursing child support payments.

*OEI; 06-00-00040, -00041*

### **Child Support Payment Distribution**

This review will examine a State distribution process for child support payments. Indications are that computer glitches and several layers of contracting and subcontracting agencies have contributed to significant delays in providing child support payments to custodial parents. Having several agencies involved in administering the payment system also increases the potential for charging significant and unnecessary administrative costs to the Federal Government.

*OAS; W-00-01-20005; A-04-01-00000*

### **Interstate Case Collections**

We will determine whether the collection of child support across State lines has been enhanced as a result of the Uniform Interstate Protocol. This new protocol is intended to improve States' ability to establish, enforce, or modify a support order or to determine parentage across State lines. About 30 percent of child support cases are interstate cases. Differing State programs and the lack of an effective procedure to collect interstate child support have raised barriers to increased collections for these cases. The historical problems in collecting child support across State lines make a review of this new protocol timely.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

## **State Use of Wage Withholding**

We will examine how States use wage withholding as a tool for collecting child support and whether they use it to its full potential. We will also review practices and policies that appear to allow for optimum use of this tool. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 required that States establish the bureaucracy to monitor all child support payments and to implement universal wage withholding. Wage withholding has been described as one of the most effective tools for collecting child support payments.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

## **Insurance Intercept Program**

We will determine the adequacy of State procedures for identifying and intercepting insurance payments from parents with child support debts. In region I, two States recently implemented highly successful insurance intercept programs; one State established a first-in-the-Nation Internet site to enable insurers to quickly cross-check insurance payments before payment. We will determine which States have enacted and implemented insurance intercept legislation and identify best practices. We will also examine the program's effectiveness in interstate cases and, if appropriate, the potential for improving collections using a national database or website.

*OAS; W-00-01-20005; A-01-01-00000*

## **Collecting Child Support From Federal Employees**

We will evaluate efforts by HHS and the Department of Justice to enforce collection of child support from their respective agency employees. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 required all Federal agencies to provide information to the National Directory of New Hires to help States locate noncustodial parents employed by the Federal Government. Federal agencies must also cooperate with child support enforcement efforts and comply with wage withholding orders submitted by States. This review is part of a President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency Roundtable project.

*OEI; 05-00-00300*

## **State Use of State and National Directories of New Hires**

We will determine whether States use the information provided through their State Directory of New Hires and the National Directory of New Hires to its fullest potential. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 mandated that each State



create an automated Directory of New Hires and report the data collected by the State system to the National Directory of New Hires. These automated systems were intended to assist States in establishing and enforcing child support orders. If the data from the directories are accurate and if States use the data effectively and timely, collection rates should improve. The Office of Child Support Enforcement anticipates that between 1997 and 2007, new hire reporting will bring in over \$6.4 billion in child support and that the numbers for paternity establishment and support orders will increase because of the availability of this information.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

### **Penalties for Failure to Report New Hires**

We will determine whether employers' compliance with requirements to report new hires increases as States impose stronger penalties for noncompliance. To improve child support collections, Federal law required all States to have a new-hire directory in place by October 1, 1997. States have chosen to impose various penalties for employers that fail to report new hires to the State directory. While Federal law requires a penalty of \$25 per unreported employee, with a maximum of \$500, one State holds employers in contempt and responsible for lost child support when they fail to report their new employees.

*OAS; W-00-01-20005; A-01-01-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

### **Customer Access to Child Support Enforcement Agencies**

We will examine State efforts to provide customers with access to child support enforcement information and services. These customers primarily include custodial parents, noncustodial parents, employers, and other State and local agencies. With the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, States were tasked to implement many new initiatives to enhance the enforcement and collection of child support payments. The new initiatives made customer access an even more necessary ingredient for ensuring efficient child support services. We have encountered anecdotal evidence that customer access is problematic. Systematic research will allow us to determine if problems exist, the breadth and depth of such problems, and their causes.

*OEI; 06-00-00460*

### **Support Programs for Noncustodial Parents**

This review will assess State and local programs that provide group support, training, and incentives for unemployed and underemployed noncustodial parents and the programs' impact

on preventing or reducing child support arrearages. Effective programs could benefit custodial parents and States by increasing child support collections and decreasing enforcement costs.

*OAS; W-00-01-20005; A-03-01-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

### **State Child Support Fees**

We will review State practices and procedures relating to the waiver, implementation, use, and reporting of child support enforcement fees. States may impose these fees on custodial or noncustodial parents who are not TANF recipients to cover processing costs, such as locator services and court fees. Custodial and noncustodial parents have expressed complaints about the fees imposed by States.

*OAS; W-00-01-20005; A-07-01-00000*

### **Privatization of State IV-D Agency Services**

This review will evaluate the adequacy of State agency controls and procedures for selecting and monitoring contractors that provide collection and payment processing services. We will determine whether States use performance-based contracts, conduct background checks, and examine contractor records to ensure effectiveness and minimize potential fraud and abuse. We will also review a sample of contractors. States are increasingly privatizing services once performed by State/county workers.

*OAS; W-00-01-20005; A-03-01-00000*

### **State Controls to Ensure Integrity of IV-D Personnel**

We will evaluate State processes and screens used to ensure that State IV-D personnel are not delinquent in their payment of child support and do not perform duties that would constitute a conflict of interest. In the past, there have been allegations that State officials protected themselves from child support enforcement efforts or helped others avoid paying child support.

*OAS; W-00-01-20005; A-12-01-00000*

### **State Child Support Case Closure Activities**

We will describe State case closure activities, highlighting successful strategies and exploring any challenges or vulnerabilities. Since 1989, Federal regulations have required that State child support agencies have a system for closing old and duplicate cases and cases lacking enough information to proceed. In March 1999, the Office of Child Support Enforcement

issued revised Federal regulations intended to balance the concern for ensuring “that all children receive the [child support] help they need” with the administrative concerns that State case loads include “only those cases in which there is adequate information or likelihood of successfully providing services.” Given the present incentive payment system, some advocates fear that States have such a strong financial incentive to close cases that some workable cases may be closed improperly, denying needed services to families.

*OEI; 06-00-00470*

---

## **INVESTIGATIONS**

---

### **Child Support Enforcement Task Force Model**

The OIG’s Office of Investigations and the Office of Child Support Enforcement developed a task force model that is being implemented in Columbus, Ohio; Baltimore, Maryland; Dallas, Texas; New York, New York; and Sacramento, California. It calls for the Office of Investigations, Federal Bureau of Investigations, U.S. Marshals, U.S. Attorney Offices, local law enforcement, local prosecutors, State child support agencies, and other interested parties in 20 States to join forces in creating a coordinated effort to identify, investigate, and prosecute criminal nonsupport cases. The task forces investigate intrastate as well as interstate cases, making the involvement of local law enforcement and prosecutors critical.

---

## **FOSTER CARE**

---

### **Foster Care Eligibility Determinations**

We will identify any barriers to effective implementation of the Title IV-E foster care eligibility determination process. States are legally obligated to serve all children in need of out-of-home placement and care. Under the 1996 TANF program, States are allowed to set their own standards for determining eligibility for public assistance. Potential barriers to effectively implementing Title IV-E foster care eligibility determination standards may include caseworkers’ lack of knowledge regarding the standards and inefficient or ill-defined procedures for making the determinations.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

## **Child Abuse and Neglect in Foster Care**

The objectives of this review will be to evaluate States' efforts in (1) ensuring consistent application of criteria when identifying and investigating abuse and neglect of children in foster care, (2) conducting central State registry background checks on all persons having contact with children in foster care, (3) maintaining and sharing information from the child abuse and neglect central registry, and (4) encouraging child-placing agencies to exchange information on abusive foster and adoptive parents who move from one agency to another.

*OAS; W-00-01-20008; A-06-01-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

## **Foster Care Children's Access to Medicaid**

We will examine foster care children's access to Medicaid services. Most of the more than 600,000 foster care children have Medicaid coverage that would guarantee them availability to Early, Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program services. A GAO report, "Foster Care: Health Needs of Many Young Children Are Unknown and Unmet," estimated that 12 percent of foster care children received no routine health care, 34 percent received no immunizations, and only 1 percent received any EPSDT services in the three sites reviewed. This EPSDT rate is considerably lower than the rate that we found in an evaluation of Medicaid managed care. This study will provide a comprehensive view of health care services available to foster children covered by Medicaid.

*OEI; 02-00-00360*

## **Recruitment of Family Foster Care Providers**

We will identify any barriers that States encounter in their recruitment of family foster care providers. The Social Security Act requires that States "provide for the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the State for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed." However, Federal regulations do not define "diligent recruitment" efforts, leaving interpretation of this requirement to the States. The number of children in foster care almost doubled between the mid-1980's and 1998. This study will offer States information on model efforts found successful in reducing barriers to recruitment of family foster care providers.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

## **Use of Federal Parent Locator System**

We will examine best practices in child welfare agencies' use of the Federal Parent Locator System and determine whether any barriers impede the effective use of this system. Under the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, child welfare agencies may request information from the system to locate the parents of a child or to expedite the termination of parental rights in order to plan permanent placement of a foster child. This study will offer information on the extent that the system is used and to what effect.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

## **Licensing and Oversight of Group Homes**

We will determine whether one State has properly implemented its revised licensing and oversight requirements for in-State and out-of-State foster care group homes. These requirements include stringent provisions on comprehensive group home evaluation visits, qualifications of group home administrators, standardized training and continuing education of facility managers and child care workers, visits to group homes by social workers and probation officers, controls over the placement of foster children in out-of-State facilities, and numerous other licensing and oversight requirements.

*OAS; W-00-01-20008; A-09-01-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

## **Therapeutic Foster Care Per Diem Rates**

We will evaluate the criteria used to determine whether therapeutic foster care is needed and whether the need for continued care at that level is adequately supported. Children who are considered to be emotionally disturbed and who cannot be properly cared for in regular foster care homes are placed in therapeutic foster care homes. Because these children require intensive monitoring and counseling, their per diem rates are considerably higher than rates for regular foster care. Our survey work in one State indicates that many children remained in therapeutic foster care homes after they no longer needed intense monitoring and counseling.

*OAS; W-00-01-20008; A-05-01-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

## **State Foster Care Contracts With Local Agencies**

We will review State foster care contracts with local child placement agencies. A consultant advised one State that 75 percent of the students receiving advice from a school counselor were foster care candidates. The State proposed amendments to its service and cost allocation plans, charged these school-based case management costs to the Title IV-E foster care

program, and increased its quarterly claim for administrative costs by \$6.5 million. The ACF regional office has deferred payment of the claim. We will determine the extent to which States claim such costs, whether the target populations are foster care candidates as defined by ACF, who determines whether clients are candidates for foster care, the rationale for the 75 percent factor, and whether the amounts charged by States represent costs for allowable services.

*OAS; W-00-01-20008; A-07-01-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

### **Administrative Costs Billed by Child Placement Agencies**

We will determine whether child placement agencies improperly billed for administrative costs when filing maintenance payment claims for Federal reimbursement. By statute, foster care maintenance payments cover a child's basic needs, such as food, clothing, shelter, and personal incidentals, but not administrative costs. Also, according to ACF policy, costs borne by child placement agencies are not eligible for Federal funding. During a review in one State, we found that these agencies had been reimbursed for maintenance payments that included administrative costs. We will review the State's procedures for reimbursing child placement agencies for maintenance payments and determine the extent of administrative costs paid.

*OAS; W-00-01-20008; A-01-01-00000*

---

## **HEAD START**

---

### **Enrollment Claimed by Head Start Grantees**

This review will determine whether Head Start grantees (1) generally met their budgeted enrollment within a reasonable time frame after the school year began and (2) reported to ACF, in a timely fashion, any excess funds due to underenrollment that could be allocated to other programs with greater need. We have indications from our past work that some grantees misrepresented actual enrollment of children to obtain maximum Federal funding for their programs.

*OAS; W-00-01-20009; A-12-01-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

### **Blended Funding**

We will determine whether combining several separate funding sources into one general-purpose fund (blended funding) resulted in Head Start grantees' charging a disproportionate share of costs to the Federal Government. The OMB Circular A-122 requires that costs be allocated in accordance with relative benefits received. Our recent review identified a serious

deficiency in one grantee's cost allocation system in which costs were inequitably charged to the Federal Government rather than allocated to other benefitting nonfederal programs. We will attempt to determine which practices and components of a cost allocation plan lead to an acceptable system for blended funding.

*OAS; W-00-01-20009; A-09-01-00000*

### **Matching Contributions**

We will review the matching contributions (cash or in-kind) reported by Head Start grantees. Grantees are generally required to provide 20 percent of total program costs. The matching share must be from nonfederal sources, must be program related, and may be in the form of cash or in-kind contributions. Our recent work indicated that the value of matching contributions could be inflated or unreasonable or could represent unallowable costs. We will also determine, if possible, the effects of TANF work requirements--and the possible resulting loss of volunteers--on grantees' ability to meet their projected in-kind contributions.

*OAS; W-00-01-20009; A-07-01-00000*

### **Construction and Renovation of Head Start Facilities**

We will determine whether ACF's review and approval of the purchase and renovation of Head Start facilities were adequately planned, supported, and in compliance with requirements. We will also determine whether all necessary documents to protect the Government's interest were obtained, including purchase agreements, deeds of trust, and proofs of insurance. This work will expand on our earlier review, requested by ACF, in which we found that grants were awarded to buy property without the necessary information, such as appraisals and building inspection reports. In addition, restrictions imposed by supplemental funding sources (funds other than Head Start funds) were not considered to ensure that awards did not conflict with Head Start requirements.

*OAS; W-00-00-20009; A-09-00-00061*

---

## **OTHER ISSUES**

---

### **Critical Infrastructure Protection**

We will evaluate ACF's efforts to safeguard its critical infrastructure. Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 63, "Critical Infrastructure Protection," issued in May 1998, calls for a

national effort to ensure the security of the increasingly vulnerable and interconnected physical and cyber-based infrastructures. Our review is part of the HHS-wide PDD 63 initiative.

*OAS; W-00-00-40001; A-12-00-00005*

### **Safeguarding Persons With Disabilities**

This review will determine State procedures to identify, investigate, and resolve reports of abuse of persons with disabilities. We will determine the information that appropriate State and Federal agencies and protection and advocacy groups are collecting and whether the Department can use this information to evaluate the effectiveness of federally funded programs for the disabled.

*OAS; W-00-99-20002; A-01-00-02502*

### **Social Services and Targeted Refugee Assistance Programs**

We will evaluate State administration and operation of the social services and targeted assistance programs for refugees. Prior reviews have shown deficiencies relating to States' contracting for employment services, oversight of contractors, and use of funds.

*OAS; W-00-01-20017; A-04-01-00000*

### **Verification of Immigrant Status and Citizenship**

We will review implementation of immigration and citizenship verification procedures required by 1996 welfare reform legislation. The statute restricts access to Federal public benefits, including child welfare, TANF, Medicaid, and Developmental Disabilities, to certain qualified aliens. Qualified aliens include legal permanent residents, asylees, and refugees and exclude undocumented aliens and aliens admitted on a temporary basis for work, study, or pleasure. This review will determine (1) provider and recipient awareness of eligibility criteria, (2) the nature and extent of verification procedures, and (3) the impact of verification procedures on providers and applicants. Information from this review will be of interest to the HHS work group on immigration.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

### **Office of Refugee Resettlement Grant Administration**

We will review the effectiveness of Office of Refugee Resettlement practices and procedures for selecting, monitoring, and closing out discretionary grants. Recent audits of other ACF



programs showed significant problems with grantee performance. We will determine if grant and program officials take steps to weed out problem grantees and if assistance is provided to high-risk grantees.

*OAS; W-00-01-20002; A-12-01-00000*

### **Data Used to Support Performance Measures**

We will examine ACF's use of State-supplied data for performance measurement in one or more major programs, including TANF. In passing the Government Performance and Results Act, the Congress emphasized that the usefulness of agency performance reports was largely dependent on congressional confidence in the reported data. We will determine whether ACF takes adequate steps to screen State data for reliability and whether selected States have adequate controls in place to ensure that their data are reliable and valid.

*OAS; W-00-01-20002; A-07-01-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

### **State Agency Child Welfare Information System**

We will conduct a joint programmatic and fiscal review of the State Agency Child Welfare Information System. This HHS-financed computer system (75 percent matching for implementation) is designed to allow child welfare workers on-line access to other State human service and health programs, such as TANF, child support, and Medicaid. The system is intended to help with case management, thus allowing child welfare workers more time for supporting the needs of children and their families. By FY 2003, Federal and State costs for the system will total about \$1.6 billion. We will address the reliability of the data, the effectiveness and impact of the system, and the appropriateness of costs charged.

*OAS; W-00-00-20002; A-02-99-02008*  
*OEI; 00-00-00000*

### **Contract Administration**

This followup review will determine the adequacy of steps taken by ACF to improve its contract administration. Prior reviews identified problems in the solicitation, award, monitoring, and closeout of contracts. Particular attention will be given to consultant services contracts.

*OAS; W-00-01-20002; A-12-01-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

## **Audit Resolution Process**

This review will follow up on ACF's efforts to reduce its backlog of unresolved audit findings. We will identify the reasons for and impact of untimely resolution. A prior review disclosed that program officials had given little attention to audit resolution.

*OAS; W-00-01-20003; A-12-01-00000*

*Expected Issue Date: FY 2002*

---

## **ADMINISTRATION ON AGING**

---

### **Critical Infrastructure Protection**

We will evaluate the Administration on Aging's (AoA) efforts to safeguard its critical infrastructure. Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 63, "Critical Infrastructure Protection," issued in May 1998, calls for a national effort to ensure the security of the increasingly vulnerable and interconnected physical and cyber-based infrastructures. Our review is part of the HHS-wide PDD 63 initiative.

*OAS; W-00-00-40001; A-12-00-00007*

### **Funding the Aging Network**

We will describe the response of State units on aging and area agencies on aging to a static funding level under the Older Americans Act and the effect on services to older Americans. The AoA funding to the aging agency network has remained essentially unchanged at about \$850 million for most of the 1990's. In response to level funding and an increased demand for services, State units on aging have sought funding from other Federal sources. We will determine how the additional funding sources have changed the service package offered to the traditional AoA population.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

### **Supportive Services**

In selected States, we will determine whether (1) AoA's supportive service programs duplicate other HHS programs, specifically Medicaid and Medicare, and (2) barriers continue to impede opportunities for expanding services. The AoA's supportive services, designed to enable older Americans to remain in their homes and communities, include transportation, in-home, community, and care giver support services. In FY 2000, about \$310 million is available

nationwide to fund these services; for FY 2001, HHS requested \$450 million, of which \$125 million is for services to support family care givers of older persons.

*OAS; W-00-01-20001; A-12-01-00000*

### **Followup on Long-Term-Care Ombudsman Program**

This followup review will examine the capacity of the long-term-care ombudsman program and report on trends in complaint data from the National Ombudsman Reporting System. In March 1999, we reported that the capacity of the ombudsman program to monitor and ensure quality of care in nursing homes was limited. We also found that ombudsman complaints were steadily increasing, including complaints about serious quality-of-care problems. We will examine changes in the process since our earlier reports.

*OEI; 00-00-00000*

### **Data Used to Support Performance Measures**

This review will examine AoA's use of State-supplied data for performance measurement. We will determine whether AoA takes adequate steps to screen State data for reliability and whether selected States have adequate controls in place to ensure that data are reliable and valid. In passing the Government Performance and Results Act, the Congress emphasized that the usefulness of agency performance reports was largely dependent on congressional confidence in the reported data. In response to concerns expressed by the House Appropriations Committee, AoA is developing and field-testing new performance outcome measures for the aging network

*OAS; W-00-01-20001; A-12-01-00000*