



December 13, 2017

Performance Audit

Performance Monitoring of Social Service Contracts

Department of Family and Community Services

Report No. 16-108



**CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
OFFICE OF INTERNAL AUDIT**

PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT
PERFORMANCE MONITORING OF SOCIAL SERVICE CONTRACTS
DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY & COMMUNITY SERVICES
REPORT NO. 16-108

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Findings:	
1. DFCS Should Establish an Effective Process for Monitoring the Performance of Social Service Contracts.	3
2. DFCS Should Establish an Efficient Process for Monitoring the Performance of Social Service Contracts.	9
Conclusion	11
Appendix A – Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	13
Appendix B – FY16 Social Service Contracts with Performance Monitoring and Objective Issues	15

Performance Monitoring of Social Service Contracts

Performance Audit

December 13, 2017

Audit #16-108

The purpose of this audit was to determine if the Department of Family and Community Services has an effective and efficient process for monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts

Executive Summary

The Department of Family and Community Services (DFCS) is responsible for monitoring Social Service Contracts to ensure compliance with all City, State, and Federal regulations that govern the Social Service Contracts administrative, financial and programmatic operations.

Performance monitoring is performed to ensure social services are provided in accordance with each contract, funding is spent for its designated purpose, and performance objectives are accomplished within the time of performance.

In fiscal year 2016, DFCS had a passive performance monitoring process for over half of the department's Social Service Contracts. Fifty-nine percent of the contract files, totaling approximately \$33.2 million, had little or no evidence of performance monitoring and reporting, or did not meet the 90 percent performance objective requirement. As a result, DFCS does not have an adequate process to ensure that established performance objectives are accomplished, and renewed 83 percent of Social Service Contracts with performance monitoring issues.

DFCS should establish an effective and efficient process for monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts. By establishing a consistent, standard and centralized process for monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts, DFCS management can ensure that expected outcomes are met, and the City fully benefited from the provided services.

DFCS concurred with the first finding, but did not concur with the second finding. However, DFCS will consider implementing the recommendation of the second finding if funding is available.

Recommendations

• • •

DFCS should:

- Establish a consistent, standard and documented process to monitor the performance of Social Service Contracts.
- Ensure that all performance monitoring staff are trained on new and existing policies and procedures to ensure the consistent application of the monitoring and progress reporting requirements.
- Ensure that Social Service Contracts are annually monitored with a consistent process to determine if performance objectives are met.
- Create a centralized process that will allow DFCS management and program managers to actively manage the performance of Social Service Contracts.



City of Albuquerque

Office of Internal Audit

December 13, 2017

Accountability in Government Oversight Committee
P.O. Box 1293
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

Audit: Performance Monitoring of Social Service Contracts
Department of Family & Community Services
Audit No. 16-108

FINAL

INTRODUCTION

The Office of Internal Audit (OIA) completed a performance audit of the Department of Family & Community Services (DFCS) process for monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts. This audit was not included in OIA's fiscal year 2016 (FY16) audit plan but was initiated as a request from the Albuquerque City Council (Council). Information pertaining to the audit objectives, scope and methodology can be found in **Appendix A**.

DFCS's mission is "to improve the quality, delivery, and effectiveness of health, social, recreational, nutritional, educational, housing, and other human service programs for residents of the Albuquerque metropolitan area; to increase the available services through resource sharing and coordination; and to improve the quality of life for low and moderate income residents."

A Social Services Contract is a contract with a private, nonprofit, or public governmental agency for social services in return for the payment by the City of Albuquerque (City) of costs associated with the provision of social services, including, but not limited to, the costs for labor, supplies, operating expenses, equipment, and the acquisition or improvement of real property.

DFCS is responsible for monitoring contractor's performance to ensure compliance with all City, State, and Federal regulations that govern the Social Service Contracts administrative, financial and programmatic operations. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring services are provided according to each contract, funding is spent for its designated purpose, and performance objectives

are accomplished within the time of performance. The audit specifically focused on DFCS's performance monitoring of Social Service Contracts.

At the request of Council, OIA tested 100 percent of the entire population of active Social Service Contracts during FY16. Testing an entire population is unique and requires additional time to complete. OIA typically tests a statistical random sample that represents the entire population.

For each contract file, OIA reviewed the following:

- Correspondence, monitoring documentation, and progress reports to determine if performance monitoring was performed by DFCS,
- Performance objectives to determine compliance with the contract requirements,
- Corrective action measures for contracts for performance objectives that were partially or not met, and
- Documentation to support contract renewals.

The City's FY16 Budget appropriated funding to 188 funding sources for Social Service Contracts totaling \$62.3 million. OIA tested 162 contract files totaling \$56.9 million. Seventeen funding sources were excluded from testing for the following reasons:

- 10 - Contracts were not established in FY16,
- 3 - Contracts were completed prior to FY16,
- 1 - Contract was associated with a project that the City was ordered to place on hold by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD),
- 1 - Contract had a time of performance outside the scope of the audit,
- 1 - Contract was associated with a project that never started, and
- 1 - Contract was terminated by the vendor.

Glossary of Terms

Social Services Contract Procurement Rules and Regulations

Regulations to establish policies, procedures, and guidelines related to the procurement, management, and control of Social Services Contracts.

Administrative Requirements

Uniform administrative rules that govern the City's Social Service Contracts awarded by DFCS.

Performance Objectives

Measureable requirements established in each contract that are used to determine if the major tasks of the contracts have been completed.

Progress Reports

Periodic communications prepared by the contractor to communicate the status of the performance objectives.

Performance Monitoring

The inclusive monitoring process used by DFCS to ensure contractors are meeting performance objectives.

Corrective Action Measures

Proactive activity and communication to bring non-compliant contractors into compliance with performance objectives.

90 Percent Performance Objective Requirement

The City's *Social Services Contracts Procurement Rules and Regulations*, require DFCS staff to determine if contractors have met at least 90 percent of the performance objectives stated in the Social Service Contract for two consecutive years prior to contract review, and it has been determined that extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the Contractor did not preclude its ability to meet the goals, the contract shall not be renewed and future contracts for these Social Services shall be procured by RFP.

COSO Framework

The Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO) developed the *Internal Control-Integrated Framework (COSO Framework)*, to assist organizations in "designing, implementing, and conducting internal control and assessing its effectiveness." The *COSO Framework* has gained global acceptance and is considered best practices for internal controls. OIA uses the *COSO Framework* as a standard by which to measure the design and effectiveness of internal controls.

FINDINGS

The following findings address areas that OIA believes could be improved by the implementation of the related recommendations.

1. DFCS SHOULD ESTABLISH AN EFFECTIVE PROCESS FOR MONITORING THE PERFORMANCE OF SOCIAL SERVICE CONTRACTS.

DFCS's performance monitoring process is not effective for identifying and addressing non-compliance with performance objectives. DFCS does not have a consistent, standard or documented process for monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts.

DFCS used a passive performance monitoring process for over half of FY16's Social Service Contracts. Fifty-nine percent (95 of 162 contracts) of the contract files, totaling approximately \$33.2 million, had little or no evidence of performance monitoring and reporting, or did not meet the 90 percent performance objectives requirement. In addition, corrective action plans for addressing non-compliance were not always created or documented as required by the *Administrative Requirements*.

As a result, DFCS does not have an adequate process to ensure that established performance objectives are accomplished, and renewed 83 percent (79 of 95 contracts) of Social Service Contracts with performance monitoring issues. Information pertaining to the specific contracts with performance monitoring issues can be found in **Appendix B**.

Further details are provided in the following sub-sections that explain DFCS’s inconsistent, and generalized performance monitoring process for Social Service Contracts.

Inconsistent Performance Monitoring Process

DFCS does not have a standardized or consistent process for monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts. For example, four of seven DFCS sections overseeing Social Service Contracts did not maintain supporting documentation for performance monitoring activities or follow a consistent performance monitoring process. Interviews with program managers and review of contract file documentation revealed that performance monitoring activities are not uniform across the department.

Of the 162 contract files tested, 95 (59 percent) had one or more issues relating to performance monitoring, progress reporting, and/or compliance with the 90 percent performance objective requirement. The table below summarizes the number and dollar amount of contracts that did not have evidence of performance monitoring and/or did not meet the 90 percent performance objectives requirement. Although some performance objectives were partially met, as a whole, the contractors included in the table below did not meet the 90 percent requirement for all objectives.

FY16 Contracts with Performance Monitoring Issues

Performance Monitoring Issue	Number of Contracts	Contract Amount	Performance Objectives Partially Met (1)	Performance Objectives Not Met (1)	Renewed	Not Renewed	On Hold/In Process (1)
Contractors that did not meet the 90-percent performance objective requirement	32	\$6,405,104	27	5	29	3	
No evidence of DFCS performance monitoring or Contractor progress reporting	29	\$3,084,900			24	5	
No evidence of DFCS performance monitoring	20*	\$21,818,516	4	4	13	2	5
No evidence of Contractor progress reporting	14	\$1,942,009			13	1	
Total	95	\$33,250,529	31	9	79	11	5

* Of the 20 contractors, 12 were not monitored, but met performance objectives
 (1) – Gray areas indicate not-applicable

Source: DFCS Files

DFCS program managers noted the following reasons for the inconsistent performance monitoring process:

- There is not a standard or documented process for monitoring contractor performance of Social Service Contracts,
- Was not aware of how performance monitoring process was performed, but is anxious to learn the process, and
- The practices of the past administration are followed.

Of the 95 contracts with performance monitoring issues, 63 had little or no evidence of performance monitoring or reporting. For example, 14 contracts had no evidence of progress reporting. Contractors are required to report on project activities as required by the *Administrative Requirements*. The *Administrative Requirements* state, “As required in the contract but no less than quarterly, Contractors shall submit a summary report on progress toward meeting the measurable objectives included in the Work Plan on forms specified by the Department.”

DFCS management stated that progress reports were not submitted by the 14 contractors because the services are fee based, and the agency is only reimbursed for the services they provide. However, if the 14 contracts are considered and appropriated as Social Service Contracts, they must comply with all required rules and regulations including the *Administrative Requirements* for Social Service Contracts.

DFCS program managers also stated that the lack of evidence for performance monitoring was due to the following:

- Performance monitoring and progress reporting was not:
 - Completely documented,
 - Maintained by their predecessor,
 - Performed due to personnel issues, or
 - Completed because it had not yet occurred;
- Discussions happened telephonically and in face-to-face meetings;
- Monitoring staff did not know documentation retention was required; and
- Practices of the past Administration were followed.

The City’s *Social Services Contracts Procurement Rules and Regulations* states:

All contracts shall be monitored annually prior to contract renewal to determine if the service performance standards/goals established by the Department have been met. The Department shall keep for public inspection written documentation of whether goals have been met. Because the contracting process requires a determination of goal

compliance prior to the completion of the funding year, the Department reserves the right to make a determination of whether goals were met, based on a history of the prior year(s) goal performance, the Contractor's performance to date, and the Contractor's anticipated performance in achieving the goal in the current year.

The *COSO Framework* acknowledges that policies reflect management's statement of what should be done to effect control. According to the *COSO Framework*, Principle 14, Management selects, develops, and deploys controls that help ensure that information is shared through internal communication and that help management and other personnel carry out control responsibilities across multiple functions, operating units, or divisions." Principle 14 implies that information should be communicated and shared uniformly within an organization to ensure that processes are consistent.

General Policies and Procedures

The existing *Administrative Requirements*, which have not been updated since 2010, generalize performance monitoring requirements but do not include sufficient detail to standardize and ensure the consistent application of performance monitoring of Social Service Contracts. For example, Section E(1)(a)(i) of the *Administrative Requirements* states, "Verify project outcomes and determine if services were provided in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and procedures." However, the *Administrative Requirements* do not reference steps, forms, processes, or examples of a standard approach.

The *COSO Framework*, Principle 12, states that management should periodically reassess policies and procedures and related control activities to determine their continued relevance and effectiveness, and should revise them when necessary.

DFCS management stated that they realize they need to improve the performance monitoring process, and have started meeting with the program managers to address issues identified during the audit. DFCS management also stated that revisions to the requirements are usually performed every four to six years and/or when fund regulations drastically change.

RECOMMENDATIONS

DFCS should:

- Establish a consistent, standard and documented process to monitor the performance of Social Service Contracts. This process should include:
 - Standardized forms, record requirements, retention schedules,

- performance reporting requirements, and detailed processes;
- Review and update the *Administrative Requirements* to ensure performance monitoring of all Social Service Contracts.
- Determine and document a review schedule for updating and revising the *Administrative Requirements*.
- Ensure that all performance monitoring staff are trained on new and existing policies and procedures to ensure the consistent application of the monitoring and progress reporting requirements.
- Ensure that Social Service Contracts are annually monitored with a consistent process to determine if performance objectives are met.
- Ensure progress reports are received for all Social Service Contracts, including fee based contracts.
- Determine whether services that are fee based should be categorized and appropriated as Social Service Contracts.

RESPONSE FROM DFCS

“DFCS concurs and management recognizes the opportunity to improve the performance monitoring process. DFCS has commenced meeting with the program managers to compile, review, and formalize current processes and resources. DFCS will implement a consistent and documented core process for monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts. This process will include DFCS standardized forms, monitoring schedules, record requirements, retention schedules, performance reporting requirements, and detailed procedures. However, due to the variety of funding sources (federal, state, county, city, charitable grant, etc.), absolute uniformity is not an appropriate goal. Flexibility is required to meet the requirements of the various oversight agencies related to the specific funding sources.

“Processes and resources will be documented in DFCS policies and procedures which will be maintained separately from the Administrative Requirements for Social Service Contracts. The Administrative Requirements are guidance for contractors, not DFCS staff. DFCS will, however, complete a review and update of the Administrative Requirements including determining and documenting a review schedule for updating and revising the Administrative Requirements.

“Training of all appropriate staff will immediately follow the completion of the document review and completion. DFCS finds significant flaws in the contract tables exist leading to inaccurate indicators. First and foremost, no formal guidance was cited for the determination that Professional/Technical Contracts issued by DFCS must be monitored as Social Service Contracts. DFCS has found

no basis for the statement, “if the 14 contracts are considered and appropriated as Social Service Contracts, they must comply with all required rules and regulations including the Administrative Requirements for Social Service Contracts,” nor the recommendation, “Ensure progress reports are received for all Social Service Contracts, including fee based contracts.”

“Article 5 of the Albuquerque Code of Ordinances defines these contracts as follows:

“PROFESSIONAL/TECHNICAL SERVICES: Those services performed by or under the direction of a licensed professional, other professional technician, or other person with technical training, as more particularly defined by the City Purchasing Officer.

“SOCIAL SERVICES: A social services contract is a contract with a nonprofit organization or public agency for social services in return for the payment by the city of costs associated with the provision of social services, including, but not limited to, the costs for labor, supplies, operating expenses, equipment, and the acquisition or improvement of real property.

“DFCS relies on City Code and Procurement rules and requirements with regard to all contracts. The mischaracterization of DFCS Professional/Technical Contracts alone affects at least twenty contracts in the table. The report references only 14 fee-based contracts.

“Inaccuracies in the table also lead to misleading counts. For example, the City of Albuquerque Department of Senior Affairs Agreement and UNM Health Sciences Center Contracts were both monitored. Monitoring reports for both remain in the respective folders. In the Exit Conference on November 1, the definition of “Performance Monitoring?” was provided as an on-site visit. The definition in the report has been expanded to “Evidence to substantiate verification of performance objectives when monitoring completed by DFCS personnel.” On-site visits evaluate compliance with administrative, regulatory and other such requirements. Performance evaluation may be part of the visit, but performance monitoring is also accomplished through reports, invoices and other ongoing processes. Additionally, it should be noted that on-site monitoring occurs throughout the fiscal year. At the time of the actual on-site monitoring, the agency may, in fact, be on target for achieving their performance goals. As such, there would not be a corrective action plan contained in the monitoring report. Further performance monitoring is conducted utilizing the other processes referenced above.

“Not all activities are currently kept in the folders reviewed for this audit including phone call conversations, meetings, presentations and other verbal communications are often part of the technical support and guidance process with contractors. Going forward, any forms of performance monitoring will be maintained in the contract files for compliance and auditing purposes.”

“As noted in the “90 Percent Performance Objective Requirement” definition, DFCS makes determinations regarding circumstances when renewing contracts. Renewals of a contract are allowable even if some performance objectives were partially met. The report did not take into account the Department’s determination regarding circumstance, despite the auditors having received documentation of such determinations. The Administrative Requirements also specify “in the event of a conflict between the contract and the Administrative Requirements, the contract will take control.”

“As specified in the report, “the City’s Social Services Contracts Procurement Rules and Regulations, require DFCS staff to determine if contractors have met at least 90 percent of the performance objectives stated in the Social Service Contract for two consecutive years prior to contract review, and it has been determined that extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the Contractor did not preclude its ability to meet the goals, the contract shall not be renewed and future contracts for these Social Services shall be procured by RFP.” Many of the contracts cited in the table were renewed through procurement by RFP, or were in year 1 of the RFP cycle. As such, it was within the guidelines to renew those contracts.”

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATES

“June 30, 2018”

2. DFCS SHOULD ESTABLISH AN EFFICIENT PROCESS FOR MONITORING THE PERFORMANCE OF SOCIAL SERVICE CONTRACTS.

DFCS does not have a centralized document, system, or process to manage the performance of Social Service Contracts that would enable management to identify contractors that are due for performance monitoring or not meeting performance goals. The current process relies on program managers regularly updating DFCS management on the performance of Social Service Contracts.

However, it is not possible for program managers to update management if the program managers are not actively monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts. In FY16,

three of seven program managers passively managed the performance of the Social Service Contracts they oversaw.

Without a consistent and centralized process to determine the status of performance objectives, DFCS management cannot actively manage performance activity to ensure that expected outcomes have been met for the \$62.3 million appropriated to Social Service Contracts in FY16 and future social service contract appropriations.

DFCS management stated that they realize they need to have a consistent and actively managed process, and will address this during the updates to the procedures. A centralized system or process will enable management to actively manage the performance of Social Service Contracts in a timely manner.

Principle 13 of the *COSO Framework* states:

Maintaining quality of information is necessary to an effective internal control system, particularly with today's volume of data and dependence on sophisticated, automated information systems. The ability to generate quality information begins with the data sourced. Inaccurate or incomplete data, and the information derived from such data, could result in potentially erroneous judgments, estimates, or other management decisions. The quality of information depends on whether it is accessible, correct, current, protected, retained, sufficient, timely, valid, and verifiable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

DFCS should:

- Create a centralized process that will allow DFCS management and program managers to actively manage the performance of Social Service Contracts. Ideally, this process should include electronic configuration to maximize the communication of information, such as a case management system.
- Consider creating a specialized position to implement, coordinate, track, train, communicate, and manage the performance monitoring process of Social Service Contracts.

RESPONSE FROM DFCS

“DFCS does not concur with Finding 2. DFCS has performed monitoring of social service contract in accordance with Department’s Administrative Requirements. However, DFCS will consider implementing an electronic configuration and creating a specialized position if funding is provided.”

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATES

“To be determined based on funding.”

CONCLUSION

DFCS should establish an effective and efficient process for monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts. By establishing a consistent, standard and centralized process for monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts, DFCS management can ensure that expected outcomes are met, and the City has fully benefited from the provided services.

An effective and efficient performance monitoring process will enable DFCS management to actively manage the overall performance of Social Service Contracts, as well as identify and address non-compliance with performance objectives.

We greatly appreciate the assistance, involvement, and cooperation of the DFCS management and staff. Their time, assistance, involvement and cooperation are greatly appreciated.

Senior Information Systems Auditor

Principal Auditor

REVIEWED & APPROVED:

APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION:

Lawrence L. Davis, Acting City Auditor
Office of Internal Audit

Chairperson, Accountability in
Government Oversight Committee

APPENDIX A

OBJECTIVES

The audit objectives were to determine:

1. Does the Department of Family and Community Services (DFCS) have an efficient process for monitoring the performance of Social Service Contracts?
2. Is DFCS's Social Service Contract monitoring process effective for identifying and addressing non-compliance with performance objectives?

SCOPE

Our audit did not include an examination of all functions and activities related to Social Service Contracts. Our scope was limited to the objectives above.

This report and its conclusions are based on information taken from all Social Service Contracts in effect as of June 30, 2016 and does not represent an examination of all related transactions and activities. The audit report is based on our examination of activities through the completion of fieldwork on September 14, 2017 and does not reflect events or accounting entries after that date.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

METHODOLOGY

Methodologies used to accomplish the audit objectives include but are not limited to the following:

- Reviewed policies and procedures to gain an understanding of the monitoring process of social service contracts;
- Determined if policies and procedures are up-to-date;
- Interviewed DFCS management to determine the process for monitoring performance of contractors providing social services;
- Reviewed DFCS files maintained for each contractor;
- Reviewed progress reports submitted by contractors;
- Verified whether contractors met performance measures;

Performance Monitoring of Social Service Contracts
DFCS
December 13, 2017

16-108

- Tested all active FY16 Social Service Contracts;
- Reviewed performance monitoring performed by DFCS personnel; and
- Reviewed correspondence between DFCS personnel and the contractors.

APPENDIX B

FY16 Social Service Contracts with Performance Monitoring and Objective Issues

Agency	Contract Amount (1)	Performance Monitoring? (2)	Progress Reporting? (3)	Performance Objectives Met? (4)	Corrective Action? (4)	Contract Renewed? (4)
Atrisco Heritage Foundation	\$40,000	No	No		No	Yes
Associated Builders and Contractors	\$15,000	No	No		No	Yes
Northern NM Independent Electrical Contractors Association	\$15,000	No	No		No	Yes
Greater Communities	\$6,000	No	No		No	No
Greater Communities	\$10,000	No	No		No	Yes
APS - Albuquerque Public Schools	\$180,000	No	No		No	Yes
Canteen	\$300,000	No	No		No	Yes
Catholic Charities	\$173,000	No	No		No	Yes
Cuidando Los Ninos	\$207,000	No	No		No	Yes
Sherrel Rohrig - Disabilities Program Consultant/CDC	\$25,000	No	No		No	Yes
Sandra Jan Wayland - Nurse	\$30,000	No	No		No	Yes
Sandra Jan Wayland - Disabilities Coordinator	\$30,000	No	No		No	Yes
Anna Nunez - Consultant/Systems Coordinator	\$20,000	No	No		No	Yes
Lydia Montoya - Nutritionist	\$30,000	No	No		No	Yes
Gregory Webb - Program Consultant	\$40,500	No	No		No	Yes
Crossroads for Women	\$142,000	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
New Day	\$51,000	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
New Mexico AIDS services	\$27,510	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
New Mexico Coalition to End Homelessness	\$57,640	No	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
Albuquerque Health Care for the Homeless	\$665,215	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
New Mexico Coalition to End Homelessness	\$56,100	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
New Mexico Coalition to End Homelessness	\$23,038	No	Yes	Yes		Yes

Performance Monitoring of Social Service Contracts
DFCS
December 13, 2017

16-108

Agency	Contract Amount (1)	Performance Monitoring? (2)	Progress Reporting? (3)	Performance Objectives Met? (4)	Corrective Action? (4)	Contract Renewed? (4)
New Mexico Coalition to End Homelessness	\$55,291	No	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
St. Martin's	\$146,880	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
St. Martin's	\$70,000	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
CLN Kids	\$204,191	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
St. Martin's	\$112,200	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
St. Martin's	\$72,000	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Albuquerque Housing Authority	\$250,700	Yes	Yes	Not Met	Yes	Yes
YDI	\$131,280	No	Yes	Yes		No
CLN Kids	\$29,000	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
Barrett Foundation	\$25,000	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
United Way	\$100,000	No	No		No	No
ABC Comm Schools (County MOU) / Charter EMSI	Rate charged per meal (5)	No	No		No	Yes
NM National Dance Institute	\$76,400	No	No		No	Yes
ABC Comm Schools/Charter EMSI	\$113,900	No	No		No	Yes
Homework Dinner/ Community Schools		No	No		No	Yes
APS	\$80,000	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
People Helping People	\$45,000	No	No		No	Yes
APS / EMSI	\$1,122,100	No	No		No	Yes
Angela Nichols	\$5,000	No	No		No	Yes
La Vida Felicidad, Inc.	\$210,000	No	Yes	Not Met	No	Yes
Bernalillo County Youth and Senior Services	\$100,000	No	No		No	Yes
City of Albuquerque / Senior Affairs	\$6,778,894	No	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
Comfort Keepers, Inc.	\$54,000	No	No		No	No
Premier Home Healthcare, Inc.	\$210,000	No	No		No	Yes
Share Your Care, Inc.	\$686,000	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
Share Your Care, Inc.	\$129,000	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
Cottonwood Healthcare, Inc. DBA Right At Home, Inc.	\$22,055	No	Yes	Not Met	No	Yes
UNM Health Sciences Center	\$67,000	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Addus Healthcare, Inc.	\$210,000	No	Yes	Not Met	No	Yes

Performance Monitoring of Social Service Contracts
 DFCS
 December 13, 2017

16-108

Agency	Contract Amount (1)	Performance Monitoring? (2)	Progress Reporting? (3)	Performance Objectives Met? (4)	Corrective Action? (4)	Contract Renewed? (4)
Curtis Graf, PH.D.	\$45,000	No	Yes	Not Met	No	No
Village of Tijeras	\$100,000	No	No		No	Yes
Greater Albuquerque Housing Partnership (GAHP) - Cuatro Construction Loan	\$2,416,000	No	Yes	In Process		In Process
Sawmill Community Land Trust - Madera Crossing Construction Loan	\$4,149,288	No	Yes	In Process		In Process
UR 205 Silver, LLC	\$3,350,000	No	Yes	In Process		In Process
Wesst Corp.	\$25,000	No	No		No	No
Office of Neighborhood Revitalization (6)	\$1,045,850	No	Yes	Partially Met	Project put on hold	
Sawmill Community Land Trust	\$500,000	Yes	Yes	Not Met	Yes	Yes
Greater Albuquerque Housing partnership (GAHP) - Casa Feliz Construction Loan	\$2,800,000	No	Yes	In Process		
Little Globe	\$12,000	No	No		No	No
Albuquerque Health Care for the Homeless	\$38,760	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
First Nations	\$204,387	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	Yes
Engender	\$187,500	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	No
Life Quest	\$25,000	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	Yes
Rape Crisis Center	\$317,000	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	Yes
PB & J	\$77,520	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	Yes
Supportive Housing Coalition	\$298,000	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes, start-up FY16
Albuquerque Health Care for the Homeless	\$129,400	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
St. Martin's	\$43,040	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	Yes
Project Share/St. Martin's	\$15,400	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	Yes
UNM/AMCI (Metro Intake)	\$983,581	Yes	Yes	Not Met	Yes	Yes
Working Classroom	\$85,600	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	No

Performance Monitoring of Social Service Contracts
 DFCS
 December 13, 2017

16-108

Agency	Contract Amount (1)	Performance Monitoring? (2)	Progress Reporting? (3)	Performance Objectives Met? (4)	Corrective Action? (4)	Contract Renewed? (4)
YDI Youth Development Inc.	\$188,630	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	Yes
YDI Youth Development Inc.	\$101,700	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	Yes
Albuquerque GED	\$76,500	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	Yes
All Faiths Receiving Home	\$96,830	Yes	Yes	Not Met	No	Yes
AHCH - ABQ Healthcare for the Homeless - Jail Re-entry	\$125,000	Yes	Yes	Not Met	No	Yes, start-up FY16
APS - Albuquerque Public Schools/FAST Program	\$152,850	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	No	Yes
Community Dental Services	\$315,280	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	No
Resources Inc. / Domestic Violence Prevention	\$153,510	Yes	Yes	Partially Met	Yes	Yes
A New Awakening	\$75,000	Yes	No		No	Yes
Bosque Mental Health Associates	\$75,000	Yes	No		No	No
Common Sense Consulting	\$126,055	Yes	No		No	Yes
Counseling World, LLC	\$75,000	Yes	No		No	Yes
Engender, Inc.	\$524,000	Yes	No		No	Yes
Evolution Group	\$173,900	Yes	No		No	Yes
Infinite Possibilities	\$75,000	Yes	No		No	Yes
Juntos Podemos, Inc. II	\$342,050	Yes	No		No	Yes
Mano de Ayuda	\$128,661	Yes	No		No	Yes
NM Solutions (Behavioral Health Services, LLC DBA NM Solutions)	\$75,000	Yes	No		No	Yes
RavenSnow	\$75,000	Yes	No		No	Yes
St. Martin's Hospitality Center	\$47,343	Yes	No		No	Yes
Tandy Counseling	\$75,000	Yes	No		No	Yes
Albuquerque Behavioral Health LLC	\$75,000	Yes	No		No	Yes
Total	\$33,250,529	49 (No)	43 (No)	40 (Partial/Not)	68 (No)	79 (Yes)

- (1) - For some contracts this will be an aggregate amount consisting of multiple funding sources
- (2) - Evidence to substantiate verification of performance objectives when monitoring completed by DFCS personnel
- (3) - Evidence of progress reporting received from contractor
- (4) - Gray areas indicate not-applicable
- (5) - Child Meals - Breakfast \$1.47, Lunch \$2.60, and Snack \$0.80; Adult Meals - Lunch \$3.00
- (6) - Contract amount is a combination of prorated amounts from Memos Of Understanding during 1/1/2015-6/30/2016 & 1/1/2016-6/30/2017 to reflect the amount during FY2016