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This summary outlines information that the ECTA Center has gathered from your state’s APR or SPP.

Updated information about how your state is measuring and using the family outcomes data will help ECTA provide higher quality TA. Please verify that the information we have provided below is correct for your state. If you see information that is incorrect or would like to provide any missing information, please let us know so we can update it. Send corrections to: Siobhan Colgan at siobhan.colgan@unc.edu.

The profile is divided into three sections:

I. Approach information and survey methodology
II. Data quality
III. Performance trends

I. Approach information and survey methodology
- Survey used for C4: State Developed Survey
- Scoring cutoff/scoring metric used: Not reported
- Timing: Point in time survey of all families conducted annually
- Family population: Six months or longer
- Sampling plan: No
- Sampling type: Na
- Distribution: Multiple methods
- Return approach: Multiple
- Online version: Yes
II. Data Quality

This section reports state response rate and representativeness of data by different subgroups. ECTA encourages states to use several approaches to examine the quality of their data, including response rates and proportions of respondents representing various subgroups. Many factors impact survey response rates, and response patterns often differ among subgroups (e.g., those from different geographic regions, those having different family reading levels, etc.).

- State response rate: 18.72% [Average response rate across the 56 states and territories reporting: 39.72%]
- State included response rates by subgroup: Yes
- State reported data were representative: No
- Comparison data used for the representativeness analysis: Other
- State examined subgroups to determine representativeness of the surveys: Yes
- Subgroups used to determine representativeness of the surveys:
  - Race or ethnicity: No
  - Program location or region: Yes
  - Child’s gender: Not reported
  - Other variables: Not reported

*Comments about representativeness included in APR:* The Family Survey workgroup recommended a more family friendly language for the three questions reported on above. The responses demonstrate an insignificant change in responses from FFY 2016 to FFY 2017. Responses to the family survey were analyzed by state region to evaluate whether the responses were reasonably representative of the statewide population served. As indicated in the table below, the percent of statewide responses received for each region was reasonably consistent with the percent of surveys distributed statewide for each region. Responses to the family survey are analyzed to assess the representativeness of the response group. The data is not representative of the statewide population by race and ethnicity.

III. Performance Trends

- State examined family outcomes by subgroups: Yes
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