

## Reviewing Workshop Participation in the QPR/PPR: Tip Sheet

Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood (HMRF) clients will not be able to benefit from grant programming if they do not participate in it. Therefore, the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) has developed performance measures to help HMRF grantees monitor and improve clients' participation in workshops. Sections B-02 of the quarterly progress report (QPR) and C-04.1-2 of the semiannual program progress report (PPR) are designed to help grantees track client participation in primary and optional workshops. Templates of each report are available on the HMRF Grantee Resources site ([HM versions](#) and [RF versions](#)). This tip sheet describes how workshop participation is reported, using references to PPR sections. It explores how grantees can review their progress toward the annual targets they set for ACF's primary workshop participation (PWP) measures.

Grantees should consider the timing of each QPR and PPR relative to their programming to determine whether they are on track to meet their PWP targets and other participation goals by the end of the grant year, or whether they need additional strategies to improve client participation.

### Initial participation (PPR Section C-04.1)

This section of the PPR is designed to help grantees monitor when clients typically participated in programming after enrollment. Grantees can use this to determine whether clients' initial participation in program services aligns with their service delivery plans.

In Section C-04.1 (see box at right), grantees can monitor how quickly clients who enrolled in the current grant year participated in a program service (either a workshop or individual service contact [ISC]). The lower half of the table focuses on when clients participated in an initial workshop session after enrollment. (The QPR presents only the workshop session portion of this table.)

This table considers client receipt of any type of ISC (including reminder-only, substantive, or other) and participation in any type of workshop (primary or optional).<sup>1</sup> It includes a set of columns for each population a grantee enrolls and serves in the grant year, regardless of whether it has participation goals for that population. The denominator in the percentage column includes all clients or couples in that population who were enrolled during the grant year to date. Couple units are counted rather than each partner; couples are considered to have participated in an initial service when either partner receives an ISC or the couple receives one together, or when both partners attend or make up a workshop session together.

1. Initial Participation		
	Adult couples	
	#	% <sup>a</sup>
<i>Participated in their first <u>program service</u> (workshop session series occurrence or individual service contact) during the time period shown</i>		
<i>Within 1 week of program enrollment</i>	2	1.7%
<i>Between 2 and 4 weeks of program enrollment</i>	94	80.3%
<i>Between 1 and 2 months of program enrollment</i>	1	0.9%
<i>More than 2 months since program enrollment</i>	0	0%
<i>Not yet participated in a service</i>	20	17.1%
<i>Participated in their first <u>workshop session series occurrence</u> during the time period shown</i>		
<i>Within 1 week of program enrollment</i>	2	1.7%
<i>Between 2 and 4 weeks of program enrollment</i>	94	80.3%
<i>Between 1 and 2 months of program enrollment</i>	1	0.9%
<i>More than 2 months since program enrollment</i>	0	0%
<i>Not yet participated in a workshop session series occurrence</i>	20	17.1%

<sup>1</sup> PPR Section C-04.3 focuses on substantive ISCs.

The example Section C-04.1 in the box shows that most enrolled couples (80.3 percent) participated in their first program service between 2 and 4 weeks of their enrollment; the bottom half of the table clarifies that was through participating in a workshop (rather than receiving an ISC). The grantee in this example might determine that this aligns with its service delivery plan, if engaging couples in workshop programming within a month of enrollment seems to improve the grantee’s ability to retain couples in programming.

However, the example also shows that 20 couples have not participated in any program service. The grantee can review the data export or the ISC and primary workshop participation detailed operational reports to identify these 20 couples and determine whether they are recent enrollees on track to participate within their first month of enrollment, or whether case managers should conduct focused outreach to reengage them in programming.<sup>2</sup>

## Attendance at workshops (PPR Section C-04.2a)

This section of the PPR is designed to help grantees monitor attendance at each primary and optional workshop offered that had at least one session series end within the reporting period. Grantees can use this report section to monitor retention by workshop for clients or couples who have been enrolled since the start of the grant year and attended or made up at least one workshop session.

This section of the PPR includes all clients enrolled in the grant year to date, regardless of whether the grantee has participation targets for that population. This section particularly helps grantees that offer more than one workshop monitor for potential differences in attendance across workshops.

(See example in box at right.)

2a. Attendance at Workshops				
The table(s) in this section reports participation only for session series that are completed.				
<b>Primary Population Served:</b> <i>Adult couple</i> <b>Workshop Name:</b> <i>Relationships 101</i> <b>Workshop Activities:</b> <i>Divorce reduction; Reduction of disincentives to marriage; Marriage and relationship education-skills (MRES); Marriage enhancement; Marriage mentoring; Pre-marital education</i> <b>Workshop Type:</b> <i>Primary</i> <b>Workshop Curricula:</b> <i>Love Notes</i> <b>Workshop Elements:</b> <i>Financial management; Parenting skills</i>				
	Adult couples		Adult individuals	
	#	% <sup>a</sup>	#	% <sup>a</sup>
<b>Workshop Retention</b>				
Did not attend any workshop session series hours	0	0%	0	0%
Attended 1 to 24 percent of all workshop session series hours	0	0%	0	0%
Attended 25 to 49 percent of all workshop session series hours	5	5.2%	0	0%
Attended 50 to 74 percent of all workshop session series hours	4	4.1%	0	0%
Attended 75 to 89 percent of all workshop session series hours	22	22.7%	1	100%
Attended 90 to 99 percent of all workshop session series hours	0	0%	0	0%
Attended 100 percent or more of all workshop session series hours	66	68%	0	0%
<sup>a</sup> Denominator is all clients/couples enrolled during reporting period who are registered for/or attended the named workshop.				

<sup>2</sup> Because all grantees are required to offer primary workshops, we recommend using the primary workshop detailed report as it includes all enrolled clients, including those who have not yet participated in a primary workshop session. The session series attendance report can also be used to monitor workshop participation, but grantees should keep in mind that this report includes only clients who were registered for or attended a workshop series.

The header of each table in this section includes the workshop set-up information that the grantee entered into nFORM<sup>3</sup>. Each table aggregates attendance information for all series of that primary or optional workshop that ended within the reporting period. As in Section C-04.1 (and in accordance with ACF policy), attendance for couples is counted only when both partners attend or make up a workshop session together.

In the example Section 2a (see example in box above), the grantee offered only one workshop in the current grant year: a primary workshop called Relationships 101 that uses the Love Notes curriculum. Therefore, only one table appears in the PPR. The grantee intended for this workshop to support adult couples, but an adult individual also attended this workshop in the reporting period. In this example, the grantee can see that although two-thirds (66) of the couples participated in the full workshop, a third (31) of the couples who had the opportunity to complete programming did not. The grantee can use the data export or the PWP detail operational report to identify these 31 couples and investigate why they did not complete programming. This information could help the grantee develop strategies for improving retention in future workshops.

## Primary workshop participation (PPR Section C-04.2b)

This section of the PPR is designed to help grantees monitor their clients' participation in primary workshops compared with the annual targets a grantee sets for hours of participation (Section C-04.2b Table 1) and for the number of clients who will achieve each participation benchmark (Section C-04.2b Table 2). Both tables include participation data for clients who have attended at least one primary workshop session, even if a client dropped out before completing the program. Attendance is counted for all primary workshop sessions in which attendance has been fully recorded, including completed session series as well as those that are still in progress. The calculations do not include sessions for which one or more registered clients have **not** been marked as having attended or not attended. Consistent with Sections C-04.1 and C-04.2a, and ACF policy, attendance for couples is counted only when both partners attend or make up a workshop session together.

**PPR Section C-04.2b Table 1.** Table 1 provides the average number of primary workshop hours a grantee's clients have completed to date compared with the grantee's current target for PWP hours. Information on cumulative participation to date is organized by the grant year in which clients enrolled. Grantees can use Table 1 to monitor average hours of participation for recently enrolled clients; Table 1 also helps grantees assess how their clients' average hours might differ by the grant year in which clients enrolled.

In the example Table 1 below, adult couples enrolled in Grant Year 1 had the lowest average PWP hours. However, couples enrolled in Grant Year 2, on average, met the grantee's 12-hour target.

**2b. Primary Workshop Participation**

The tables in this section report participation in all session series, both series that are completed and series that are still in progress, where attendance has been fully recorded.

**Table 1: Cumulative participation in primary workshop hours through end of reporting period**

Adult couples	Target hours (current grant year)	Average hours	Average %
Grant year 3— Participation in primary workshop hours for clients enrolled in grant year 3	12	10.5	87.5%
Grant year 2— Participation in primary workshop hours for clients enrolled in grant year 2	12	12	100%
Grant year 1— Participation in primary workshop hours for clients enrolled in grant year 1	12	10	83.3%

NOTE: Table 1 includes clients/couples enrolled from start of grant year 1 through reporting period end date who have attended at least one primary workshop session.

Refer to the notes above and below each table as reminders about the data it includes.

All client participation in Table 1 is compared with the grantee's target hours for the current grant year. If a grantee's target hours change over time, clients are compared to the current target rather than the target when they enrolled.

<sup>3</sup> For more information on setting up workshops in nFORM, grantees can review the [Setting Up Workshops Properly in nFORM 2.0](#) tip sheet available on the HMRP Grantee Resources site.

When reviewing Table 1, grantees should consider the time frame that the quarterly report covers and when during the grant year clients typically enroll and participate. The average hours in this table could be affected if recently enrolled clients have not yet had the chance to achieve the primary workshop hours target for their population. For example, if the table represents a grantee’s PPR for the first six months of Grant Year 3, the grantee could use the series session attendance and primary workshop participation detailed operational reports to identify the number of clients enrolled so far in Grant Year 3 who have not yet had a chance to achieve PWP benchmarks (described below for PPR Section C-04.2b Table 2) and complete the target number of PWP hours. The grantee could then provide this information in their quarterly progress narrative.

**PPR Section C-04.2b Table 2.** Table 2 displays the progress a grantee has made toward its current grant year target for each PWP benchmark. ACF’s PWP benchmarks are initial attendance, halfway attendance, completion (of 90 percent of target hours), and fully finished (100 percent or more of target hours). For each benchmark, the client counts are reported by the grant year in which clients enrolled as well as combined in the Total Clients column. This table, in conjunction with Table 1, allows grantees to determine whether clients are completing primary workshops at the expected rate or if additional strategies are needed to improve retention.

Table 2 counts only clients who meet a participation benchmark in the current grant year (see example below). Clients enrolled in previous grant years (Columns GY1–GY2 in the example) will only be counted in Table 2 when they achieve benchmarks in the current grant year. Cells in the columns for the prior grant year enrollees are not cumulative – those clients will be included in multiple rows only if they achieved more than one benchmark in the current grant year.

In the example Table 2, the two fully finished adult couples who enrolled in Grant Year 1 (Column GY1) and attended at least 100 percent of primary workshop hours in the current grant year met the other participation benchmarks in prior grant years. This is clear from the example Table 2, because no couples enrolled in Grant Year 1 met any of the other benchmarks in Grant Year 3. In the GY2 column, the four fully finished couples would count toward the other benchmarks only if they achieved those benchmarks in Grant Year 3. The extent of client overlap across the counts in the GY2 column is not clear in this example Table 2.

**Table 2: Achievement of participation benchmarks during reporting period**

Adult couples	Count of clients achieving benchmark in current grant year				Target count of clients for bench-mark (TGT)	Percent of target met (PCT=TC/TGT)
	Clients enrolled in grant year 1 (GY1)	Clients enrolled in grant year 2 (GY2)	Clients enrolled in grant year 3 (GY3)	Total clients (TC=sum of all GYs)		
Benchmarks for participation in primary workshops (BP)						
Initial attendees: Attended at least one primary workshop session	0	3	40	43	90	47.8%
Halfway attendees: Attended at least 50% of primary workshop hours	0	2	32	34	80	42.5%
Completed clients: Attended at least 90% of primary workshop hours	0	5	20	25	70	35.7%
Fully finished clients: Attended at least 100% of primary workshop hours	2	4	18	24	60	40%

NOTE: Table 2 includes clients/couples enrolled from start of grant year 1 through reporting period end date who have achieved at least one benchmark during the selected reporting period; only clients in populations with participation benchmark targets in the selected reporting period are included. Enrollment numbers for the current grant year may be found in QPR Section B-01. For other grant years, refer to past QPRs/PPRs or the enrollment tab of the query tool.

All clients who achieve a benchmark in the current grant year will count toward the grantee’s annual target for the benchmark, even if they enrolled in a prior grant year.

If clients are not receiving the target hours of primary workshops (Table 1), and fewer clients than expected are reaching the Completed or Fully Finished benchmarks, make sure that your workshop setup in nFORM includes the correct number of PWP hours for each workshop series

By contrast, clients enrolled in the current grant year (Column GY3 in the example above) are counted for every benchmark they achieved, because all of their participation to date is within their grant year of enrollment. In the example, the 18 clients who are counted as fully finished in the GY3 column are also included in the counts for the other three benchmarks because they also achieved those benchmarks this year. Grantees can use the primary workshop participation detailed operational report or the data export to identify the clients in each cell of Table 2.

For each PWP benchmark, Total Clients (column TC in the example) is compared with the grantee's target count for that benchmark to calculate the Percent of Target Met (PCT). In the example Table 2, the 43 clients who attended their first primary workshop session by this point in the grant year (3 of whom enrolled in GY2 and 40 in GY3) represent slightly less than half (47.8 percent) of the grantee's target of 90 initial attendees for GY3.

As a reminder, grantees should consider the point in the grant year that the QPR or PPR reflects relative to their programming to determine whether they are on track to reach their targets by the end of the grant year. If example Table 2 covers the first two quarters of the grant year, and the grantee starts new client cohorts throughout the year, the grantee might expect to be about halfway to its goal for initial attendees after two quarters. However, if the grantee starts new cohorts only every October, they might expect to have met 100 percent of their target count for initial attendees after two quarters.



Contact the nFORM 2.0 help desk with any questions at [nform2helpdesk@mathematica-mpr.com](mailto:nform2helpdesk@mathematica-mpr.com). We are happy to help!

This tip sheet was prepared by Hannah McInerney and Grace Roemer of Mathematica, Washington, DC, (2023) under contract with the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHSP233201500035/75P00120F37054). OPRE Project Officers: Katie Pahigiannis, Pooja Gupta Curtin, Harmanpreet Bhatti, and Rebecca Hjelm. Mathematica Project Director: Grace Roemer.