

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT REPORTING RECOMMENDATIONS
Performance, Simplicity, and Accountability

A Draft Report on the Performance Measurement Reporting
Procedures Prepared for the New York State Department of State
Appalachian Regional Commission Program Unit

July 9, 1997

Richard C. Sauerzopf

NYS ARC Graduate Intern to the Governor

Executive Summary:

ARC's performance measurement and reporting requirements are best understood within the contexts of the legal provisions contained within the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA); the performance management paradigm, upon which the GPRA is in part grounded; ARC's position vis a vis other relevant agencies of government, and the area development process itself.

Performance measurement and reporting should be implemented with an eye not only towards satisfaction of ARC requirements, but also with an understanding of the desirability of making performance measurement and reporting serve the area development process. Performance measurement and reporting should also be implemented in a fashion sensitive to the need to create procedures that are prima facie simple and achieve sufficient efficiencies and economies of scale. Performance procedures should contribute to, not detract from, overall program performance.

The nature of New York State's area development program, and logic intrinsic to performance measurement and reporting within an area development context, suggest a hierarchical, multi-state information flow from project to Commission. In this schema, the LDDs will act as the information collection, reporting, interpretation, and utilization hubs. This is desirable for a number of reasons that can be drawn from the present objective position of the LDDs within the development process.

The recommended information flow schema, outlined in this report, will as a matter of course require a multi-level information handling mechanism that will be facilitated by reporting and filing procedures and formats. This report lays a conceptual groundwork for such a system of reports and information collection, handling, and reporting procedures. This report presents schematic suggestions for report formats as well.

It should be understood that the format and procedural suggestions are, in fact, only schematic and are intended to indicate what sorts of information will need to be handled, how, and by whom. Whether the actual information system is composed of paper forms and reports or digital electronic impulses is at this point a secondary issue to the broad schema of information flow and the logic that informs it. However, there are clear advantages to using a unified electronic data base information storage format on the LDD level that should be explored.

More work needs to be done towards constructing a performance information system. Care should be taken to ensure that such a system is as consistent and simple as possible. A new system should mesh with the area development process in both substance and procedure.

In finding economies of scale, the author recognizes that his knowledge of current area development procedures is not complete. Therefore, there may be opportunities for achieving efficiencies through merging performance measurement and reporting procedures with current programmatic operations than are recognized here.

Prolegomenon: Contextualizing Performance Measures Within the Performance Management Paradigm

Mission, Accountability, and the Performance Management Paradigm

In compliance with the United States Government Performance and Results Act (or GPRA), the Appalachian Regional Commission is requiring its state offices to submit to the Commission information indicating program performance. This is the latest in a series of sequential GPRA requirements that the Commission must fulfill.

The purpose of GPRA is multiple and draws from a broader spirit-of-the-times that emphasizes agencies' effective and certifiable performance relative to carefully considered missions and mission-related goals. This emphasis on mission-based accountability has become the policy imperative of the day. This draws from at least two broad sources. There is an objective need to maximize the cost-effectiveness of government activities in a time of shrinking relative public expenditures. Further, this emphasis stems from a public agenda increasingly dominated by popular concerns over the effectiveness and worthiness of broad classes of governmental activities and expenditures. GPRA is in part a response to these concerns.

The mechanisms for mission-based accountability built into GPRA are legislative manifestations of the performance management paradigm. The performance management approach has its philosophical roots in the late Reginald Demming's theory of Total Quality Management or TQM. TQM is a business management philosophy long in vogue in corporate Japan and increasingly, in the United States. According to this approach, a corporation must first identify who its customers are and what they want. After this has been accomplished, firms need to make customer satisfaction, through the maximization of quality, the imperative of their corporate environment. All managerial and procedural reforms that a company engages in must have this imperative as their end. This is more important than procedural specifics. As the theory goes, if the structure of every corporate activity and practice is altered such as to maximize customer satisfaction through quality, then long-term corporate profits, satisfied and productive employees, shareholder returns, and other goods will follow.

GPRA is an interesting piece of legislation from the standpoint that it seeks to apply a version of Total Quality Management to the public sector. The performance management paradigm is TQM's

public sector analogue and differs from TQM insofar as the public sector differs from the private. The most critical difference is the difficulty in the public sector of identifying who the "customer" of an agency is. Much of the ambiguity associated with the performance management paradigm and GPRA itself draws from the multiplicity of potential "customers" or interested parties.

In an attempt to deal with this ambiguity, GPRA requires that agencies first identify those who have an interest in their successful operation and to work with these parties in the development of a mission statement and associated goals. Once this is done, agencies must develop strategies toward goal achievement and develop a system of reporting by which the effectiveness of strategies can be evaluated towards later adjustment or improvement. The accomplishment of a mission-based end through quality service is what connects performance measurement to TQM. It is the mission-based end that should ground determinations of specific programmatic reforms.

The Commission and the New York State Program Office have made considerable progress towards laying the groundwork of the performance management paradigm and GPRA compliance. A broad mission statement that identifies a service population and a vision for the future vis a vis that population has been developed, mission related goals have been identified, and strategies towards goal achievement have been developed. Because the Commission and the New York State Program Office have long operated a thoughtful program with an eye towards improving the lives of Appalachia's residents, initial work on fulfilling GPRA has mostly amounted to giving greater relevance and specificity to what were already deeply rooted public service priorities.

It is now time to develop a system of performance measure data collection and reporting that will fulfill the Commission's and GPRA's requirements. This represents a new project the instrumentalities of which should be pursued in light of ends intrinsic to performance management. The multi-level data collection and reporting required by GPRA might be viewed as an odious burden on the Commission, the states, the LDDs, and on project sponsors. GPRA, in fact, was enacted in part to enable Congressional evaluation of agency performance. Agencies must now justify, in quantitative terms, their continued funding.

However, there is a potential advantage to all program levels in implementing a performance measurement system. GPRA is intended to answer negative public perceptions of governmental programs

through increased agency focus and accountability. The GPRA performance information process will give agencies access to information by which they can certify their effectiveness in terms relevant to publicly recognized needs.

The GPRA process can also benefit an agency internally. The first stage, the clarification of priorities, is arguably a healthy periodic process for any organization. The latter stage of GPRA, accountability through performance measurement, has internal advantages as well. Through an efficient system using carefully selected indicators, every level of the a program can have access to information showing what approaches are most effective in producing good results. Assuming that clear development goals have been established, this information can facilitate professional judgement.

Therefore, the development and implementation of a performance measurement and reporting system should be done with facilitation of the area development process in mind. This point, originally offered by Dr. Sid Mann, indicates the greatest potential value to all levels of the ARC program, but particularly for the LDDs, of GPRA's requirement for mission-based accountability. The substantive use of performance information in the area development process, however, will require people who are interested in making performance-based judgements. Without this interest, GPRA will at best constitute an administrative hassle. At worst, it will actually decrease program performance as its fulfilling its requirements are allowed simply to consume valuable resources.

Considerations Preliminary to the Development of Performance Information Collection and Reporting Procedures

The below recommendations are made in light of GPRA's emphasis on performance management and of the need for information gathering and reporting procedures that are relatively simple and represent a minimal addition to staff work. In whatever procedure is decided upon, performance measurement data collection and reporting should be incorporated into other operating procedures. Performance measurement should not involve a wholly new and independent set of operations for the State Program Office or the LDDs. Incorporation has two justifications. It reduces the amount of work that needs to be done by staff through creating economies of scale. Such economies also create an environment whereby project performance is considered, in thinking, narratives, and procedure, in concert with area development priorities.

I would note before moving on to specifics that my recommendations are both flexible and simple. They are flexible from the standpoint that recommended procedures are fungible as long as changes are made in light of the substantial incorporation of process into the broader program and its development ends. Further, the recommendations below leave substantial room to the LDDs and program sponsors to determine project-specific measurement reporting requirements. They are also, in fact, simple. Though the below narrative may be somewhat lengthy due to my efforts toward specificity, the procedures outlined are recommended with an eye towards reducing logistical work and the confusion that less fully developed procedures can cause. More attention initially paid to the careful development of performance measurement information collection and reporting will translate into less confusion and work later.

A Note on Performance Indicators

The New York State ARC Program Unit staff, in consultation with Commission staff and the Local Development Districts, has made substantial progress on the development of performance measures. These efforts have resulted in guidelines for project-specific indicators that will have to be agreed upon by the LDDs, project sponsors, and eventually the State Program Office, project by project. A system of broad recommendations guiding project-level measure determinations prevents minute bureaucratic instrumentalities from dictating substantive project direction. This is significant as the ARC program's emphasis is on responding to local initiatives, not on the predetermination of every project approach.

However, in recommending individual indicators for project outputs and outcomes, the LDDs (and the State Program Office, where appropriate) should follow some general principles. Performance indicators, whenever possible, should be consistent in format to aggregate assessment information on the region already available to the State and LDDs through other agencies such as the Department of Education. Also, where possible, it should be information that is already gathered as a matter of course by the project sponsor or a related agency. These considerations, assuming substantive information requirements are met, might ease data collection and interpretation. Such economies of scale will also facilitate the incorporation of such information into narratives and thought on the region's overall condition.

Specific indicators should also be selected with an eye towards their usefulness in the area development process itself. This point is very important and means that indicator selection should be part of a continuous process whereby LDD staff asks what, given what is already known about the area, could this project's performance usefully tell us? And, what indicators, within broad and established information parameters, will show if this sort of approach is most effective in advancing area development? This will make project performance information gathered by the LDDs of cumulative value to their area development efforts and their guidance of project sponsors.

A Final Note

Ultimately, procedures themselves lack substance. As structures, they can encourage more substantial processes, but

they cannot determine them. It is up to individuals working together to decide whether or not information gathered and reported is done so in a fashion that substantially incorporates knowledge into future area development-related critical judgements.

Performance Data Collection and Reporting Recommendations

The narrative below is organized around the answering of a number of primary questions that the performance measurement and reporting requirements of GPRA raise. The recommendations are framed by an information flow dynamic represented by schematic diagrams. These recommendations also refer to the production of various information handling mechanisms and reports. Conceptual versions of these documents or files are also attached to the end of this report as appendices. These indicate the information that these files or reports will need to contain more than they do any specific layout or format (paper or digital).

I What Does the New York State Program Office Need to Accomplish and How?

The New York State ARC Program Unit's role in data collection and reporting will be relatively straightforward. Each year, Program Unit will need to collect project output and outcome information from the LDDs and report it to the Commission.

Recommendations

I recommend that performance data be reported in the following manner:

- 1) Collect project output and outcome data once a year from the LDDs.
--LDD reporting to the State would best be done in a formalized section of one of the two Semi-Annual Program Reports.
- 2) Sort output and outcome data by strategic goal and tally data in relevant categories.
- 3) Use the Annual Strategy Statement as a vehicle for reporting performance measures to the Commission.
- 4) Work performance data into brief narratives at the end of each goal-based section of the Annual Strategy Statement's Regional Analysis. These narratives should be written in relation to the general description of the area and any aggregate information on the area presented. Such narratives allow a substantive incorporation of information into a broader picture of the area and give the State a chance to highlight accomplishments of special note.
--Ultimately, area analysis and performance reporting should be integrated in form and content. I will propose methods to accomplish this in my forthcoming draft area analysis for the upcoming Annual Strategy Statement.
- 5) Provide a summary data appendix at the end of the Annual Strategy Statement's Regional Analysis, or as an addendum sent only to the Commission, whereby all outputs and outcomes reported for the year are tallied by goal and specific measure type.

--Incorporation of performance information into the Annual Strategy Statement has a number of advantages. It prevents the State Program Office from needing to produce a wholly separate performance measure report. Further, performance information and narrative would be automatically provided to anyone obtaining a copy of the Annual Strategy Statement. The fewer documents that the program office must handle, the better. Incorporation of this information into Strategy Statements also makes keeping a record of overall performance simple. Finally, this process encourages the consideration of overall performance within the context of area development priorities and needs.

Performance measure collection and reporting should constitute a simple processes for the New York State Program Office. However, it will require that the LDDs provide the State with annual performance data reports. Toward this:

5) The State Program Office will need to work with the LDDs and, perhaps to some extent with ARC staff, to develop specific procedures for information gathering and reporting. This will include the modification of existing policy documents to reflect new requirements. It will also involve the production and use of some new materials. These will be discussed in this report. A new program calendar will also have to be devised.

II What Will Be Required of the LDDs?

The Local Development Districts will be responsible for providing the State with overall project performance data each year. Therefore, a large proportion of the data handling work will need to be done by the LDDs. Accordingly, the recommendations that follow are designed with an emphasis on simplicity, specificity, and consistency.

1) The LDDs will need to provide the State Program Office with annual performance information in a single yearly report. As with the State's use of the Annual Strategy Statement, I recommend that the LDDs use one of their Semi-Annual Program Reports as a vehicle for the discussion and transmission of accumulated performance information to the State Program Office. I will call the performance report section of the Semi-Annual Program Report that contains it the Overall Performance Report or OPR.

Notes regarding OPRs:

--I recommend that an OPR due date be decided upon in conference with the LDDs. This date would preferably be between two weeks and a month before the Annual Strategy Statement final draft is to be finished. This may require a realignment of the due dates for the Semi-Annual Program Reports. Again, only one of these two reports will contain the OPR.

--The format of the OPR section should be consistent between the LDDs and from year to year. It should amount to a standard single form or set of project-level forms with blanks for project-level and/or cumulative data. I will make specific and detailed recommendations for a report format.

--The OPRs will include all of the output and outcome measures that are both due and available by the time the LDDs complete their reports for transmittal to the State Program Office. This issue, though prima facie straightforward, requires some discussion.

--Note on reporting dates:

It will not always be possible for the LDDs to receive all of the project output and outcome information that is due before OPRs are prepared. Therefore, the data collection and reporting methods recommended here will only require of the LDDs that all information is eventually reported, that all due and late information collected in a

given year be included in that year's end OPR, regardless of whether it was reported late, and that no datum be reported to the state twice. The responsibility for making sure that this is the case will be facilitated by the specific reporting recommendations made here.

2) The LDDs will need to work with individual project sponsors to settle on specific project performance indicators and project sponsor data collection strategies. They will need to determine who, exactly, will be contractually obligated to provide the LDDs with output and outcome information.

3) The LDDs will need to require project sponsors to report outputs and outcomes to them in a fashion that facilitates LDD preparation and timely transmittal of OPRs. The reports that project sponsors will need to submit to the LDDs I will call Project Performance Reports or PPRs.

--PPRs should as much as possible be new versions of, or additions to, whatever project reports are currently required by the LDDs or ARC. The format for PPRs should be consistent with the format for the LDD's OPR to ease LDD information handling. I will make specific report format recommendations.

--There should be a uniform annual deadline for PPRs. This date should be soon enough before the OPR deadline to allow the LDDs time to handle the information. If a PPR is transmitted to an LDD after transmission of the LDDs OPR, the information will simply have to be included in the next years' OPR.

4) Because individual project performance indicators will be multiple, and because outputs may be due a year or more before outcomes are due, the LDDs will need to maintain information handling systems that facilitate the organized collection and reporting of performance data over time. Such systems will allow LDD staff to tell at a glance what information they have, what they are expecting, what is late, and what information has already been reported to the State. I will make a recommendation for such a system below. It will involve, essentially, the maintenance and use of tracked project-level report cards (PRCs). The PRC recommendations I make here are for paper documents, but PRCs could just as well be digital files in a data base system. Information from project performance reports (PPRs) will be entered onto PRCs, and this information will

be used to create the LDD's Overall Performance Reports (OPRs). An individual PRC will indicate what information is due and when from the sponsor, what information has been received from the sponsor, and what information has been reported to the State.

III What Will be Required of Project Sponsors?

1) Project sponsors, working in consultation with the LDDs, will have to agree to methods and responsibility for information gathering and reporting. This process will begin with the guidance normally given to sponsors at the initial application phase.

2) Project sponsors will transmit performance information to the LDDs by agreed-to deadlines in the form of standard Project Performance Reports (PPRs).

--For simplicity, there should be one annual deadline for PPRs that applies to all of those due in a given year. This date will make information gathering and handling less confusing and time consuming for LDD staffers. The due date should be determined in consideration of the LDD's need to get the information in summary form (in the OPR) to the State.

--Because agreed upon outcomes will often come later than outputs, many project sponsors will need to submit at least two Project Performance Reports over time, one for outputs and another for outcomes.

--The total number of PPRs that a project sponsor is required to submit to the LDD should be kept to a minimum. Generally, there will be two such reports submitted, one with all of the outputs that will ever be reported and one with all of the outcomes that will ever be reported. However, there may be a few circumstances, particularly with outcomes, where some outcomes will be available to project sponsors significantly long before the final outcomes. In these circumstances, it may be desirable for the LDD to accept more than two PPRs from a project sponsor. This, however, will complicate matters as it will require LDDs to be careful in their handling of PRCs in order to keep track of what it has included in past OPRs so as not to transmit a datum to the state more than once.

--PPR information format will be consistent with that of the tracked project report card (PRC) maintained by the LDDs and with the LDD's OPR (Overall Performance Report section of the Semi-Annual Program Report). This means that the bulk of the report will be a standardized form. However, the report should include a brief narrative as well, dealing with any

substantive issues or non-quantifiable performance information.

--PPR blanks, along with a brief instruction/policy narrative, should be provided to project sponsors at the outset. Timely and complete submission of PPRs should be made a contractual obligation on the part of the project sponsor. However, LDDs may need to do some follow-up work to remind sponsors of their obligations.

IV Project Time Line

The below time line is offered to illustrate the performance information process by tracking a hypothetical and exemplary project from the initial stages of application through to the retirement of the project's performance file.

- 1) Initial project application is submitted.** This application will have a preliminary discussion of possible performance indicators and proposed data collection methods.
- 2) Initial project application is accepted.** At this time, work on agreed upon indicators and reporting responsibility should be underway.
- 3) Roadshow.** Here, a final consultation on performance measures, methods, and responsibility is made which includes representatives from the State Program Office and ARC.
- 4) Final application is submitted.** This application will include a final narrative on output and outcome data reporting deadlines and responsibility.
- 5) Final application is approved and a contract is awarded.**
 - Responsibility and details for project performance reporting should be a contractual obligation. The number, due date, and content of each expected PPR should be made explicit.
 - Project sponsors should be provided with blank PPRs at this time.
- 6) A fresh Project Report Card or PRC for the project is initiated by the LDD.**
- 7) Project output information due date arrives.**
 - Output information will be reported to the LDD in the Output Project Performance Report. This will preferably be due on a universal date affecting all project sponsors with information due that year. The due data should be a few weeks before the LDD must transmit this information, as part of its Overall Performance Report, to the State

Program Office. This information is entered on the project's PRC by LDD staff. It is preferable that all outputs that a project will ever report be reported at the same time, in one PPR, to the LDD. This principle holds for outcome PPRs as well. The fewer the number of PPRs, the fewer times the LDD has to handle project-level information in incoming PPRs, in their PRCs, or in the OPR, the better. However, if all outcome or all output information is not due at once, or all is not available at once, then more than two PPRs may need to be submitted, data from a project will be included in more than two OPRs, and so on, thus complicating LDD information tracking.

8) The LDD submits its annual Overall Performance Report to the State Program Office.

--This report is part of one of the two Semi-Annual Program Reports transmitted by the LDDs to the office and includes the output information reported by the project sponsor in the output Project Performance Report. In fact, the OPR includes all information gathered from project sponsors by the LDD in that year. LDDs will sweep all active project report cards PRCs in search of information that is ready to report. As information from PRCs is included in OPRs, the PRCs are marked and re-filed to indicate a progression as information is gathered, reported, and transmitted to the State.

9) The New York State ARC Program Unit takes all performance information (outputs and outcomes) from the LDDs and includes it in the Annual Strategy Statement for submission to ARC.

10) Project outcome information is due to be sent to the LDD by the project sponsor/designated party.

--An outcome PPR is prepared. This initiates an information cycle involving the PRC, OPR, and Annual Strategy Statement identical to that for outputs outlined above.

11) All project performance information has been received by the LDD and transmitted to the state in OPRs, the projects PRC is complete and retired. A copy of the complete PRC is transmitted to the State for records.

The above is an ideal scenario. Most likely, in any given year, the LDDs will have some difficulty getting information from all of their project sponsors. Therefore, the LDDs may institute standard procedures for reminding sponsors of their obligations and following up when information is not provided on time.

V Information Flow Diagrams

Following are two information flow diagrams. The first is an overall performance information flow chart that illustrates in an elementary fashion the transmission of performance information from project sponsors to successively higher administrative levels. This chart does indicate that the LDDs will as a matter of course be responsible for a considerable amount of the information handling work.

In order to handle this work, I have suggested that the LDDs devise a standard information handling system composed of progressive files and individual Project Report Cards. The second information flow chart is a schematic construct of such a system. While one can easily imagine a series of individual project level hard copy Report Cards moving from paper file to paper file, this system could just as well be an electronic one. An electronic data base performance information system might facilitate more dynamic manipulation and use of performance information. Data base filing would allow LDD staff to access instantly, for instance, all project sponsors that owe information in a given year, all projects that are completed, all projects that are from group 2, whether completed or not, et cetera. Further, through selective merge writing and printing, an electronic data base information system would facilitate the regular contacting of project sponsors who owe, or will owe, performance reports (PPRs). Selective merge printing would also allow the LDDs to provide project sponsors with Project Performance Reports that are already nearly complete insofar as all of the general information is concerned. However, a paper version would itself be rather simple and useful.

Regardless of form, the proposed filing system should facilitate the easy collection, handling, and reporting of project performance data to the State and other interested parties. It should also facilitate LDD internal use of performance information.

VI Sample Documents

The above report calls for the production and handling of some performance report documents (the Project Performance Report, the Overall Performance Report, and Annual Strategy Statement Area Assessment) and an information filing document (or electronic data base file) called the Project Report Card. This section presents suggestions for the content of these items.

A paper document's layout or an electronic file's format are less important at this point than the content of these items. Therefore, the suggestions below amount to a list of the information that will be required on these documents, not suggestions for specific forms or formats. It is my goal to anticipate the sorts of information that will be necessary to include in these items in order to facilitate the efficient and accurate handling, and effective use, of performance information.

A) The Project Performance Report or PPR

The PPR will be submitted to the LDD independently or as part of whatever periodic reports are currently submitted to the LDD. As few of these reports should be submitted to the LDD by a project sponsor as possible. There should be one overall due date for all project information due in a particular ARC program year. On or before this date, all project sponsors with performance information due will send a PPR to the LDD. Information due dates (years) and the information anticipated will be determined before project initiation. Therefore, much of the information in the PPR, such as anticipated outputs, will be available at the time of contract approval. The reporting sections of the PPR outlined below offer a number of information blanks. The blanks for anticipated information can be filled out upon project initiation. (Perhaps they should be.) For most projects, many of these blanks will be irrelevant. They are included here as an illustration of the sorts of contingencies, such as multiple output types and cumulative reporting over time, that might arise.

Ideally, a project sponsor will submit one report for all outputs immediately after project completion and another, somewhat later, for all promised project outcomes. A few projects may only require one PPR total, including all outputs and outcomes. This is especially the case for water and sewer projects. However, some project sponsors may have difficulty realizing all of their outcomes or outputs within a neat period of time. It is these sponsors who will be sending in more than two PPRs and who will need to distinguish newly reported outputs or outcomes from cumulative performance information. Making such a distinction, which the below framework allows, necessary.

General Information

1. Date of report submission:
2. Date report due:
3. Project name:
4. Project sponsor:
5. Project administrator:
6. Approved contract period by start and completion dates:
7. Extension end date (if any):
8. Project description (one sentence):
9. Contractual performance information provider (if different from sponsor):
10. Performance information contact:
11. Project status - was the project completed?

Performance Information:

Instructions: this report should be used to indicate to your Local Development District what outputs and outcomes your project has accomplished. You must take care to indicate to the LDD what information included in this report is new and what has already been reported to the LDD in a previous Project Performance Report. You may limit the information included on this report to new information, as the LDD has a record of all previously reported information.

Project Performance Narrative:

Performance reporter may write a brief narrative on project performance, discussing non-quantitative aspects of performance or explaining any special problems or advantages associated with project performance or performance measurement.

PPR page 2

Output Performance Information:

Output 1

output description:

total outputs anticipated at project beginning:

output accomplishment due date:

new outputs (that have not been reported before):

cumulative outputs achieved (if different from above):

Output 2

output description:

total outputs anticipated at project beginning:

output accomplishment due date:

new outputs (that have not been reported before):

cumulative outputs achieved (if different from above):

Output 3

output description:

total outputs anticipated at project beginning:

output accomplishment due date:

new outputs (that have not been reported before):

cumulative outputs achieved (if different from above):

Discussion of any additional outputs:

Outcome Performance Information:

Outcome 1

outcome description:

total outcomes anticipated at project beginning:

outcome accomplishment due date:

new outcomes (that have not been reported before):

cumulative outcomes achieved (if different from above):

Outcome 2

outcome description:

total outcomes anticipated at project beginning:

outcome accomplishment due date:

new outcomes (that have not been reported before):

cumulative outcomes achieved (if different from above):

Output 3

outcome description:

total outcomes anticipated at project beginning:

outcome accomplishment due date:

new outcomes (that have not been reported before):

cumulative outcomes achieved (if different from above):

Discussion of any additional outcomes or special problems,
clarifications:

Person Completing this Report _____

B) The Project Report Card

The Project Report Card, or PRC, is the vehicle by which the LDDs will handle all project Output and Outcome information. This document or file and its filing system really will be the backbone of the performance information system. It will enable the tracking of information owed, received, and transmitted to the State. The PRC filing system will allow the LDDs to send information reporting reminders or follow-ups to project sponsors in an organized fashion. And, it will allow LDDs to get an immediate handle, at any time, on performance information by project year, information-related date, or information type.

Below is something of a listing of information that should be included on the PRC. Each datum may either be a line on a standard paper form or a field in an electronic data base file. The latter, in the long run, would probably be more useful and easy to handle.

General Information

1. Date PRP initiated:
2. Project name:
3. Project sponsor:
4. Project administrator:
Name-
Title-
Address-
5. Approved contract period by start and completion dates:
6. Extension end date (if any):
7. Project description (one sentence):
8. Contractual performance information provider (if different from sponsor):
9. Performance information contact:
10. 1) Name-
Title-
Address-
2) Name-
Title-
Address-
11. Project status:
Has the project been completed?

12. PRP file status: check off as report card progresses through LDD information system.

- 1) New project report card. date
- 2) All project outputs have been reported to LDD by sponsor. date
- 3) LDD has reported all outputs to DOS. date
- 4) All project outcomes have been reported to LDD by sponsor. date
- 5) All anticipated outputs and outcomes have been reported to DOS by LDD. PRP retired and copy transmitted to DOS. date
- 5b) Project report card has been retired incomplete and transmitted to DOS. date

Performance Information

Anticipated outputs and outcomes, and information due dates, should be filled in upon PRC initiation. Most of the blanks below will be redundant for most projects. There are so many information options due to the need here to cover contingencies.

PRC page 2

Output Performance Information:

Output 1

Output description:

ARC goal area:

Total outputs anticipated at project beginning:

Output accomplishment due date:

New outputs reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

New outputs reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

Total outputs:

Output 2

Output description:

ARC goal area:

Total outputs anticipated at project beginning:

Output accomplishment due date:

New outputs reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

New outputs reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

Total outputs:

Output 3

output description:

ARC goal area:

total outputs anticipated at project beginning:

output accomplishment due date:

new outputs reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

new outputs reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

total outputs:

Discussion of any additional outputs or special problems:

Have all expected outputs been reported to DOS? |_____|

PRC page 3

Outcome Performance Information:

Outcome 1

Outcome description:

ARC goal area:

Total outcomes anticipated at project beginning:

Outcome accomplishment due date:

New outcomes reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

New outcomes reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

Total outcomes:

Output 2

Outcome description:

ARC goal area:

Total outcomes anticipated at project beginning:

Outcome accomplishment due date:

New outcomes reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

New outcomes reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

Total outcomes:

Output 3

Outcome description:

ARC goal area:

Total outcomes anticipated at project beginning:

Outcome accomplishment due date:

New outcomes reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

New outcomes reported:

 date reported:

 date transmitted to DOS:

Total outcomes:

-Discussion of any additional outcomes or special problems:

-Have all expected outcomes been reported to DOS? | _____ |

PRC page 4

-Attachment: Attach all received Project Performance Reports (PPRs) to the end of this file.

C) The Overall Performance Report

An Overall Performance Report (OPR) is the vehicle I propose by which LDDs would transmit performance information the ARC Program Office. These three LDD reports, essentially identical in format, would contain a strategic goal-based summary of all of the output and outcome information collected by the respective Local Development Districts in a given year. The OPR, for reasons discussed above, should be a portion of one of the LDD Semi-Annual Progress Reports. OPRs would best be due two weeks to a month before the State Program Office must complete its Annual Strategy Statement.

Prior to preparation of the OPR, LDDs will need to make a survey of all of their Project Report Cards and tally all of the performance information that has been reported by project sponsors to the LDD, but not reported by the LDD to the State. This information will then be entered in the year's end OPR. Only information that has heretofore never been reported to the State by an LDD should be included in an OPR.

OPR Information Format

--Goal 1

Output Information

Output type 1:

Output description:

Output 1 quantity:

Output type 2:

Output description:

Output 2 quantity:

et cetera on output types.

Outcome Information

Outcome type 1:

Outcome description:

Outcome 1 quantity:

et cetera on outcome types.

--Goals 2-5 (repeat format)

--Regional Initiatives (repeat format)

--Odds and ends with explanation (repeat format)

Attachments:

Attach photocopies of relevant Project Report Cards. It might be desirable (and easy) to have LDDs attach copies of all PRCs that contain information contributing to the OPR.