Welcome

• Purpose of Training
• How the session will be organized
• Your Trainers
• All information is provided in the PART Guidance at www.omb.gov/part
Overview – First Half

• Why PART?
• Where We Are Now
• PARTWeb and ExpectMore.gov
• The PART Guidance
• Schedule
Why PART?

- Evaluate programs in a systematic, consistent, and transparent manner.
- Inform agency and OMB decisions on resource allocations.
- Focus on program improvements that can include specific actions related to management, legislative or regulatory improvements, and funding.
- Establish accountability for performance.
- PART strengthens and reinforces GPRA-mandated performance reporting.
Where We Are Today
Distribution of Cumulative Ratings 2002 - 2006

Results Not Demonstrated  Ineffective  Adequate  Moderately Effective  Effective
Programs Improve

Distribution of 2006 PART Ratings of Programs Initially Assessed in 2002

- Effective: 5% (2002) vs 14% (2006)
- Ineffective: 5% (2002) vs 5% (2006)
- Results Not Demonstrated: 50% (2002)
Programs Improve

Distribution of 2006 PART Ratings of Programs Initially Assessed in 2003

Effective: 21%
Moderately Effective: 30%
Adequate: 22%
Ineffective: 4%
Results Not Demonstrated: 23%

Percentage of Assessments: 2003 2006
PART Scores and Ratings (p. 62)

• Answers to questions generate scores which are weighted to tally a total score.

• Ratings based on total scores: Effective, Moderately Effective, Adequate, Ineffective.

• Results Not Demonstrated assigned to programs that do not have performance measures or data, regardless of overall score.
How Do I Get Started? (pp. 4-7)

• Determine the Program Type
  – Block/Formula Grant
  – Capital Assets and Service Acquisition
  – Competitive Grant
  – Credit
  – Direct Federal
  – Regulatory-based
  – Research & Development

• Flag potential issue with questions: \textit{weights}
  and those \textit{not applicable}
How is an Assessment completed?

- Close, cooperative OMB and Agency Staff participation.

- Process for completing PART questionnaire varies from agency to agency
  - Kick-Off
  - Review of Agency Draft Responses
  - Iterative/Collaborative Process

- Evidence is required for “Yes” answers
PARTWeb is the online system used to enter PART answers and evidence, performance data, and follow-up actions.

ExpectMore.gov provides the public access to PARTs and PART Summaries.

PARTWeb generates PART Summaries for ExpectMore.gov.
PARTWeb v3.0.4
Search for a Program in PARTWeb
Register New Program Assessment in PARTWeb
ExpectWare.gov Batch Report
Nuclear Physics
Edit Program
User Permissions
Create New Assessment
2005 Update Assessment
Edit Assessment
Fall Updates
PART Summary
Funding Accounts
Question Answers
Answer Question 1.1
Question Weights
Performance Measures
Follow-up Actions
Administration
Users
Import Program
Change Password
PARTWeb How-to's
Contact Us
Logout

Is the program purpose clear?

DIRECT FEDERAL PROGRAM QUESTION 1.1

Answer: Yes

Explanation:
The mission of the Nuclear Physics (NP) program is to foster fundamental research in nuclear physics that will provide new insights and advance our knowledge on the nature of matter and energy and develop the scientific knowledge, technologies and trained manpower that are needed to underpin DOE missions.

Evidence:
FY04 Budget Request (www.mbe.doe.gov/budget/04-budget/index.htm), Public Law 95-115, that established the Department of Energy (DOE). The NP Mission has been validated by the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee (NSAC).

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Purpose of the question: to determine whether the program has a focused and well-defined mission.

Elements of a Yes answer: a Yes answer would require a consensus of program purpose among interested parties (e.g., Congress, Administration, public) and a clear and unambiguous mission. Considerations can include whether the program purpose can be stated succinctly. A No answer would be appropriate if the program has multiple conflicting purposes.
PARTWeb Performance Measures
Entry Screen

**PARTWeb v3.0.7**
- Search for a Program in PARTWeb
- Register New Program Assessment in PARTWeb
- Export More.gov Batch Report

**Prison Construction 2005 Update Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Construction Cost per bed for Medium Security Facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>$74,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>$76,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>$81,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>$84,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>$86,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>$88,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>$92,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>$94,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Annual     | Outcome         | Critical Systems Equipment Replacements in Accordance with Industry Standards. |
| 2004       | Target | Actual State |
| Baseline   | 15%    |              |
| 2005       | 25%    |              |
| 2006       | 27%    |              |
| 2007       | 30%    |              |
| 2008       | 40%    |              |
| 2009       | 50%    |              |
The Federal Government is working to ensure its programs perform well. Here we provide you information about where we’re successful and where we fall short, and in both situations, what we’re doing to improve our performance next year.
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Early Reading First
The Early Reading First (ERF) program is designed to implement research-based early literacy programs in already existing preschool programs to enhance the early language, literacy, and prereading development of preschool-aged children.

PERFORMING
⭐⭐ Moderately Effective

- The program addresses a compelling need. Studies show that a high percentage of children from low-income families attend preschools that often fail to provide the language, cognitive, and early reading instruction and activities needed. The Early Reading First program is intended to address the gaps in quality between low-income children and their peers of higher socioeconomic status.

- The program is reaching its original performance targets. The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in ERF programs who demonstrated age-appropriate oral language skills increased from 26 percent in 2004 to 67.9 percent in 2005.

- The Department of Education has recently established new performance measures in the areas of significant literacy gains and program efficiency.

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:

- Collecting data for the new measures: significant gains in early literacy skills, and the cost per preschool-aged child participating in Early Reading First programs who achieves significant gains.
- Implementing a measure of kindergarten readiness by requiring entities that receive a grant for a second three-year period to collect former participants’ academic achievement in kindergarten.
- Updating the recent performance data on the program’s website as they become available.
ExpectMore.gov Assessment Details

DETAILED INFORMATION ON THE
EARLY READING FIRST ASSESSMENT

- View this program’s assessment summary.
- Visit ExpectMore.gov to learn more about how Federal Government programs are assessed and their plans for improvement.
- Learn more about detailed assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>1003322</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Title</td>
<td>Early Reading First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Name</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency/Bureau Name</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type(s)</td>
<td>Competitive Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Year</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Rating</td>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Section Scores</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Purpose &amp; Design</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Results/Accountability</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Funding Level (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2006 $103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2007 $103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2008 $115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Program Improvement Plans
- Program Performance Measures
- Questions/Answers (Detailed Assessment)

Program Improvement Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Began</th>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Collecting data for the new measures: significant gains in early literacy skills, and the cost per preschool-aged child participating in Early Reading First programs who achieves significant gains.</td>
<td>Action taken, but not completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Began</th>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Implementing a measure of kindergarten readiness by requiring entities that receive a grant for a second three-year period to collect former participants’ academic achievement in kindergarten.</td>
<td>No action taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Began</th>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Updating the grantees’ performance data on the program’s website as data become available.</td>
<td>Action taken, but not completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Performance Measures
PART Questions

• Grouped into four sections
  – I. Program Purpose and Design (20%)
  – II. Strategic Planning (10%)
  – III. Program Management (20%)
  – IV. Results (50%)
Section I: Program Purpose and Design (pp. 16-22)

- 20% weight of the total PART score
- Clarity and relevance of program purpose
- Soundness of program design
- Addresses program’s structural issues
- Clear design and purpose an essential for identifying performance measures
- Question 1.4 (Design Flaws) requires evidence to justify a “No” (p. 18)
Section II: Strategic Planning
(pp. 23-37)

- 10% weight on the total PART score with linkages to Section IV questions
- Addresses program’s plans and approach to achieve specific long-term goals
- Programs must have long-term and annual performance measures
- Programs must have ambitious targets
- Evaluation of program effectiveness and to support performance improvement
Section III: Program Management (pp. 38-54)

- Addresses elements related to managing a program to achieve performance goals
  - Accountability of managers, performance of partners
  - Coordination with related programs
  - Financial management, improving efficiency
  - Addressing deficiencies

- To get a “Yes” on Question 3.4, programs must have procedures in place to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness

- 20% weight on the total PART score
Section IV: Program Results/Accountability (pp. 55-61)

• Assesses the extent to which a program is achieving its long-term and annual performance goals and efficiency goals

• Reporting of actual performance compared to targets (identified in Sections II and III)

• Effectiveness in achieving goals based on independent evaluations

• Comparison of performance with similar programs

• 50% weight on the total PART score
## Required PART Question Linkages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If Q2.1=&quot;no&quot;</th>
<th>Q2.2</th>
<th>Q2.3</th>
<th>Q2.4</th>
<th>Q2.5</th>
<th>Q4.1</th>
<th>Q4.2</th>
<th>Q4.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must answer &quot;no&quot;</td>
<td>Must provide explanation of how annual performance goals contribute to long-term outcomes and purpose to receive a &quot;yes&quot;</td>
<td>Must answer &quot;no&quot; if both Q2.1=&quot;no&quot; and Q2.3=&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td>Must answer &quot;no&quot; if adequate outcome (or output) measures are not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Q2.3=&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must answer &quot;no&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Q2.1=&quot;yes&quot; and Q2.2=&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not higher than &quot;small extent&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Q2.3=&quot;yes&quot; and Q2.4=&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Q.3.4=&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must answer “no”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2007 PART Schedule (p. vii)

• Agencies Complete PART Drafts by March 30\textsuperscript{th}.

• Consistency Check and Review of Performance Measures – April 30\textsuperscript{th} to May 4\textsuperscript{th}.

• Appeals due by May 25\textsuperscript{th}.

• Complete PART Summaries & Improvement Plans for ExpectMore.gov July 9\textsuperscript{th}.

• Data Entry Locked on August 3\textsuperscript{rd}.

• PARTs published on ExpectMore.gov in mid-August.
Performance Measures (pp. 7-11)
(Questions 2.1-2.4, 4.1-4.2)

• Outcome

• Output

• Efficiency (In addition questions 3.4, 4.3)
  – Outcome efficiency
  – Output efficiency
  – Input productivity
Outcomes – Events or conditions external to the program and of direct importance to the public, beneficiaries and/or customers. They relate to the program’s mission, purpose and strategic goals.

Outputs – Internal program activities; products and services delivered to the public, beneficiaries.
Efficiency Measures

• Reflect economical and effective acquisition, utilization, and management of resources to achieve program outcomes or produce program outputs.

• Can also reflect improved design, creation, and delivery of goods and services.
Efficiency Measures

• **Outcome efficiency**
  – Preferred type of performance measure that captures improvement in efficiency with respect to a program’s outcomes.

• **Output efficiency**
  – Performance measure that captures improvement in efficiency with respect to a program’s outputs.

• **Input productivity**
  – Ratio of an outcome or output to an input.
Efficiency Measures

• PART requirements:
  – Outcome efficiency measures should consider the benefit to the customer.
  – Output efficiency measures should reflect efficient resource use rather than other changes.
  – Measures that involve a baseline, standard, or benchmark must have a history of changes.
  – Include inputs for Federal and non-Federal resources for programs that combine them.
Output Efficiency Measures
Fiscal Year Comparison
(Appendix D)

• In comparisons of among time periods, output efficiency measures are only valid when the outputs intended to be produced within each time period are comparable.

• The PART requires an assessment of the comparability of an input productivity measure when it is used as output efficiency measures.
Performance Goals (pp. 11-12)

• Targets – Improved level of performance needed to achieve stated goals.

• The PART requires programs to have ambitious but realistic, achievable targets and timeframes for performance measures. (also Questions 2.2, 2.4, 3.4)

• Together, the measures, targets and timeframes establish the program’s performance goals.
Performance Goals (pp. 11-12)

Performance Goal = Performance Measure + Ambitious Target

- Considerations for target-setting
  - Past performance (baseline)
  - Legislative changes
  - Funding
  - External factors
Program Evaluations

• **Scope** - Examine the underlying cause and effect relationship between the program and achievement of performance targets.

• **Independence** - Performed by non-biased parties with no conflict of interest should conduct the evaluations. (TBD by agency and OMB staff.)

• **Quality**
  – **Applicability** – All programs expected to undergo some type of evaluation.
  – **Impact** – Prefer effectiveness evaluations consider a program’s impact (outcome, e.g., whether the Federal intervention makes a difference).
  – **Rigor** – Provide the most rigorous evidence that is appropriate and feasible for that program.
Quality Program Evaluation

- Can a program demonstrate impact?
  - If Yes - randomized controlled trials are generally the highest quality, unbiased evaluation to demonstrate actual impact, but only when it is appropriate and feasible to conduct such studies.
  - If No - a variety of quasi-experimental methods (e.g., comparison group studies) and non-experimental methods may help shed light on how or why a program is effective.
  - Bottom line - Evaluations must be appropriate to the type of program.
Does It Ever End?

• Steps after PARTs are completed
  – Draft summaries for ExpectMore.gov
  – Spring Updates in PARTWeb
  – Complete Improvement Plans
    • All programs must have regardless of PART rating
    • Focus on the findings in the PART assessment
    • Implement plans and report on progress
  – ExpectMore.gov release mid-August
Lessons to Learn Quickly

• Share drafts, communicate frequently to plan and coordinate.

• Use clear, direct language in explanations and evidence.

• Stick to the deadlines.

• Don’t take the PART personally.

• Rely on evidence, not anecdotes.

• Speed the process -- don’t flood OMB with mounds of “evidence”. Point out exactly where the evidence is any document.
Resources on PART

• www.omb.gov/part
  – Information on process and schedule
  – Guidance for completing PART
  – PARTWeb link, user’s manual
  – Supporting materials

• www.ExpectMore.gov
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL

Questions and Answers