

**REVIEW OF AGENCY PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**REPORT ON AUDIT  
FOR THE YEAR ENDED  
JUNE 30, 2009**



## **AUDIT SUMMARY**

This report summarizes our review of the executive branch agency performance measures and provides recommendations based on our observations. Section 30-133 of the Code of Virginia requires the Auditor of Public Accounts to conduct an annual audit of performance measures and to review the related management systems used to accumulate and report the results.

We reviewed information on *Virginia Performs* for 48 key performance measures and nine productivity measures at selected agencies. Governor Kaine designated key performance measures as critical to the central operational purpose of each agency, and productivity measures show the costs associated with core business functions. We reviewed information on *Virginia Performs* to determine if the performance measure information was accurate, reliable, and understandable.

Performance management in the Commonwealth is an evolving process, and there has been significant improvement in the overall completeness and accuracy of reported performance measures information since our first review in 2002. Overall, we have found that performance measures results reported on *Virginia Performs* are accurate and reliable, but the usefulness of the information continues to be limited.

We continue to find that citizens and others may have difficulty understanding the information because performance measure names, descriptions, and methodologies are inaccurate, incomplete, and confusing. In addition, *Virginia Performs* does not include a link between the budget structure and amounts appropriated to the performance measures reported. The Commonwealth's current financial systems have inherent technological shortcomings that have hindered efforts to link budget and performance information. We have included both of these issues in our previous reports, and until the various parties involved in the process address these issues, we believe information on *Virginia Performs* will be of limited usefulness to both those inside and outside of government.

Planning and Budget is in the process of developing and implementing a new budgeting and performance management system that will eventually replace *Virginia Performs*. Planning and Budget expects the new system will provide additional functionality that will help to address some of the findings in this report and the new administration should consider these as they move forward with this system initiative.

– TABLE OF CONTENTS –

	<u>Pages</u>
AUDIT SUMMARY	
REVIEW OF AGENCY PERFORMANCE MEASURES	
Background Information	1-2
Scope and Method of Review	3-7
Results of Review of Key Performance Measures	7-9
Status of Prior Year's Findings	9
TRANSMITTAL LETTER	10-11
AGENCY RESPONSE	12
APPENDIX A – Summary of Findings by Individual Agency and Performance Measure	13-20

## REVIEW OF AGENCY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

This report summarizes our review of the executive branch agency performance measures and provides our recommendations. Section 30-133 of the Code of Virginia requires the Auditor of Public Accounts to conduct an annual audit of performance measures and to review the related management systems used to accumulate and report the results.

The current performance management system has components for strategic planning, performance measurement, program evaluation, and performance budgeting. Together, these components provide information that can help manage strategy and communicate the results of government services. Section 2.2-1501 of the Code of Virginia requires the Department of Planning and Budget (Planning and Budget) to develop, coordinate, and implement a performance management system. Planning and Budget must ensure that the information is useful for managing and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of state government operations, and is available to citizens and public officials.

Our report has three separate sections. The first section includes background information on *Virginia Performs* and discusses roles and responsibilities over information in the system. The second section outlines the scope of our work and the method of review. The third section presents the results of the work performed and provides recommendations based on our observations and best practices for reporting and communicating performance information.

### Background Information

Performance management provides information to help policy makers and state officials evaluate the results of government services. This information is available to the general public and allows the public to monitor the results of government services. An effective performance management system generally has four linked processes: strategic planning, performance measurement, program evaluation, and performance budgeting. The Commonwealth first implemented a performance management system in the 1990s, and the system has evolved since then.

In 2000, the General Assembly passed legislation requiring Planning and Budget to develop, implement, and manage an Internet-based performance information system. In response, Planning and Budget developed a website that made agency performance data available to the public.

In 2003, the General Assembly established the Council on Virginia's Future (the Council) to develop a unified vision for the Commonwealth and guide Planning and Budget in aligning strategic plans and performance measures with this vision. The Council's objectives include the provision of a focus on significant issues affecting the Commonwealth, improvements to the policy-making and budgetary processes, increased transparency and accountability, improved government performance, and the engagement of citizens in a dialogue about the future of the Commonwealth. At the direction of the Council, Planning and Budget directed a statewide reorganization of the budgeting and agency strategic plan structure, effective July 1, 2006. As a result, the Executive Budget document for the 2006-2008 biennium contained the new budget structure and also included a reporting of performance measures for agencies.

To further this effort, the Council and Planning and Budget launched the *Virginia Performs* website in January 2007, which replaced the previous performance measures website. *Virginia Performs* provides performance management information about state agencies and programs, including agency strategic plans, but does not include performance information for colleges and universities. The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia has performance information for colleges and universities.

*Virginia Performs* reports performance measures by three types – key measures, productivity measures, and other measures. Governor Kaine designated certain measures as key measures because they measure agency performance on the major or most important programs or activities of the agency. *Virginia Performs* showed productivity measures for the first time during fiscal year 2009 to provide cost information on agency processes with significant impacts on customers, budget, or performance outcomes. Productivity measures also identify ways to improve productivity and track the progress of improvement initiatives. Other agency measures include all measures not considered key or productivity.

Planning and Budget has the following statutory requirements related to *Virginia Performs* from Section 2.2-1501 of the Code of Virginia.

*11. (Effective until July 1, 2013) Development, coordination and implementation of a performance management system involving strategic planning, performance measurement, evaluation, and performance budgeting within state government. The Department shall ensure that information generated from these processes is useful for managing and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of state government operations, and is available to citizens and public officials.*

*12. Development, implementation and management of an Internet-based information technology system to ensure that citizens have access to performance information.*

Planning and Budget has assumed various responsibilities in meeting these requirements. They maintain the *Virginia Performs* website, which includes granting and monitoring access to the website. Planning and Budget also provides training to agencies on performance measures as well as annual instructions for updating *Virginia Performs*. Planning and Budget has changed and improved these materials over the last several years in an effort to strengthen their guidance and address recurring issues that have come up in our reviews.

Planning and Budget analysts also review agency performance measure data before publication of the performance measure data on the website. While the analysts review performance measure data before publication, Planning and Budget believes each individual agency's management has ultimate responsibility and ownership of their performance measure data.

Aside from Planning and Budget and agency management, there may be a number of other parties involved in the process including the Governor and the applicable Secretary. Both the Governor and the applicable Secretary may have an interest in determining what the agency should measure and how the agency reports its efforts in achieving this measurement.

## Scope and Method of Review

Our objective was to determine that performance measure information on *Virginia Performs* was accurate, reliable, and understandable for the performance measures we reviewed. Performance measures on the *Virginia Performs* website contain several standard reporting elements. For each measure, we reviewed the various elements on *Virginia Performs* for accuracy, reliability, and understandability. We sought to ensure the average user could understand the performance measures results and accompanying information. We specifically evaluated each element as follows:

- We reviewed the *Measure Name* to ensure that it accurately reflected what the measure was.
- We reviewed the *Measure Type* and *Preferred Trend* to ensure that these elements were appropriate in relation to the performance measure.
- We reviewed the *Measure Methodology* to ensure it was reasonable and offered the user the necessary information to determine the data sources and how the agency calculated the measure.
- We reviewed the *Measure Baseline* and *Measure Targets* to ensure that the agency provided the appropriate data and the data accurately represented the information within the performance measure.
- We reviewed the *Measure Frequency* to ensure that the updating of the measure occurred in accordance with the established time frame.
- We reviewed the *Measure Data* (results) reported for fiscal year 2009, or the most recent available data points, to ensure that it was accurate, within a five percent tolerable threshold.
- We reviewed the *Explanatory Note* field for applicability and appropriateness, and ensured that agencies had followed guidelines established by Planning and Budget.

As part of our review, we obtained and reviewed documentation from the various agencies and interviewed agency staff. We reviewed guidance and instructions issued by Planning and Budget to the individual agencies. Also, we followed up on recommendations and specific exceptions from our prior review to determine if the agencies had resolved the issues previously reported.

We obtained a copy of the *Virginia Performs* database from Planning and Budget as of September 14, 2009. The database duplicates information presented on the *Virginia Performs* website and included over 1,400 individual performance measures. Of these measures, there are 233 key measures and we selected a sample of 48 key measures as shown on the following page.

	<b>2008 Review</b>	<b>2009 Review</b>
Number of Key Measures Tested	59	48
How we selected measures for review	All key measures for agencies with budgets greater than or equal to \$1 billion or central service agencies	All key measures for agencies with budgets between \$50 million and \$1 billion

Our review this year also included productivity measures, which were new in fiscal year 2009. There were 75 productivity measures in the database and we selected nine of these measures for review from agencies that were included in our prior year review. We have detailed the key measures and productivity measures we selected for review below:

### **Sample of Key Performance Measures by Agency**

#### **Comprehensive Services for At-Risk Youth and Families**

1. We will increase the proportion of children served at home, in school and in the community

#### **Department for the Aging**

1. The number of Area Agencies on Aging business processes incorporated in the No Wrong Door initiative

#### **Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

1. Maintain Virginia's Tuberculosis-, Brucellosis- and Pseudorabies-free status
2. Economic value of products inspected, graded and certified, the sales values of marine, nursery, and wine products, as well as export values of all Virginia agricultural and forestry products
3. Number of acres of farmland preserved by local purchase of development rights programs
4. Rate of voluntary compliance with the Virginia Food Safety Code for establishments inspected by the Office of Dairy and Foods

#### **Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control**

1. We will increase the Underage Buyer compliance rate for retail alcohol licensees
2. Increase the combined profits and taxes annually transferred to the General Fund and localities

#### **Department of Conservation and Recreation**

1. Number of acres managed under 1 of 5 agricultural priority conservation practices
2. Number of acres preserved for conservation purposes towards the Governor's 400,000-acre statewide goal
3. Percent of excellent or good responses on the State Park Customer Satisfaction Survey
4. Number of overnight visits to state parks

#### **Department of Correctional Education**

1. Passing rates for the SOL's for grades 9-12
2. The number of Industry-Based Certification programs for adult construction trade areas
3. Percentage of inmates tested on the WorkKeys assessment that earn a Career Readiness Certificate

#### **Department of Criminal Justice Services**

1. We will provide training and education to criminal justice practitioners and professionals that are rated at or above satisfactory by those attending the training
2. We will review quarterly grant reports by agency grant monitors to review progress by grantees toward meeting grant goals

#### **Department of Environmental Quality**

1. The annual number of days when ozone levels are above the 8-hour ozone standard
2. The annual number of pounds of nitrogen nutrients discharged from significant point sources in the Chesapeake Bay watershed
3. The annual number of pounds of phosphorus nutrients discharged from significant point sources in the Chesapeake Bay watershed

#### **Department of Game and Inland Fisheries**

1. Customer satisfaction survey of hunting and freshwater angling licenses holders
2. Acres of land conserved and protected in the Commonwealth
3. Customer satisfaction survey of registered boat owners

#### **Department of General Services**

1. Control the amount of square feet of office space leased per occupant of leased space
2. Increase the number of local government eVA users
3. Reduce greenhouse emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>) released into environment by state flex-fuel vehicles

#### **Department of Housing and Community Development**

1. The percentage of Virginia households spending more than 30 percent of their income for housing
2. The estimated number of homes lacking “complete indoor plumbing facilities” including a bathroom and connection to an approved water and wastewater system
3. The percentage of Virginia localities that have unemployment rates greater than 150 percent of the state average

#### **Department of Juvenile Justice**

1. Percentage of juveniles convicted of a new misdemeanor or felony within a year of being released from a juvenile correctional facility
2. Percentage of juveniles convicted of a new misdemeanor or felony within a year of being placed on probation

#### **Department of Rail and Public Transportation**

1. The number of passenger trips per person on public transportation systems in urbanized areas of the Commonwealth
2. Passenger trips on public transportation systems taking by elderly, disabled and low income people in Virginia
3. The percentage of rail enhancement projects utilizing an on-time, on-budget constraint
4. Increase the volume of freight shipped by rail through completed Rail Enhancement projects and express in truckload equivalents diverted from Virginia’s highways

#### **Department of Rehabilitative Services**

1. Percentage of vocational rehabilitation consumers who achieve their employment goals and work satisfactorily for at least 90 days upon completion of their programs



**Department of State Police**

1. Percentage of the investigations successfully closed involving sex offenders failing to register
2. Percentage of crime victims and individuals involved in traffic accidents who rate their experience with the department as “Very Good or “Excellent”
3. Average response time to emergency calls

**State Compensation Board**

1. Overall customer satisfaction with Compensation Board activities, as demonstrated by the ratings (%) received in an annual survey of all constitutional officers

**State Council of Higher Education for Virginia**

1. Increase the state’s progress toward meeting student financial needs
2. Institutional success in meeting their performance measure targets

**Virginia Information Technologies Agency**

1. Average cost per E-911 call received by local public safety answering points (PASP’s)
2. Percentage of service level objectives met
3. Percentage of major information technology (IT) projects completed on time and on budget against their managed project baseline

**Virginia Port Authority**

1. The container throughput for the Port of Virginia
2. The number of jobs provided by port-related businesses
3. The number of TEU’s handled per acre per year

**Sample of Productivity Measures by Agency**

**Department of Corrections**

1. The Department of Corrections will provide efficient, secure confinement services as measured by annual per capita costs. Cost controls should limit per capita cost increases to less than 5 %

**Department of Education**

1. Staff costs per fully accredited Virginia public school based on approved Standards of Accreditation

**Department of Health**

1. The cost of providing certified records by the Division of Vital Records

**Department of Motor Vehicles**

1. Cost to renew vehicle registration

**Department of Social Services**

1. Amount of child support collected per dollar expended

**Department of Taxation**

1. Average cost to process an individual income tax return

### **Department of Transportation**

1. VDOT Administrative Expense (percent of total)
2. Construction Engineering and Inspection Expense (CEI) [percent of total construction expenditures]

### **Virginia Employment Commission**

1. Measure and report the “Cost Per Call” per customer service representative assigned to the Customer Contact Center (CCC)

### **Results of Review of Performance Measures**

Overall, we found that performance measures results reported for fiscal year 2009 were accurate and reliable for the majority of our sample. Of the 57 measures reviewed, we found three measures (five percent) where the 2009 results reported were inaccurate. We also found a significant number of exceptions in other data elements that affect the user’s ability to understand the performance measure and interpret the results. We have summarized these exceptions below, noting that some performance measures had more than one type of exception.

- *Measure Name* was not an accurate description of what the agency was measuring or was not worded in accordance with Planning and Budget guidance for 17 performance measures (30 percent error rate). Of these errors, agencies could easily correct five items, such as eliminating the use of an acronym in the measure name.
- *Measure Type* was not accurate for four performance measures (7 percent error rate).
- *Preferred Trend* was not appropriate for two performance measures (4 percent error rate).
- *Measure Methodology* was not adequate so the user could understand how the agency calculated the measure for 28 performance measures (49 percent error rate).
- *Measure Baseline* did not include the appropriate information required by Planning and Budget for three performance measures (5 percent error rate).
- *Measure Target* was not reasonable or did not include the appropriate information required by Planning and Budget for 12 performance measures (21 percent error rate).
- *Measure Frequency* was not accurate for two performance measures (4 percent error rate).

- *Explanatory Note* did not include appropriate information to assist the user in determining the basis of the measurement for nine performance measures (16 percent error rate).

Of the exceptions found in our review, the inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the *Measure Name* are the most significant. This occurred in 30 percent of our sample and is significant because the *Measure Name* is one of the first elements a user will see when navigating to the agency performance measures section of *Virginia Performs*. It is critical that the *Measure Name* be clear, concise, and accurate. Agency management initially proposes a *Measure Name*, and then it undergoes review by Planning and Budget and possible revision by the Cabinet Secretary and the Governor. Having multiple parties in the process provides various viewpoints and can result in a more effective measure.

One of our audit challenges is to identify specific weaknesses in the process and make recommendations for improvements when we find that the Measure Name is not clear, concise, and accurate. Because multiple parties are involved in the process, we cannot specifically identify who had responsibility for the instances where a performance measure name did not comply with Planning and Budget guidance. Additionally, a number of agencies in our review expressed concern about their ability to change a measure name after its approval by the Governor.

Another significant issue is the number of performance measures where the *Measure Methodology* was inadequate to explain the calculation of the measure. Almost half of the measures in our sample had this deficiency, and we had to obtain additional information from these agencies to understand how they calculated their results. The intent of *Virginia Performs* is for a user to understand the measure and the agency calculation without any additional information.

*Recommendation #1*

*Agencies, along with Planning and Budget, need to continue to improve the performance measures on Virginia Performs to ensure they meet the guidance issued by Planning and Budget. At a minimum, they need to strengthen their review of measure names and methodologies for current key measures to ensure they comply with the guidance.*

*However, at some point, Planning and Budget along with the agencies needs to review all measures in Virginia Performs for compliance with the guidelines. Inaccurate, incomplete, and confusing performance measure names and methodologies limit the usefulness of the information on Virginia Performs.*

Another issue that came up in our review this year was the process for making changes to performance measure information during the year. Planning and Budget issues guidance to agencies for updating their strategic plans and performance measures each biennium, and this is the preferable time to make significant changes. Throughout the fiscal year, agencies can make

technical changes to performance measure information on *Virginia Performs*, but may not make any changes that alter the intent of the measure. There is not a formal policy on what changes agencies can or cannot make during the year, and there was a lot of confusion among agencies on the process.

*Recommendation #2*

*Planning and Budget should develop formal policies and procedures for updating performance measure information during the fiscal year. The policies and procedures should address what changes agencies can and cannot make during the year, and a process for requesting and approving these changes.*

To further evaluate our results, we have detailed our exceptions by agency and performance measures in Appendix A. We informed individual agencies of our test results and any exceptions based on our review.

Status of Prior Year's Findings

As part of our review, we followed up on the issues noted during the prior audit for specific agencies and performance measures. We found that these agencies had resolved all of the issues noted during the prior audit.

Our prior report also included recommendations about the linkages between the performance measures on *Virginia Performs* and agency budgets. We reported that most service areas performed more than one function and that not all functions had a related performance measure. As a result, there is not a direct link between the performance measures and use of budget resources, making it difficult for the average citizen to use this information to make any evaluations.

In their response to our prior report, Planning and Budget agreed that it was difficult to link agency budgets directly to performance measures. Their response discussed the desired linkage would require a collaborative effort between the executive and legislative branches. Planning and Budget also acknowledged that the Commonwealth's current financial systems have inherent technological shortcomings that hinder measureable progress in defining and reporting on the relationships.

The lack of a linkage between the performance measures information on *Virginia Performs* and budget resources continues to exist. Since our last report, *Virginia Performs* includes some summary budget information, but this information is for an agency as a whole, and does not link to individual performance measures. Planning and Budget has a system development initiative to replace the current statewide budgeting and strategic planning systems, which would eventually replace *Virginia Performs*. Under the initiative, the new strategic planning system would be operational in March 2011 and would provide greater flexibility in updating and tracking changes to performance measures information.



**Walter J. Kucharski, Auditor**

# Commonwealth of Virginia

**Auditor of Public Accounts  
P.O. Box 1295  
Richmond, Virginia 23218**

January 21, 2010

The Honorable Robert F. McDonnell  
Governor of Virginia

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox  
Chairman, Joint Legislative Audit  
and Review Commission

We have audited the performance measures reported on the *Virginia Performs* website and are pleased to submit our report entitled "Review of Agency Performance Measures." 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.

## Scope and Methodology

Our objective was to determine that performance measure information was accurate, reliable, and understandable for fiscal year 2009. Our review of agency performance measures included executive branch key and productivity performance measures reported and published by Planning and Budget on the *Virginia Performs* website. We did not include higher education performance measures, which are the responsibility of the State Council of Higher Education.

We selected a sample of 48 key performance measures and nine productivity measures for detailed review. During our review, we obtained supporting documentation for each performance measure in the sample and information related to internal controls. We also reviewed the information system controls over access to the *Virginia Performs* website and followed up on issues noted in the prior year audit report to determine if they have been resolved.

## Results of Review

Overall, we found that performance measures results reported for fiscal year 2009 were accurate and reliable for the majority of our sample. However, we did find a significant number of exceptions in other data elements that affect the user's ability to understand the performance measure and interpret the results.

We also followed up on our audit findings from the prior year audit report and the results of this follow up are discussed in the section entitled “Status of Prior Year’s Findings.”

#### Exit Conference and Report Distribution

We discussed this report with Department of Planning and Budget management on March 30, 2010. Planning and Budget management concurred with the report and elected not to do a formal agency response.

This report is intended for the information and use of the Governor and General Assembly, management, and the citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia and is a public record.

AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

LCW/alh

### AGENCY RESPONSE

We met with Planning and Budget management on March 30, 2010 to discuss the report. They concurred with the report and elected not to prepare an agency response for the report.

## Appendix A: Summary of Findings by Individual Agency and Performance Measure

### Key Performance Measures

#### Comprehensive Services for At-Risk Youth and Families

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
We will increase the proportion of children served at home, in school and in the community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with the phrase "we will" or a verb.</li> </ul>

#### Department for the Aging

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
The number of Area Agencies on Aging business processes incorporated in the No Wrong Door initiative.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> included acronyms that may be unclear to the average user. Additionally, the methodology did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> <li>The <i>Explanatory Note</i> field should have explained anomalies in the data for the measure.</li> </ul>

#### Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Maintain Virginia's Tuberculosis-, Brucellosis- and Pseudorabies-free status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with a verb.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> </ul>
Economic value of products inspected, graded, and certified, the sales values of marine, nursery, and wine products, as well as export values of all Virginia agricultural and forestry products.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Name</i> was unclear and appeared to measure multiple items through one measure.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Target</i> was incorrect based on the agency's explanation of how the target was calculated.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on Virginia Performs was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.</li> </ul>



**Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (continued)**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
Number of acres of farmland preserved by local purchase of development rights programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li></ul>
Rate of voluntary compliance with the Virginia Food Safety Code for establishments inspected by the Office of Dairy and Foods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Target</i> appeared unreasonable since the agency has exceeded the target for several years. The agency should explain its reasoning for maintaining a low target.</li><li>• The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included outdated information that the agency should remove.</li></ul>

**Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
We will increase the Underage Buyer compliance rate for retail alcohol licensees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with the phrase "we will" or a verb.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> included unfamiliar terms that the agency should explain. Additionally, the methodology did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li><li>• The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included irrelevant information that did not pertain to the measure or the data reported.</li></ul>
Increase the combined profits and taxes annually transferred to the General Fund and localities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with a verb.</li><li>• The <i>Preferred Trend</i> was contradictory to the measure's intent.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Target</i> was lower than the previous fiscal year's actual data value, which was contradictory to the measure's intent.</li></ul>

**Department of Conservation and Recreation**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
Number of acres managed under 1 of 5 agricultural priority conservation practices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> did not clearly describe what the measurement is.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> used unfamiliar language and acronyms that the agency should explain.</li><li>• The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included unfamiliar acronyms that require explanation.</li></ul>

**Department of Conservation and Recreation (continued)**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
Number of acres preserved for conservation purposes towards the Governor's 400,000-acre statewide goal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> </ul>
Percent of excellent or good responses on the State Park Customer Satisfaction Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Target</i> appeared unreasonable since the agency has exceeded the target for several fiscal years. The agency should explain its reasoning for maintaining a low target.</li> </ul>
Number of overnight visits to state parks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Target</i> was a percentage but the data was a number. The agency should standardize the figures so the user can determine whether the agency is meeting its target.</li> </ul>

**Department of Correctional Education**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
The number of Industry-Based Certification programs for adult construction trade areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> </ul>
Percentage of inmates tested on the WorkKeys assessment that earn a Career Readiness Certificate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Type</i> was inaccurate.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> <li>The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included outdated information. Additionally, the information in the note did not clearly relate to the measure.</li> </ul>

**Department of Criminal Justice Services**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
We will provide training and education to criminal justice practitioners and professionals that are rated at or above satisfactory by those attending the training.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with the phrase "we will" or a verb.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> </ul>
We will review quarterly grant reports by agency grant monitors to review progress by grantees toward meeting grant goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with the phrase "we will" or a verb.</li> </ul>

**Department of Environmental Quality**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
The annual number of pounds of nitrogen nutrients discharged from significant point sources in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> used unfamiliar acronyms that the agency should explain.</li></ul>
The annual number of pounds of phosphorus nutrients discharged from significant point sources in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> used unfamiliar acronyms that the agency should explain.</li></ul>

**Department of Game and Inland Fisheries**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
Customer satisfaction survey of hunting and freshwater angling license holders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Type</i> was inaccurate.</li></ul>
Acres of land conserved and protected in the Commonwealth.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Target</i> was unattainable based on historical and current data reported. Additionally, the data was in a format that is inconsistent with the target.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on Virginia Performs was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.</li></ul>
Customer satisfaction survey of registered boat owners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on Virginia Performs was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.</li></ul>

**Department of General Services**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
Control the amount of square feet of office space leased per occupant of leased space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with a verb.</li></ul>
Increase the number of local government eVA users.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with a verb.</li></ul>
Reduce greenhouse emissions (CO2) released into environment by state flex-fuel vehicles.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with a verb.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Target</i> value conflicted with the target description.</li></ul>

**Department of Housing and Community Development**

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
The percentage of Virginia households spending more than 30 percent of their income for housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> </ul>
The percentage of Virginia localities that have unemployment rates greater than 150 percent of the state average.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> </ul>

**Department of Juvenile Justice**

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percentage of juveniles convicted of a new misdemeanor or felony within a year of being released from a juvenile correctional facility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated. Additionally, the methodology included an inaccurate time frame for reporting the data.</li> <li>The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included an inaccurate time frame for reporting the data.</li> </ul>
Percentage of juveniles convicted of a new misdemeanor or felony within a year of being placed on probation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Type</i> was inaccurate.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated. Additionally, the methodology included an inaccurate time frame for reporting the data.</li> <li>The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included an inaccurate time frame for reporting the data.</li> </ul>

**Department of Rail and Public Transportation**

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
The number of passenger trips per person on public transportation systems in urbanized areas of the Commonwealth.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> </ul>
Passenger trips on public transportation systems taken by elderly, disabled, and low income people in Virginia.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Baseline</i> was inaccurate according to the historical data reported.</li> </ul>
The percentage of rail enhancement projects utilizing an on-time, on-budget constraint.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> </ul>
Increase the volume of freight shipped by rail through completed Rail Enhancement Projects, and express in truckload equivalents diverted from Virginia's highways.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with a verb.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li> <li>The <i>Measure Baseline</i> was zero, which was misleading since baseline data was not yet available.</li> </ul>

**Department of State Police**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
Percentage of the investigations successfully closed involving sex offenders failing to register.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Target</i> appeared unreasonable since the agency has exceeded the target for several fiscal years. The agency should explain its reasoning for maintaining a low target.</li></ul>
Percentage of crime victims and individuals involved in traffic accidents who rate their experience with the department as “Very Good” or “Excellent.”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included information that was unclear.</li></ul>

**State Compensation Board**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
Overall customer satisfaction with Compensation Board activities, as demonstrated by the ratings (%) received in an annual survey of all constitutional officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Target</i> appeared unreasonable since the agency has exceeded the target for several fiscal years. The agency should explain its reasoning for maintaining a low target.</li></ul>

**State Council of Higher Education for Virginia**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
Increase the state’s progress toward meeting student financial needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget’s guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with a verb. Additionally, the measure name did not clearly indicate what the agency was measuring.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Target</i> date stated was not within the appropriate biennium.</li><li>• The <i>Explanatory Note</i> field was blank but could have clarified the unit of measurement since this information was not apparent from the measure name or data.</li></ul>
Institutional success in meeting their performance measure targets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> did not clearly describe what the measurement is.</li></ul>

### Virginia Information Technologies Agency

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Average cost per E-911 call received by local public safety answering points (PSAPs).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Target</i> appeared unreasonable since the agency has exceeded the target for several fiscal years. The agency should explain its reasoning for maintaining a low target.</li></ul>

### Virginia Port Authority

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
The container throughput for the Port of Virginia.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Frequency</i> conflicted with the frequency description.</li></ul>
The number of jobs provided by port-related business.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Target</i> appeared unreasonable since the agency has exceeded the target for several fiscal years. The agency should explain its reasoning for maintaining a low target. Additionally, the target date was not within the appropriate biennium.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Frequency</i> was inappropriate based on when data is available for reporting.</li></ul>
The number of TEUs handled per acre per year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> used an unfamiliar acronym that the agency should explain.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Type</i> was inaccurate.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.</li><li>• The <i>Measure Baseline</i> did not accurately reflect historical data.</li></ul>

## Productivity Measures

### Department of Corrections

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
The Department of Corrections will provide efficient, secure confinement services as measured by annual per capita costs. Cost controls should limit per capita cost increases to less than 5%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with the phrase "we will" or a verb. Additionally, the measure name should not include a target.</li></ul>

**Department of Motor Vehicles**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
Cost to renew vehicle registration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Preferred Trend</i> conflicted with the measure methodology.</li></ul>

**Virginia Employment Commission**

<b>Performance Measure Name</b>	<b>Exception(s) Noted</b>
Measure and report the “Cost Per Call” per customer service representative assigned to the Customer Contact Center (CCC).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget’s guidelines. Measures should begin with the data form, not with a verb.</li></ul>

*Exceptions noted in this Appendix were communicated to the agencies during the course of our review. Some exceptions were subsequently corrected on the Virginia Performs website.*