

REVIEW OF AGENCY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**REPORT ON AUDIT
FOR THE YEAR ENDED
JUNE 30, 2011**



AUDIT SUMMARY

We found that performance measures results reported on *Virginia Performs* were accurate and reliable for 89 percent of the performance measures reviewed this year; however, we continue to find that citizens and others may have difficulty understanding the measures and their results due to inaccurate, inconsistent, and confusing descriptions and information. Additionally, *Virginia Performs* does not include a link between the performance measure results and the budget structure and amounts appropriated, so the usefulness of the performance measure results to evaluate programs and activities continues to be limited.

Performance management in the Commonwealth continues to evolve and there has been significant improvement in the overall completeness and accuracy of performance measures information since our initial review, but there are still opportunities for improvement.

As we have discussed in our previous reports, the Commonwealth's current financial systems have inherent technological shortcomings that have hindered efforts to link budget and performance information. Planning and Budget is implementing a new system that will replace *Virginia Performs* as well as other budgeting systems. The Performance Budgeting System implementation will occur in two phases. In September 2010, Phase I implementation occurred addressing four functional areas: budget development (operating and capital), six-year financial planning, and budget execution.

Phase II of the implementation will address strategic planning and this phase of the system will replace *Virginia Performs*. Phase II has a scheduled implementation in Summer 2012. Planning and Budget expects that the new system will provide additional functionality and address some of the issues in this report.

– TABLE OF CONTENTS –

	<u>Pages</u>
AUDIT SUMMARY	
REVIEW OF AGENCY PERFORMANCE MEASURES	
<i>Results of Review of Performance Measures</i>	1-3
<i>Status of Prior Year's Systemwide Recommendations</i>	3-4
<i>Status of Prior Years' Recommendations on Individual Agency Performance Measures</i>	4
<i>Objectives, Scope, and Method of Review</i>	4-6
TRANSMITTAL LETTER	7
APPENDIX A – Summary of Results by Individual Agency and Performance Measure	8-25

REVIEW OF AGENCY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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. This information is available to citizens and public officials on the *Virginia Performs* website.

Results of Review of Performance Measures

Of the 86 measures reviewed, we found 10 measures (11%) where the 2011 results were inaccurate. We were unable to test the 2011 results for five performance measures because the agency did not have supporting documentation. In most of these cases, the agency estimated 2011 results, but they did not have documentation to support the estimates and did not subsequently update the information with actual data.

Similar to previous years, 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. Seventy six of the 86 (88%) performance measures we reviewed had some type of issue that affected the user's ability to understand what the agency was measuring or how it measured 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 did not follow Planning and Budget naming guidance for 14 performance measures (16 percent error rate).
- *Measure Type* was not accurate for one performance measure (2 percent error rate).
- *Preferred Trend* was not appropriate for three performance measures (3 percent error rate).
- *Measure Methodology* was not adequate so the user could understand how the agency calculated the measure and the source of data for the measure for 62 performance measures (72 percent error rate).
- *Measure Baseline* was not reasonable or did not include the appropriate information required by Planning and Budget for three performance measures (3 percent error rate).
- *Measure Target* was not reasonable or did not include the appropriate information required by Planning and Budget for 41 performance measures (48 percent error rate).

- *Measure Frequency* was not reasonable for eight performance measures (9 percent error rate).
- *Explanatory Note* did not include appropriate information to assist the user in determining the basis of the measurement for eight performance measures (9 percent error rate).

We did see significant improvement in the *Measure Name* for the performance measures we reviewed. Planning and Budget took several steps to address this issue since our last review. Planning and Budget staff performed a targeted review of measure names and also provided training to agency staff to address issues identified with measures names. It is critical that the *Measure Name* be clear, concise, and accurate because it is one of the first things a user will see on *Virginia Performs*, so we encourage Planning and Budget to continue efforts to address this issue.

Aside from the *Measure Name*, we continue to find the most issues with the *Measure Methodology* information. For over two-thirds of the measures we reviewed, the *Measure Methodology* did not adequately explain the calculation and the source of the data used for the calculation. We frequently obtained additional information from the agencies to understand how results were calculated. The intent of the information provided on *Virginia Performs* is for a user to understand the measure and the agency calculations without any additional information.

During the course of our review, we provided our preliminary results to Planning and Budget to determine whether their staff had identified any similar understandability issues during their internal reviews. Planning and Budget staff review performance measures information before agencies put the information on *Virginia Performs*. Planning and Budget staff did not have any information to support whether they found similar issues or addressed the issue in their internal reviews. In addition, as discussed later in this report, one agency we selected in our review this year had not updated information on *Virginia Performs* since 2009. Planning and Budget staff did not detect this issue during their internal review.

Recommendation #1

Agencies and Planning and Budget need to continue to improve the information reported for performance measures to ensure they meet the guidance issued by Planning and Budget. Shortcomings in the review process, both at the agency level and at Planning and Budget, continue to contribute to the number of agencies that have understandability issues with their performance measures. Inaccurate, incomplete, and confusing performance measure names, methodologies, and other information limits the usefulness of the performance measure information to citizens of the Commonwealth and other users.

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

Status of Prior Year's Systemwide Recommendations

Our prior report included two recommendations to improve the overall process or system. Our first recommendation was that both agencies and Planning and Budget need to continue to improve the information reported for performance measures to ensure they meet the guidance issued by Planning and Budget, including strengthening the review procedures. We continued to find similar issues in our review this year and repeat that recommendation in this report. We believe shortcomings in the review process, both at agencies and Planning and Budget, continue to contribute to the number of agencies that have understandability issues with their performance measures. We found that 88% of the measures we reviewed this year had some type of issue that affected user's ability to understand what the agency was measuring or how it measured the results.

Our prior report also included a recommendation that Planning and Budget develop formal policies and procedures for updating performance measure information during the fiscal 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; however, agencies can make some technical changes during the year. We continue to find that there is not a consistent understanding on the process or what or when agencies can make changes and, as a result, we repeat our recommendation below.

Recommendation #2

Planning and Budget should develop formal policies and procedures for updating performance measure information during the fiscal year, and communicate these policies to the agencies. The policies and procedures should specifically address when changes can be made for specific data fields, which data fields will allow changes at any time and which data fields have restrictions for changes, and lastly, specific directions on how changes can be made to performance measure data. Furthermore, the policies and procedures should also identify the process for requesting and approving these changes.

With the implementation of the new Performance Budgeting System in Summer 2012, an opportunity exists for Planning and Budget to establish specific policies and procedures surrounding performance measure data that will eliminate the confusion and inefficiencies surrounding the old performance measure system.

Our previous reports have also included recommendations about the linkages between the performance measures on *Virginia Performs* and agency budgets. Currently, there is not a direct

link between performance measures and the use of budget resources, making it difficult for the average citizen to use performance measure information to make an evaluation of programs. In their response to our previous reports, Planning and Budget agreed that it was difficult to link agency budgets directly to performance measures and 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. This situation continues to exist, but Planning and Budget expects the new Performance Budgeting System, once fully implemented, will improve the user's ability to link performance information and the budget.

Status of Prior Years' Recommendations on Individual Agency Performance Measures

As part of our review, we followed up on the issues found in our last two reviews for specific agency performance measures. We found that most of these issues were resolved by the end of our review as follows.

- Twelve (86%) out of 14 agencies have resolved the issues in our 2009 review. Of the two agencies that did not resolve their issues, one agency continues to work on resolving an issue with the measure target, while the other agency has not addressed the issue due to staff turnover.
- Fifteen (79%) out of 19 agencies resolved the issues in our 2010 review. Of the four agencies that did not resolve the issues, Planning and Budget guidance recommended that two agencies not make changes; one agency thought their changes addressed the issue, but it did not; and one agency had no explanation.

While there was significant improvement in the resolution of issues from our prior reviews, agencies continue to struggle with understanding Planning and Budget guidance and procedures for changing performance measures in *Virginia Performs* and this is addressed in the previous section.

Objectives, Scope, and Method of Review

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.

Our review included key and productivity performance measures reported on the *Virginia Performs* website for executive branch agencies. We did not include higher education performance measures, which are the responsibility of the State Council of Higher Education

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* to ensure that it was appropriate in relation to the performance measure for key measures. This is not applicable for productivity measures.
- We reviewed the *Preferred Trend* to ensure it was 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 used for the measure 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* for consistency with the measure target and measure baseline, and to ensure that updating of the measure occurred in accordance with the established time frame.
- We reviewed the *Measure Data* (results) reported for fiscal year 2011, or the most recent available data points, to ensure that it was accurate, within a five percent tolerable threshold, and to ensure that it was updated per Planning and Budget guidelines.
- We reviewed the *Explanatory Note* field for applicability and appropriateness, and ensured that agencies 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 from Planning and Budget to the individual agencies. In addition, we followed up on recommendations and specific exceptions from our prior review to determine if the agencies had resolved those issues.

We obtained a copy of the *Virginia Performs* database from Planning and Budget as of January 11, 2012. The database duplicates information on the *Virginia Performs* website and included 1,487 individual performance measures. Of these measures, there are 231 key measures and 87 productivity measures. The Governor has determined that Key measures are performance measures that are significant, while productivity measures measure efficiency and costs.

The following table summarizes the scope of our work on key and productivity measures since their introduction in 2008 and 2009 respectively. Over this four-year period, we have tested all key performance measures and most of the productivity measures at executive branch agencies.

**Summary of Performance Measures Tested in APA Reviews
Fiscal Years 2008 - 2011**

	2008 Review	2009 Review	2010 Review	2011 Review
Number of Key Measures Tested	59	48	52	64
Number of Productivity Measures Tested	0	9	17	22
How we selected measures for review	Key measures for agencies with budgets greater than \$1 billion or central service agencies	Key measures for agencies with budgets between \$150 million and \$1 billion and productivity measures from agencies tested in 2008	Key measures and productivity measures for agencies with budgets between \$50 million and \$150 million	Key measures not previously tested in 2008, 2009, and 2010, and productivity measures for those agencies selected

As shown above, we selected a sample of 64 key measures and 22 productivity measures in the current year's review. The review included key and productivity measures at the following agencies and a complete listing of the individual performance measures tested by agency is included in Appendix A.

*Board of Accountancy
Commonwealth Attorneys' Services Council
Department for the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing
Department of Business Assistance
Department of Employee Dispute Resolution
Department of Historic Resources
Department of Human Resource Management
Department of Labor and Industry
Department of Minority Business Enterprise
Eastern Virginia Medical School
Frontier Culture Museum of Virginia
Gunston Hall
Human Rights Council
Innovation and Entrepreneurship Investment
Authority*

*Institute for Advanced Learning and Research
Jefferson Science Associates
Motor Vehicle Dealer Board
New College Institute
Roanoke Higher Education Authority
Southern Virginia Higher Education Center
Southwest Virginia Higher Education Center
Virginia Board for People with Disabilities
Virginia Commission for the Arts
Virginia Museum of Natural History
Virginia Parole Board
Virginia Racing Commission
Virginia School for the Deaf and the Blind at
Staunton
Virginia Tourism Authority*

The Science Museum of Virginia was included in our original sample for testing this year, but we were unable to test their performance measures because they had not updated performance measure results on *Virginia Performs* since 2009.



Commonwealth of Virginia

Auditor of Public Accounts

Walter J. Kucharski
Auditor of Public Accounts

P.O. Box 1295
Richmond, Virginia 23218

April 20, 2012

The Honorable Robert F. McDonnell
Governor of Virginia

The Honorable John M. O'Bannon III
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.

Results of Review

Overall, we found that performance measures results reported for fiscal year 2011 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 sections entitled "Status of Prior Years' Recommendations on Individual Agency Performance Measures" and "Status of Prior Year's Systemwide Recommendations."

Exit Conference and Report Distribution

We provided a draft of this report to Department of Planning and Budget management on May 3, 2011. 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

Appendix A: Summary of Results by Individual Agency and Performance Measure

Board of Accountancy

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percentage of overall customer satisfaction with Board of Accountancy (BOA) activities, as demonstrated by the ratings received in an annual survey of BOA customers.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No exceptions noted.
Labor cost per licensee.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No exceptions noted.

Commonwealth Attorneys' Services Council

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percentage of attorney satisfaction with training programs.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated. The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The measure results have consistently exceeded the target. The target date was not current. The <i>Measure Frequency</i> was not reasonable. The frequency conflicts with other information in the measure.
Number of training programs offered annually.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The <i>Measure Type</i> was not accurate. The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data for the measure calculation. The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The measure results have consistently exceeded the target. The target date was not current.

Commonwealth Attorneys' Services Council (continued)

Performance Measure Name	
Unit cost of producing Continuing Legal Education (CLE) training hours (cost of producing CASC training programs ÷ number of CLE training hours).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data for the measure calculation. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date was not current. • The <i>Measure Data</i> did not include fourth quarter information. • The <i>Measure Frequency</i> was not reasonable. The frequency conflicts with other information in the measure.

Department for the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
We will fill interpreter requests from Virginia Courts, state agencies and 12-step programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measure names should contain a data form, and should not begin with the phrase "we will" or a verb. • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated and included an acronym that may be unclear to the average citizen. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date was not current and there was not a description for the measure target. The agency should reevaluate the measure target since they have consistently exceeded the target. • The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent. Supporting documentation was not available in order to recalculate the measure data. • The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included data calculations that did not yield the measure data posted, and acronyms that may be unclear to the average citizen.

Department for the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing (continued)

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Cost efficiency in providing Interpreter Services to Virginia courts, state agencies and 12-Step programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Name</i> was not clear. The name did not accurately describe the measure.• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source of the data used for the calculation.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date and description contained conflicting information and the dates were not current. The agency should reevaluate the measure target since they have consistently exceeded the target.• The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent. Supporting documentation was not available in order to recalculate the measure data.

Department of Business Assistance

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of companies assisted by the Virginia Jobs Investment Program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target was not consistent with the preferred trend and measure baseline.
Number of jobs created and retrained through the Virginia Jobs Investment Program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated.
Amount of public and private capital investment by businesses receiving loans from the Virginia Small Business Financing Authority.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description did not include a data form for the target.• The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.

Department of Business Assistance (continued)

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percent of state contract dollars awarded by all state agencies to small, women and minority (SWaM) businesses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date was not current.• The <i>Measure Data</i> did not include fourth quarter information.
Average cost to administer an economic development project seeking assistance from the Virginia Jobs Investment Program.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source of the data used for the calculation.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target was not consistent with the preferred trend and measure baseline.

Department of Employee Dispute Resolution

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percentage increase of completed training sessions by state employees in workplace conflict management and resolution.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Name</i> was not clear. The data form of the measure was incorrect.
Average cost per completed training session (to include workplace dispute resolution services overview, workplace conflict management best practices, and the grievance procedure).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the calculation of the measure.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target should be reevaluated. The measure results have consistently exceeded the target.• The <i>Measure Frequency</i> was not reasonable. The frequency conflicts with other information in the measure.• The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.

Department of Historic Resources

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of historic properties identified and documented in statewide historic resource inventory data-sharing system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated. • The <i>Measure Frequency</i> was not reasonable. The frequency conflicts with other information in the measure.
Number of private rehabilitation projects leveraged through the agency's assistance and incentives.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated. • The <i>Measure Frequency</i> was not reasonable. The frequency conflicts with other information in the measure.
Total audience reached through historic preservation training and environmental education programs, classes, exhibits, and events.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. The measure name did not contain a data form. • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The agency should reevaluate the measure target since they have consistently exceeded the target. • The <i>Measure Frequency</i> was not reasonable. The frequency conflicts with other information in the measure.
Private dollars invested in historic rehabilitation projects leveraged and enhanced by the state tax credit program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated and did not include the source data used for the measure calculation.
Cost of rehabilitation project certifications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Name</i> was not clear. The name did not accurately describe the measure.

Department of Human Resource Management

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percentage of customers rating services received as good or better.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable and the target date was not current.
Average Employer Health Claim Cost per Employee.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Data</i> was not timely; there was no data as of November 2011.

Department of Labor and Industry

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of apprentices participating in the Registered Apprenticeship training programs.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.
Percentage of valid payment of wage investigations closed within 90 days or less.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain the calculation of the measure.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The agency should reevaluate the measure target since they have consistently exceeded the target.
Rate of workplace fatalities in the high-hazard construction industry per 100,000 workers.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.
Cost of providing Registered Apprenticeship services per Registered Apprenticeship participant.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The agency should reevaluate the measure target since they have consistently exceeded the target.

Department of Minority Business Enterprise

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Amount of contracting dollars spent with Small, Women- and Minority-owned vendors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Name</i> was not clear. The name did not accurately describe the measure. • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated and included unfamiliar acronyms that require explanation. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description contains information that conflicts with the target value. • The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included information that was outdated and unfamiliar acronyms that require explanation.
Number of contracts awarded to Small, Women-owned, and Minority-owned vendors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated and included unfamiliar acronyms that require explanation. • The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included information that was outdated.
Number of certified Small, Women- and Minority-owned businesses and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise vendors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated and included unfamiliar acronyms that require explanation. • The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included information that was outdated and unfamiliar acronyms that require explanation.
Unit cost of processing certification applications (total costs required for processing applications / # of certification applications processed).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The agency should reevaluate the measure target since they have consistently exceeded the target.

Eastern Virginia Medical School

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Student pass rates on the national USMLE (United States Medical Licensing Exam) Part I exam comparable to the national pass rates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Name</i> was not clear. The name did not accurately describe the measure.• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain the calculation of the measure or include the source data for the measure calculation.
Student pass rates on the national USMLE (United States Medical Licensing Exam) Part II exam comparable to the national pass rates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Name</i> was not clear. The name did not accurately describe the measure.• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.
Amount of patient care revenue per clinical faculty member.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Preferred Trend</i> was not reasonable. The preferred trend conflicts with other information in the measure.• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source of the data used for the calculation.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date was not current and the target description contained information that conflicts with other information in the target.• The <i>Measure Data</i> was not timely and there was no data as of January 2012.

Frontier Culture Museum of Virginia

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Total museum visitation.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source of the data used for the calculation.
Percentage of Museum education programs that will correlate with the objectives of the Standards of Learning (SOL) Curriculum Framework for History and Social Science.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date was not current.

Frontier Culture Museum of Virginia (continued)

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percentage of Museum visitors who will rate program effectiveness as good or excellent.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated.
Marketing cost per paying visitor.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source of the data used for the calculation.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date conflicts with the date noted in the target description.

Gunston Hall

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of paying on-site students.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date was not current. The measure target and target description conflict with the measured data.
Number of Virginia school teachers attending instructional programs and workshops relating to George Mason and life in the 18th-century Virginia.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date was not current. The measure target and target description conflict with the measured data.

Human Rights Council

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
The number of days it takes to process complaints received from the public after the complaint is filed in our office.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The agency should reevaluate the measure target since they have consistently exceeded the target.

Innovation and Entrepreneurship Investment Authority

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Rank of venture capital investments made in Virginia.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptions noted.
Cost savings from the application of innovative technology solutions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Name</i> was not clear. The name did not accurately describe the measure. • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target conflicts with other information in the measure. • The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent. The data posted represents an estimate made by the agency; no supporting documentation exists to support the measure data. • The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included unfamiliar acronyms that require explanation and extreme details that may be confusing to the average citizen.
Investment conversion rate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Name</i> was not clear. The name did not clearly describe the measure. • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source data used for the measure calculation. The measure calculation was not accurate.
Private sector investment leverage ratio.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source data used for the measure calculation. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The agency should reevaluate the measure target since they have consistently exceeded the target.

Institute for Advanced Learning and Research

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of new commercial ventures achieved annually.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The measure results have consistently exceeded the target. • The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.
Number of new jobs created by Sustainable Energy Technology Center.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Baseline</i> was not reasonable. The measure was new and did not contain a baseline, and also included unfamiliar acronyms (also used in the methodology and explanatory notes) that require explanation.
Total dollar amount spent annually on research and development for horticulture and forestry products.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source data for the measure calculation.
Number of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) programs, courses, and workshops offered annually.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptions noted.
Number of participants who attend a Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) program, course or workshop.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source data for the measure calculation and included a target.
Return on Investment of State Funds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source data for the measure calculation. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The measure results were significantly below the target and the agency should reevaluate the target. • The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation. • The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included unfamiliar acronyms that require explanation.

Jefferson Science Associates

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percentage of participation by Virginia university faculty and students in research at Jefferson Lab.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No exceptions noted.
Ratio of federal/private matching funds to state-provided funds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No exceptions noted.

Motor Vehicle Dealer Board

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percentage of email correspondence responded to within 3 business days.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.
Percentage of "clean" salespersons applications processed within 5 business days.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The measure results have consistently been below the target.• The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included unfamiliar acronyms that required explanation.
Percentage of opening inspections of (new) original dealerships within 30 days.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain the calculation of the measure and included unfamiliar acronyms that required explanation.
Average amount of time spent by a support technician on processing an initial salesperson application.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Preferred Trend</i> was not reasonable. The preferred trend was “maintain” but should be “down”.• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain the calculation of the measure or include the source data for the measure calculation.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date was not current. The agency should reevaluate the measure target since they have consistently exceeded the target.• The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent. No supporting data was available for Fiscal year 2011.

New College Institute

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Enrollment in academic programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. The measure name did not contain a data form.• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The measure results were significantly below the target for FY 2011.• The <i>Explanatory Note</i> included information that was outdated that should be eliminated.
Number of contacts made (to students, families, etc.) by Outreach Educators.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.• The <i>Measure Frequency</i> was not reasonable. The frequency conflicts with other information in the measure.• The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.

Roanoke Higher Education Authority

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Average rating for facility and support services of satisfaction surveys conducted with our member institutions, students and clients.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No exceptions noted.

Southern Virginia Higher Education Center

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of students enrolled in for-credit courses in Center-based post-secondary educational programs, including General Educational Development (GED), Associate, Bachelor, Masters, Doctoral level programs and Career Studies Certificate programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No exceptions noted.

Southern Virginia Higher Education Center (continued)

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of students participating in PreK-12 Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) programs.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.

Southwest Virginia Higher Education Center

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of student registrations in undergraduate and graduate courses.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description conflicts with the measure target value.
Number of organizations who use the center for meetings and/or economic development activities.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description conflicts with the measure target value.

Virginia Board for People with Disabilities

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Mentors and information providers recruited and trained to assist individuals with disabilities to obtain and or more effectively utilize Medicaid home and community based waivers.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No exceptions noted.
Non-State (VBPD) Dollars Leveraged per Virginian with Developmental Disabilities Served.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No exceptions noted.

Virginia Commission for the Arts

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of arts events provided to the public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description conflicts with the measure target date.
We will assist arts organizations to increase public attendance at Commission funded arts events.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. Measure names should contain a data form, and should not begin with the phrase "we will" or a verb. • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description conflicts with the measure target value and date. • The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.
Amount of private and local government financial support for the arts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description conflicts with the measure target value and date.
Student participation in the arts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Name</i> wording did not comply with Planning and Budget's guidelines. The measure name did not contain a data form. • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated. • The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description conflicts with the measure target value and date.
Staff costs to process each grant application.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Measure Name</i> was not clear. The name did not accurately describe the measure. • The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.

Virginia Commission for the Arts (continued)

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description conflicts with the measure baseline description and with the measure name.• The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.

Virginia Museum of Natural History

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of outreach programs and services to areas of the state not currently being served.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.
Annual museum attendance.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The measure results have consistently been below the target.• The <i>Measure Frequency</i> was not reasonable. The frequency conflicts with other information in the measure.
Number of scientific collaborations.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.
Cost per visitor to provide temporary exhibits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source data for the measure calculation.

Virginia Parole Board

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Average number of days between the date of hearing and decision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain how the measure was calculated.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date was not current. The measure results have consistently been below the target.

Virginia Parole Board (continued)

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Cost per Virginia Parole Board decisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source data used for the measure calculation and contained outdated information.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target date was not current.• The <i>Measure Data</i> reported on <i>Virginia Performs</i> was not accurate within five percent of supporting documentation.

Virginia Racing Commission

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of Permits Issued and Renewed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No exceptions noted.
Number of Live Race Days.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Preferred Trend</i> was not reasonable. The preferred trend was “maintain” but should be “increase”.
Amount of Pari-Mutuel Tax Revenue Received by the Commonwealth and Localities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No exceptions noted.
The Cost of Each Permit Issued or Renewed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No exceptions noted.

Virginia School for the Deaf and the Blind at Staunton

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percentage of deaf students in grades 1-8 demonstrating improvement in their instructional reading level from fall to spring.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain the calculation of the measure.• The <i>Measure Baseline</i> was not reasonable. The baseline description did not include the data form.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description did not include the data form.• The <i>Measure Data</i> was not accurate within five percent. The agency could not provide the source data for review.

Virginia School for the Deaf and the Blind at Staunton (continued)

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Percentage of blind students in grades 1-8 demonstrating improvement in their reading comprehension from year to year.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not clearly explain the calculation of the measure.• The <i>Measure Baseline</i> was not reasonable. The baseline description did not include the data form.• The <i>Measure Target</i> was not reasonable. The target description did not include the data form.

Virginia Tourism Authority

Performance Measure Name	Exception(s) Noted
Number of consumer inquiries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source data used for the measure calculation.
Number of tourism businesses and localities assisted.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not explain how the measure was calculated or include the source data used for the measure calculation.
Cost per unique user of Virginia Tourism Corporation websites.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The <i>Measure Methodology</i> did not include the source data used for the measure calculation.• The <i>Measure Data</i> was not accurate within five percent of the supporting documentation.

* Denotes measure names that changed after the start of the audit.

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.