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Are we making progress here?

- US Government wants accountability of its tax dollars
  - Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993
  - GPRA Modernization Act of 2010
    - Signed by President Obama Jan 2010
MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF DEPA

FROM: Jacob J. Lew
Director
Jeffrey Zients
Deputy Director for Management

SUBJECT: Delivering on the Accountable Gov
GPRA Modernization Act of 2010

Building a government that works smarter, better, and more efficiently for the American people is a cornerstone of the President’s Accountable Government Initiative. The Administration is committed to delivering a Federal Government that uses taxpayer dollars in more effective and cost-effective ways. Critical to that is creating a culture of performance where agencies constantly strive to achieve meaningful progress and find lower-cost ways to achieve positive impacts. Government leaders must know what works on the ground and what does not, and speed adoption of best government practices. We owe it to the American people to be clear about what we are trying to accomplish and to be disciplined in our delivery.

On January 4, 2011, President Obama signed into law the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010 (the Act), Public Law 111-352. The Act modernizes the Federal government’s performance management framework, retaining and amplifying aspects of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA) while also addressing some of its weaknesses. In addition, the Act reinforces key elements of the Administration’s approach to improving the effectiveness and efficiency of government:

- Leaders set clear, ambitious goals for a limited number of outcome-focused and management priorities;
- Agencies measure, analyze, and communicate performance information to identify successful practices to spread and problematic practices to prevent or correct; and
- Leaders frequently conduct in-depth performance reviews to drive progress on their priorities.

The Act emphasizes the use of goals and measures to improve outcomes, and requires the Federal Government to adopt a limited number of crosscutting goals, defined as objectives that cut across organizational (such as agency) boundaries. These goals are expected to focus on
Purposes of GPRA

- Improve citizen confidence in government
- Improve program effectiveness and accountability
- Improve service delivery
- Initiate program reform
- Improve congressional decision making
- Improve internal management
US Government is forcing us to SWITCH to:

- A results-oriented focus
- **FROM**: Program Inputs Oriented
  - (number of workshops, people contacted, how dirty you get, how busy you look, etc.)
- **TO**: Results Achieved
  - (short, medium, and long term programmatic outcomes)
Development of an Action Plan

- Complete strategic plan with timelines and responsibilities
- How can you accomplish these desired changes?
- What methods, actions, activities will best suit your identified clientele group?
- Milestone evaluations and reporting significant outcomes
Measuring Accomplishments

- Did you meet your stated objectives?
- Did participants adopt the practices?
- How did participants benefit from the change?
- Did others benefit?
- What was the scope of this change or benefit?
You did A LOT of work...SO WHAT?

“I think you should be more explicit here in Step Two.”

You need to convey your accomplishments
How do you do this?
Use a logic model

- Extension project planning at UH-CTAHR requires use of “logic model planning”
CALL FOR EXTENSION PLAN OF WORK PROPOSAL
FY 2014

All faculty are encouraged to prepare a 5-year umbrella POW that describes all responsibilities that reflect their extension FTE assignment. When describing integrated (applied research and extension) and multi-state activities into your FTE priority will be given to integrated and multi-state activities. POWs for the leader programs will also be allowed, with the prior approval of the Associate Dean for Extension.

An Extension POW may be submitted at any time, especially for new extension receive full funding for the initial year, a POW should be approved by October 1 submission and review of POWs for FY2014 is given below. A POW proposal includes County Administrator (for County-based faculty) or directly to the Department Chair (for faculty) who will provide brief reviews. The County Administrator or Department Chair receives the proposal) can obtain an optional peer review (for example the PI and provide a brief written response to reviewers’ comments and recommend Administrators will forward proposals to Department Chair for review. Proposal then forwarded to the Associate Dean for Extension.

Projects may be approved for up to five years. Projects in their final year may be extended by one additional year, upon request to, and approval by, the Associate Dean for Extension projects may be revised, and approved for up to an additional five-year period. The format is the same as a proposal for a new project. However, once approved, continues to carry the original project number.

Included in this packet are the following attachments:
- Attachment 1: Guidelines: Essentials of the Extension Plan of Work
- Attachment 2: Extension Plan of Work Cover Sheet
- Attachment 3: Extension POW Review by County Administrator / Chair
- Attachment 4: Extension POW Final Review Form
- Attachment 5: USDA Knowledge Areas

Each approved POW will receive a standard allocation (amount dependent on funding will be allocated equally by quarter unless otherwise requested. Funding annually for the duration of the POW as long as meaningful progress is seen in narratives are submitted on a timely basis. Annual allocations are expected to be reduced in the fiscal year in which they are allocated—carryover of unexpended funds will not be allowed. POWs, please utilize the concepts found in the Logic Model for program evaluation: http://www.uwex.edu/dpdand/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html

TIMETABLE FY 2014

July 15, 2013  Principle Investigator (PI) submit proposals to the County Administrator (for County-based faculty) or directly to the Department Chair (for Department Chair). County Administrators forward the proposal to PI for review and approval. An optional peer review done at the Department Chair level.

August 15, 2013  Final proposal due to CTAHR Associate Dean for Extension. It should include (1) County Administrator’s / Chair (2) PI’s response to any review recommendations.

October 1, 2013  Project start data for FY 2014

meetings, camps, develop curricula, write publications, handouts, create videos, PowerPoint presentations, websites (or updates), install test plots, or conduct field days. Outputs can be thought of as the means, processes, or procedures used to accomplish the POW’s performance objectives. Please include a timeline of activities by year.

XIII. EXPECTED OUTCOMES and OUTCOME INDICATORS: Describe measurable short, medium or long term outcomes and indicators that can reflect changes or trends in industries, communities, families, individuals, and /or the State of Hawaii. Outcome indicators may be measured in a variety of ways, including retrospective surveys, behavior checklists, interviews and data (pre and post-test scores, sales records, production records, etc.). Each outcome may have more than one indicator and can be short, medium, or long term. See Logic Model for further information: http://www.uwex.edu/dpdand/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html

XIII. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL LINKAGES: List linkages with other CTAHR faculty, other UH faculty as well as other institutions, organizations, and individuals that will be used to strengthen the project.

XIV. TARGET AUDIENCE(S): Who are the stakeholders who will benefit from this work? Examples of stakeholders are: families, consumers, farmers, processors, other scientists, etc.

XV. POW DURATION: (Typically 5 years for POW).

RESOURCES: Note: A budget sheet is NOT required for a POW. A limited amount of funding will be provided for each POW. This can be used for any day to day POW activities such as materials and supplies, travel (local or national, but not international), that is appropriate to the plan. Extension funds can be used for domestic travel, but if you want to use the funds for a US mainland trip (such as to attend a conference) you must obtain prior permission from the Associate Dean for Extension to do so. Permission for the use of extension funds for mainland travel will only be granted with strong justification, including how attendance will support your POW objectives and how the information obtained will be shared with others in CTAHR.

Supplemental funding can be requested through the RFP process announced annually. Faculty should also consider extramural funding from other sources.
A logic model is...

- A depiction of a program showing what the program will do and what it is to accomplish.
- A series of “if-then” relationships that, if implemented as intended, lead to the desired outcomes.
- The core of program planning and evaluation model at UH CTAHR.
Simplest Form

INPUTS  →  OUTPUTS  →  OUTCOMES
Logic models can be applied to:

- a small program,
- a process (i.e. a team working together),
- a large, multi-component program,
- organizations or businesses
Logic Model: Definition

LOGIC

- the principles of reasoning
- reasonable
- the relationship of elements to each other and a whole

MODEL

- small object representing another, often larger object (represents reality, isn’t reality)
- preliminary pattern serving as a plan
- tentative description of a system or theory that accounts for all its known properties
“If you don’t know where you are going, how are you gonna’ know when you get there?”

Yogi Berra

- Where are you going?
- How will you get there?
- What will show that you’ve arrived?
Many people say a logic model is a road map.
Accountability Era

- What gets measured gets done
- If you don’t measure results, you can’t tell success from failure
- If you can’t see success, you can’t reward it
- If you can’t reward success, you’re probably rewarding failure
- If you can’t see success, you can’t learn from it
- If you can’t recognize failure, you can’t correct it.
- If you can demonstrate results, you can win public support.

Reinventing Government, Osborne and Gaebler, 1992
What logic model is not...

A theory
Reality
An evaluation model or method

- It is a framework for describing the relationships between investments, activities, and results.
- It provides a common approach for integrating planning, implementation, evaluation and reporting.
Why the hype? What’s the benefit?

- Focus on and be accountable for what matters – OUTCOMES
- Provides common language
- Makes assumptions EXPLICIT
- Supports continuous improvement
- Promotes communications
- Busy work is important, but it needs to count
Logic modelling is a way of thinking... not just a pretty graphic

“We build the road and the road builds us.”
-Sri Lankan saying
If-Then Relationships

Underlying a logic model is a series of ‘if-then’ relationships that express the program’s theory of change.
How will activities lead to desired outcomes?
A series of if-then relationships

Tutoring Program Example

IF then
We invest time and money

IF then
We can provide tutoring 3 hrs/week for 1 school year to 50 children

IF then
Students struggling academically can be tutored

IF then
They will learn and improve their skills

IF then
They will get better grades

IF then
They will move to next grade level on time
Logical chain of connections showing what the program is to accomplish

**INPUTS**
- Program investments

**OUTPUTS**
- Activities
- Participation

**OUTCOMES**
- Short
- Medium
- Long-term

What we invest → What we do → Who we reach → What results
Everyday example

Situation: HEADACHE

Inputs: Get pills

Outputs: Take pills

Outcomes: Feel better

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Program Development and Evaluation, © 2008 by the University of Wisconsin System.
Every day logic model – Family Vacation

**INPUTS**
- Family Members
- Budget
- Car
- Camping Equipment

**OUTPUTS**
- Drive to state park
- Set up camp
- Cook, play, talk, laugh, hike

**OUTCOMES**
- Family members learn about each other; family bonds; family has a good time
A bit more detail

**INPUTS**

- Program investments

**OUTPUTS**

- Activities
- Participation

**OUTCOMES**

- Short
- Medium
- Long-term

What we invest → What we do → Who we reach → What results

**SO WHAT??**
What is the VALUE?
Program Planning

- Evaluate
- Modify & Revise
- Identifying Needs/Issues
- Industry Impact/Priority
- Design Program Plan
- Implement Program Plan

J. Sugano, University of Hawaii at Manoa, College of Tropical Agriculture
Fully detailed logic model

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Program Development and Evaluation, © 2008 by the University of Wisconsin System.
First, we assess the situation and identify program inputs
Components: Inputs

Examples:
- Internal & External Agencies
- Grant Funds
- Cooperators
- Retailers & Wholesalers
- Facilities
- Equipment
- Technologies
- Materials
- Etc.
Next we execute educational program using various program outputs
## Components: Outputs (Examples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Delivery</th>
<th>Hard Copy Materials</th>
<th>Alternative Methods</th>
<th>Electronic Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field visitations</td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>Translated materials</td>
<td>Web site information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td>Picture sheets</td>
<td>Email Alerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>Translators</td>
<td>PDF sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>PPT Lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Visits</td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Video / DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax material</td>
<td>Manuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>Self paced materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Electronic Material
- Web site information
- Email Alerts
- PDF sheets
- PPT Lessons
- Video / DVD
- Social media

### Traditional Delivery Examples
- Field visitations
- Workshops
- Meetings
- Demonstrations
- Office Visits
- Phone calls
- Fax material
- Conferences
- Associations

### Hard Copy Materials Examples
- Newsletters
- Bulletins
- Brochures
- Publications
- Articles
- Journals
- Manuals
- Self paced materials

### Alternative Methods Examples
- Translated materials
- Picture sheets
- Translators

### Electronic Material Examples
- Web site information
- Email Alerts
- PDF sheets
- PPT Lessons
- Video / DVD
- Social media
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>What we do</th>
<th>Who we reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td>• Train, teach</td>
<td>• Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deliver services</td>
<td>• Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop products and resources</td>
<td>• Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Network with others</td>
<td>• Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build partnerships</td>
<td>• Decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess</td>
<td>• Policy makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with the media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTICIPATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Program Development and Evaluation, © 2008 by the University of Wisconsin System.
## Delivery Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATIONS</th>
<th>WEB/VIDEO</th>
<th>SCH.</th>
<th>PUBLIC RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROWERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Growers</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Growers</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Yard Growers</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhoc Advisors</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Investigators</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Managers</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Leaders</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Audience**

Matching media with Audiences

University of Hawaii Extension
Then we assess...what is the program outcomes and IMPACT?

Short, medium and long term program outcomes

Asking the ‘So What?’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>What results for individuals, families, communities.....</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in</td>
<td>• Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Behavioral intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIUM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in</td>
<td>• Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LONG-TERM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conditions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social (well-being)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Counterparties_
Examples of **Short Term Expected Outcomes**

- **Identification** of promising new varieties with superior characteristics
- **Increased knowledge** about the role of the ____ system and its ability to produce high quality ____ across the state
- **Better understanding** about modifications to ____ production and its effect on crop quality/yields
Examples of Intermediate Expected Outcomes

- Evaluation and trial of new ____varieties or cropping systems by growers
- Acceptance of new ____by growers and processors
- Collaborative partnerships established between growers and processors
Examples of **Long Term** Expected Outcomes

- Reduced dependence / less reliance on ______
- Greater self sufficiency for Hawaii
- Increased Hawaii’s market share in ___production
- Advancement of Hawaii’s diversified agriculture sector
- Increase in locally produced commodities
Hierarchy of effects

Source: Bennett and Rockwell, 1995, Targeting Outcomes of Programs

- **Participation**
  - Number and characteristics of people reached; frequency and intensity of contact

- **Reactions**
  - Degree of satisfaction with program; level of interest; feelings toward activities, educational methods

- **Learning**
  - Changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, aspirations

- **Actions**
  - Changes in behaviors and practices

Social-economic-environmental improvements
Language: What do you mean by...

- Goal = Impact
- Impact = Long-term outcome
- Objectives (participant focused) = Outcomes
- Activities = Outputs
  - Outputs may signify “tangible” accomplishments as a result of activities; products
**Simple logic model**

**SITUATION:** During a county needs assessment, majority of parents reported that they were having difficulty parenting and felt stressed as a result

---

**INPUTS**
- Staff
- Money
- Partners
- Research

**OUTPUTS**
- Develop parent ed curriculum
- Deliver series of interactive sessions
- Facilitate support groups
- Targeted parents attend

**OUTCOMES**
- Parents increase knowledge of child dev
- Parents better understanding their own parenting style
- Parents gain skills in effective parenting practices
- Parents identify appropriate actions to take
- Parents use effective parenting practices
- Improved child-parent relations
- Strong families

---

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Program Development and Evaluation, © 2008 by the University of Wisconsin System.
Advanced logic model: Tabaco Control

Research: evidence-base
Policy
Practitioners
Advocates
Funders
Partners

Community programs
Chronic disease pr’grms
School programs
Enforcement
Statewide programs
Counter-marketing
Cessation programs
Evaluation and Surveillance
Administration & management

Policy makers
Current and potential users
Disparate populations
Key stakeh’ders
Publics

Change in knowledge, attitudes, skills, motivation
Change in support
Change in access
Policy change
System change
Individual change

Decreased smoking
Reduced exposure to ETS
Reduce mortality, morbidity
Advanced logic model: Systems Approach

INPUTS  

OUTPUTS  

SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES  

MED-TERM OUTCOMES  

LONG-TERM OUTCOMES  

Single organization  

Multi-Org partnership  

Community  

Source: Adapted from CDC: http://www.phppo.cdc.gov/phtn/DLSummit2004/1

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Program Development and Evaluation, © 2008 by the University of Wisconsin System.
Programs are not linear!
Goal – outcome definition

**Goal** represents a general, big-picture statement of desired results. “We find that it is useful to think of **goals** as the answer to the question ‘What are issues that you would like the program to address?’ (e.g., the goal of the program is to address existing community laws and norms about ATOD use)

**Outcomes** as the answer to: ‘What changes do you want to occur because of your program?’ (e.g., the outcome of the program will be to increase the number of community residents who believe teenaged smoking is dangerous).”

(Western CAPT)
Outputs vs. Outcomes

• OUTPUT:
  • Number of patients discharged from state mental hospital
  • Reached 100 people at a workshop

• OUTCOME:
  • Percentage of discharged who are capable of living independently
  • Ten individuals lowered their blood pressure with exercise and health eating

FOCUS ON THE OUTCOME

Adapted from University of Wisconsin-Extension, Program Development and Evaluation, © 2008 by the University of Wisconsin System.
Not how many worms the bird feeds its young, but how well the fledgling flies.
Logic model and evaluation component

Needs/asset assessment:
What are the characteristics, needs, priorities of target population?
What are potential barriers/facilitators?
What is most appropriate?

Process evaluation:
How is program implemented? Fidelity of implementation?
Are activities delivered as intended?
Are participants being reached as intended?
What are participant reactions?

Outcome evaluation:
To what extent are desired changes occurring? For whom?
Is the program making a difference?
What seems to work? Not work?
What are unintended outcomes?
EVALUATION:
What do you (and others) want to know about this program?

Staff
- Develop parent ed curriculum
- Deliver series of interactive sessions
- Facilitate support groups

Parents attend
- Parents increase knowledge of child dev
- Parents better understand their own parenting style
- Parents gain skills in effective parenting practices
- Parents use effective parenting practices
- Parents identify appropriate actions to take

Improved child-parent relations
- Strong families

What amount of $ and time were invested?

How many sessions were actually delivered? How effectively? # and quality of support groups?

Who/how many attended/did not attend? Did they attend all sessions? Supports groups? Were they satisfied – will they come again?

To what extent did knowledge and skills increase? For whom? Why? What else happened?

To what extent did behaviors change? For whom? Why? What else happened?

To what extent are relations improved? Does this result in stronger families?
Common Logic Model Variations

UWEX logic model

Inputs → Activities → Participation → Outputs → Outcomes → Outcomes

Other common logic model used by United Way, Center for Disease Control and others

Inputs → Activities → Outputs → Outcomes

Inputs → Activities → Outputs → Outcomes
Check your logic model

1. Is it meaningful?
2. Does it make sense?
3. Is it doable?
4. Can it be verified?
Logic model in evaluation

What do you want to know?  How will you know it?

EVALUATION: check and verify

University of Wisconsin-Extension, Program Development and Evaluation, © 2008 by the University of Wisconsin System.
Logic model with indicators for Outputs and Outcomes

**Outputs**

- Program implemented
- Targeted farmers
- Farmers learn

**Outcomes**

- Farmers practice new techniques
- Farm profitability increases

Outputs and Outcomes indicators:

- Number of workshops held
- Quality of workshops
- Number and percent of farmers attending
- Number and percent who increase knowledge
- Number and percent who practice new techniques
- Number and percent reporting increased profits; amount of increase
I say...Start with the End in Mind

- Example: Long term adoption of agricultural recommendations provided by CTAHR
How do we increase grower adoption (APPLICATION) of research-based information?

*** With the end in mind, what do we have to do to UPFRONT to ensure we will get the outcomes we expect at the end of the program?

- Inputs
- Outputs
- Priorities
- Etc.?
So, why bother? What’s in this for you?

- “This seems like a lot of work.”
- “Where in the world would I get all the information to put in a logic model?”
- “I’m a right brain type of person – this isn’t for me.”
- “Even if we created one, what would we do with it?”
Building a government that works smarter, better, and more efficiently for the American people is a cornerstone of the President’s Accountable Government Initiative. The Administration is committed to delivering a Federal Government that uses taxpayer dollars in more effective and cost-effective ways. Critical to that is creating a culture of performance where agencies constantly strive to achieve meaningful progress and find lower-cost ways to achieve positive impacts. Government leaders must know what works on the ground and what does not, and speed adoption of best government practices. We owe it to the American people to be clear about what we are trying to accomplish and to be disciplined in our delivery.

On January 4, 2011, President Obama signed into law the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010 (the Act), Public Law 111-352. The Act modernizes the Federal government’s performance management framework, retaining and amplifying aspects of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA) while also addressing some of its weaknesses. In addition, the Act reinforces key elements of the Administration’s approach to improving the effectiveness and efficiency of government:

- Leaders set clear, ambitious goals for a limited number of outcome-focused and management priorities;
- Agencies measure, analyze, and communicate performance information to identify successful practices to spread and problematic practices to prevent or correct; and
- Leaders frequently conduct in-depth performance reviews to drive progress on their priorities.

The Act emphasizes the use of goals and measures to improve outcomes, and requires the Federal Government to adopt a limited number of crosscutting goals, defined as objectives that cut across organizational (such as agency) boundaries. These goals are expected to focus on
After Program Delivery: Ask Yourself, ‘So What? What’s the Impact?’