IL NET

an ILRU/NCIL National Training and Technical Assistance Project

Expanding the Power of the Independent Living Movement

IL & OUTCOME MEASUREMENT

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

A Two-Part National Teleconference & Webcast

Part I

Monday, March 12, 2007
3:00 – 4:30pm Eastern

Part II

Wednesday, March 14, 2007
3:00 – 4:30pm Eastern

Training Materials

Contributors to the training materials:

Mike Hendricks
Bob Michaels
Tim Fuchs

IL & OUTCOME MEASUREMENT
WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

A Two-Part National Teleconference & Webcast

ILRU Program
2323 S. Shepherd Street
Suite 1000
Houston, Texas 77019
713-520-0232 (V)
713-520-5136 (TTY)
713-520-5785 (FAX)
ilru@ilru.org

http://www.ilru.org

NCIL
1710 Rhode Island Ave., NW
5th Floor
Washington, DC 20036
202-207-0334 (V)
202-207-0340 (TTY)
202-207-0341 (FAX)
1-877-525-3400 (V/TTY - toll free)
ncil@ncil.org
http://www.ncil.org

Substantial support for the development of this publication was provided by the Rehabilitation Services Administration, U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement of the Department of Education should be inferred.

The IL NET is a collaborative project of Independent Living Research Utilization (ILRU) and the National Council on Independent Living (NCIL), with funding from the
Rehabilitation Services Administration, through Agreement No. H132B99002.

IL & OUTCOME MEASUREMENT
WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

A Two-Part National Teleconference & Webcast

IL NET STAFF

ILRU

Lex Frieden
Executive Director
713.520.0232 (ext. 116)
lfrieden@ilru.org

Richard Petty
Program Director
713.520.0232 (ext. 122)
richard.petty@bcm.tmc.edu

Laurel Richards
Training Director
713.520.0232 (ext. 135)
lrichards@ilru.org

Laurie Gerken Redd
Administrative Director
713.520.0232 (ext. 120)
lredd@ilru.org

ILRU (Continued)

Dawn Heinsohn
Training Coordinator
713.520.0232 (ext. 130)
heinsohn@ilru.org

ILRU
2323 S. Shepherd
Suite 1000
Houston, TX 77019
713-520-0232 (V)
713-520-5136 (TTY)
713-520-5785 (FAX)
ilru@ilru.org
http://www.ilru.org

NCIL

John Lancaster
Executive Director
202.207.0334
john@ncil.org

Tim Fuchs
Operations Director
202.207.0334 (ext. 1005)
tim@ncil.org

Denise Law
Member Services Associate
202.207.0334 (ext. 1000)
denise@ncil.org

Jorge Pineda
Accountant
202.207.0334 (ext. 1006)
jorge@ncil.org

NCIL (Continued)

NCIL
1710 Rhode Island Ave., NW
5th Floor
Washington, DC 20036
202.207.0334 (V)
202.207.0340 (TTY)
202.207.0341 (FAX)
ncil@ncil.org
http://www.ncil.org

ABOUT ILRU

The Independent Living Research Utilization (ILRU) Program was established in 1977 to serve as a national center for informa
tion, training, research, and technical assistance for independent living. In the mid-1980's, it began conducting management training programs for executive directors and middle managers of independent living centers in the U.S.

ILRU has developed an extensive set of resource materials on various aspects of independent living, including a comprehensive directory of programs providing independent living services in the U.S. and Canada.

ILRU is a program of TIRR, a nationally recognized, free-standing rehabilitation facility for persons with physical disabilities. TIRR is part of TIRR Systems, a not-for-profit corporation dedicated to providing a continuum of services to individuals with disabilities. Since 1959, TIRR has provided patient care, education, and research to promote the integration of people with physical and cognitive disabilities into all aspects of community living.

ABOUT NCIL

Founded in 1982, the National Council on Independent Living is a membership organization representing independent living centers and individuals with disabilities. NCIL has been instrumental in efforts to standardize requirements for consumer control in management and delivery of services provided through federally-funded independent living centers.

Until 1992, NCIL's efforts to foster consumer control and direction in independent living services through changes in federal legislation and regulations were coordinated through an extensive network and involvement of volunteers from independent living centers and other organizations around the country. Since 1992, NCIL has had a national office in Arlington, Virginia, just minutes by subway or car from the major centers of government in Washington, D.C. While NCIL continues to rely on the commitment and dedication of volunteers from around the country, the establishment of a national office with staff and other resources has strengthened its capacity to serve as the voice for independent living in matters of critical importance in eliminating discrimination and unequal treatment based on disability.

IL & OUTCOME MEASUREMENT
WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

A Two-Part National Teleconference & Webcast

ABOUT THE IL NET

This training program is sponsored by the IL NET, a collaborative project of the Independent Living Research Utilization (ILRU) of Houston and the National Council on Independent Living (NCIL).

The IL NET is a national training and technical assistance project working to strengthen the independent living movement by supporting Centers for Independent Living (CILs) and Statewide Independent Living Councils (SILCs).

IL NET activities include workshops, national teleconferences, technical assistance, online information, training materials, fact sheets, and other resource materials on operating, managing, and evaluating centers and SILCs.

The mission of the IL NET is to assist in building strong and effective CILs and SILCs which are led and staffed by people who practice the independent living philosophy.

The IL NET operates with these objectives:

- Assist CILs and SILCs in managing effective organizations by providing a continuum of information, training, and technical assistance.
- Assist CILs and SILCs to become strong community advocates/change agents by providing a continuum of information, training, and technical assistance.
- Assist CILs and SILCs to develop strong, consumer-responsive services by providing a continuum of information, training, and technical assistance.

ABOUT YOUR TRAINER

Mike Hendricks received his Ph.D. in Methodology and Evaluation Research from Northwestern University, and ever since, he's worked to help programs become as effective as possible. In particular, Mike believes it's very important that CILs and SILCs know exactly what we're trying to achieve, have a way to measure how we're doing, monitor our progress on a regular basis, and consistently use what we learn to improve our efforts. He's successfully used this approach with a wide variety of clients – governments at all levels (city, county, state, national), foundations, national nonprofit associations, and local service delivery agencies.

Mike is also a well-known and respected member of the program evaluation community. A former board member of the American Evaluation Association, he serves on the editorial board of the American Journal of Evaluation, speaks and publishes regularly, and is often invited to train others. Mike recently spent two weeks in England training front-line service providers in five different cities.

IL & OUTCOME MEASUREMENT
WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

A Two-Part National Teleconference & Webcast

Part I – March 12, 2007
3:00 – 4:30pm EDT
Part II – March 14, 2007
3:00 – 4:30pm EDT

AGENDA: PART I

Welcome & Introductions

Background of Independent Living & Outcome Measurement
- Forces Encouraging Outcome Measurement
- Q & A

IL Response to Outcome Measurement
- NCIL & ILRU
- Outcome Measures Task Force
- CILs, SILCs, and IL Associations
- Q & A

Outcomes
- What are Outcomes?
- Examples
- Outcomes vs. Outputs
- Q & A

Logic Models
- What is a Logic Model?
- Creating Logic Models
- Examples
- Q & A

Indicators
- What is an Indicator?
- Why Do We Need Indicators?
- Examples

Q & A

IL & OUTCOME MEASUREMENT
WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

A Two-Part National Teleconference & Webcast

Part I – March 12, 2007
3:00 – 4:30pm EDT
Part II – March 14, 2007
3:00 – 4:30pm EDT

AGENDA: PART II

Welcome & Introductions

Brief Review of Part 1
- Q & A

The Outcome Measures Task Force
- The IL Logic Model
- Need to Create Applicable Indicators
- The Need for Input from CILs & SILCs
- Q & A

IL NET Website for Candidate Indicators
How You Can Help
- Q & A

Next Steps
- Outcomes Measurement Workshops
- Choosing Indicators
- NCIL Conference
- Putting the Process to Work

Q & A

IL & OUTCOME MEASUREMENT
WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

A Two-Part National Teleconference & Webcast

Training Materials — Table of Contents

Training Materials

IL & OUTCOME MEASUREMENT

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

A Two-Part National Teleconference & Webcast

ExpectMORE.gov

Expect Federal Programs to Perform Well, and Better Every Year

About Us

WHO WE ARE

The content on ExpectMore.gov is developed by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget and Federal agencies. Together, we assess the performance of every Federal program and hold ourselves accountable for improvement.

HOW WE ASSESS PROGRAMS - The Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

The Federal Government wants programs to work. It is assessing all programs to make sure they are working well for the American people.

We use a standard questionnaire called the Program Assessment Rating Tool, or PART, for short. The PART asks approximately 25 important, yet common sense, questions about a program's performance and management. For each question, there is a short answer and a detailed explanation with supporting evidence. The answers determine a program's overall rating. Once each assessment is completed, we develop a program improvement plan so we can follow up and improve the program's performance.

PART assessments help us learn how we can achieve better results for the American people - we are always striving to make improvements, regardless of whether a program performs well or not.

ABOUT PROGRAM RATINGS

The program rating indicates how well a program is performing, so the public can see how effectively tax dollars are being spent.
ExpectMore.gov tells you whether or not a program is performing.

> Programs that are PERFORMING have ratings of Effective, Moderately Effective, or Adequate.
>
> Effective. This is the highest rating a program can achieve. Programs rated Effective set ambitious goals, achieve results, are well-managed and improve efficiency.
>
> Moderately Effective. In general, a program rated Moderately Effective has set ambitious goals and is well-managed. Moderately Effective programs likely need to improve their efficiency or address other problems in the programs' design or management in order to achieve better results.
>
> Adequate. This rating describes a program that needs to set more ambitious goals, achieve better results, improve accountability or strengthen its management practices.
>
> Programs categorized as NOT PERFORMING have ratings of Ineffective or Results Not Demonstrated.

Ineffective. Programs receiving this rating are not using your tax dollars effectively. Ineffective programs have been unable to achieve results due to a lack of clarity regarding the program's purpose or goals, poor management, or some other significant weakness.

Results Not Demonstrated. A rating of Results Not Demonstrated (RND) indicates that a program has not been able to develop acceptable performance goals or collect data to determine whether it is performing.

ACTION PLANS FOR IMPROVING PERFORMANCE

There is always room for improvement, which is why each assessed program has a plan to improve performance and management over time. The U.S. Office of Management and Budget and Federal agencies develop these plans collaboratively and then track the progress that is made. As a result, all assessed programs are held accountable for improving their performance and management.

The type and scope of the follow-up actions in improvement plans vary greatly. In some cases, the recommended actions focus specifically on one or two key areas needing improvement. In other cases, the follow-up actions are much broader. Sometimes, a program assessment finds that a program is duplicative of other, better run programs or even that the program has already fulfilled its original purpose. In cases such as these, one of the follow-up actions might be to work with the Congress to end, or terminate, the program.

OVERVIEW OF RATINGS FOR ALL FEDERAL PROGRAMS

This is the fifth year that we have assessed the strengths and weaknesses of Federal programs and made recommendations for improving their performance. In the next two years, we will have completed assessments for all Federal programs.

To date, we have assessed about 96% of all Federal programs. Here's how they stack up, by rating.

Distribution of Program Ratings

Number of Programs Assessed — 977
Effective — 17%
Moderately Effective — 30%
Adequate — 28%
Ineffective — 3%
Results Not Demonstrated — 22%

Visit the homepage to search for an individual program and to learn whether or not it is performing.

ExpectMORE.gov

Expect Federal Programs to Perform Well, and Better Every Year

Program Assessment

Independent Living for People with Disabilities

The Independent Living programs, which include the Center for Independent Living and IL State Grants programs, help individuals with disabilities live independently in their communities by providing skills training, counseling, information and referral, and assistance with individual and systems advocacy.

NOT PERFORMING—Results Not Demonstrated

(A rating of Results Not Demonstrated (RND) indicates that a program has not been able to develop acceptable performance goals or collect data to determine whether it is performing.)

The program has performance measures, but has not collected performance data and used it to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. The program is in the process of collecting performance data that can be used to evaluate the program.

The programs lacks credible evidence from rigorous evaluations to measure the impact of their services on individuals with disabilities. Evaluations have indicated that these programs are meeting their legislative requirements, but the evaluations were not designed to measure the impact of the programs effectiveness in delivering services.

The program has not met the program's statutory site review requirement. The statute requires that the program perform site reviews of 15 percent of Center for Independent Living grantees and 1/3 of state-administered Center for Independent Living grantees each year.

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

Collecting performance data and using these data to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

Conducting periodic and high quality evaluations.

Devising and implementing a plan for meeting the statutory site review requirements.

Notes:

2003 PART Results for the Independent Living Program

PART Question (note that some questions have been shortened)

Section 1 – Program Purpose and Design

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? YES
1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? YES
1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other effort? YES
1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit its effectiveness or efficiency? YES
1.5 Is the program effectively targeted so that resources reach beneficiaries and address purpose? YES

Section score - 100%

Section 2 – Strategic Planning

2.1 Does the program have specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes? NO
2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? NO
2.3 Are there annual performance measures that track progress toward the long-term goals? NO
2.4 Does the program have baselines, targets, and timeframes for its annual measures? NO
2.5 Do all partners commit to and work toward the program's annual and/or long-term goals? NO
2.6 Do independent evaluations improve the program and assess effectiveness and relevance? YES
2.7 Are Budget requests tied to accomplishing the annual and long-term performance goals? NO
2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? NO

Section score - 12%

2003 PART Results for the Independent Living Program

Section 3 – Program Management

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect and use timely and credibly performance information? NO
3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners accountable for cost, schedule and performance? NO
3.3 Are all funds obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? YES
3.4 Does the program measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness? NO
3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? YES
3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? YES
3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? NO
3.CO1 Are grants awarded based on a competitive process that includes an assessment of merit? YES
3.CO2 Does the program have oversight practices that provide knowledge of grantee activities? NO
3.CO3 Does the program annually collect and make available grantee performance data? NO

Section score - 40%

Section 4 – Program Results/Accountability

4.1 Has the program shown progress in achieving its long-term outcome performance goals? NO
4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? NO
4.3 Has the program improved its efficiency or cost-effectiveness each year? NO
4.4 Does the program's performance compare favorably to relevant other programs? NO STUDIES
4.5 Do independent evaluations indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? SMALL EXTENT

Section score - 8%

Overall rating ------- "Results Not Demonstrated"
(Included under "Not Performing")

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) Scores

All Department of Education Programs (as of 02/05/2007) for 2008 Budget - http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2008/sheets/part.pdf

21st Century Community Learning Centers
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 75%
Management (20%) -89%
Results (50%) – 13%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $981.00
2007 Estimate - $981.00
2008 Request - $981.00

Adult Education State Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) -100%
Results (50%) – 80%
Rating – Effective
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $564.00
2007 Estimate - $564.00
2008 Request - $564.00

Advanced Placement
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) -100%
Results (50%) – 42%
Rating – Moderately Effective
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $32.00
2007 Estimate - $32.00
2008 Request - $122.00

American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 75%
Management (20%) -50%
Results (50%) – 53%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $33.00
2007 Estimate - $34.00
2008 Request - $34.00

American Printing House for the Blind
Program Purpose & Design (20%) -60%
Planning (10%) - 13%
Management (20%) -67%
Results (50%) - 0%
Rating - Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $18.00
2007 Estimate - $18.00
2008 Request - $18.00

Assistive Technology Alternative Financing Program
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 0%
Management (20%) -40%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $4.00
2007 Estimate - $4.00
2008 Request - $-

B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 40%
Planning (10%) - 50%
Management (20%) -50%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $1.00
2007 Estimate - $1.00
2008 Request - $-

Byrd Honors Scholarships
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 40%
Planning (10%) - 63%
Management (20%) -44%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $41.00
2007 Estimate - $41.00
2008 Request - $-

Charter Schools Grant
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) -80%
Results (50%) – 47%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $215.00
2007 Estimate - $215.00
2008 Request - $215.00

Child Care Access Means Parents in School
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 63%
Management (20%) -70%
Results (50%) – 17%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $16.00
2007 Estimate - $16.00
2008 Request - $16.00

College Assistance Migrant Program
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 50%
Management (20%) -60%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $15.00
2007 Estimate - $15.00
2008 Request - $15.00

Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 25%
Management (20%) -60%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $56.00
2007 Estimate - $56.00
2008 Request - $56.00

Comprehensive School Reform
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 84%
Management (20%) -63%
Results (50%) – 33%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $8.00
2007 Estimate - $10.00
2008 Request - $-

Developing Hispanic-serving Institutions
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) -80%
Results (50%) – 17%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $95.00
2007 Estimate - $95.00
2008 Request - $95.00

Early Reading First
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) -100%
Results (50%) – 59%
Rating – Moderately Effective
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $103.00
2007 Estimate - $103.00
2008 Request - $118.00

Education - Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 50%
Management (20%) -100%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $50.00
2007 Estimate - $50.00
2008 Request - $50.00

Education - State Assessment Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 90%
Planning (10%) - 86%
Management (20%) -78%
Results (50%) – 17%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $400.00
2007 Estimate - $400.00
2008 Request - $400.00

Education for Homeless Children and Youths
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 75%
Management (20%) -89%
Results (50%) – 34%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $62.00
2007 Estimate - $62.00
2008 Request - $62.00

Education State Grants for Innovative Programs
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 20%
Planning (10%) - 0%
Management (20%) -56%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $99.00
2007 Estimate - $99.00
2008 Request - $-

English Language Acquisition State Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 63%
Management (20%) -78%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $669.00
2007 Estimate - $671.00
2008 Request - $671.00

Enhancing Education Through Technology
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 63%
Management (20%) -100%
Results (50%) – 17%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $272.00
2007 Estimate - $273.00
2008 Request - $-

Even Start
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 43%
Management (20%) -63%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Ineffective
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $99.00
2007 Estimate - $112.00
2008 Request - $-

Federal Family Education Loans
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) -44%
Results (50%) – 53%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $28,068.00
2007 Estimate - $6,415.00
2008 Request - $5,078.00

Federal Pell Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) -67%
Results (50%) – 53%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $13,045.00
2007 Estimate - $12,607.00
2008 Request - $13,223.00

Federal Perkins Loans
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 20%
Planning (10%) - 50%
Management (20%) -33%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Ineffective
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $65.00
2007 Estimate - $65.00
2008 Request - $-

Federal Support for Gallaudet University
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 75%
Management (20%) -100%
Results (50%) – 25%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $107.00
2007 Estimate - $107.00
2008 Request - $107.00

Federal Support for Howard University
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) -67%
Results (50%) – 60%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $237.00
2007 Estimate - $234.00
2008 Request - $234.00

Federal Support for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 75%
Management (20%) -56%
Results (50%) – 40%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $56.00
2007 Estimate - $56.00
2008 Request - $56.00

Federal Work-Study
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 63%
Management (20%) -56%
Results (50%) – 20%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $980.00
2007 Estimate - $980.00
2008 Request - $980.00

Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 84%
Management (20%) -88%
Results (50%) – 13%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $303.00
2007 Estimate - $303.00
2008 Request - $303.00

Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) -100%
Results (50%) – 25%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $30.00
2007 Estimate - $30.00
2008 Request - $30.00

High School Equivalency Program
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 25%
Management (20%) -60%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $19.00
2007 Estimate - $19.00
2008 Request - $19.00

IDEA Special Education - Parent Information Centers
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 25%
Management (20%) -60%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $26.00
2007 Estimate - $26.00
2008 Request - $26.00

IDEA Special Education - Research and Innovation
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 40%
Management (20%) -60%
Results (50%) – 8%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $72.00
2007 Estimate - $72.00
2008 Request - $72.00

IDEA Special Education - Technical Assistance and Dissemination
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 25%
Management (20%) -60%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $49.00
2007 Estimate - $49.00
2008 Request - $49.00

IDEA Special Education Grants for Infants and Families
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 29%
Management (20%) -44%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $436.00
2007 Estimate - $432.00
2008 Request - $432.00

IDEA Special Education Grants to States
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 75%
Management (20%) -100%
Results (50%) – 25%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $10,583.00
2007 Estimate - $10,492.00
2008 Request - $10,492.00

IDEA Special Education Personnel Preparation Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 0%
Management (20%) -60%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $90.00
2007 Estimate - $90.00
2008 Request - $90.00

IDEA Special Education Preschool Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 40%
Planning (10%) - 0%
Management (20%) -56%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $381.00
2007 Estimate - $381.00
2008 Request - $381.00

IDEA Technology and Media Services
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 38%
Management (20%) -60%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $38.00
2007 Estimate - $38.00
2008 Request - $25.00

Impact Aid Basic Support Payments for Children with Disabilities
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 13%
Management (20%) -78%
Results (50%) – 25%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $1,141.00
2007 Estimate - $1,141.00
2008 Request - $1,141.00

Impact Aid Construction
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) -100%
Results (50%) – 17%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $18.00
2007 Estimate - $47.00
2008 Request - $18.00

Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 0%
Management (20%) -50%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $64.00
2007 Estimate - $64.00
2008 Request - $64.00

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 100%
Management (20%) -100%
Results (50%) – 50%
Rating – Moderately Effective
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $2,887.00
2007 Estimate - $2,887.00
2008 Request - $2,787.00

Independent Living for People with Disabilities
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 13%
Management (20%) -40%
Results (50%) – 8%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)
2006 Actual - $97.00
2007 Estimate - $97.00
2008 Request - $97.00

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) Scores

All Department of Education Programs (as of 02/05/2007) for 2008 Budget CONTINUED -

http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2008/sheets/part.pdf

Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 50%
Management (20%) - 89%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 95
2007 Estimate - 95
2008 Request - 95

International Education Domestic Programs
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 70%
Results (50%) – 8%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 92
2007 Estimate - 92
2008 Request - 92

Javits Fellowships
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 70%
Results (50%) – 25%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 10
2007 Estimate - 10
2008 Request - 10

Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 20%
Planning (10%) - 13%
Management (20%) - 78%
Results (50%) – 20%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 65
2007 Estimate - 64
2008 Request - 0

Magnet Schools
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 63%
Management (20%) - 70%
Results (50%) – 20%

Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 107
2007 Estimate - 107
2008 Request - 107

Mathematics and Science Partnerships
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 38%
Management (20%) - 78%
Results (50%) – 0%

Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 182
2007 Estimate - 182
2008 Request - 182

Mentoring Program
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 70%
Results (50%) – 0%

Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 49
2007 Estimate - 19
2008 Request - 0

Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 50%
Management (20%) - 40%
Results (50%) – 13%

Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 2
2007 Estimate - 2
2008 Request - 0

Migrant State Agency Program
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 75%
Management (20%) - 78%
Results (50%) – 33%

Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 387
2007 Estimate - 380
2008 Request - 380

National Assessment for Educational Progress
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 100%
Management (20%) - 70%
Results (50%) – 100%
Rating – Effective
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 88
2007 Estimate - 88
2008 Request - 111

National Center for Education Statistics
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 89%
Management (20%) - 60%
Results (50%) – 100%
Rating – Effective
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 90
2007 Estimate - 90
2008 Request - 119

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 90%
Management (20%) - 90%
Results (50%) – 42%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 107
2007 Estimate - 107
2008 Request - 107

National Writing Project
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 13%
Management (20%) - 50%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 22
2007 Estimate - 22
2008 Request - 0

Parental Information and Resource Centers
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 40%
Planning (10%) - 38%
Management (20%) - 60%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 40
2007 Estimate - 40
2008 Request - 0

Physical Education Program
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 50%
Management (20%) - 90%
Results (50%) – 8%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 73
2007 Estimate - 73
2008 Request - 0

Projects with Industry for People with Disabilities
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 75%
Management (20%) - 50%
Results (50%) – 40%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 20
2007 Estimate - 20
2008 Request - 0

Reading First State Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 100%
Results (50%) – 75%
Rating – Effective
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 1,029
2007 Estimate - 1,019
2008 Request - 1,019

Ready to Learn Television
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 50%
Management (20%) - 70%
Results (50%) – 8%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 24
2007 Estimate - 24
2008 Request - 24

Rural Education
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 89%
Results (50%) – 25%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 169
2007 Estimate - 169
2008 Request - 169

Safe and Drug Free Schools State Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 63%
Management (20%) - 78%
Results (50%) – 8%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 347
2007 Estimate - 352
2008 Request - 100

Smaller Learning Communities
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 75%
Management (20%) - 80%
Results (50%) – 8%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 94
2007 Estimate - 90
2008 Request - 0

Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 78%
Results (50%) – 17%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 238
2007 Estimate - 238
2008 Request - 238

Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 78%
Results (50%) – 17%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 58
2007 Estimate - 58
2008 Request - 58

Strengthening Institutions
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 80%
Results (50%) – 17%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 80
2007 Estimate - 80
2008 Request - 80

Student Aid Administration
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 78%
Management (20%) - 75%
Results (50%) – 28%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 719
2007 Estimate - 718
2008 Request - 708

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 63%
Management (20%) - 56%
Results (50%) – 20%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 771
2007 Estimate - 771
2008 Request - 0

Teacher Quality Enhancement
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 29%
Management (20%) - 50%
Results (50%) – 13%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 60
2007 Estimate - 60
2008 Request - 0

Teaching American History
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 50%
Management (20%) - 70%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 120
2007 Estimate - 120
2008 Request - 50

Tech-Prep Education State Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 43%
Management (20%) - 56%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 105
2007 Estimate - 105
2008 Request - 0

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 100%
Results (50%) – 50%

Rating – Moderately Effective
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 12,713
2007 Estimate - 12,713
2008 Request - 13,909

Training and Advisory Services
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 38%
Management (20%) - 70%
Results (50%) – 0%

Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 7
2007 Estimate - 7
2008 Request - 7

Transition to Teaching
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 90%
Results (50%) – 17%

Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 44
2007 Estimate - 44
2008 Request - 44

Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 0%
Management (20%) - 30%
Results (50%) – 0%

Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 7
2007 Estimate - 7
2008 Request - 7

Troops-to-Teachers
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 50%
Management (20%) - 60%
Results (50%) – 27%

Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 15
2007 Estimate - 15
2008 Request - 15

TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 80%
Results (50%) – 59%
Rating – Moderately Effective
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 42
2007 Estimate - 42
2008 Request - 42

TRIO Student Support Services
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 90%
Results (50%) – 59%
Rating – Moderately Effective
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 273
2007 Estimate - 273
2008 Request - 273

TRIO Talent Search
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 90%
Results (50%) – 50%
Rating – Moderately Effective
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 145
2007 Estimate - 145
2008 Request - 145

TRIO Upward Bound
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 80%
Planning (10%) - 72%
Management (20%) - 55%
Results (50%) – 17%
Rating – Ineffective
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 311
2007 Estimate - 311
2008 Request - 311

Vocational Education State Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 20%
Planning (10%) - 43%
Management (20%) - 56%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Ineffective
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 1,182
2007 Estimate - 1,182
2008 Request - 600

Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 38%
Management (20%) - 50%
Results (50%) – 0%
Rating – Results Not Demonstrated
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 7
2007 Estimate - 7
2008 Request - 7

Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 57%
Management (20%) - 44%
Results (50%) – 42%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 2,720
2007 Estimate - 2,837
2008 Request - 2,837

Vocational Rehabilitation Training
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 100%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 80%
Results (50%) – 33%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 38
2007 Estimate - 38
2008 Request - 38

William D. Ford Direct Student Loans
Program Purpose & Design (20%) - 60%
Planning (10%) - 88%
Management (20%) - 44%
Results (50%) – 53%
Rating – Adequate
Program Funding Levels in millions of dollars
2006 Actual - 7,011
2007 Estimate - 5,176
2008 Request - 500

Revised 704 Annual Performance Report Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

In this document, the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) offers answers to substantive questions posed by representatives of centers for independent living (CILs), statewide independent living councils (SILCs) and designated state units (DSUs) regarding the revised annual section 704 Report. Part I of the 704 Report is completed jointly by DSUs and SILCs. Part II of the 704 Report is completed by CILs.

This FAQ document is a follow-up to the National Teleconference and Webcast conducted by Independent Living Research Utilization (ILRU) and RSA in August 2006. Areas addressed here are taken from a variety of sources including questions received directly by RSA as well as those posted on the national training discussion board (http://ncil.org/phpBB2/viewforum.php?f=11). RSA would like to thank the many individuals who contributed to this process, with special thanks to Ms. Julia Sain for her efforts in this training and subsequent discussion board activity.

The revised 704 Report incorporates newly established performance goals and measures for the Independent Living (IL) program. These measures aim to better reflect the IL impact on individuals and the community. The primary difference in the new 704 Report is its increased focus on "outcomes," in comparison with "outputs." Outputs represent the independent living activities and services provided by centers for independent living, DSUs and other IL service providers. Outcomes represent the impact that the IL services and activities have on the consumer, that is, the extent to which consumers achieved greater independence and community integration. Outcomes are the ends, whereas outputs are the means. Both are important yet, ultimately, the independent living program will be evaluated based on its outcomes.

Full document is available at:
http://www.ilru.org/html/publications/704/704_Report_FAQ_Final.doc

Current Performance Measures for the IL Program (704 Report)

PROGRAM GOAL: To promote and support a philosophy of independent living, including a philosophy of consumer control, peer support, self-help, self-determination, equal access, and individual and system advocacy, in order to maximize the leadership, empowerment, independence, and productivity of individuals with disabilities, and the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the mainstream of American society.

OBJECTIVE #1: Through the provision of IL services (including the four IL core services), increase the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.

Indicator -- Increase the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, health care, and assistive technology.

> Measure– As a result of direct services provided by a CIL (including referral to another service provider), the *percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to previously unavailable* transportation, appropriate accommodations to receive health care services, and/or assistive technology resulting in increased independence in at least one significant life area.

Indicator – Increase the percentage of CIL consumers moving out of institutions.

> Measure – Through the provision of IL services (including the four IL core services), the *percentage of CIL consumers who move out of institutions* into a community-based setting.

OBJECTIVE #2: Increase the percentage of community services available to persons with disabilities.

Indicator – Increase the percentage of community services available to persons with disabilities.

> Measure – The *percentage of CILs with CIL staff, board members and/or consumers creating/participating* on community committees, in advocacy initiatives, in public information campaigns, and/or other community events designed to increase the accessibility to transportation, develop relationships with health care providers, increase the availability/access to assistive technology, and/or increase the compliance with applicable laws/regulations governing the number of affordable, accessible housing units within the community.

OBJECTIVE #3: Improve the efficiency and transparency of the Centers for Independent Living Program.

Indicator -- Improve the efficiency and transparency of the Centers for Independent Living Program.

> Measure -- The *number of months* from due date to the release of CIL data to the public

NCIL Letter to Officials / Representatives of the Executive & Legislative Branches of the Federal Government

September 8, 2006

Dear xxxx: [The following letter was sent to several representatives of the Executive and Legisalative branches]

The National Council on Independent Living (NCIL) is excited to join forces with the centers for independent living (CILs), state independent living councils (SILCs), the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) of the U.S. Department of Education, and the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to improve programs serving people with disabilities.

As you know, social programs of all types are now accountable not only for smooth and efficient operations, but also for achieving positive outcomes for beneficiaries. It is no longer sufficient for programs to be prudent stewards of program resources, to offer appropriate services, or even to work hard. While these tasks are essential, it is also important that program inputs, activities, and outputs lead to positive outcomes, at both the individual and the community levels.

Agreeing completely with this emphasis on outcomes, and responding to forward-thinking encouragement from local CILs, NCIL has launched a 16-person Outcomes Task Force to move the independent living community more firmly into this orientation. Our Task Force will make explicit the desired outcomes of the CIL program, identify measurable indicators for these outcomes, and establish practical, consistent procedures for measuring these indicators. This Task Force has been operating for several months and will continue for the foreseeable future.

Because our commitment to outcomes overlaps so extensively with similar interests within both RSA and OMB, NCIL has invited these two organizations to work closely with our Task Force, and I am delighted to report that their cooperation and assistance has been remarkable. In particular, Mr. Thomas Kelley, Mr. Felipe Lulli, and Ms. Teresa Cahalan from RSA and Ms. Jameela Raja Akbari from OMB have given generously of their time and knowledge and have added considerably to our progress. While we at NCIL have not always agreed with every decision of RSA or OMB, I want to acknowledge their excellent support to date on this effort. Our current collaboration is, in my opinion, an exemplary model of how advocacy organizations and the federal government should cooperate.

NCIL's ultimate assignment to our Task Force is to provide individual CILs around the country with the tools to measure and interpret, on a regular basis, the extent to which they are achieving the desired outcomes for the persons and communities they serve. That is, NCIL views outcome measurement first and foremost as a way for local CILs to continually improve programs, and to a remarkable degree, individual CILs are eager to begin. We realize, however, that outcomes could also be aggregated in order to describe the achievements of the CIL program as a whole, and we welcome that opportunity as well. NCIL looks forward to helping various audiences better understand both our accomplishments and our challenges, and we recognize that RSA and OMB also need to portray the aggregated CIL program as a whole. By using agreed-upon outcome measures gathered consistently across all CILs, each of our organizations can obtain the program-wide information for our respective needs. However, NCIL remains firm in our belief that it would be methodologically inappropriate to compare individual CILs against each other, since each CIL serves a unique population and community in a unique way.

Measuring outcomes is not easy, and our Outcomes Task Force has already developed an appreciation for the complexities involved and a respect for those persons in RSA and OMB who have wrestled with the challenges on their own. We believe that NCIL's involvement will bring to these discussions the CIL-level expertise that is so essential for grounding future decisions in program reality.

However, it is already apparent that one large challenge will be to develop an effective new outcomes system in the presence of RSA's current reporting requirements. As you may know, RSA gathers information from local CILs via an annual report, known as the 704 Report, which is required under Section 704 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The current 704 Report gathers information for three outcome measures and one efficiency measure. We at NCIL acknowledge the good-faith efforts of RSA and OMB to develop these measures.

Nonetheless, in the spirit of open and frank collaboration, we must also acknowledge that, in our opinion, these four measures are seriously flawed. They will not only fail to provide the accurate program-level view we all desire, they will almost certainly present a distorted view of the CIL program, a distortion that will benefit no one. For example:

* One newly required 704 measure is "the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, appropriate accommodations to receive health care services, and/or assistive technology". Certainly these are three important needs, but by no means the only needs. Yet the 704 emphasis on these three needs has already spurred some CILs to alter the services they provide in order to please the funder, whether or not these three needs are the most prevalent in the local community. Certainly this is not what RSA and OMB intended when they highlighted these three areas of interest.

* We agree it is important to measure the percentage of community services available to persons with disabilities. Yet the 704 Report measures the availability of these community services by counting how many CILs have "staff, board members, and/or consumers creating/participating" in various community functions, an entirely different concept. Clearly, there is a logical mismatch between this objective and this indicator.

NCIL Letter to Officials / Representatives of the Executive & Legislative Branches of the Federal Government

* A serious gap in the 704 involves the lack of outcomes for community-level achievements. Each CIL works to improve conditions for individual persons with disabilities, but almost every CIL also works to improve conditions community-wide. In fact, we estimate that up to 40% of all CIL funds may be directed to achieving community-wide improvements. This is a fundamental and essential part of NCIL's approach to the CIL program, and any representative set of outcomes must capture this vital aspect of our work.
* The 704 Report currently measures the efficiency of RSA's CIL program by counting "the number of months from due date to the release of CIL data to the public". Public disclosure of program data is an important function for RSA, yet considering this a measure of the program's "efficiency" stretches OMB's own definition too far. Our Task Force readily agrees with the need to measure the efficiency of the CIL program, and we look forward to continuing to work closely with RSA and OMB on this issue.
* Because of the mid-year timing of the 704 revisions, different CILs have responded to these new reporting requirements in different ways. Some CILs are relying on existing consumer service records, but others are creating new surveys, changing consumer intake forms, and modifying goal reporting forms. Centers need 18 months lead time before any changes are made to the 704 Report, so that they have an opportunity to modify data collection systems in an orderly way. Without this lead time, data from CILs will inevitably vary, and RSA and OMB will eventually be aggregating apples and oranges, but without realizing which is which.

In summary, NCIL strongly supports the concept of measuring outcomes for the CIL program, but we are unable to support the measures required in the current 704 Report. As constituted at present, these measures neither reflect the essence of the independent living philosophy nor capture the impact of our core independent living services. We realize that RSA and OMB has no choice but to continue using the present measures for now, but NCIL hopes that within 1-2 years, the current 704 measures can be replaced by an agreed-upon set that more accurately reflects the totality of the CIL program.

We are convinced that our Outcomes Task Force, together with the excellent collaboration of RSA and OMB, can produce these more-appropriate measures, and we will continue working toward that goal. Because of your important role in this issue, we will certainly keep you informed of our progress.

Thanking you again for your important support and encouragement, I am

Sincerely,

Kelly Buckland
President, NCIL

This Letter is also available at:
http://www.ilru.org/html/publications/outcome_measures/NCIL_letter_10_06.doc

Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA)'s Response to NCIL's Letter

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUACTION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Mr. John A. Lancaster
Executive Director
National Council on Independent Living
1710 Rhode Island Avenue, NW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Mr. Lancaster:

Thank you for your September 2006 letter regarding the new performance indicators and the revised 704 Report. We appreciate your comments about the National Council on Independent Living (NCIL)'s positive working relationship with RSA, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the U.S. Department of Education's Budget Service.

We fully agree with the need for performance indicators that reflect the desired outcomes of the independent living (IL) programs and for consistent procedures to collect data regarding such outcomes. RSA appreciates the center-level expertise offered by NCIL's Outcomes Task Force and the centers for independent living (CILs) and looks forward to our continued collaboration.

Having discussed your letter with IL Unit Supervisor Thomas Kelley, I am pleased to respond to each of your specific concerns quoted below:

1) RSA's new reporting requirements have "spurred several CILs to alter the services they provide in order to please the funder."

RSA response: RSA has stated that these areas are not intended as CIL priorities and has affirmed that IL priorities are to be established by each CIL based on its local community needs.

2) "We agree it is important to measure the percentage of community services available to persons with disabilities. Yet the 704 Report measures the availability of these community services by counting how many CILs have 'staff, board members and/or consumers creating/participating' in various community functions, an entirely different concept. Clearly, there is a logical mismatch between this objective and this indicator."

RSA response: Measuring the IL program's impact on community services is perhaps the greatest challenge in developing outcomes-based performance measures. Though the indicator cited above does not directly measure the CILs' impact, it does offer a realistic,

Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA)'s Response to NCIL's Letter

proximate measure of the CILs' community activities contributing to an increased availability of community services.

3) "The 704 involves the lack of outcomes for community-level achievements."

RSA response: The revised 704 Report does collect information related to community-level achievements and outcomes. The table in Subpart IV quantifies the number of hours spent by CIL staff, board members and volunteers in community and systems advocacy, community education, technical assistance, outreach, networking and other community capacity-building efforts. It also collects narrative information about the outcomes achieved through these efforts.

4) 'The 704 Report currently measures the efficiency of RSA's CIL program by counting 'the number of months form due date to the release of CIL data to public.' Public disclosure of program data is an important function for RSA, yet considering this a measure of the program's 'efficiency' stretches OMB's own definition too far."

RSA response: RSA does not regard the cited public disclosure measure as the efficiency measure for the IL program and is developing a more outcomes-based efficiency measure. RSA, OMB and Budget Service have actively engaged NCIL's Outcomes Task Force in this process.

5) "Because of the mid-year timing of the 704 revisions, different CILs have responded to these new reporting requirements in different ways. Centers need 18 months lead time before any changes are made to the 704 Report so that they have an opportunity to modify data collection systems in an orderly way. Without this lead time, data from CILs will inevitably vary and RSA and OMB will eventually be aggregating apples and oranges, but without realizing which is which."

RSA response: OMB's temporary approval of the 704 Report was granted on September 30, 2005, and RSA forwarded a copy of the preprint and instructions to statewide independent living councils (SILCs), designated state units (DSUs) and CILs shortly thereafter. The final version approved by OMB in May 2006 is essentially identical to the one approved in September 2005 – except for a few changes made in response to the recommendations from a NCIL work group convened at RSA's invitation.

RSA recognizes the challenges for DSUs, SILCs and CILs in adjusting to the new 704 Report requirements and has provided significant technical assistance, including a National Teleconference and Webcast funded through RSA's training and technical

Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA)'s Response to NCIL's Letter

Page 3 – John Lancaster

assistance grant and a "Frequently Asked Questions" document based on the teleconference.

In conclusion, let me to take this opportunity to reaffirm RSA's willingness to consider improvements to the new performance measures and the revised 704 Report. This has been perhaps RSA's most consistent theme in engaging our IL partners. RSA
welcomes the Outcomes Task Force's participation and awaits its recommendations.

Tom and I would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to further discuss any unaddressed concerns and specific ways in which you believe RSA could address NCIL's concerns in the future.

Sincerely,

Edward Anthony
Delegated the authority to perform the functions of Commissioner for the Rehabilitation Services Administration

cc: Kelly Buckland
Thomas Kelley

NCIL Outcome Measures Task Force Letter to NCIL Membership

TO: NCIL Members
FROM: Bob Michaels, Chair Outcome Measures Task Force
DATE: December 21, 2006
RE: Outcome Measures Update

The following is an update on the progress of the Outcomes Measure Task Force. This task force was put into place by Kelly Buckland, President of NCIL and has been functioning because of the support of IL Net, the training and technical assistance project of ILRU and NCIL.

As we have pointed out in previous correspondence, NCIL's motivation for establishing the task force was in direct response to two factors:
1. Using the Performance Assessment Rating Tool (PART), the Office of Management and Budget was unable to determine whether or not Independent Living was an effective program. IL, therefore, was given a "results not demonstrated" rating, putting future funding for the Independent Living Program in jeopardy,
2. Members have been insisting that NCIL help develop outcome measures that accurately address the work of CILs. (Our intention is to have RSA replace the measures in the current 704 Report with ones that better-reflect what we do.)

Toward that end, the Task Force first began identifying desired outcomes that centers may have in common. We did this by developing a logic model that is available for your review on the web site linked below.

The next phase in this process is identifying ways to measure whether we are achieving our desired outcomes. This is where we need your help and you can assist in two ways.

First, we will be conducting a series of workshops between now and the NCIL Conference in July to get your input. We already ran workshops at APRIL and in Region IV. Other workshops are scheduled for the SILC Congress and in Regions VI, VIII, and X. IL Net has agreed to cover the facilitation costs of three-four hour regional workshops, so if you want to add one to a regional event let me know. It would be great if you can attend one of these workshops to share your thoughts.

Second, visit the Outcome Measures area on the IL Net web site. The link is: http://www.ilru.org/html/publications/outcome_measures/index.html . On this page, you will find lots of background information, including our logic model, and some of the draft measurable indicators of success that have already been put forward.

NCIL Outcome Measures Task Force Letter to NCIL Membership

The key word here is 'draft'. The Task Force isn't going to develop the measurable outcomes, you are. As you will see when you visit the site, we have presented a number of indicators that the field has already put forward. Tell us what you like and don't like — and share with us your own suggestions. Our job will be to sort through your comments, dropping what you don't like and adding what you do like. We will be awarding cash prizes or NCIL Conference registrations to the top five new ideas.

Again, if you have any questions or concerns don't hesitate to contact me directly at bobmichaels@cox.net.

Outcome Measures Work Group:

Bob Michaels, Task Force Chair
Dwight Bateman, Task Force Member
Jan Day, Task Force Member
Benjamin F. Harville, Task Force Member
John Nousaine, Task Force Member
Tom Osborn, Task Force Member
Pat Puckett, Task Force Member
Steven Thovson, Task Force Member
Tina Treasure, Task Force Member
Richard Petty, ILRU Staff
Kelly Buckland, NCIL President
John Lancaster, NCIL Staff
Tim Fuchs, NCIL Staff

This letter is also available at: http://www.ilru.org/html/publications/outcome_measures/members_Letter_12_06.doc.

Measuring Outcomes in the Independent Living Movement

This article is also available at:
http://www.ilru.org/html/publications/outcome_measures/ncil-website-blurb-for-ILNet-2.doc

One of the most significant changes in the nonprofit world during the past few years has been the big emphasis on outcomes – outcomes being defined as changes in knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, behavior, condition, or status of the persons or communities we work with. We can hardly turn around these days without hearing about outcomes, results, impacts, improvement, or accountability. Many of our colleagues in human services and advocacy are already identifying the outcomes they want to achieve, regularly measuring their progress, and using what they learn to improve their programs and to document their successes. The outcome measurement train isn't coming down the track – this train's already here.

Those of us in the IL movement are ready, even eager, to jump on this train. We know without a doubt that we help the people we serve, and we know we change communities for the better. For that reason, we look forward to showing ourselves, our funders, our partner agencies, the persons we serve, and the general public that we do an excellent job. But we also know in our hearts that we could probably accomplish even more. So we welcome the chance to better define our hoped-for outcomes, to find ways to measure how well we're doing, and to make improvements where they're needed.

Someone described not measuring program outcomes as like managing a baseball team, but without being able to see the scoreboard. Or driving to a new destination, but without having a map. It's simply not possible to manage well if we don't know how we're doing right now. Of course, it's also important to use that information wisely when we have it, but first we have to know our outcomes.

For that reason, NCIL has launched a 16-person Outcomes Task Force to move our IL community more firmly into measuring outcomes. This task force has been operating for several months, and we expect it to continue for the foreseeable future. There's a lot of work ahead, but we're making steady progress. In order to bring you up-to-date on our work and to seek your input, we've placed several products on this website: this brief introduction, a draft logic model of the CIL program , and a way you can help us decide what to measure in order to gauge our progress (our measurable indicators) . Below we will explain both logic models and measurable indicators.

Measuring outcomes starts with three key steps: (1) developing a logic model of our program, (2) identifying the outcomes we want to measure, and (3) creating measurable indicators of each outcome.

Measuring Outcomes in the Independent Living Movement

Step One: A Draft Logic Model of the CIL Program

The phrase "logic model" is jargon, to be sure, but it's also a phrase that's becoming more common all the time. Perhaps you've heard it from a government agency, your local United Way, or a foundation, since more and more funders are routinely asking their grantees to develop logic models. But what exactly *is* a logic model? The answer is pretty simple: A logic model is a way to show visually, on one page, what a program does (its activities), what it's trying to achieve (its desired outcomes), and in what order (the different levels of outcomes). The lines connecting the boxes show how each of these pieces fit together.

The Outcomes Task Force has created a draft logic model for the CIL program, so let's learn from that example. As you can see, the bottom row (yellow) shows the CIL program's three main activities: IL services, I&R, and systems advocacy. The rest of the page shows the CIL program's desired outcomes, divided into the levels of initial outcomes (orange), intermediate outcomes (red), and ultimate outcomes (blue).

Working up the logic model from the bottom row, immediately above each activity is the initial outcome that each activity hopes to produce. For example, the initial outcome of systems advocacy is that "barriers and problems are identified". But why? Why do we want to identify barriers and problems? The answers are in the two outcomes right above this box – we want to identify barriers and problems *so that* "A consumer agenda for change exists" and "Active coalitions exist around our issues". But why do we want a consumer agenda for change to exist? Again, the answer is right above that box – we want a consumer agenda for change to exist *so that* "Decision-makers agree with our agenda".

Using slightly different words, but looking at the same boxes, we see that IF we do systems advocacy, THEN barriers and problems will be identified. And IF barriers and problems are identified, THEN a consumer agenda for change will exist AND active coalitions will exist around our issues. And IF a consumer agenda for change exists, THEN decisions-makers will agree with our agenda.

In this same way, we can ask this why? question and draw these IF-THEN connections all over the logic model. Doing so shows us very clearly what the CIL program is all about.

Measuring Outcomes in the Independent Living Movement

Step Two: Desired Outcomes of the CIL Program

Our CIL logic model contains 20 different boxes. Three of these boxes represent our three different activities, and the remaining 17 boxes represent our 17 different desired outcomes. That is, the CIL program as a whole wants to achieve 17 different outcomes. Some of these outcomes are for individuals (the left side and middle of the logic model) and some of these outcomes are for communities (the right side of the logic model), but each of the 17 outcomes is important.

Ideally we would like to measure our progress on all 17 desired outcomes, but in the real world we probably won't have the time, money, or people to measure them all. Eventually we'll need to pick and choose which ones to measure. It may be that all CILs measure the same outcomes, or this may vary from CIL to CIL, depending on the local interests. At this stage, our Task Force isn't deciding which outcomes we should measure – for now, we're looking at all 17.

Step Three: Measurable Indicators of Desired Outcomes

In measuring outcomes, the "rubber meets the road" when we wrestle with how to measure our progress on a desired outcome. Until we do this, we have warm, fuzzy concepts ("Communities are fully accessible"), but how do we measure that? How do we know the extent to which a community is fully accessible without measuring *something*? For example, maybe we measure "the number and percentage of multifamily housing properties in our community that meet fair housing requirements". Or maybe we measure "the length of waiting lists for Section 8 vouchers or affordable, accessible housing". Or maybe we measure something else – but we must measure *something specific*, and what we measure is called our measurable indicators.

Our Task Force is now wrestling with this step of the process – we are creating a laundry list of possible measurable indicators for each of the 17 desired outcomes of our logic model. We have some first ideas, but we need more. Elsewhere on this website is an easy way for you to give us your ideas for how to measure CIL outcomes, and we hope you'll give us lots of ideas. Don't worry about the exact form or wording of your suggestions – we have experts to help us with that. What we need are your creative, real-world ideas of what might be good to measure. Please give us as many ideas as you possibly can, and we promise that the Task Force will consider each one seriously.

Conclusion … For Now

Measuring outcomes is important for the IL movement. We agree wholeheartedly with this emphasis, and our Task Force is working hard to develop ways for us to do this. We need your help in order to capture and reflect the reality of local CILs, so please do give us your best ideas. For our part, we promise to keep you fully up-to-date on our progress. Please watch this space for future postings.

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Why Measure Outcomes?

Increase effectiveness

Communicate value

graphic: megaphone

Who’s Focusing on Outcomes?

* Government at all levels
* National nonprofit associations
* Local nonprofit agencies
* Foundations
* Accrediting bodies
* Private sector
* International development agencies

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Outcome Measurement Resource Network

Welcome to United Way of America's Outcome Measurement Resource Network. As leaders in results-oriented philanthropy, United Way of America and United Way organizations across the country have championed the adoption of outcome measurement by health and human service programs. The Resource Network offers information, downloadable documents, and links to resources related to the identification and measurement of program- and community-level outcomes.

The Outcome Measurement Resource Network has 7 sections:

Home
Purpose and FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions)

What's New?
Listing of recent additions and sign up option to receive email notifications when the Outcome Measurement Resource Network is updated

Outcome Measurement: What and Why?
Introduction to what outcome measurement is and is not, key terms, and the rationale for and benefits of engaging in outcome measurement

UWA Outcome Measurement Resources
Descriptions, excerpts or downloadable copies of United Way of America outcome measurement resources

Who is Involved in Outcome Measurement?
Selected outcome and performance measurement initiatives within the United Way system; national health, human service, and youth-serving organizations; public sector agencies; and other nonprofit organizations

Resource Library
Full-text resources and links on program outcome measurement, community-level initiatives, and related topics

United Way of America 701 N. Fairfax Street, Alexandria, VA 22314
Local United Way Listing
Visit us in Spanish at unitedway.org/espanol

This webpage is available at: http://national.unitedway.org/outcomes/

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Program Outcome Model

Inputs

Resources dedicated to or consumed by the program

- money
- staff & staff time
- volunteers & volunteer time
- facilities
- equipment & supplies

Activities

What the program does with inputs to fulfill its mission

- feeding and sheltering homeless families
- providing job training
- educating teachers about signs of child abuse
- counseling pregnant women

Outputs

The volume of work accomplished by the program

- # of classes taught
- # of counseling sessions conducted
- # of educational materials distributed
- # of service delivered
- # of participants served

OUTCOMES!

Benefits or changes for participants in program activities

- new *knowledge*
- increased *skills*
- changed *attitudes* or *values*
- modified *behavior*
- improved *condition*
- altered *status*

Inputs, Activities, Outputs, and Outcomes

Here's an easy way to remember the differences among these four key concepts:

An INPUT is usually expressed as a NOUN
(the name of a person, place, thing, or concept). For example: *staff, volunteers, clients, facility, food, money, time.*

An ACTIVITY is usually expressed as an "-ing" VERB
(a gerund). For example: *feeding homeless people, training people for jobs, counseling pregnant women, mentoring teenagers.*

An OUTPUT is usually expressed as the VOLUME of work accomplished
by an activity (number of things produced). For example: *number of homeless people fed, number of people trained for jobs, number of pregnant women counseled, number of teenagers mentored.*

An OUTCOME is usually expressed as a CHANGE in people. For example: *a change in knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, behavior, condition, or status*.

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Examples of Diverse Programs and Possible Outcomes

Comprehensive child care
Possible Outcomes:
* Children exhibit age-appropriate physical, mental, and verbal skills
* Children are school-ready for kindergarten

General Equivalency Diploma (GED) preparation
Possible Outcomes:
* Participants obtain their GED certificates
* Within 6 months after obtaining their GED, participants are employed full-time

Outpatient treatment for adolescent substance abusers
Possible Outcomes:
* Adolescents increase their knowledge about the effects of substance abuse and substance abuse addiction
* Adolescents change their attitudes toward substance abuse
* Graduates remain free of substance abuse 6 months after program completion

Congregate meals for senior citizens
Possible Outcomes:
* Seniors interact socially with peers
* Seniors are not home-bound
* Seniors eat a nutritious and varied diet
* Seniors exhibit fewer health problems

Overnight camping for 8- to 12-year-old inner-city boys
Possible Outcomes:
* Boys learn outdoor survival skills
* Boys feel more competent
* Boys develop and maintain positive relationships with their peers

Outputs versus Outcomes: What's the Difference?

Comprehensive child care
Possible Outputs (volume of work accomplished)
* Number of children cared for
* Number of child-days of care
Possible Outcomes (changes in people)
* Children exhibit age-appropriate physical, mental, and verbal skills
* Children are school-ready for kindergarten

General Equivalency Diploma (GED) preparation
Possible Outputs (volume of work accomplished)
* Number of participants tutored
* Number of tutoring sessions held
* Number of participants tested and re-tested
Possible Outcomes (changes in people)
* Participants obtain their GED certificates
* Within 6 months after obtaining their GED, participants are employed full-time

Congregate meals for senior citizens
Possible Outputs (volume of work accomplished)
* Number of seniors served lunch
* Number of seniors led in exercise programs
* Number of tables of seniors organized for after-lunch games
Possible Outcomes (changes in people)
* Seniors interact socially with peers
* Seniors are not home-bound
* Seniors eat a nutritious and varied diet
* Seniors exhibit fewer health problems

Inputs through Outcomes:
The Conceptual Chain

Inputs **Lead to**

Activities **which lead to**

Outputs **which lead to**

Initial Outcomes **which lead to**

Intermediate Outcomes **which lead to**

Longer-Term Outcomes

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Activities Lead to Outcomes: A Chain of Influences

If… These Activities
Then… This Outcome
Then… This Outcome
Then… This Outcome

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Common Chain of Influence

If… These Activities
Then . . . this change in knowledge
Then . . . this change in behavior
Then… this change in condition/status

A Sample Logic Model
Teen Mother Parenting Education Program

IF… These INPUTS:
MSW program manager; assistant program manager; part-time RN instructor; MFCC counselor; social work and counseling interns; nationally certified educational manuals, videos and other instructional materials; facilities; funding

Then… Ideally, these ACTIVITIES:

- Program manager and RN instructor provide classes for pregnant teens on prenatal nutrition and health; delivered in high schools twice a week for one hour.
- Program manager and RN instructor provide classes on infant health care, nutrition, and social interaction; delivered in high schools twice a week for one hour.
- Counselor meets individually with teens once per week to support application of material presented in classes to teens' situations.

And If Those ACTIVITIES, Then… Ideally, these OUTPUTS will follow:

- Number of teens served in prenatal classes; infant care classes
- Number of hours of instruction provided in prenatal classes; infant care classes
- Number of hours of counseling provided to pregnant teens; mothers of infants

And If Prenatal Care Classes/Counseling, Then… Ideally, these OUTCOMES will follow:

- Pregnant teens know prenatal nutrition and health guidelines.
- Pregnant teens follow prenatal nutrition and health guidelines.
- Pregnant teens deliver healthy babies.

Or If Infant Care Parenting Classes/Counseling, Then… Ideally, these OUTCOMES will follow:

- Teen mothers know infant nutrition, development, safety, and social interaction guidelines.
- Teen mothers provide proper health care, nutrition, and social interaction to their babies.

And If Those Outcomes, Then… Ideally, this Ultimate OUTCOME will follow:

- Babies achieve appropriate 12-month milestones for physical motor, verbal, and social development.

A Sample Logic Model

Literacy-oriented Employment Program

IF… These Inputs:
Program manager; three teachers and two teacher assistants; vocational counselor; volunteer coordinator and team of volunteers; widely used/tested literacy and vocational skills curricula for populations like those recruited for this program; vocational software; computers, videos, and other teaching tools; funding; facilities

And If those INPUTS, Then… Ideally, these ACTIVITIES will follow:

- Literacy classes on reading, writing, speaking English (5 days/week, 6 hours/day; for up to 6 months)
- Workplace skills classes (5 days/week, 6 hours/day for 3 months) on work habits, time management, teaming, interpersonal communication, problem solving, using computers, customer service
- One-on-one vocational counseling sessions (1 hour/week) focused on job interests, job search, interviewing skills
- Weekly follow-up coaching, problem-solving phone calls/meetings by volunteers, counselor, teachers with participants who obtain employment

And If Those ACTIVITIES, Then… Ideally, these OUTPUTS will follow:

- Number of participants served
- Number of literacy classes held
- Number of hours of literacy training provided
- Number of hours of workplace skills training provided
- Number of hours of vocational counseling sessions conducted
- Number of weekly follow-up phone calls/meetings with participants once employed

And If Follow-Up, Then… Ideally, these OUTCOMES will follow:

- Graduates identify work-related problems.
- Graduates identify solutions to work-related problems.
- Graduates resolve work-related problems.

Or If Literacy Classes, Then… Ideally, these initial OUTCOMES will follow:

- Program graduates are proficient in reading, writing, speaking English.
- Graduates are able to fill out job applications.
- Graduates have key workplace skills.
- Graduates interview effectively.

Or If Workplace Skills Training, Then… Ideally, these initial OUTCOMES will follow:

- Graduates have key workplace skills.

Or If Vocational Counseling, Then… Ideally, these initial OUTCOMES will follow:

- Program graduates know effective interview skills.
- Graduates interview effectively.

And If Those Initial OUTCOMES, Then… Ideally, this intermediate OUTCOME will follow:

- Graduates obtain full-time employment appropriate for their skills.

And If These Intermediate OUTCOMES, Then… Ideally, this ultimate OUTCOME will follow:

- Graduates remain employed 6 months after program.

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Ways a Logic Model
Is Useful By Itself

- Create a shared vision of the program
- Make the program’s theory very explicit
- Recruit, orient, and train staff
- Help allocate resources properly
- Communicate the program’s intent to stakeholders
- Explain the program to potential clients
- Negotiate “fair” accountability with funders and others
- Guide a systematic review of outcome data in order to identify improvement opportunities

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Outcome Indicators

The specific things we measure in order to show how fully the desired outcome is being achieved.

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Possible Outcomes & Indicators for Various Programs

Comprehensive child care
Possible Outcomes:
* Children exhibit age-appropriate physical, mental, and verbal skills
* Children are school-ready for kindergarten
Possible Indicators:
* Number and % of full-year children who pass [the school-approved test] to determine school readiness

General Equivalency Diploma (GED) preparation
Possible Outcomes:
* Participants obtain their GED certificates
* Within 6 months after obtaining their GED, participants are employed full-time
Possible Indicators:
* Number and % of GED graduates who are regularly paid at least a minimum wage for at least 35 hours per week

Outpatient treatment for adolescent substance abusers
Possible Outcomes:
* Adolescents increase their knowledge about the effects of substance abuse and substance abuse addiction
* Adolescents change their attitudes toward substance abuse
* Graduates remain free of substance abuse 6 months after program completion
Possible Indicators:
* Number and % of adolescents attending sessions at least 3 days per week who can describe 5 harmful effects of using drugs

Congregate meals for senior citizens
Possible Outcomes:
* Seniors interact socially with peers
* Seniors are not home-bound
* Seniors eat a nutritious and varied diet
* Seniors exhibit fewer health problems
Possible Indicators:
* Number and % of seniors attending at least twice a week who can name 3 or more new people they have met here

Overnight camping for 8- to 12-year-old inner-city boys
Possible Outcomes:
* Boys learn outdoor survival skills
* Boys feel more competent
* Boys develop and maintain positive relationships with their peers
Possible Indicators:
* Number and % of campers who had no school-time altercations with other boys for the first three months of the school year

Key Traits of a Good Indicator

A good indicator is SMART:

Specific –The indicator is clear enough that different people would measure the same thing in the same way

Measurable – The necessary information can be observed, counted, or weighed with reasonable efforts and costs

Ambitious –The indicator sets a high standard for program participants to achieve the desired outcomes

Realistic – The standard is not so high that program participants cannot achieve it with reasonable effort

Timely –The indicator is measured during an appropriate period of time to provide useful information

Outcome Measures Task Force – Logic Model for Independent Living (Text Version)

This logic model is also available at:
http://www.ilru.org/html/publications/outcome_measures/logic-model_visual-12-06.doc

A logic model is a way to show visually, on one page, what a program does (its activities), what it's trying to achieve (its desired outcomes), and in what order (the different levels of outcomes). It does this by showing separate boxes, connected by lines and arrows. This narrative is an attempt to put into words the visual logic model developed by the NCIL Outcome Measures Task Force.

In this logic model, there are three types of center activities represented in three separate boxes along the bottom of the page:

- IL Services (Peer Support, Skills Training, Transition Assistance, Individual Advocacy)
- Information and Referral
- Systems Advocacy

As a result of carrying out these three activities, centers achieve initial, intermediate, and ultimate outcomes. These outcomes are represented by boxes that flow upward from each activity box. The combination of carrying out these three types of activities eventually leads to our ultimate desired outcome, "People with disabilities are fully mainstreamed into American Society." In other words, the outcome boxes all converge at one ultimate outcome at the top of the page.

Although there is some crossover between these three streams (or columns), most desired outcomes flow from one set of activities directly upward. Using an "If – Then" logic as we work our way up the page from activities to the ultimate outcomes, the logic model may be described this way:

On the left side is the IL Services stream. Because of IL services, persons with disabilities first have the skills and knowledge to support their choices. If they have these skills and knowledge, then they will make their own choices. If they make their own choices, then they will simultaneously regard themselves as more independent and also will, in fact, be more independent. If they both regard themselves as more independent, and are, in fact, more independent, then persons with disabilities will participate in communities to the extent they wish. This is the top of the IL services stream.

In the middle is the Information and Referral stream. Because of I&R, persons with disabilities first see different possibilities and simultaneously have a community, identity, or culture. (These two outcomes are achieved mostly due to I&R, but IL services also contribute.) If persons with disabilities both see different possibilities and have a community, identify, or culture, then they will advocate for increased community supports. This is the top of the I&R stream.

On the right side is the Systems Advocacy stream. Because of systems advocacy, barriers and problems are first identified. If these are identified, then two different outcomes will be achieved: a consumer agenda for change will exist and active coalitions will exist around our issues. Each of these two outcomes then leads to a "mini-stream" of its own. First, if a consumer agenda for change exists, then decision makers will agree with this agenda. If decision makers agree with this agenda, then communities will have more resources. This is the top of one "mini-stream".

At the same time, if active coalitions exist around our issues, then methods and practices will promote independence. If methods and practices promote independence, then resources will support independence and individual choice. This is the top of the other "mini-stream".

These two "mini-streams" then merge. If communities have more resources AND resources support independence and individual choice, then communities will be more accessible (in terms of housing, transportation, information, employment, education, assistive technology, health care, etc.). This is the top of the systems advocacy stream.

Finally, the top outcomes from each of these three streams of outcomes (left, middle, and right) all combine to achieve the ultimate outcome. That is, if persons with disabilities participate in communities to the extent they wish AND if they advocate for increased community supports AND if communities are more accessible, then persons with disabilities will be fully mainstreamed into American Society.

Graphic: ILRU Logo
Graphic: IL NET Logo

ILRU/NCIL
National Training & Technical Assistance Project

WIN $100 OR a free registration to the NCIL Conference!

The Task Force is asking you--IL ADVOCATES--for ideas on how to measure outcomes of IL services. We have developed some draft outcomes and begun the process of identifying some ways to measure them.

Now.......we NEED YOUR HELP!!

The Task Force willl award either a $100 cash prize OR a free registration to the NCIL Conference (a $265 value) to the five best new ideas for outcome measures.

1. If we want to know if: People with disabilities (PWD) participate in communities to the extent they wish…

Would it Make Sense to Measure:
A. # and % of PWD served by the CIL within the past year who report they are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the extent of their participation in the community
__Use It or __Lose It

B. # and % of PWD served by the CIL within the past year who report they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement “I take part in community activities to the extent I want to.”
__Use It or __Lose It

C. # and % of PWD served by the CIL within the past year who report they “regularly” or “often” participate in activities outside their homes.
__Use It or __Lose It

. . .but an even better thing to measure would be (Please suggest your new idea):

This webpage is available at: http://www.ilru.org/html/forms/indicator2.html

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Possible Sources of Program Outcome Data

Existing Information
- Case/client records
- Documents of various types
- Data files (paper or electronic)

Individuals
- Program participants
- Others who know participants
- Other individuals/general public

Physical/environmental conditions
- Physical environment

Graphic: United Way of America, 2007

Possible Methods of Collecting Program Outcome Data

- Data file review
- Document review
- Record review
- Questionnaire
- Interview
- Observation
- Testing
- Mechanical measurement

Ways to Analyze Outcome Data

Begin With the Basics

* Calculate overall outcomes for all clients
* Compare these to earlier outcomes
* Compare these to pre-established targets
* Compare these to any outside standards
* Compare these to similar programs

Delve Deeper into Subgroups

* Compare outcomes by demographic groups
* Compare outcomes by service characteristics
* Do the basics (above) for relevant subgroups
* Examine patterns across different outcomes

Make Sense of the Numbers

* Identify which findings to highlight
* Seek explanations for the key findings

USE Outcome Data to Manage for Success

Increase effectiveness

*
*
*
*

Communicate value

*
*
*
*

Other creative uses

*
*
*
*

Notes: