

## PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT CHECKLIST

|                        |  |    |    |    |    |
|------------------------|--|----|----|----|----|
| <b>Applicant Name:</b> |  |    |    |    |    |
| Members Requested/Type |  | FT | PT | RT | QT |
| <b>Yes</b>             | Selected/Potential to Use Agency-Wide Priority Measure(s): If so, which? |    |    |    |    |
| <b>No</b>              |  |    |    |    |    |

| #  | Review Item  | Yes | No | Unclear | Comments |
|--|--|-----|----|---------|----------|
| <b>NEEDS AND SERVICES ACTIVITY OVERVIEW - TITLE:</b> |  |     |    |         |          |
| <b>FOCUS AREA:</b>                                   |  |     |    |         |          |
| 1.   | Need is clearly stated and provides supporting data. <i>(not justification of intervention or activity description)</i>  |     |    |         |          |
| 2.   | Activity/Intervention gives enough detail to know what member service truly entails. <i>(NOTE: keep this in mind when considering what propose to measure)</i> |     |    |         |          |
| 3.   | PMW activity description matches narrative.  |     |    |         |          |
| 4.   | The activity/intervention/strategy aligns with the need identified in the narrative.   |     |    |         |          |
| 5.   | The intervention is likely to lead to the proposed results (outputs and outcomes.)   |     |    |         |          |
| 6.   | The performance measure set <b>aligns</b> with theory for change described in the program narrative.   |     |    |         |          |
| 7.   | The set of performance measures represent a <b>significant program activity and impact.</b>  |     |    |         |          |

| <b>Output:</b> |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 8.             | Output measures people served. <i>(except in environment)</i>  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.             | There is only one indicator for the output.  |  |  |  |  |
| 10.            | The output target seems realistic given the number of members involved and the level of effort. <i>(Consider average number of people served by each member over the program year)</i>         |  |  |  |  |
| 11.            | Proposed output instrument(s) appear appropriate to count people served. <i>(usually logs, rosters, sign in sheets, etc. Not tools which measure change, i.e. no pre/post test or surveys)</i> |  |  |  |  |
| 12.            | The output measure is internally aligned.  |  |  |  |  |

| <b>Outcome:</b> |   |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 13.             | The outcome aligns with the theory of change. <i>(Does the outcome logically occur as result of the activity/intervention?)</i>   |  |  |  |  |
| 14.             | The proposed outcome aligns with the output <i>(Does outcome measure the same beneficiaries?)</i>   |  |  |  |  |
| 15.             | The outcome result are able be measured during a 1-year grant period.   |  |  |  |  |
| 16.             | Only one indicator is provided. <i>(NOTE: Sometimes may list several components to be measured that are part of one outcome. E.g., improved student engagement may measure attendance, behavior, etc.)</i>            |  |  |  |  |
| 17.             | The outcome target clearly identifies who/how many/how much change will occur. <i>(Does it seem reasonable given the number of members and level of effort) If more than one indicator – need a target for each.)</i> |  |  |  |  |
| 18.             | Outcome target seems reasonable given the number of members involved and the level of effort. <i>(Not too high or 100% or too low)</i>  |  |  |  |  |
| 19.             | The outcome measure is internally aligned.  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.             | Outcome instrument(s) appears appropriate to measure the proposed outcome. <i>(Beware of generic instrument descriptions or listing multiple unrelated instruments)</i>   |  |  |  |  |

**OTHER NOTES:**