

MERCATUS CENTER

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

FY 2005 Annual Performance Report Scorecard U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

SCORE SUMMARY	
Transparency:	15
Public Benefits:	12
Leadership:	11
Total:	38
<u>Score (1-5)</u>	TRANSPARENCY
<u>5</u>	<p>1. Is the report easily accessible and easily identified as the agency’s Annual Performance Report?</p> <p>The home page has a direct link to the report, which is downloadable only in separate sections. The web site names and provides phone numbers for employees to contact for further information.</p>
<u>4</u>	<p>2. Is the report easy for a layperson to read and understand?</p> <p>The report is generally easy to read and understand. It makes effective use of tables, graphics and photos. For example, a table on pages 38-40 presents a good overall summary of the agency’s goals, measures, and results. A “Performance Highlights” section lists the agency’s “top ten achievements” in selected areas (pgs.33-35). It also provides specific examples of the agency’s accomplishments for each strategic goal (pg.41). The performance section uses a good format to present the agency’s results under individual measures (pg.71).</p>
<u>3</u>	<p>3. Are the performance data valid, verifiable, and timely?</p> <p>The data aspects of the report are much improved over last year. The administrator’s transmittal letter certifies that the report’s financial and performance data are reliable and complete. The agency reports FY 2005 results for all but 5 of its 71 measures, those 5 being subject to lagging data. This is a great improvement over last year’s report, which included few results for the applicable fiscal year. In this regard, the inspector general states that USAID has made “notable improvements” in its performance management system, although more remains to be done (pg.47). The performance section does not provide specific data sources and data quality assessments for individual measures.</p>
<u>3</u>	<p>4. Did the agency provide baseline and trend data to put its performance measures in context?</p> <p>The report includes baseline and trend data for individual measures that generally go back to FY 2002 where applicable. However, a number of measures are relatively new and thus have limited prior year data.</p>
<u>Subtotal: 15</u>	

<u>Score (1-5)</u>	BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY
<u>5</u>	5. Are the goals and objectives stated as outcomes?
	USAID shares a joint strategic plan with the Department of State and thus uses many of the same strategic goals as the State Department. (State has some additional strategic goals that USAID does not use.) Most of USAID's annual performance goals (pgs.38-40) are also the same as the State Department's. These strategic and annual performance goals are highly outcome-oriented.
<u>3</u>	6. Are the performance measures valid indicators of the agency's impact on its outcome goals?
	The agency's performance measures or indicators (pgs.38-40) generally relate directly to the goals. However, the measures are much less outcome-oriented than the strategic and performance goals. They consist of some outcomes but also many output and activity measures.
<u>3</u>	7. Does the agency demonstrate that its actions have actually made a significant contribution toward its stated goals?
	Overall, the performance metrics do an adequate job of demonstrating the contributions flowing from the agency's work. The accompanying narratives in the performance section, including the highlights section for each goal, are also useful in this regard. The performance metrics would be stronger if the measures were as outcome-oriented as the goals.
<u>1</u>	8. Did the agency link its goals and results to costs?
	The linkage exists only at the strategic goal level (pg.32).
<u>Subtotal: 12</u>	

Score (1-5)	FORWARD-LOOKING LEADERSHIP																			
<u>3</u>	9. Does the report show how the agency’s results will make this country a better place to live?																			
The report’s narratives do a generally good job of describing the benefits that flow from the agency’s work. For example, it includes a section on public benefits for each strategic goal (e.g., pg.73) and provides many examples of specific accomplishments.																				
<u>2</u>	10. Does the agency explain failures to achieve its goals?																			
The report clearly discloses failures to achieve goals both in the introductory portion and in the performance section. However, it does not provide explanations for the performance shortfalls (e.g., pgs.87, 95, 103, 120, 121, 125).																				
<u>3</u>	11. Does the report adequately address major management challenges?																			
The report has an interesting section on “performance challenges” (pgs.45-46). This is followed by the discussion of inspector general-identified major management challenges (pgs.47-48). The presentation of major management challenges is brief and lists only 4 challenges. The limited narratives do give the agency credit for making good progress in two areas, Managing for Results and Human Capital Management. However, USAID has poor scores on the President’s Management Agenda:																				
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">President’s Management Agenda “Status” Scores as of 9/30/05</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Human Capital</th> <th>Competitive Sourcing</th> <th>Financial Management</th> <th>E-Government</th> <th>Budget/perf Integration</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Y</td> <td style="text-align: center;">R</td> <td style="text-align: center;">R</td> <td style="text-align: center;">R (down)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Y</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						President’s Management Agenda “Status” Scores as of 9/30/05					Human Capital	Competitive Sourcing	Financial Management	E-Government	Budget/perf Integration	Y	R	R	R (down)	Y
President’s Management Agenda “Status” Scores as of 9/30/05																				
Human Capital	Competitive Sourcing	Financial Management	E-Government	Budget/perf Integration																
Y	R	R	R (down)	Y																
<u>3</u>	12. Does it describe changes in policies or procedures to do better next year?																			
The report has a number of sections that discuss future challenges facing the agency and how USAID will address them (e.g., pgs.14, 45, 58). These sections, while useful, are largely conceptual. By contrast, the report is weak in explaining specific performance shortfalls and what will be done to improve on them.																				
<u>Subtotal: 11</u>																				