

**Author Full Name :** Erica McFadden**Received Date :** 08/11/2021 04:58 PM**Comments Received :**

Historically, our Council has run into the issue of supporting data changes requested by ACL after our contracts are already in place, making it difficult to track all of the data required for the PPR process. Many of the performance measures requested are vague and duplicative. It is unclear when we turn in numbers, what they are used for. The measures may not be interpreted the same way by everyone, so they may not be reliable. Even among our staff there are different interpretations, and we have the guidance docs and the training.

The largest ambiguities lie in determining output and outcome measures.

For example, regarding policies, why report SC 2.1.1, when that's already reported in SC 1.1 and SC 1.2. e.g., change and improvement in a policy are synonymous? Why not have them more clearly differentiated?

Supporting a promising or best practice is also very much the same as implementing it. SC 2.1.4 is very much the same as SC 1.3.4.

It may help if the Councils better understood how this data was being used, or if it's being used. If it's not being used, then the PPR needs to be more streamlined and less redundant for all concerned. For our state, the level of detail that is being asked by the PPR regarding the output/outcomes measures is unnecessary and does not truly get to the heart of what we have accomplished. If numbers are needed to compare year to year, keep the more aggregate measures or simplify what's being reported so we can also use these numbers for our annual reports. For example, the following can be used: SC 1.1 and SC 1.2 can be collapsed, SC 1.5, SC 1.3.1 & SC 1.3.3 can be collapsed; SC 1.3.2 & SC 1.3.4 can be collapsed; SC 1.4; SC 1.5; SC 2.1 but only apply it to improved promising/best practices; SC 2.1.2, SC 2.2. Eliminate the rest.

There is also a lot of duplication in the narrative. We have to write a summary in the Intro, then again in the progress report for each objective while including performance measures in that write up, include in that same section progress towards outcomes, which is already included in the progress report write up, and then again an overview in each Goal summary. The Goal section may only be needed if it needs to be amended or if the objectives aren't moving the Council to achieving its Goal.

Also, we are not clear what the strategies section is used for and why that's needed when those activities are already reported in the narrative.

The measures of collaboration are also duplicative and covered under the Progress Report section.

Regarding the demographic info collected, that is always spotty for us. Many grantees have a difficult time capturing this info, as participants just do not fill it out.

The reporting needs to be streamlined. We have multiple staff spending more than a month pulling together all of the info that is requested.

A lot of us find ourselves copying and pasting, which I'm sure our project officers don't love to read. If every council has to submit a 300 page report each year - there is something very wrong with the reporting process. The whole process needs to be re-examined so it's more concise, more effective and useful, and less confusing.