



Using Reports to Assess Progress and Inform Planning



Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Reports Used to Assess Progress.....	2
2.1 IDIS Reports	3
2.2 CAPER/PER	4
2.3 Subrecipient Progress Reports	4
2.4 HMIS Reports	5
3. Appropriate Follow-Up Activities	5

1. Introduction

A wealth of information concerning the implementation of CPD programs is available to grantees on an ongoing basis and regularly collected to comply with reporting requirements. The use of these reports, including those that can be generated through IDIS, the CAPER/PER and information collected from subrecipients, represents a data-driven method to assess progress against the goals articulated in the Consolidated Plan. The purpose of this document is to describe the nature of these reports and how they can be analyzed to assess progress.

Assessing progress against goals is critically important in determining if the programs, projects and activities funded through CPD formula programs—CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA—are effective on the state and local level in addressing needs and achieving objectives. Monitoring progress on a consistent basis provides confidence in good performance, warning of poor performance and may help identify successful practices on which to build or others that should be revised or eliminated. Such monitoring should also give grantees insight into whether or not they are maximizing the impact of their grant-funded investments.

2. Reports Used to Assess Progress



The CAPER/PER provides an annual summary of activities, expenditures and accomplishments. It is intended to give a clear picture of the grantee's achievements over the course of the program year.

The use of reports submitted or generated more frequently, such as IDIS reports, particularly the Con Plan Goals and Accomplishments (Microstrategy) report or subrecipient reports, may permit more real-time assessment of progress. This type of assessment, unlike the annual retrospective offered by the CAPER, may assist grantees in adjusting their program design and possibly reallocating resources to support more effective activities. Grantees should consider the need to maximize the impact of their investments in these activities, rather than continuing to fund minimally effective programs, when considering changes in program design.

Additionally, many grantees require their subrecipients to submit monthly and/or quarterly reports on their progress as well as information on specific activities accompanying their requests for payment. Making the connection between these reporting requirements and assessing progress against goals on a broader scale increases the significance of the required reporting for both the grantee and the subrecipient, encouraging both to submit accurate accomplishment data on a timely basis.

2.1 IDIS Reports

Reports available through the Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) can be generated by the grantee and provide data on program accomplishments in several areas. The usefulness of these reports depends upon the extent to which the grantee has accurately entered accomplishment data. The most productive reports for assessing progress include the following:

IDIS Report	Content	Use in Assessing Progress
Grantee Performance Report (PR 03)	Program and financial info on each funded activity: objectives, outcomes, proposed and actual accomplishments	Determine which activities are most effective in meeting goals; help guide both program and subrecipient selection in subsequent program years (note that both the Weighing the Value of Projects and Activities and Evaluating Subrecipients to Optimize Performance tools can be used in conjunction with this analysis to guide selection)
Summary of Consolidated Plan Projects for Report Year (PR 06)	Shows funds committed and drawn down during the report year compared to planning estimates for each program funded activity	Shows accuracy of estimates and indicates which activities require reevaluation or further analysis prior to establishment of goals (Grantees may use Weighing the Value of Projects and Activities tool to validate the results of this analysis)
Summary of CDBG Accomplishments (PR 23)	Summarizes accomplishments and funds expended by activity group and shows beneficiary information	Indicate effectiveness in addressing goals, by activity category, to serve specific racial or ethnic or particular income groups. Determine which activities are most cost effective and provide the most benefit to specific groups
Performance Measurement Reports (PR 81, 82, 83 85)	For each program, shows accomplishments in context of HUD performance measurement indicators	Indicates progress in meeting goals to extent that local goals align with HUD performance measures
At Risk Activities (PR 59)	Shows CDBG and HOME activities flagged as "at-risk" (no draws in 12 months) and "pending at-risk"	Examine and analyze obstacles to progress. Analysis of underlying issues for at-risk activities may provide guidance regarding activity or partner selection and inform future funding decisions (Weighing the Value of Projects and Activities and Evaluating Subrecipients to Optimize Performance tools may be helpful in confirming results)
Con Plan Goals and Accomplishments Report (Microstrategy)	Summary of recorded accomplishments against program year and strategic plan goals throughout the year	Provides capability to check ongoing progress in meeting goals and objectives

2.2 CAPER/PER

The CAPER or the PER (for state grantees), is submitted annually to HUD by all CPD formula program grantees. It summarizes progress based on specific measures and includes narrative descriptions of accomplishments, and how they relate to stated goals and to needs identified in the Consolidated Plan (see SP-25 Priority Needs). Note that the Con Plan Goals and Accomplishments (Microstrategy) report provides much of the same information on an ongoing basis (see above). This report can be generated throughout the program year and thus be used to continually assess progress against Con Plan goals.

Beyond reporting results and indicating that the funded activities had achieved (or not achieved) the overall goal, the grantee may analyze the CAPER to determine factors that may have contributed to the success or apparent failure of the respective activities. For example, the grantee may examine expected vs. actual accomplishments for the program year and strategic plan to date, such as affordable housing units developed or populations served. In highlighting discrepancies between expected and actual accomplishments, the analysis may help determine links to known obstacles or an absence of data. The grantee may also use the [Evaluating Subrecipients to Optimize Performance tool](#) for this purpose, specifically to determine if lack of subrecipient capacity may have contributed to an inability to achieve goals.

Depending on the results of that analysis, the grantee may determine that there is a way to learn from the success of the subrecipient that achieved greater than the expected number of units or to work around the barriers faced by the less successful subrecipient or that the latter organization should not be funded again.

Each year's CAPER may also be analyzed in comparison to the previous year's version, both with respect to accomplishments overall and, more specifically, the effectiveness of each funded program activity and partner organization. This will provide insight regarding the extent to which the grantee is meeting its goals, funding the right mix of programs and maximizing the impact of its investment.

Program-specific reporting requirements may also yield valuable information for assessing progress against goals. For example, the HOPWA CAPER includes specific accomplishment data, comparing the planned goal with the actual outputs. It also requires activity and beneficiary data and a summary of performance outcomes.

2.3 Subrecipient Progress Reports

These reports describe the activities undertaken and completed by subrecipients during a specified interval (monthly, quarterly), in accordance with their written agreements. Analysis of these reports can assure consistency with the agreements, highlight discrepancies between expected and actual accomplishments, identify obstacles to completion of activities or achievement of goals, and help determine if there have been changes in demand or need for specific programs. Comparison of accomplishment data for similar activities carried out by different subrecipients can help determine which were most effective in implementing programs as well as which achieved cost efficiencies.

2.4 HMIS Reports

Reports generated through the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) provide data on the assistance provided through the range of homeless assistance programs in the community, including provision of emergency shelter and supportive services. Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funded providers are now required to report results in HMIS. Analysis of these reports can help grantees determine whether the need for these services is being met effectively and ensure that there is no duplication of service provision. For example, there may be economies of scale between ESG and CDBG funded providers that would allow the grantee to better maximize its investment.

3. Appropriate Follow-Up Activities



To effectively assess progress against the goals articulated in the Consolidated Plan using the reports listed above:



Reinforce the need for accurate, timely reporting—work with subrecipients that have not been timely and/or accurate in the past and discuss the need for information to demonstrate accomplishments resulting in accurate reporting



Review goals and determine if adjustments are needed—based on progress toward specific goals and the extent to which the available data can support the attainability of existing goals. If none of the goals were achieved, were they unattainable? Conversely, if subrecipients overachieved, were the goals too easily attainable? Do the reports indicate that certain needs may have been adequately addressed by the activity and thus, may not need to be further addressed with future funding?



Determine if additional support for subrecipients is needed to increase understanding of goals and objectives or to improve performance. Do the subrecipients completely understand their role in the achievement of community goals and objectives? Do they have the capacity to carry out the planned activities? (See [Evaluating Subrecipients to Optimize Performance](#) tool)



Compare accomplishments of similar programs and, where differences in performance exist, determine underlying causes and whether there are opportunities for subrecipients to learn from each other regarding program operations or project management. (See both [Weighing the Value of Projects and Activities](#) tool and [Evaluating Subrecipients to Optimize Performance](#) tools.)



Assess changes in demand for programs using first-hand information, from user interviews, surveys and focus groups and use this data to inform funding allocations and program design in order to maximize the impact of investments. (See [Evaluating Subrecipients to Optimize Performance](#) tool, [Using Stakeholder Input in Consolidated Planning](#) tool)

