Validation of Data Used in Performance Measures – FY 2014

Name of indicator:	**Regulatory staff with RFA expertise**
Name of office/program:	**Office of Advocacy**
Performance goal indicator header (title):	**Regulatory staff with RFA expertise**
Indicator overview/summary. Briefly answer the following four questions:	
1. Why was this indicator chosen?	Best available measure.
2. Relevance of this indicator for measuring program success.	Measure is an indicator of productivity in implementing Advocacy's mandate to provide Regulatory Flexibility Act compliance training to federal regulatory officials (see Executive Order 13272). This training provides to a targeted audience the expertise needed to develop and publish better rules that achieve agencies' regulatory objectives while minimizing unnecessary burdens on small entities. Reduced RFA-related litigation and better compliance by regulated entities also result.
3. Any limitations on relevance to measure program success?	This measure is directly relevant to Advocacy program success, but the training of federal regulatory staff requires the cooperation of other federal agencies in agreeing to such training. Advocacy is required by Executive Order to provide RFA compliance training, but other federal agencies are not required to take it.
4. How is this indicator used or will be used to manage the program?	Measure is used to assess the productivity of the RFA training program.
Is this indicator intended for internal use only?	No
Section I: Indicator definition and relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective, and Priority Goal if any, that the indicator measures.	Strategic Goal: 1 Objective: 1.2
Indicator type: Select the indicator measure as a Contextual, Customer Service, Efficiency, Input, Outcome, Output, Priority Goal or Process (result).	Outcome
Priority Goal indicator category.	N/A
Actual direction.	Decrease from FY 2011 to FY 2012, though well above nominal goal in both years, the last for which full-year data was available for reporting in the FY 2014 Congressional Budget Justification, which includes the Annual Performance Report for FY 2012.
Unit of Measurement: Indicate unit in dollar, number or percentage and indicate what you are measuring.	The unit of measure is the number of those receiving RFA compliance training, usually at a 3.5 hour live training session conducted by Advocacy attorneys and economists.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measures – FY 2014

Origination Date: (MM-DD-YYYY) (As applicable)	N/A
End Date: (MM-DD-YYYY) (As applicable)	N/A
Calculation Method: Explanation of how the measure is calculated.	Each person receiving Advocacy-conducted RFA training is counted towards Advocacy's annual goal.
Timeliness: Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting	Data on the number of those receiving RFA compliance training are available immediately in real time, and formal reports to management are done quarterly.
Section II: Data quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: • Identify how the data record is captured. • What is the data source?	• The number of those receiving Advocacy-conducted RFA training is captured in an internal database immediately after training. • Those completing RFA compliance training by Advocacy are counted at the conclusion of the training session.
Identify the frequency of data capture:	The data are captured at the conclusion of each training session. They are also presented in a quarterly report to Advocacy management.
Describe any limitations to accuracy, measuring program success, or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.). Include OIG/GAO findings.	No limitations to accuracy, measurement or completeness. No OIG or GAO findings pending in FY 2014.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data. Provide Internal Control, OIG/GAO recommendations.	N/A. No OIG or GAO recommendations pending in FY 2014.
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, then: (1) describe any changes affecting data quality, and (2) identify any changes that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No changes have occurred affecting data quality or comparability with prior years' data.
Data Quality Assessment: HIGH – No known weaknesses and accurately represents the results of the program. MEDIUM – Some risks or weaknesses exist but the data is of sufficient quality to manage the program. LOW – Shows significant weakness and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated as "low" will not be used for reporting.	High

Certification

I hereby certify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data supplied above is accurate and reliable. I also confirm the data/targets being reported for SBA's Congressional Budget Submission.

/s/ Claudia Rodgers, Deputy Chief Counsel for Advocacy