

Performance Measures Validation

Recommendation

That the June 22, 2018, Office of the City Auditor report CR_6083, be received for information.

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of the Performance Measures Validation

Report

The Way Ahead Final Report 2017 includes current and historical results for each of the 26 corporate outcome measures. It also provides an analysis of the results including an explanation of performance. In previous years, we validated 16 of the 26 corporate outcome measures. This year we validated the remaining 10 corporate outcome measures. They are:

- Measure 2.2 Edmontonians' Assessment: Access to Infrastructure, Amenities and Services that Improve Quality of Life
- Measure 3.2 Journey to Work Mode
- Measure 5.2 Edmontonians' Assessment: Connected to Community
- Measure 6.1 Health and Wellness
- Measure 6.3 City Park Usage
- Measure 7.2 Edmontonians' Assessment: Safe City
- Measure 9.1 Community Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Measure 11.1 Edmonton Economic Diversity Index
- Measure 11.2 Edmonton Small to Medium-sized Businesses
- Measure 12.1 Edmonton Region Gross Domestic Product Growth.

Criteria

The criteria we used to validate each of the measures were as follows:

1. Criteria Relating to Reliability of Performance Measures

- a. Is the measure based on data that can be replicated by an independent observer? Is it reasonably complete and accurate? Is it free from significant omissions?
- b. Is the information obtained from independent sources credible, reliable, and presented consistently with the original source data?
- c. Does the measure result being presented fairly represent the underlying data?

- d. Is there a clear linkage between the data used to calculate the measure and the performance that it claims to represent?

2. Criteria Relating to Understandability of Performance Measures

- a. Is supporting information precise and clearly stated in plain, non-technical language? Does it focus on critical facts and information that enables users to obtain reasonable insights and draw reasonable conclusions?
- b. Does the presentation method (graph, table, etc.) ensure a reasonably informed user would correctly interpret the information?

3. Criteria Relating to Comparability of Performance Measures

- a. At a minimum, are prior period, current results, and current targets presented?
- b. Has time series information (trends) or other appropriate comparators been provided to allow users to assess performance in relation to targets?
- c. Does the comparative data give the user the context as to whether the performance is improving, stable, or deteriorating?
- d. Is the data used to produce the measure prepared in a manner consistent with previous reporting periods?

The scope of our work covered all data and supporting information provided in the Final Report that related to the measures we validated. This included all comparative information in the graphs, and figures contained within the supporting information.

Reliability

Based on our review of the measure for reliability, we suggested changes to the results presented in 6 of the 10 measures we validated. The reasons why we suggested the changes included:

- To ensure there was a clear linkage between the data used to calculate the measure and the performance that it claims to represent (e.g., the original name of a measure did not reflect the data used to calculate the measure).
- To ensure the performance measure owners present information obtained from independent sources consistently with the original data source (e.g., we were unable to agree original results to the results calculated by an independent source).
- To ensure that the results can be replicated (e.g., when we recalculated the results they did not agree with the original results presented because the methodology used was unavailable).
- To ensure results fairly represent the underlying data (e.g., measure results were revised to include all relevant data).

The performance measure owners made all of our suggested changes. We can conclude that the results presented in the Final Report for the 10 measures we validated are reliable.

Understandability

We suggested changes to the supporting information presented in the original draft of the Final Report for 7 of the 10 measures we validated. The changes we suggested related to ensuring:

- The narratives are in non-technical language.
- The statements in the narratives were correct, clear, and not open to interpretation.
- Any additional information provided (i.e., the information provided in the “About Our Result” sections) was correct.
- The graphs and figures allow readers to draw the appropriate conclusion (e.g., the name of the graph represents the performance it measures).

The performance measure owner and Strategic Design staff made all of the changes we suggested. We can conclude that the results presented in the Final Report for the 10 measures we validated are understandable.

Comparability

We suggested changes to 5 of the 10 measures we validated to ensure current year results, prior year results, and targets are comparable. The reasons why we suggested the changes were:

- The wording of the survey questions used to gather data for each measure changed. Therefore, prior period results were not comparable and we suggested removing them from the chart.
- The categories of data used to calculate the additional information changed. Therefore, prior period results were not comparable and we suggested removing them from the chart.

The performance measure owner and Strategic Design staff made all of the changes we suggested. We can conclude that the results presented in the Final Report for the 10 measures we validated are comparable.

Policy

Bylaw 16097, Audit Committee Bylaw, Section 14(d) states that, “Committee will review all reports from the City Auditor dealing with completed audit projects.”

Public Engagement

Public engagement was not required for this report.