



PART Evidence

An OMB Perspective

Brian Kleinman
Office of Management and Budget
Program Examiner

June 15, 2007
Environmental Evaluator's Networking Forum

PART Evidence (2007 Guidance)

- “Responses must be evidence-based and not rely on impressions or generalities.” (p. 1)
- “The PART holds programs to high standards. Compliance with the letter of the law is not enough. A program must satisfy all the requirements of a question to earn a *Yes*... The PART requires a high level of evidence to justify a *Yes* response, and credit for a question cannot be given without evidence. That evidence should **address every element of the question, be credible, and current (i.e., from the last five years).**” (p. 13)

PART Evidence (2007 Guidance)

- **“Evidence.** Evidence cited in the PART should generally be from the last five years.

In addition, the description of evidence should provide information on both the source and basis for the judgment used to determine the answer. Discussion of evidence should summarize the content of the evidence and provide a context for the explanation (e.g., evidence provided for the performance measurement questions must compare actual performance to baseline performance).” (p. 14)

PART Evidence (Examiner Experience)

■ Early PART evidence

- Boxes and boxes of hard copy documents with General citations (i.e. The Report on X)
- Unrealistic Agency Drafts given limited evidence provided (i.e. “YES” to every question)

■ 2007 PART evidence

- Primarily electronic documents; some with more specific citations (i.e. Section 2.A.1 of Report X)
- More Realistic Agency Drafts given “better” evidence (i.e. “NO” to some answers)

PART Evidence – The Ideal

- Concise
- Realistic
- Clearly supports question/sub-question answers
- Credible, high quality
 - Can vary depending on the question
- Timely